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Abstract

This dissertation examines the origin, evolution, facility, and effectiveness of Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory to eradicate racism in the United States during the last decade, 2000 - 2010. During the founding of the country, a sense of civic responsibility, and moralized manifest destiny sanctioned land conquest and enslavement of Africans for the achievement of personal gain. Society justified subjugating Africans into chattel slavery, considering color and cultural difference as confirmation and rationale to discriminate. Today, the U.S. Constitution prohibits discrimination and society at-large disapproves racist acts and behavior. Nonetheless, racist incidents continue. While undeniably, the issue of race in America is still a serious concern, many suggest civil rights and affirmative action redresses divide society, advancing one group, over others. Today, as civil rights, and affirmative action recipients, African Americans make up a significant number of the middle class, whereas whites, in contrast, comprise a considerable number of a middle class that is shrinking, from an economic recession, caused in part by globalization and the country’s transformation from industry to service. Conversely, the black underclass increases, as a result, of loss of unskilled work sent to overseas countries paying lower salaries, deficient labor laws, and environmental protections. Obfuscating the dialectical relationship existing between race and class, special interest groups incite and infuse racist rhetoric, to augment their own self-serving interest. Consequently, race baiting occurs to keep racism alive, preventing empowerment of a unified bi-racial group’s capacity to pressure political leaders to address the needs of the working and middle classes, over the interest of the wealthy. It is in this way that the capacities of anti-racist systems to eradicate racism are negated.
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**Introduction**

From its inception, the United States has embodied a culture that embraced countless races and ethnicities, while at the same time openly discriminated against others. During the 1800s when the country needed a large source of workers to fill the jobs created by industrialization, America welcomed the multitudes of immigrants seeking a better life in the new world. It was in this way that the newly arriving immigrant populations displaced the former workforce of African slaves. Occurring mainly because racial differences in the U.S. during the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries represented a subjugation of those exhibiting any semblance of African heritage to a lifetime of inferior status, whereas other groups, i.e., Italians, Poles, Germans etc. experienced discrimination to a lesser degree than Africans did.\textsuperscript{1} Whiteness scholars asserted this occurred because of the dominant group’s variation with blacks in terms of color, hair texture and physical features, and, because of the aggrandizement of the

---


\textsuperscript{2} Many immigrant groups although not enslaved experienced racial and ethnic discrimination, i.e. Irish, Chinese and others. In time, the groups eluded the essence of bias as society accepted them into the collective of white status. For more information see: Allen, Theodore W., The Invention of the White Race: The Origin of Racial Oppression in Anglo-America. London & New York: Verso Publishing, 1997. P 5-6
assortment of non-African, Europeans and others into the establishment and creation of
the status of whiteness.”

To fulfill the country’s need for a cheap source of workers, the country allowed
slavery, all while proclaiming in the U.S. Constitution that “All men are created equal.”
The duplicity of the founding fathers set the stage for the country’s uncharacteristic
importance given to race, and the irrelevance towards forging racial harmony. Culture,
not easily changed, American society accepted and administered slavery, segregation
and racism, as a condition of legalized sanctioning. It was in enacting, the 1896 Plessey
v. Ferguson ruling, the court, in essence, sought the termination of impartiality “anti-
racist legislation coming from Reconstruction, [the Supreme Court] help[ed] speed and
consolidate the affirmative institutionalizing and legalizing of a racist society.”

In was in

---

3 As mentioned previously, and for more information on the immigrant treatment see: Allen, Theodore W.,

In addition, the situation for those of Asian ancestry evolved much slower, as the country granted
citizenship to only whites, and three major court cases, Ah Yup v. State of California, Ozawa v. United
States and the Thind v. U.S. Supreme Court cases. In the Ozawa case, the Court applied both the
common knowledge theory involving societal recognition of whiteness as well as scientific evidence
concluding that Ozawa of Japanese heredity, and the Japanese people were not white. In all three
cases, the courts denied citizenship and white status to those of Asian ancestry, ultimately challenging
their admittance into the guild of whiteness.

---

4 See the U.S. document, the Declaration of Independence

5 Aptheker, Herbert, Racism, Imperialism, & Peace, eds. Berlowitz, Marvin J., and Carol

this way, uncontested racism established a solid foundation in American society; and as a by-product of the social construction of race, racism in the United States emerged, and in opposition to racism, anti-discriminatory practices surfaced. This dissertation rests upon several themes and argues that Whiteness theory is an ancillary of Anti-racism; that identity politics embedded within Whiteness theory do not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade, as a result, Anti-racism and Whiteness theories’ attempts to eradicate racism are futile.

Thus, the Quaker movement launched the first major attempt to employ antiracist intervention against racism—demonstrated in slavery. Winthrop Jordan wrote,

… that for the Quakers it was part of the mandates of their denomination that they not only preach justice but they speak as social activists to undermine injustice wherever it would be found: [the Quakers] underwent years of persecution partly for doctrinal heresy and partly for their stubborn persistence in pushing the religious principle of equality into areas which nearly everyone else regarded as of purely temporal concern.6

Afterwards, landmark legislation from the 1954 Brown decision, with the desegregation of public education, and the 1963 Civil Rights Movement initiated, fought and won legal ground against institutionalized racism in housing, hiring, and firing, advancing antiracist’ objectives. In his book Anti-Racism, Alastair Bonnet provided an

6 Ibid P 92
illustration of what antiracism represented and entailed “A minimal definition of anti-racism is that it refers to those forms of thought and/or practice that seek to confront, eradicate and/or ameliorate racism.”7 Today, Anti-racism activism engages the eradication of both personal and institutionalized manifestations of racist actions and behavior. Further, anti-racism entailed educational practices to re-educate society and to seek out racism embedded within established practices. Barry Tryona suggested that the most salient feature imbued in anti-racism education was in its ability to provide a forum for undermining racist’ practices. Troyna considered anti-racism a virile means to confronting the duplicity of racism’s multi-layered constitution. Troyna wrote:

The starting point of Anti-Racist Education is a recognition of the significance of power relations associated with ‘race’, sex and class [its] rationale, that there must be exposed and challenged in a programmatic strategy of education.8

As an additional anti-bias model, Whiteness theory evolved as a practice to abolish the benefit, privilege and status bestowed on white people to ensure the domination of the white race, and the suppression of all others. Whiteness theory suggested that in


constructing whiteness the dominant group—whites, ensured self-hegemony to whites only. Wise inferred the creation of the white race, “...emerged as a term of concept to describe Europeans as a group in the late 1600s.”\textsuperscript{9} Consequently, the construction of the white race occurred as a rationale to establish a system of class and racial division primarily to support the economic position of the wealthy. Thus, the existence of the white race occurred, because of, “…the systematic extension of a privileged status by the ruling class,”\textsuperscript{10} to only the working class peoples of European descent. Moreover, capitalist slave owners used the domination they had over blacks in slave labor, together with the exploitation of poor whites, to construct whiteness as a method to subdue and control both groups. Allen contended that a major stimulus behind the formation of a white race involved a plot to dissolve white and black working class unity, by creating a class and racial divide that would ensure the domination of the slavocracy. Thus, Whiteness theorists contended that whiteness developed for the purpose of generating a, “system of racism,”\textsuperscript{11} by dominant whites to safeguard their political, social and economic worth. More importantly, Gallagher suggested, that whites today are oblivious as to the occurrences that have supported white identity, status and domination.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid P 188  
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid P 5-6  
Whites of this generation have no knowledge of the disciplined, systematic, and collective group activity that has structured white identities in American society.\textsuperscript{12}

Further, this dissertation argues that Whiteness theory is an ancillary of Anti-racism; that identity politics embedded within whiteness theory do not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade, as a result, Anti-racism and Whiteness theories’ attempts to eradicate racism are futile. Katz conceptualized “racial identity,”\textsuperscript{13} affected the way in which the individual responded to the world in which he was a part of. As such, identity was affected directly by how society constructed a position for others, as well as the way in which the individual then intercepted and was responsive to his or her surroundings. Barlow contended that within the paradigm of otherness, “The act of defining a people as “different” also defined other people as non-ethnic, or “normal” and privileged.”\textsuperscript{14} Weber inferred that “…how a person is treated does not depend so much


upon what he is as upon the manner in which he is defined,” suggesting that identity on the part of individuals shared a direct connection with the view society held for that individual.

On the other hand, the status of black identity evolved in relation to their consequence of arriving and living under a social construct of the black race as inferior. Further, the discourse involving the state of black identity was grounded in slavery, whereas, black identity originated from a status of chattel—property. Myrdal reminded, “When slavery disappeared, caste remained.” Consequently, black identity from the beginning suffered as a direct result of slavery, *Jim Crow* and racism.

Today, escalating through a history of racism, and a *United States Constitution* professing an egalitarian system of meritocracy the country remains embroiled in a racialized debate as to whether racism is still a prevalent factor in society, hindering the life chances of certain groups, to a greater degree than what others’ experience.

