

police. The lack of critical attention to the ideas about morality that some undocumented immigrants held feels like a missed opportunity.

Notwithstanding these critical observations, this book makes an important contribution to the fields of sociology, legal studies, political science, and Latino and ethnic studies, and I highly recommend it for political science courses both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The wide-ranging methodologies deployed will surely inspire graduate students; Asad provides an exceptional example of how to incorporate in-depth interviews within a book in ways that maintain the dignity and integrity of the participants. The book is accessible, well structured, and theoretically rich.

Response to Yalidy Matos's Review of *Engage and Evade: How Latino Immigrant Families Manage Surveillance in Everyday Life*

doi:10.1017/S1537592724000756

— Asad L. Asad 

I appreciate Dr. Yalidy Matos's review of *Engage and Evade*. One of the synergies between our books is our shared interest in how ordinary people make sense of their place in society—and in the consequences that various attitudes and behaviors can play in reproducing inequality. Still, we study this dynamic differently: Matos by foregrounding white Americans' expressed opinions on immigration politics, and me by foregrounding how undocumented Latino immigrants with young children perceive and respond to the institutional forms of surveillance they endure every day (with an eye toward the impact such action has on their membership). Some of these differences are reflected in Matos's comments on *Engage and Evade*.

First, Matos asks whether using the phrase “selective engagement”—rather than mobilizing “engagement” and “evasion” as contrasting terms—better describes undocumented immigrants' interactions with institutions that surveil them. I heartily agree and strived to develop my theoretical framework to make this same point about existing research. As I noted, undocumented immigrants exhibit a “*selective engagement* with the institutions that surveil [them], sometimes interacting with them and sometimes avoiding them depending on the type of institutional surveillance encountered and the social roles and responsibilities most salient in an encounter” (20; emphasis in original). This is why, in describing how undocumented immigrants make a life in the United States, I conceptualize engagement and evasion as “two sides of the same coin.”

Second, Matos encourages greater consideration of the complexity of Latinidad. In particular, she asks

whether a more intersectional analysis of undocumented Latino immigrants' race, sexuality, or both would have altered the book's interpretations and conclusions. Unfortunately, such heterogeneity was not present among my interview respondents. They used “Latino” as both their ethnic and racial category; no one in the study identified as Black or Afro-Latino or Indigenous. No one I interviewed identified as queer either; in part, this reflected the conditions under which study recruitment took place. As outlined in the book's methodological appendix, the study recruited interviewees based on the presence of children between the ages of three and eight in the household. Recruitment began in 2013, two years before the Supreme Court struck down the Defense of Marriage Act and expanded the immigration system's consideration of “family” to encompass non-heteronormative families. I cannot say for sure, but I speculate that undocumented Latino immigrants who are Black or members of a sexual minority with young children would experience the dynamics I outline even more acutely—especially with respect to street-level bureaucrats' racialized, classed, and fundamentally heteronormative perceptions of undocumented immigrants' morality and caregiving. Future work would certainly benefit from exploring these intracategorical comparisons based on undocumented Latino immigrants' race, sexuality, or both.

Finally, Matos questions whether the book would have benefited from greater problematization of undocumented immigrants' perceptions of morality. I regularly describe in the book my own discomfort about some of my respondents' moral claims, including when discussing Ricardo, a respondent whom Matos mentions. As I saw it, Ricardo's moral criticisms “reproduced some of the same stereotypes that politicians, immigration officials, and the media use to justify greater restrictions on [undocumented immigrants'] lives” (78). And in the conclusions to chapters 2 and 3, I show how my respondents' perceptions of morality emerged *in and through interaction* with street-level bureaucrats, who regulate undocumented immigrants' access to material and symbolic resources. Undocumented immigrants' perceptions of morality in the study, therefore, reflect their beliefs about these bureaucrats' expectations of immigrants. Ultimately, as elaborated in chapter 4 and in the book's standalone conclusion, undocumented immigrants' efforts to meet these perceived expectations rarely shield them from deportation or facilitate their legalization.

Overall, whether from the perspective of relatively empowered white Americans (as in Matos's book) or relatively disempowered undocumented Latino immigrants (as in *Engage and Evade*), I take away from this dialogue the importance of attending to how ordinary

groups of people at particular social positions, and in defined social contexts, perceive and respond to state power in dynamic ways.

