

1. Hernández's central claim revolves around the existence of a "Latino racial innocence" cloak that, she argues, veils Latino complicity in US racism and thus undermines the ability to fully address the interwoven complexities of nationwide anti-Black prejudice. In what other spaces and identity groups do you believe the theory of the cloak of racial innocence can be applied? What makes this term particularly effective, and, in your opinion, how can a community remove this "cloak"?
2. What does the ethno-racial term "Afro-Latino" reveal about the complexities of identity and identity-based oppression? What was your understanding of the difference between race and ethnicity before reading this book, and how are the experiences of those at the intersection of minoritized ethnicities *and* races markedly different from the experiences of those who identify firmly as one or the other?
3. On page 7, Hernández makes the claim that "the unequal treatment of Afro-Latinos is invisible in our public discourse with its reference to all Latinos regardless of appearance as 'brown.'" Where else throughout history or in the modern day, in the United States or in other countries, have colloquially accepted racial markers failed to capture the complexities of intergroup identities. What can be done to remedy the shortcomings of this language?

4. Hernández notes that “the Latino bias against Afro-Latinos is dismissed as merely a part of the hierarchies internal to Latino communities that is not like ‘real racism’” (9). In your definition, what is “real racism”? What purpose does it serve to differentiate interethnic racism from “real” racism, and how does Hernández expand or complicate the definition of “real racism” in this context?
5. Throughout this book, Hernández references legal cases to “help illuminate the contours of Latino anti-Blackness” (10). What do you see as the value of placing the law at the center of this text? How does a focus on law specifically inform your perspective on the issue at hand?
6. What makes the home a particularly influential site for harmful idea formation, and how can the cloak of racial innocence be discarded in this setting? What normalized but damaging sayings were you introduced to at home or by family that have gone unchallenged?
7. Hernández makes a note about intentionally using the term “Latino” as opposed to Latina/o, Latinx, or Latin@. Reflect on Hernández’s careful word choices throughout the book. How does Hernández’s argument here shift or inform your perspective on other recent attempts to reappropriate or revise terminology in the pursuit of more inclusive

language (e.g., “womxn,” “queer”). Who are these terms serving? Who do these terms leave out? Who originates them?

8. Hernández points out a number of cases wherein individuals were offered compensation for emotional distress. In what nonfinancial ways might we reimagine a redress of discriminatory harm? What is the effect of monetary reparations, and what are its limitations and advantages?
9. Hernández makes the case that “when confronted with accounts of discrimination, people often respond with expressions of hope that education and the progression of time will effectuate social change” (45). Reflect on passive attitudes toward change. Where have you seen these attitudes promoted in your own life? In media? Why is “time” not enough, and what are effective steps that can, extending beyond good intentions, deconstruct the hierarchies that play a crucial role in US racism?
10. Hernández organizes this book around playing and learning spaces, the workplace, housing issues, and physical violence. Why are these particular spaces and occurrences particularly salient in Hernández’s argument? What other spaces might offer new insight?

11. On page 59, Hernández introduces the story of José Arrocha whose assigned judge made the comment that “*diversity* in an employer’s staff undercuts an inference of discriminatory intent” (60). What does this example reveal about workplace “diversity,” and how does this book challenge or expand traditional definitions of diversity that don’t take into account all facets of identity? How has the focus on diversity changed in recent history, and how does it still leave room for preferential or discriminatory treatment? How does the language of diversity often operate as a veil around possible racial discrimination?
12. Hernández states that “[i]ntersectional discrimination occurs when multiple sources of bias (such as race and gender) converge for a person as a single experience of discrimination with interactive stereotypes” (62). Where in this book do you see clear examples of intersectional discrimination? How might gender, immigration status, nationality, sexuality, socioeconomic class, or other factors play a role in the narratives in this book?
13. Hernández makes the claim that “[w]hen Latinos are segregated out of White non-Hispanic spaces and fighting for status in limited ‘colored’ spaces, turf defense explodes into interethnic violence” (113). Where else has a fear of replacement or “turf defense” been present in US history?

Reflect on the act of excluding others as a device to erect and sustain racial hierarchy.

14. The author defines Latinidad as a color-blind vision of a panethnic Latino community (121). Why might a vision of panethnicity be appealing to minority and/or diasporic communities, and how is the vision behind Latinidad crucial in the development of the racial innocence cloak?
15. On page 129, the author goes into depth about shifts in Latino disassociation from Blackness on census forms. What do the fluctuations in Latino census responses signify about the fluidity of racial self-identification? What do they reveal about the forces behind identity formation?
16. Why do you think Hernández chose to craft her argument around individual narratives of discrimination? What effect does this method of storytelling have on your understanding of her central argument?