During the 60s, President Johnson initiated *Executive Order No. 11,365* creating the *National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, because of the racial unrests that devastated much of the country. Rioting perpetrated by angry black communities devastated many of the country’s largest cities. The riots occurred as the black community distraught with its second-class citizenship, exhibited in lower wages, and

---


The assassination of Dr. King rioted for racial equality.\textsuperscript{17} In response, Johnson’s commission found that a major cause for the disorder stemmed from the social, political and economic residual, obscuring a history of slavery, \textit{Black Codes}, and \textit{Jim Crow} segregation. Moreover, the committee’s findings concluded that: the segregation of society, into identifiable black, white enclaves, was disheartening in that American society was still then decidedly, separate, and unequal, and that continuation on the current course far from irreparable, was unfortunately still valid today [1960s period]. However, the racial segregation, which the \textit{Kerner Commission} reported, exists today, but stems from factors other than race. Today, the partitioning existing in America is more indicative of class differences. Class determines how and where individuals live, what schools they attend, and what work they are, as a condition of educational achievement, capable of obtaining. In the past, society explained segregation as a factor decided by, and attributed to racial difference; today racially segregated societies exemplify class difference, in which not all members compose the same racial group. Today, a considerable number of blacks compose the middle class, while the middle class itself is in decline. Thus, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory as mechanisms to eradicate racism fail to address the significance of class; rather both models focus solely on racial matters as incentive to transform society, neglecting the dialectical relationship, which exist between race and class.

\textsuperscript{17} For more information see: The Civil Rights Movement
and peoples of color—Hindu-Indians, Asians, Hispanics and blacks. In the past, regardless of educational background, black doctors, lawyers, teachers, undertakers, and postal workers all lived in the same urban neighborhoods with all other blacks. Today, because of civil rights and affirmative action rulings, society is less concerned by racial difference, and as a result, African American professionals, and their children progress. Along with landmark civil rights legislation in the 60s’ allowing equal hiring, and access to better housing, blacks joined the ranks of the middle class. William Julius Wilson contended that major influences in generating the success of the black middle class originated with the positive climate after post-Title VII regarding, …economic and political systems…”18 consenting to …talented blacks to fill positions of prestige and influence.”19 As a result, again, the significance of the dialectical relationship between race and class was obscured. As Wilson suggested, the importance of class, in terms of racial development outweighed the significance of race, only as a result of the country’s remedying of former bias practices, “…for the first time in American history class issues can meaningfully compete with race issues in the way blacks develop or maintain a sense of group position.”20 As such, in Anti-racism and Whiteness Theories’ failure to address the significance of the current rise of the black middle class as foundational to the dialectical relationship existing between race and class accounts for failure on the part of both practices toward the eradication of racism.


19 Ibid P 22

20 Ibid P 22
However, where affluent blacks continue to experience economic growth, the situation for urban blacks was different. Urban black populations were not as fortunate as the talented benefactors of affirmative action were. Lack of access to educational opportunities, lack of work in the inner city caused by the migration of working class and professional blacks, whites, and poor whites to suburban areas, and the relocation of businesses, left inner-city blacks out of work and out of hope. Wilson suggested that for urban blacks, a history of slavery, Jim Crow segregation, and racism all served to initiate their state of impoverishment, and “…created a huge black underclass.”

However, more importantly, their status, unlike that of their middle class counterparts, depended upon access to unskilled work for survival, of which, as Wilson concluded, “…technological and economic revolutions have combined to ensure it a permanent status.” In consequence, in comparison to middle class blacks, the situation for urban blacks appeared different, as the issue of race and class appeared constant—urban blacks were underprivileged, therefore no conflict between race and class appeared to exist. However, considering the factual reasons for the urban black dwellers conditions, the situation becomes more palatable. For instance, although federal enactment of affirmative action policies served to purge forms of institutionalized racism, it had another unintended consequence, it elevated to middle class, talented black recipients’, whereas, it had an alternate effect on the members of the inner city. Unable to compete in post-secondary education, as first-generation college dwellers, black ghetto dwellers experienced a form of socialized and educational ostracism from colleges and

21 Ibid P 22

22 Ibid P 22
universities unprepared to address the needs of such students. As such, black students failed and dropped out in record numbers. Ultimately, instead of propelling African Americans to an equal status with other citizens, affirmative action policies “…contributing[ed] to the growing economic class divisions with the black community.”

Thus, for the rising black underclass the correlation between race and class were positive, in that urban blacks, in terms of race, experienced the same socio-economic status, i.e. class as blacks’ pre-civil rights and affirmative action eras.” Therefore, for Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to eradicate racism, it was, and is necessary to challenge the actual causes for racial division, rather than rely simply on anti-discriminatory rhetoric. Rather than assert redundant pre-Title VII, affirmative action, anti-discriminatory incantations to do away with racism, this dissertation argues that Anti-racism and Whiteness theory should incorporate the dialectical relationship of race and class, and the current economic, social and political conditions, into its discourse to eradicate racism. Obscuring such central issues deters anti-discriminatory practices from completing their principal objective. Further, in focusing solely on problems endemic to one race, the amalgamation of all racial groups is inhibited. Thus, in

23 Ibid P 19

24 See Besharov, Douglas, Evidence and Explanation of the Economic Stagnation of the Black Middle Class, (Relative to Whites), Besharov argues that even though the college dropout rates for blacks has actually risen since the 1980s, the graduation rate for blacks has also risen since the 1980s, accounting for the emergence of a rising black middle class. Besharov cites as foundational to the growth of the black underclass, the following statistics: “Since 1971, white college dropout rate, decreased from 50 percent to about 47 percent in 2003. The Hispanic dropout rate has remained somewhat constant around 66 percent. The black dropout rate has increased from about 63 percent in 1971 to about 64 percent in 1980 and then 67 percent in 2003.” In addition, Besharov cites as well fundamental to the growth of the black underclass as, “the main proximate cause of the lack of economic progress among African-Americans is the continuing difference in educational attainment between whites and blacks.
addressing the complexity of the dialectical relationship between race and class, the climate is ripe for bi-racial alliances to form.

It is important to consider, society constructed race as a means to classify groups, attributing status to certain racially defined groups over others. Society used physical differences, such as, skin color, hair texture, and eye and nose shape, to award social standing to various ethnic groups. As a result, those groups exhibiting physical characteristics the most distinct from the dominant group inherited lower ranking; conversely those society viewed as similar, society elevated, to a higher social standing. As a result, races in the latter group had easier access to work, better living conditions, social access and political support; whereas others, because of lower standing, received limited social mobility. It was in this way society's social construction of race symbolized society's unbridled capacity for domination. Thus, Chapter I argues that the consequences of society's construction of race and ethnicity generated the development of racism, and the necessity for anti-discriminatory processes.

The next three chapters examine the origin, development and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory within the last decade. As an anti-bias procedure, Anti-racism involved all forms of deracialized verbal, physical actions, and processes meant to dissolve racism. As Anti-racism was not considered simply the anti-thesis to racism, it implied a fundamental power approach engaging racism, wherever racist behavior transpired. In addition, through landmark, civil rights decisions, Anti-racism became a dynamic factor in contesting all forms of racist action. Today, Anti-racism incurs serious challenges because of the intersection of race and class. Specifically within the last
decade, the ranks of the middle and upper class are composed of members of both racial groups, demonstrating the significance of the dialectics between race and class. Thus, the current status of class differences continues to segregate members of society; however the ranks of the marginalized are no longer solely composed of blacks. Thus, this dissertation argues that the existence of identity politics within Anti-racism and Whiteness theory do not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade, and that in both paradigms failure to augment the dialectical relationship of race and class into their strategy for eradicating racism accounts for their inability to be successful.

As Whiteness evolved because of collective European white immigrants, and as a method to access sources of power, privilege, and status for the now newly formed dominant group, the next chapters examine the social and political development of Whiteness theory. As a way to ensure class status, the wealthy established voting rights, access to work and the right to own property to white immigrants only, ensuring loyalty to the white race. As a result, Whiteness theory suggested that the privilege, rank, status and benefit of whiteness developed. Specifically, Chapter II, and III argue that the identity politics embedded within Whiteness theory do not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade; as such, attempts to eradicate racism are futile.

As the foremost anti-discrimination activists suggested, prejudice and bigotry still active today warranted committed activism and failed in specifying which of the various
anti-bias practices to employ. As anti-discriminatory practices, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory emerged claiming to comprise the best practices to eradicating a history of racism. Both models professed to provide a more inclusive, and egalitarian society. Proponents of Anti-racism contended that adherence to anti-discriminatory practices, such as introducing society to diversity education, and the historical evolution of racism, ensured the eradication of racism. Advocates of Whiteness theory insisted that the abolishment of the status of whiteness, and the privilege, and benefit that whiteness established for white people, guaranteed the termination of white privilege, and ultimately the end of racism. Thus, Chapter IV contends that Whiteness theory is a component of Anti-racism and is therefore redundant. Specifically, that Anti-racism and Whiteness theory are incongruous with the dialectical relationship between race, class and identity politics. Further, that Anti-racism and Whiteness studies function theoretically, rather than as actual programs, which accounts for the discontinuity of Anti-racism and Whiteness studies to eradicate racism.