Moral and Immoral Whiteness in Immigration Politics.

By Yalidy Matos. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. 256p. \$99.00 cloth, \$29.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592724000744

— Asad L. Asad , Stanford University
asadasad@stanford.edu

Yalidy Matos's *Moral and Immoral Whiteness in Immigration Politics* is a timely and detailed examination of how white Americans' investment in whiteness informs their expressed opinions about immigration politics in the United States. By whiteness, Matos does not refer simply to racial classification. Instead, she draws on a rich interdisciplinary literature—spanning political science, sociology, and critical race studies—to define whiteness as a social role that “comes with a set of norms, beliefs, values, and behaviors that mean white people are part of the group of other whites who choose to *do* whiteness” (16; emphasis in original). The key “choice” that white Americans have is whether “to produce and reproduce a system structured on white supremacy...or to repudiate it” (1). Altogether, Matos builds a convincing argument that whiteness, and not simply racial identification as White, has long undergirded many aspects of US society, including white Americans' opinions about what immigration and immigration enforcement should look like.

To develop this argument, Matos marshals an impressive range of secondary survey datasets, with one chapter also making use of congressional roll-call vote data. The secondary datasets include the American National Election Studies (run quadrennially between 2000 and 2016), the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (2018), and the Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (2020). These data will be familiar to social scientists of immigration because they are used widely in existing research. Matos's innovation is to leverage familiar data to ask new research questions about whiteness that may be unfamiliar to some in political science and adjacent fields: “Under what conditions do whites choose to lean toward reproducing whiteness and/or repudiating it, and what role do predispositions play in the moral choices whites make about immigration” (1)? Although the sheer number of results presented throughout the book can sometimes overwhelm the reader, what is admirable is Matos's command of her datasets and her attention to detail. I tried to distill the most salient of these results here.

The book consists of five main chapters. In chapter 1, Matos builds her novel theoretical framework to reveal an undeniable link between whiteness and immigration politics. She makes three claims. First, she argues that

whiteness structures immigration attitudes by framing white Americans' perceptions of their prized position atop the US racial hierarchy and by maintaining their institutional privileges (27). Second, she claims that immigration attitudes are moral choices about the responsibilities we have to others and therefore demand a politics of accountability (28). Third, she contends that various political and psychological predispositions give meaning to the moral foundations undergirding immigration attitudes, a reflection of socialization into whiteness (28).

Chapter 2 establishes a descriptive link between whiteness, immigration attitudes, and these predispositions. Matos begins by outlining a five-part measure of white Americans' social identity (66–68): self-identification as white; how important being white is to one's identity; ethnocentrism, or a preference for the ingroup relative to an outgroup; group consciousness, or the importance of working together to change laws that white Americans perceive to be unfair to their group; and racial privilege, or white Americans' belief that they enjoy certain advantages because of the color of their skin. Using secondary datasets, she shows that white Americans who believe their race is important to their identity, who are more ethnocentric, who have greater group consciousness, and who are unaware of their racial privilege are the most likely to express anti-immigrant beliefs and oppose pro-immigrant policies. Matos also shows that whiteness and white Americans' associated beliefs largely reflect five predispositions (59–64): moral traditionalism (i.e., a belief in “traditional” or “normative” family and social organization), authoritarianism (i.e., a belief in absolute submission to authority figures and punishment for deviation from this belief), racial resentment (i.e., anti-Black sentiment masquerading as colorblindness), egalitarianism (i.e., belief in the equality of opportunity for all people), and partisanship (i.e., affiliation with a political party).

Chapter 3 shows how whiteness is associated with white Americans' immigration policy preferences. Using the predispositions outlined earlier, Matos examines their relationship to white Americans' support for various restrictive immigration policies, including allowing police checks of legal status, decreasing immigration levels, increasing border security spending, building a border wall, and rescinding birthright citizenship for the US-born children of undocumented immigrants. Between 2000 and 2020, the correlation between whiteness—especially among those with high levels of ethnocentrism and group consciousness—and white Americans' preferences for punitive immigration policies increases. The predisposition that consistently predicts white Americans' policy preferences is moral traditionalism, or a preference for maintaining the status quo—and therefore leaving unchanged the social-structural advantages afforded to white people relative to non-white and