Chapter V argues that the identity politics embedded within both theories do not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade, as a result Anti-racism and Whiteness theories’ attempts to eradicate racism are futile. Thus, within the chapter, an examination of the demographic trends over the last decade occurs. Examined within the chapter are the factors that explain the shrinking middle class, such as globalization, and the devastation of unskilled work, outsourced overseas by companies seeking cheap labor, to countries that do little to enforce better wages, and working conditions for their workers. Additionally, the rise of the black middle class and
the growing black underclass are discussed. Today, many blacks occupy a higher number of white-collar jobs than whites, although “…the proportion of blacks in the middle class is still about 30 years behind that of whites.”25 In addition, the 2010 Census serves as a reference point for determining the legitimate status of the current black underclass. Additionally, data from the 2005 U.S. Civil Rights Commission “The Economic Stagnation of the Black Middle Class” contributes to understanding a different perspective on the status of the black middle class. For instance, conference findings suggested that racism, lack of unskilled jobs, a significant number of single-headed families,26 and poor graduation rates more accurately explain the growing black underclass, as well as an idle black middle class. Moreover, as identity politics insist that only those victimized can provide a coherent dialogue regarding their oppression, the chapter also examines the problematic of identity embedded within Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to achieve their stated goal to eradicate racism. Arthur Schlesinger, a strong opponent of identity politics, adamantly insisted that all forms of identity politics, be they ethnic in flavor, detract from national unity. In the Disuniting of America he wrote,

What happens when people of different ethnic origins, speaking different languages and professing different religions, settle in the

25 Ibid P 23

26 Note: Statistical research presented in the study: The Economic Stagnation of the Black Middle Class, suggest that all racial groups experiencing single headed families are inclusive of lower socioeconomic status, as the incomes, represent only one working member. Black families, due to high incarceration rates, and “weaker family structures” consequently, consist of higher numbers of single-family households, than whites, or Hispanics.
same geographical locality and live under the same political sovereignty? Unless a common purpose binds them together, tribal hostilities will drive them apart. Ethnic and racial conflict, it seems evident, will now replace the conflict of ideologies as the explosive issue of our times.27

Thus, problematic for eradicating racism, neither Whiteness theory, nor Anti-racism addressed the centrality of identity politics in Whiteness theory being inconsistent with the significance of class and race, in the last decade. Thus, this dissertation argues that discontinuity accounts for the failure of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to eradicate racism.

Lastly, the objective of Chapter VI Conclusions and Recommendations proposes alternatives, and offers suggestions for engaging the current state of race, racism, and anti-discriminatory practices. In addition, within the chapter, the delimitations of the research are presented, such as the dissertation restricting the research to only examining the philosophies presented by Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, as anti-bias strategies, and the rationale for not addressing other anti-discriminatory practices such as Critical race theory.

27 Ibid P 10
Chapter I: Race and Racism as Antecedents to the Development of Anti-Racism and Whiteness Theory – (as developed in the last decade 2000 – 2010)

In the United States the issue of race is still taboo. Accordingly, the majority of discourse regarding race remains elusive. In fact, many in society regard any attention given to the topic of race, as racist in both content and purpose. Any sincere attempts to bridge the racial gap, society regards suspiciously. Thus, American society today is as divided as it was in the past. Yet, segregation witnessed in the past, society rationalized and occurred mostly, as a result of racism motivated by color difference, sanctioned both by de jure and de facto segregation. Early in the country's history, society failed to recognize how the division of the races satiated the needs of those in power, preserving power, status and authority for just a small few. Moreover, today, the country remains racially divided for many of the same reasons. Even after the passing of Title VII, The Civil Rights Bill, and the dismantling of Jim Crow segregation, the country remains racially divided. In the past, American society insisted race separation occurred because of ascribed black inferiority and white superiority mandates explained race-related achievement gaps, causing race partitioning. Today race separation occurs (obfuscated from general societal comprehension), more because of class

28 As the southern landowners—the slavocracy encompassed only a small number, around five-hundred families, that owned five hundred slaves or more, this group of southern aristocracy controlled not only slaves, but the wages of poor whites working on the plantations, and also the poor whites working as sharecroppers, and those who owned a few slaves. The slaveocracy group as well were made up of the judges, and legislatures, and controlled the legal system, thereby controlled the passing of legislature that would serve to further the legal standing, rights and benefits of this wealthy class. See also Roediger, David R., The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class. London & New York: Verso Publishers, 2007.
differences. That is to say, during slavery and segregation the wealthiest status depended upon the segregation of the races, as poor whites were in many cases not much better off than slaves were. Continuance of power for the wealthy meant the construction of a barrier to keep poor whites, and slaves from uniting and realizing the power in their number. Thus, to prevent the possibility of an alliance, slave-owners elevated the intellectual status of poor whites, over that of blacks as inferior, thereby creating a two-fold safeguard for their hegemony in the creating …the instigation of racism and the negation of a powerful coalition of workers, in the process. As slavery has long since ended, the current dominant class requires a new referendum to sustain its wealth, status, and power—manipulation of the general populace, and an easily coercible political contingent. Examples of the wealthiest class interests are easily discernible upon close examination of the economic and spatial separation, existing between the wealthy and members of the working class. Statistics provided by Michael Snyder, editor of theeconomiccollapseblog.com, describe the existing reasons for the partitioning of society:

29 Marxist scholars suggested in the orthodox Marxist theory, that because of the capitalist class’s need to maximize profit, the capitalist class instituted racism, and discord within different racial groups, to keep black and white workers from forming strong alliances, that could bargain for better wages, working conditions etc., in terms of educational, and promotional opportunities. In addition, further encouraging worker division the capitalist class encouraged discriminatory attitudes towards blacks as workers, thereby granting white workers with a sense of privileged status. Other scholars proposed the split-labor market theory, in which business permitted all workers to compete in a free market, where lower priced wageworkers would displace higher priced labor; and that only during periods of financial duress does business capitulate to a higher status in terms of wages, etc. for white workers. For more information see: Wilson, William Julius, The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Charging American Institutions.” Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980
...83 percent of all U.S. stocks are in the hands of 1 percent of the people... 61 percent of Americans "always or usually" live paycheck to paycheck, which was up from 49 percent in 2008 and 43 percent in 2007... and 66 percent of the income growth between 2001 and 2007 went to the top 1% of all Americans and (Snyder theeconomiccollapseblog.com).

Snyder’s figures move the discourse from race to economic—class importance. However, considering the wealthiest’ history of employing racially difference to sustain their dominance, it becomes apparent, that today the same rationale continues, although not perhaps to fulfill the same reasoning as it did in prior years. Today, the wealthy employ race only when individuals occupy lower class status. Specifically, today mainly class differences, preserved in economic standing, segregate society in terms of where people live, work, attend school, and experience opportunities to socialize. Formerly, the wealthy gave racial difference more prominence—a means to veil the status they invested in their own class status. Thus, the significance dedicated to supplanting race over class served to conceal the wealthiest’ rationale for empower racism. Conversely, to most of society, race, and not economic status was the true motivation behind racism. Historically, the problematic of race, racism and the lack of attention given to providing discourse, and dialogues, on race-related matters served to support the two-fold agendas of the dominant—negation of an amalgamated bi-racial coalition that could force political leaders to serve the needs of the majority, and the continued domination of the dominant minority. As a way to resolve the significance and effectiveness of Anti-racism and Whiteness theories as models to end racism,
Chapter I examines the societal construction of race as an antecedent to racism.

Moreover, as we will see, the societal construction of race exhibited a monolithic impact on the development of racism in the United States, and the launching of anti-discriminatory practices such as Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory.
A. The Current State of Race

a. Origins and Definitions

To examine the significance of racism, first involves resolving what constitutes race, and determining the rationale society had for constructing race. Many researchers regarded race as a biological classification that segregated individuals by traits of genetic distinctiveness passed throughout a particular grouping of individuals. In this way race, as a creation of science, exemplified a spectrum of traceable differences exclusive to like same race humans, while at the same time displayed differences to those who did not share the same inherent traits. Others’ resolved race as a social construction, by which society used observable difference as the rational for awarding a particular group superior status, and unwarranted privilege, alternately allotting inferior status to all others. Solomos and Back defined science and society’s attempt to classify races as socialized constructs, stating, “…structured by the signification of human biological characteristics in a manner that defines and constructs differentiated social collectivities,” society determined the significance of racial attributes. At issue, Solomos and Back’s definition involved race as a social construction fortified by a form of politicized scientific endorsement. Society, employing scientific findings, believed physical differences coincided with intelligence, consistent across an entire racial group.

---

Thus, biologically created, and socially constructed, society rationalized racial groups’ personified biosocial inventions. In an attempt to uncover the outcome of the social construction of race, racism, and the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, it is first necessary to examine society’s justification for society employing scientific and collective reasoning. Some social scientists agreed the ideology of race embodied socially constructed functions solely for reasons to divide people. Society’s manufacture of the ideology of race functioned purely as a scheme of separatism; “…races are the effect of racial practices of opposition (“we” versus “them”) at the economic, political, social, and ideological levels.”31 The central assumption regarding society’s part in formulating principles of race entailed its disingenuous origination as a political rationale supporting the hegemony of the dominate group. “The placement of groups of people in racial categories stemmed initially from the interests of powerful actors in the social system (e.g., the capitalist class, the planter class, colonizers).”32 Du Bois concurred:

The development of an antiracist culture and society, for Du Bois, meant the development of a cultural critique of the reality and foundations of racism. What was racial inequality culturally and how was it manifested within civil society? He consistently argued that racism was not derived from the real or imputed biological or


32 Ibid
genetic differences between Europeans and people of color... he observed that “race antipathy is not instinctive, but a matter of careful education.” Racism is socially constructed and is reinforced by the system of unequal power and privilege exercised by white people... The basis of racial privilege and white superiority is rooted within the dynamics of capitalism, colonialism, and domination.33

In socially constructing race in this way, the dominant group obtained unconditional status, privilege and benefit for its members. As such, the discourse of race as a biological issue, the dominant group exploited to achieve its own objectives, segregating groups that otherwise might bond together rallying against oppression.

Throughout history, the ideology of race acquired many complex aspects, in terms of differences in physical features, to religious associations, to cultural characteristics. Today there are those that infer class is relative to race, dependent upon the status attained by the lowest members of a racial group. Society utilized its social construction of race to reverse class status, devaluing the deserving, and elevating the menial. “Race” has meant various things in history. We use the term to mean a group that includes all social classes, in a situation where the most degraded member of a dominant group is exalted over any member of a subordinate group.”34 Race and class


34 Ignatiev, Noel “How to Be a Race Traitor: Six Ways to Fight Being White.” Critical
exercised this way, only served to elevate individuals and groups that society embraced and allowed.

As Justice Harry Blackmun indicated, “In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race.” Determining the efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory involves first discerning the rationale and justification for the social construction of race as a precursor to racism. As a social construct, race demonstrated significance based upon the perception of the observer. The ideology within the social construction of race not only involved the acknowledgement of uniqueness and variation amongst races, but also how individuals formed meaning for racial characteristics. As the early translations of the Roman educator, Seneca suggested race has been from the beginning described as the embodiment of certain characteristics and distinguishable differences, which individuals and/or groups of like individuals possess that are then associated as a manifestation of likeness, and then recognized as the embodiment of a stated race. For example, Seneca’s depiction of the distinguishable features represented by the
"...colour of the Ethiopian... is not notable." inferred color demonstrated no


significance except the distinguishable features of those of African descent. For Seneca, physical difference was indicative of group characteristics, and nothing else. In another passage, Seneca focused attention on hair color, "amongst the Germans red hair," \textsuperscript{37} represented inconsequential aspects of group individuality, and no more. Seneca cautioned on the harm incurred by considering the physical differences of other groups as subordinate to themselves. Seneca was cognizant that physical difference represented opportunities to unite, and/or occasions to divide. In the past, the social construction of race in the U.S. has served to divide society. Within the last decade, class issues took precedence over race, relegating anti-bias practices to lower social importance, and lessened the impact of such programs to dismantle racism.

In an attempt to examine the parameters society used to construct race, it is the intent of this chapter to explore the scientific research, which society used as a platform to determine racial exclusivity and difference; and the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory. The emerging race discourses of the day, concluded that visual differences, took precedence over scientific resolve, as the latter would not only take time to determine, but was beyond the scope of scientific study, during the early scientific periods of examinations on race." \textsuperscript{38} As such, racial group

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid

\textsuperscript{38} The premier anthropologists of the 17\textsuperscript{th}, 18\textsuperscript{th}, and early 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries, i.e., Paul Topinard, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, and Louis Agassiz, developed theories on racial characteristics before science developed DNA research, and the current findings of scientific research that other than physical difference there exist no traceable differences beyond the skin. Early race studies primarily centered on
considerations stemmed from an assortment of observable characteristics, most often recognized by color, i.e., black, white, yellow. In his Unpublished Essays, Du Bois determined that race originated as the social construction of society, sanctioned by a vast assortment of conflicting anthropological interpretations. “Blumenbach found 5, Agassiz 8, Huxley 11, Haeckel 12, Topinard 18, Crawford 60, and Giddon 150.” Nevertheless, just how many races were there, since scientific research was inconclusive. Regardless of their intent, what materialized resembled attempts to substitute “…philosophical speculation…” with methodical fact. Such hypothetical inferences transformed the discourse regarding race as lacking in scientific substance; and as a proposition based more on the inventor’s opinion regarding racial representation. Moreover, employing both difference and likeness, to advance the discourse of what aspects compose a race is in itself contradictory. Thus, reaching a reliable conclusion resided in the methodology chosen, which both scientists and society exploited to establish racial uniformity and variation, for their own ulterior motives. Thus, examining the scientific and societal motivation-surrounding race is crucial to explicating the emergence of racism, and ultimate causality for anti-bias programs (i.e. Anti-racism and Whiteness theory). Society’s construction of race

physical features, hair texture, eye and nose shape as characteristic to and endemic of a particular racial group assignment.
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represented a montage comprised primarily of societal opinion propped up with scientific fabrication.

The debate not yet concluded, many searched for the answer of what confirmed a race. Friedrich Ratzel was adamant, humanity derived from one thread, positioning racialized difference as irrelevant. He based his premise on the existence of a higher being and man’s association through spirituality to a supernatural divinity—God, resolving that humankind through association with deity bonded, rather than alienated through corporeal differences. The anthropologist Deniker constructed races as a continuum administered by natural law. Deniker resolved that there existed many different races, but was more concerned with elevating all of humanity over the animals, than considering one race more important than another. Madison Grant built on Deniker’s work to bolster the theory of eugenics—racial superiority, for those Grant’ deemed embodied the Nordic race. Grant’s work fielded the work for other scientific eugenic theorists such as his protégé, Lothrop Stoddard. Where Grant’s work sought to elevate the Nordic race over what he deemed to be the lesser races of European descent, Stoddard elevated the Nordic race over the black race. Much of the work developed by Grant, enflamed the Nazis’ to use it and was instrumental in Hitler’s plan of extermination of the Jews.

In a further attempt to examine the discourse on the social construction of race as a precursor to racism, and the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, it is the intent of this chapter to explore what methods society used to establish a definition of race. What was important to society meant deciding what rationale society
used for conferring value and status to some and not to others. Within this context, race functioned as a manifestation of group identity that exhibited variability amongst groups. In this way, society apportioned serious attention to constructing race. Moreover, the dominant group structured race to benefit itself, assigning itself the highest ranking, while demoting others to lower social standing. Initially, American society constructed race as a demarcation for which group would receive advantage, and which would not. Through cultural transmission, society’s construction of race—superiority in all things for the dominant group, and inferiority for others, infused into culture, and served to sustain racist beliefs. Moreover, just how societal manifestations, such as the social construction of race reinforced by inequality, unchallenged become accepted parts of culture determined “…these meaning-systems, while originally only ideas, gain force as they are reproduced in the material conditions of society.”

In the Semantics of Race, Goldberg concluded that rationalizing race as a concept divided the evolution of race into three major reference points. “The first established knowledge of races; the second elaborated expertise concerning management of intro- and interracial relations; and the third explained race sociologically rather than biologically.” Cultural geography researchers considered that the geographic location indicative of individuals and groups demonstrated a relation to the formation of


socialized races. “Although he did not refer to them explicitly as “races,” Bernier gave five divisions to mankind: Europeans; Far Eastern, “Black,” Lapp, and Indian (meaning American Indian).” Whereas the ideology of race, presented by these scholars supported a connection between members of the same ethnic categorization, the study involved quite another function: it joined members of society together, and it was at the foundation of segregationist practices, which was in itself in contradiction.

Others divided the races by consequence of color in relation to “temperamental qualities,” and set the standardization based upon relationship to the white race. Still others associated geographical importance to color and concluded that color was determined by geographic location, and that those occupying locations vastly remote from the heat of the sun, where superior by very nature of this fact. “…Georges Buffon judged the variations in human types according to their degree of differences from “white people,” considering that affects from the environment caused races such as closeness to the equator, and great distance from the equator caused the former to inferior intellectually to the latter.” Still other scientist added the importance of race and members hierarchal status in the human evolution to the size of the skull. For example, researchers reported what believed to have been a skull of large size in the European area, and concluded that Europeans were consequently the most intelligent of all
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species of humans, and that all others were flawed. “The first, “Caucasian,” was so named because of the location of a single skull (in the Russian Caucasus Mountains), which…represented the prototypical European head-form. The science of “craniology” was to make head-form and shape and content the major, though not the only, means of classifying human type.”

Thus, the reference of ‘Caucasian’ as a distinctive title for whites symbolized a reference point for both labeling and describing the white race. Still others used biblical scripture to concede not on the equality of God’s created people, but upon the validation that God chose only the white race to be in a position of leadership. Thus, the most holy sanctioned the rationalization of white superiority. “Voltaire, Lord Kames of Scotland, and the English physician Charles White,” determined that racial differences and issues of intellectual capacity were directly relation to biblical scripture, and enjoyed advantages and disadvantages based upon intellectual closeness to the capacity to be direct descendants of “Adam and Eve.”

These references served as justification to elevate the white race, while simultaneously reserving subordinate status to all other groups. Perhaps it was Immanuel Kant’s 17th century description of race that set the tone for describing race as a way in which peoples of observable characteristics are accorded like categorization, “…that is, people are distinguishable according to their inherited physical attributes.”

---
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meanings attributed to race, and racial differences society constructed for the singular purpose of power and economics for the dominant group:

Race can be understood as the historically contingent social systems of meaning that attach to elements of morphology and ancestry… race turns on physical features and lines of descent, not because features or lineage themselves are a function of racial variation, but because society has invested these with racial meanings.\(^{49}\)

Additionally, society constructed race to advance whiteness as a method of mandating control and dominance, “The racialization of whites thus is inherently at some level about domination because the category’s very existence is dependent on the continuation of white supremacy.”\(^{50}\) Of paramount importance to the discourse of race in the new world—America-- was that race served as a demarcation to victimize those brought to service the land and benefit the livelihoods of those vested in possessing slaves. Although important initially, race and color were not important to the development of slave trading, “Extensive English participation in the slave trade did not develop until well into the seventeenth century. Initially English contact with Africans did not take place primarily in a context, which prejudged the Negro as a slave, at least not


\(^{50}\) Lewis, Amanda E., Race in the Schoolyard Negotiating the Color Line in Classrooms and Communities. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2003. P 625
as a slave of Englishmen. Rather, Englishmen met Africans merely as another sort of men. 51 In fact, initial meetings between the races occurred as incidentally as all other expeditions to unseen lands. However, in time the English exploited racial differences as a means to subjugate. They deemed the Africans life style, character and appearance as contradictory to their own, grounds for conquest, “…reports about cosmetic mutilation, polygamy, infanticide… ritual murder, and the like,”52 the English used as grounds to conquest. Unimportant to the English was the alarm Africans must have felt as to first encountering their color, customs and practices. Beforehand, the Europeans had already established they and their lifestyle as the model for all others to emulate. The evidence was clear that the Europeans introduced and utilized this standardization as a means of exploitation, and what better group to serve as a means of comparison, than the Africans, and their unique culture. Bulmer and Solomos proposed that such attention to difference led to European preoccupation with African’s as an inferior race.

Englishmen found the peoples of Africa very different from themselves.

Negroes’ looked different to Englishmen: their religion was un-


Christian; their manner of living was anything but English; they seemed to be a particularly libidinous sort of people.\textsuperscript{53}

African cultural practices, cultural beliefs, religious customs, the conquerors applied as a rationale and justification for judging the Africans as inferior. The most caustic factor of difference for the white outsiders was the Africans color, which separated and distinguished them from the English upon sight. Jordan wrote, “For Englishmen, the most arresting characteristic of the newly discovered Africans was his color. Travelers rarely failed to comment upon it; indeed when describing Africans they frequently began with complexion and then moved on to dress (or, as they saw, lack of it).”\textsuperscript{54} In fact, the English as adventurers were more interested in discovering sources of treasure in gold, etc., than they were in seeking out unique cultures that they could learn. As such, as English explorations continued, discovering new lands, new languages, new cultures and new people, the English were themselves backward, in that they attached negative meaning to cultural difference and regarded color, in terms of good and evil. “In England perhaps more than in southern Europe, the concept of blackness was loaded with intense meaning. Long before, they found that some men were black, Englishmen found in the idea of blackness a way of expressing some of their most ingrained
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values... Black was an emotionally partisan color, the handmaid and symbol of baseness and evil, a sign of danger and repulsion."\(^{55}\)

For example, Jordan included the following:

Embedded in the concept of blackness was its direct opposite—whiteness. No other colors so clearly implied opposition,

beigns colours utterlye contrary

Every white will have its blacke,

And everye sweete its sowre.\(^{56}\)

Considered from an anthropologic perspective,\(^{57}\) race embodies the collaboration of various aspects of racial difference, (culture, ethnicity, etc.). Moreover, from a sociological and anthropological analysis, the ideology of race represents occasions to recognize difference, without devaluing or assessing value to one quality over another.

Whereas science regarded the issue of race of major importance, in time it began to bestow unequal status to some groups over others. Frantz Boas made a significant impact in underscoring attempts by society and other unscrupulous researchers to support such unethical maneuvering. During the period in the early 20\(^{th}\) century when

\(^{55}\) Ibid P 68
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\(^{57}\) Anthropology the study of humankind, especially human culture and development; taking a more historical and comparative approach than sociology.
race scientists injected the belief that the white race, was biologically superior to the black race, Boas concluded on the error of this form of scientific propositioning.

Frantz Boas…dismissed the hypothesis that race determines ability and performance… Boas tested the assumption that certain people were genetically destined to inferiority. They [Boas and his students] denied that culture determined by biology and helped to dispel widely held beliefs about racial groups- that they are temperamentally different; that there are racial “cultures” or such things as racial “moralities,” that some races are biologically and intellectually superior to others.58

The study of race advanced racism, as science manipulated its findings to fuel the development of racist belief. Although, it is not fully conclusive that science intended the study of race to promote racism; and perhaps racism is a latent, and not an intended function of the study of race, and as a result of his research, Boas successfully derailed race partiality from the study of race.

Another aspect of race as a forerunner to racism and anti-discriminatory practices involves the importance placed on color as a manifestation of race, and the ultimate

consequences in America. An outward manifestation of legalized slavery enhanced the ideology of white supremacy, and continued long after slavery ended.

This view draws on the insight that C.R. Boxer popularized: "One race cannot systematically enslave members of another for centuries without acquiring a conscious or unconscious feeling of racial superiority." That is why, in many ancient cultures, it was customary to brand or tattoo slaves to confirm their social stigma. However, in the United States no such measures were necessary. Africans were chosen for slavery in part because they were considered inferior as a race. They already wore a racial uniform, which itself became the mark of slavery, and even later a stigma of shame and inferiority.59

Thus, slaves experienced exploitation because of their color, which easily distinguished them from the white majority. In this way, color was not only a signifier of racial inferiority but also represented validation of the slaves' insignificance and identification for exploitation. In time, this situation led to class partitioning between poor whites and blacks, since because of their color, assumedly, whites occupied higher-class status than slaves did. Moreover, such conditioning elevated otherwise poor whites to higher status than land-owning freed blacks did.

The Southern doctrine of Negro inferiority immediately extended to whites, even those who were destitute and ignorant, membership in an exclusive racial club and a social position above that of all blacks, both slave and free. Edmund Morgan argues in American Slavery, American Freedom that the racial defense of Southern slavery strengthened, among whites, the conviction that, despite conspicuous differences of wealth and position, they were equal just as the Declaration of Independence posited. Racism, in other words, became a source of white social status.\textsuperscript{60}

In an attempt to examine the connection between race, racism and the origins, facility and efficacy of anti-discrimination policies, the intent of the discourse focuses on exploring the complexity of race and ethnicity.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid P 30
i. Race and Ethnicity

From the centuries-old “one-drop” rule to the complex equations used to claim tribal membership, race, culture, and heritage have always been used inconsistently in a struggle to define social, political, and economic relationships.61

Problematic to most discourse on race involves the juxtaposition between race and ethnicity. Macionis defined race as “a socially constructed category of people who share biologically transmitted traits,”62 which members of society then attach importance. Ethnicity implies a cultural heritage that members of a particular group share. Whereas race denotes social construction, ethnicity entails culture aspects derived through tradition, which society also constructed but from different aspects. Society constructs race from “biological traits,”63 and fashions ethnicity from “cultural traits.”64 As racial issues manufactured from biological, i.e. observable behaviors, ethnicity society constructed, as well but for different reasons, which society considered natural for a particular group’s culture. As ethnicity denotes qualities that are not as easily recognized as race, a discussion of ethnicity follows.
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Ethnicity involves lucid markers of identification unlike race, as ethnicity comprises a group’s religious connections, language, traditions and cultural aspects. Whereas race society constructed from biological characteristics, ethnicity “never had the imprimatur of science,”\textsuperscript{65} in which early race intellectuals considered ethnicity as a dynamic of social construction, “and subjective,”\textsuperscript{66} whereas, race issues, science regarded as creations endowed by nature and consequentially unbiased.

Like race, ethnicity as a social construction gains status for a particular group in society in relation to its bases of power, and consequently subjects other groups to a lower status, accordingly to that group’s overall standing. Ethnicity exerts influence like race to marginalize particular groups occupying the lower ranks in society, in which society deems ethnically “different and unequal in their access to social resources,”\textsuperscript{67} from the status controlled by other dominant ethnic groups. Thus, the individual societal constructions of ethnicity attribute to the larger “ethnic group to which,”\textsuperscript{68} society associates the individual to belong. Interestingly, the relationship between ethnicity and race as social constructions reveal the tendency for both ethnicity and race to promote

\textsuperscript{65} Nobles, Melissa, Shades of Citizenship: Race and The Census In Modern Politics. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2000 P 14

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid P 14


racism. For example, socially constructed race and ethnicity comprise the rationales which society considered important. Thus, society constructed race and ethnicity to promote advantage for the dominant group over other groups, the dominant group considered different. In order to ensure the hegemony of the dominant group, the dominant members of society attributed all superior qualities to whites, and all inferior qualities to peoples of color. In this way, society in constructing ethnicity (like race), constructed the basis, foundation, rationale and justification for establishing racism.

Problematic for society in constructing ethnicity and race involved the tendency of society to regard such constructions as factual and true. Thus, societies’ disingenuous rationale behind constructing ethnicity, as a way to benefit only the dominant group, society then reinforced by ignoring the fact that, “Myths [about races and ethnicities] are socially constructed.”69 In addition, ethnic social constructions systematically surfaced, “in specific times and places,”70 ensuring power for the dominant group, while keeping in check the status of other groups. For example, during the post-bellum period of Reconstruction, when the freedmen were working, educating themselves, running and winning political office, Southern whites angry after losing the war, and seeing the former slaves as their equals, initiated myths of rape on the part of black males against white women, as a way to damage the advancement the former slaves were making. These events established the origination of subversive groups such as the Ku Klux Klan i.e., KKK to terrorize and intimidate blacks into white submission.
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…it is death to the colored man who yields to the force and advances of… white women…

“Why is it that white women attract Negro men now more than in former days? There was a time when such a thing was unheard of.” There was a secret to this thing, and we greatly suspect it is the growing appreciation of white Juliet[s] for colored Romeos.\(^\text{71}\)

In this way, ethnic myths functioned to reinforce the status of whites’, reinforcing white hegemony.

In an attempt to define the static relationship between race and ethnicity as both social constructions, it is the intent of this chapter to examine the relation “between ethnicity, and stratification,”\(^\text{72}\) which occurred because of society’s rationale in constructing ethnicity as it has. Thus, a major impetus for researching ethnicity as a social construction came about as a way to treat non-whites differently, than, “…those immigrants who came to be identified as white ethnics.”\(^\text{73}\) Hence, white ethnicity comprised over 24 million various white ethnic groups, from southern and eastern

---


European stock. The immigrants represented, Slavs, Spanish, Hungarians, Italians, Serbs, Poles, Romanians, Czechs and others “of which Russian Jews were by far the largest groups”74 Of particular interest involved was the situation in which the immigrants found themselves arriving in America. Lillian B. Rubin writing in, Is This a White Country, or What? Inferred that the immigrants were ripe for exploitation, and as society considered them white, “…were ultimately assimilate-able.”75 Thus, the immigrants readily filled the description of white, bolstered white domination. In terms of their need to survive, the immigrants fulfilled the needs of providing the capitalists with an enormous work force and supplanted the ranks of white domination fueling the stature of white supremacy. As such, the immigrants “were ripe for exploitation.”76 Ultimately, as a condition of their lower class status, immigrants accepted into the white enclave, and conferred superior status, “were compelled to relinquish much of their European heritage in order to achieve their aspirations for social and economic mobility.”77 It is in this way that the formation of a class system based on a collective of white ethnicity ascended becoming white. As a condition imposed on lower status whites, by capitalist bourgeoisie, the former European ethnicities disconnected from
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non-whites, pledging allegiance to the closed society of whites. Continuing immigration laws allowed for the replenishing of lower class white immigrants eager to accept the good life in the new land. As such, the white race in America was comprised of various ethnic groups which society permitted to embrace a collective white ethnicity, whereas blacks, society relegated inferior status. In this way, society used ethnicity much in the same way as race to bestow and/or exclude privilege. White ethnic development in America endured through “four stages of national development: (1) settlement, (2) expansion, (3) agricultural development, and (4) industrial development,”\(^\text{78}\) securing a strong foothold for white dominion. Throughout the various stages, whites as well as non-white ethnics experienced conflict, with additional introduction of each new ethnic group; and along with immigrant group individual transitions, the various ethnicities underwent added tension through each groups’ culture identity—ethnicity, was exchanged and introduced to another.

Alternately, for non-white ethnics the situation was quite different. Although the white immigrants, in particular the Irish, experienced major discrimination and prejudice, it was never as hostile as that experienced by non-whites. In fact, a major force behind the antagonism non-whites endured occurred because of the “official sanction,”\(^\text{79}\) from Jim Crow segregation laws inflicted against blacks. Thus, the black legacy in America preceded that of the white immigrants, which came much later during the latter 1800s and early 1900s:
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Black Americans in particular have influenced the ever-changing national culture in many ways. They have lived here for centuries, and...they belong far more to American culture than to the culture of Africa.80

Steinberg concurred, illustrating the difficult situation blacks inhabited as an ethnic group:

Thus, at the same time that the nation pursued a policy aimed at the rapid assimilation of recent arrivals from Europe, it segregated the racial minorities who, by virtue of their much longer history in American society, had already come to share much of the dominate culture.81

Leith Mullings considered the collective embodiment of “oppression and discrimination,”82 grounds for African American chaotic ethnic categorization. European immigrants came in search of a better life; as free sources of labor, Africans came as conquest. For that reason, the social construction of ethnicity and race for whites and blacks are dissimilar. As the dominant group whites constructed race and


ethnicity to both establish white supremacy, bestow privilege, benefit and status to whiteness; while constructing race and ethnicity to justify black inferiority, refusing status and benefits to blacks. Thus, this dissertation rests upon several themes, one of which argues that the societal construction of race and ethnicity served to supplant, establish, fortify and sanction racism, resulting in the origination of anti-discriminatory practices, such as Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory.

In an attempt to examine the impact of words on the societal construction of race, racism and anti-bias programs, it is the intent of this section to explore language as a component of the discourse-involving race.
b. *How Language Influences Race, Racism and Anti-Discriminatory Discourse*

Does someone who speaks Cherokee...experience the world differently from...English or Spanish? ...each language has its own distinctive symbols that serve as the building blocks of reality ...each language has words or expressions not found in any other symbolic system...all languages fuse symbols with distinctive emotions so that ...a single idea may “feel” different when spoken in Spanish rather than in English or Chinese.83

Language as a symbol of culture, society and communication, functions to integrate and socialize individuals. As an aspect of individual and group relations, language guides and influences how people think, act and are perceived by others. As a result, language represents the ways in which individuals not only think and feel, but express thoughts and concepts. Language, ideas, beliefs, values, and judgments circulate throughout society. For instance, if the language professes positive values, judgments and assumptions regarding a particular subject, then the tone of the language will reinforce this position, and appear upbeat. On the other hand, if the language medium used possesses pessimism, then the meaning will transmit in character. Language

embodies the capacity to distort, or fortify a particular issue, depending upon the actual expressions and tone chosen. On the subject of race and racism, through the composition of words, language can express society’s position regarding the importance or disapproval of racial inequality. Consequently, the theoretical stamina of language embodies the ability to convey thoughts “and concepts but actually shapes thought.”

As racism is a historical manifestation of culture, language usage would be expected “…to be racist as well,” and reveal societal attitudes regarding race, and racism.

Linguistic scholars considered the English spoken in the U.S. as an extension of the European influence, rationale, and aversion posed against African slaves translated negatively for blacks today. Thus, the extent of the connection between language and culture represented for the English was then expressed by American society “as a vernacular revolt against the signs, symbols, manners, and authority of the mother country [Africa].” On the other hand, the language embedded into English that others insisted conveyed racist attitudes “preceded any application to black Africans.”

Moreover, that the communicated representations appeared well before any encounters

---
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with Africans. For example, consider the following term usage, “black sheep in the family, a black mark against one’s name, black as the color of death, to blackball or blackmail,” were representative of language sentiments regarding black that originated long before slavery in America, and therefore did not symbolize racism. In opposition, Moore determined that racism in the English language could be construed within the diverse “terminology, symbolism, politics, ethnocentrism, and content,” encompassing language in the U.S. Moreover, the diversity within the United States, and the racism evident within the history of the country resulted in cultural manifestations embedded in the English language grounded in racist belief systems. Anti-racist advocates concurred, suggesting that language encompassed the power to influence, to control and therefore “matters,” in terms of creating racial conflict. Gilroy (1987) and Modood (1988) inferred that, “racial” terms are neither politically neutral nor static; that they have contested histories, and therefore through social construction encompassed the power to influence society negatively; because of U.S. history, speaks for itself.

Thus to researchers, the method of conveyance for structuring racism as a socialized construct exist within the context of language as a historical, political and stagnant conception. Researchers remain adamant that society exploited language as
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a means to subjugate. Thus, the centrality of language should demonstrate positively regarding racial groups, and not the opposite, and consequently, “Everyone should have the choice to name themselves,” which assumes that everyone would speak favorably about themselves. Examples of derogatory labels implying racial discrimination such as, “nigger, spook, chink, spic,” correspond to politically incorrect depictions of racial groups. Moreover, important to the discourse regarding language used for the purpose of subordinating and debasing, central to empowering language involved the subordinating status that the racial group serving as the butt of the slur occupied, and therefore “Whites, as the dominant group, are not subjected to the same abusive characterization by our language.” Thus, references to people of color “such as minority, third world, and non-white” implied lower importance, representation and subordinate to white status. Unfortunately, even though society considered such slurs with contempt, society still uses them in every day conversation. “It is not enough to simply become aware of the effects of racism in conditioning attitudes.” While it may remain a challenge for society to eradicate the memory of these words from our repertoire, it is imperative that serious efforts focus on replacing negative connotations
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with a more “progressive perspective,”\textsuperscript{95} regarding racial and ethnic differences. Further, language as a symbol represented the governing principles of culture, and determined the manner in which groups’ behave, gain status, interact, and were identified by other groups. Thus, language serves as a tool to enhance and demote group significance.

Interestingly, the language traditions of African Americans exemplify how and why peoples of African ancestry identify themselves. For example, those of African descent disagree “over whether to use black, or to use African American,”\textsuperscript{96} as to the politically correct manner to refer to themselves as descendants of African heritage. Arguably, using either title demonstrates the politicized sentiment of the individual—i.e. individuals indicating black as a racial identification express black identity development apart from Africa, while those self-identified as African-American embrace favorably African culture.

In terms of slave vernacular, white slave-masters enforced language to render slaves submissive. Slave-owners considered communications between the slaves as highly destructive to the slavocracy’s economic stability; thus, slaves engaging in discourse comprehensible only to the slave population reinforced the possibility for concealing slave insurrections. As a result, owners prohibited slaves from engaging in indigenous dialects. Often owners segregated slaves that were found to possess the

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid P 474

ability to speak the same native tongue. As a result, “slaves were forced to speak
English.” 97 In time, the slave language evolved into a black vernacular, which,
“contributed to the creation of blacks as a separate and enduring people with a distinct
collective identity.” 98 Whether the analysis of language as a symbol of cultural
identification distinguished blacks as a separate and enduring people requires further
examination, not conducted in this research. What is apparent from historical
investigation is society in constructing race and thus, using language to define, demean
and dominate the status of slaves, exhibited a propensity to execute the task effectively.
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c. *Implications from the Census*

To expedite the completion of the census, a law was passed punishing with imprisonment or death all who failed to register. Thereupon the king issued a proclamation that all Roman citizens of all classes should present themselves, by centuries, in the Campus Martius at daybreak.99

The first Census conducted in early Rome documented the numbers of citizens for taxation purposes. The first Census collection in the United States occurred in 1790 and represented the government’s attempt to account for the number of citizens and slaves in each state, and for state representation in the Congress. Starting with the 1790 Census the United States Census has taken place every ten years since. Since the last U.S. Census occurred in 2000, thus this calendar year, 2010, a census will again transpire. The major rationale for conducting the Census every ten years involved compliance with the U.S. Constitution, which mandated the, “...representational apportionment,”100 in terms of congressional representation in accordance to the number of representatives per state, aligned to the number of citizens each state possessed. The Office of Management and Budget manages and oversees

---


the Census. In an attempt to examine the effects of race, and racism stimulating the evolution of Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory, it is the intent of this chapter to explore the challenges caused by the U.S. Census on the efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory to eradicate racism.

During slavery, counting slaves was different from how the census counted white citizens. Moreover, census counting was different for freed blacks than slaves. For instance, the census counted freed blacks as full citizens, until the Supreme Court ruled in the 1857 Dred Scott Decision.

**Article IV Section 2. [Privileges and Immunities, Extradiction, Fugitive Slaves]**

Section 2. The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states. No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

After the Scott Decision, free blacks lost their rights as citizens. For that reason, free blacks, “did not enjoy the same rights and privileges as whites.”\(^{101}\) Moreover, in terms of the Census representation for all those not considered citizens, a major problem
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remained as to how to best account for the slave population, as the number of citizens residing within a state directly affected that state’s representative number of allotted congressional constituency for the Senate. Thus, Southern states advocated counting slaves as whole persons, to increase the number of Southern representatives. Northern states possessing less land, fertile soil, and climate conditions conducive for mass production of crops and reason to possess slaves counted slaves as less than whole persons. The North understood the dispute while the South waged for possession of its’ slaves: only citizens could vote, triggering the South to want to count slaves as whole persons, which was in the end a hypocritical ploy which Southerners proposed to advance their personal political agenda. Ultimately, the South conceded to the pressure of the North “and begrudgingly accepted counting a slave as three-fifths of a person,” as a result, there were lost opportunities for more legislative seats in Congress. Historians suggested that the North’s adamancy towards counting slaves as three-fifths a person represented a biased attempt on the part of the North to minimize the political power of the South. Moreover, the three-fifths clause epitomized the antagonism existing between the North and South both wanting to use slaves as political advantage against one another. James Madison documented the dissent between Northern and Southern taxation and congressional representation objectives and the status and consequential condition for the slave:

\[\text{Slaves were both persons and property, “being considered by our laws in some respects, as persons, and in other respects, as}\]

\[102\] Ibid p 26-27
property,” ...They could not live as full persons, and therefore should not count as such.\(^{103}\)

The 1860 Census and the census count conducted after the end of the Civil War, with the slaves now free, involved new concerns for the census counting; as the incentive for the census now included blacks in terms of proportional representation for state taxes as well as benefits. In this way, the census functioned as a measure to determine the status of all citizens. Considering white already occupied a position of status in terms of \textit{de facto} and \textit{de jure} sanction; through slavery, blacks inherited inferior status, which census authorizations changed. Continued usage of the census heightened racialized disparity, however conducting the census provided an essential objective, “...monitoring and enforcing desegregation.”\(^{104}\) Thus, the continued practice of employing census data for taxation, congressional representation, and racial calculation suggested racial differences declines rather than increased because of the census. Consequently, the original uses of the census and that after the Civil War until today many contend represent continued division between the races.

During the 1870 census, the slave heading was eliminated. Moreover, the census included five color/race category headings—White, Black, Mulatto, Indian and Chinese. The following, next two census counts in 1880 and 1890 occurred during the Failure of Reconstruction, and the 1877 Compromise, in which the presidential election of

\(^{103}\) Ibid P 27

Rutherford B. Hayes and the withdrawal of federal troops from the South had a devastating effect on black livelihood. During this most disadvantageous time for blacks, white assaults on census reporting resulted in reconfigurations not based on true number counting, but occurred to negate the political, economic, and social progress made by blacks during Reconstruction.

During the 1930 schedule, the census removed the mulatto designation. Nobles contended that a major rationale involved Jim Crow and miscegenation rulings. In compliance with the one-drop directive census recordings reversed former rulings, charging that mulatto, octoroon, and quadroon were inadmissible race categorizations. Moreover, in removing the mulatto designation, the census enforced the one-drop of black blood ruling. Thus, society in conjunction with the 1930 census sanctioned and constructed race; whereas in not constructing whiteness in the same manner, society reinforced the status of whiteness.

Today, the census recognizes four races and two official ethnicities. Of particular significance to the census involved the “…identification-not-identity,” focus of the census, for the purpose of presenting precise counts of minority groups, “to gain a better understanding of intercity demographics and to maintain the ability to demonstrate disparate impact.”

---
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Conversely, important to the *National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, (NAACP)* was to ensure inclusivity for all minorities in governmental and state agencies, i.e. schools, congressional representation etc. Thus, the *NAACP* considered the census count advantageous in gaining political attention and support. To many, using the census directly affected, “…the end of college admissions, faculty recruitment, scholarships, hiring, promotion, government contracts, race-based set-asides and voting districts based on race.” Moreover, census reporting protects public policies, which function to protect the rights of American citizens.

…The first is that race is not an objective category, which censuses imply count, but a fluid and internally contradicting discourse... The second is that census bureaus are not politically neutral institutions, employing impartial methods, but state agencies that use census methods and data as instruments of governance. Third, racial discourse influences both the rationale for public policy and its outcomes… Fourth, and finally, individuals and groups seek to alter the terms of racial discourse in order to advance political and social aims.108


As such, census reports provide society with benefits, other than defining racial differences. Further, Nobles described census bureau’s influence in racialized disparity, “…census bureaus are the only or the most important places where concepts of race are made and remade.”\textsuperscript{109} Consequently, the census admittedly represented opportunities to conclude racial differences. In fact, the census supplied society with an understanding of, “…what race is and what it is not.”\textsuperscript{110} In addition, the census bestowed on society opportunities to scrutinize, “how race is constructed,”\textsuperscript{111} allowing the community to undo the negative aspects, which society constructed regarding race. In deciding which groups gained status over others, in terms of which groups historically gained automatic citizenship, and in addition, clarified the way society constructed racial distinction. Nobles concluded, the census reports, “at times has directly shaped, a shifting racist discourse.”\textsuperscript{112} In \textit{The one-drop-of-blood rule}, D’Souza inferred that the census was the source of racial instability as censuses provided the statistics, “to preserve the status quo,”\textsuperscript{113} trying to safeguard their power base. Alternately, D’Souza contradicted himself when he considered the racial categories of the census,
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“…historically and scientifically absurd classifications,”\textsuperscript{114} which should be eliminated immediately. In concurrence, in 1960 The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) was also concerned with the dissolution of, “the race question from the census in 1960.”\textsuperscript{115} However, the enactment and enforcement of the Civil Rights Laws of 1965 and the Voting Rights Act necessitated the need for specific information on minority involvement, which only the census provided.

Census record keeping provided important statistical data used for voting, congressional districting, governmental and state political assessment contributing to the creation of an egalitarian social order. Alternately, the census makes a point of reminding the community of racial differences. Tracing the census throughout history uncovers a way in which society used the census to construct race, presenting the white race with superior status, and black as inferior. Dinesh D'Souza resolved the need for census reporting marginalizing people of color has long past. He argued that society should be less concerned with color-coding its “citizens,”\textsuperscript{116} by insisting that citizens check racial boxes that force citizens into artificial categories. For D'Souza the ultimate goal was to accept a sense of unity by embracing Americanism. For others, census
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bureaus deter the status quo from re-attempting to assert hegemony over an already

disenfranchised group of Americans. Census reporting on the one hand attempted to

create a more egalitarian society by ensuring that all nationalities are adequately

represented; and on the other census documentation divide society by racial categories,
keeping society always reminded of race and race differences. Thus, this dissertation
argues that the census demonstrates a challenge for Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory
to eradicate racism, as the census is dichotomous in that it infers the creation of a
harmonious society by counting racial groups, while at the same time it divides society
into segregated races in the process, to count the collected sum of racial groups.
Contemporary efforts to eradicate the detrimental harm caused by the absence of a clear dialogue on race continue to elude society. Problematic for the discourse comes as many contend it benefits society more to acknowledge less of it. In other words, if we do not talk about it, the race problem will go away. A major impetus of the President’s Initiative on Race (1998) was to challenge these practices of silence where race was concerned, and to get race out into the open, into a place where myths, and fear would be less able to contribute to dissention.

The President’s Initiative on Race (1998) determined:

[t]he absence of both knowledge and understanding about the role race has played in our collective history continues to make it difficult to find solutions that will improve race relations, eliminate disparities, and create equal opportunities in all areas of American life. This absence also contributes to conflicting views on race and racial progress held by Americans of color and white Americans).117

In 1997 President Clinton convened the President’s Initiative on Race (IR). The initiative sought to create venues where common ground could evolve towards introducing strategies for race and racism to become less important by devoting

---

collective time into turning around the denotations into dialogues of forgiveness and restoration. The commission spent a year investigating the current state of race relations in the United States, talking to people around the country, engaging in national dialogue, researching statistics, and so forth. In its 1998 report, the commission wrote:

Our Nation still struggles with the impact of its past policies, practices, and attitudes based on racial difference. Race and ethnicity will have profound impacts on the extent to which a person is fully included in American society and provided the equal opportunity and equal protection promised to all Americans. All of these characteristics continue to affect an individual’s opportunity to receive an education, acquire the skills necessary to maintain a good job, have access to adequate health care, and receive equal justice under the law.\footnote{Ibid P 9}

The Kerner Commission was also charged to engage dialogues on race and racism advocated educating the public on what race, and racism involves of, and imparting methodologies to destabilize racism.

The following is the Kerner Commission’s findings reported thirty years before President Clinton’s Initiative on Race:

Most Americans get awfully uptight about the charge of racism, since people are not conscious of what racism really is. Racism is not a desire
to wake up every morning and lynch a black man from a tall tree. It is not engaging in vulgar epithets. These kinds of people are just fools. It is the day-to-day indignities, the subtle humiliations that are so devastating. Racism is the assumptions of superiority of one group over another, with all the gross arrogance that goes along with it. Racism is a part of us. The Kerner Commission has said that if you have been an observer you have been racist; if you have stood by idly, you are racist.\textsuperscript{119}

Thus, in order to undermine racism, one must be cognitive of race and not be afraid of engaging in race dialogue, since refraining from engaging in it, may result in the introduction of racist practices, such as using racial difference as a basis to award one group status over another. “Because the concept of race is socio-politically constructed (Wester, 1992), to reference it perpetuates its reification, to refrain from referencing it obscures the persistent, pervasive, and seemingly permanent reality of racism.”\textsuperscript{120}

Such was the charge of both the President’s Initiative on Race, and the Kerner Commission—to force dialogues on race and racism out into the open away from its ability to fester, where not engaging dialogues about race perpetuates the installation and sustenance of racism.

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid P 9

e. The Social Construction of Race as an Antecedent to the Implementation and Development of Anti-Racism and Whiteness Theory

The socialized construction of race served the exclusive needs of the dominant group. The rationale society used for constructing race represented inclusion, while at the same time segregated other groups within society. Although scientists conceded that race differences, aside from the physical, are under the skin the same, represented only what the dominant group decided it to mean. As such, the social construction of race, symbolized the needs of the dominant group. The ideology of race in the U.S. was construed as an intangible entity that served to support “…human creations rather than eternal, essential categories.” What is perhaps more important is when one considers that as a social construction the essence of race is mutable. That is to say race, as a human creation, functions in accordance with the needs and social context of its creators. “As such racial categories have a history and are subject to change.”

For example, different from in the United States, with its propensity to use race as a barrier, or a gateway for particular groups, other countries place less attention on race. Macionis contended that the social construction of race in the U.S. conflicts with that of the rest of the world.

---
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Because race is a matter of social definitions, it is a highly variable concept. For example, the members of U.S. society consider racial differences more important than people of many other countries. We also tend to “see” three racial categories—typically, black, white, and Asian—while people in other societies identify many more categories.123

Thus, what American society considered comprised a race, relied totally on observable physical differences. Consider the following: “A race is a socially constructed category of people who share biologically transmitted traits.”124 Consequently, physical uniqueness does serve as a marker of identifying and selecting individuals for like racial classification. However, the major factor in determining racial classification society based not solely upon the physical but the physical characteristics, which society placed as important. Consequently, a “race” comes into being only when the members of society decide that some physical trait (such as skin color or eye shape) actually matters.

Thus, this dissertation argues that in constructing race in the U.S. in relation to physical features, society determined racial identity served more for the purpose of the dominant groups’ political, economic, and social motivation, and functioned to elevate or demote certain groups within the social hierarchy. As such, certain members of society used race as a demarcation for separatist ideologies based upon ethnocentric bias.
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The ideology of race society constructed for various reasons, which had little to do with physical difference. Rather fabricating a philosophy of race based on physical difference occurred to secure power, dominance and hegemony over others.

But races are not simply groups of individuals who look alike (if this had been the case, the stakes would have been trivial).

The racialist postulates, in the second place, that physical and moral characteristics are interdependent; in other words, the segmentation of the world along racial lines has as its corollary an equally definitive segmentation along cultural lines.125

---

B. Summary

Rather interesting regarding the discussion of race in America is that often where whites are concerned; race is of far less importance than it is to blacks. Most whites rarely consider race, as white itself, society considered the standard to emulate. For many whites, black people are the only ones in need of a discourse on race, as whites view the subject of race, racial awareness, and race relations, beneficial to blacks only. Many whites consider discourses on race as reinforcing a crutch blacks need to build self-esteem. The following describes Blauner’s research on various societal concepts about race, “…there are two “languages” of race, one in which members of racial minorities, especially blacks, see the centrality of race in history and everyday experience, and another in which whites see race as a peripheral, nonessential reality.”126 The reality is if one group considers racial discourse important and the other group that maintains much of the political, social, and economic control does not, what impact does this have on the life chances of the former? Moreover, many in society infer that the U.S. is egalitarian and judicial and Constitutional laws have long since eradicated all measures of inequality. Further research suggests that inequality continues. Whereas whites are quick to indicate that race is not important where they are concerned, “In sum, the social science literature indicates that race influences most white decision-making most of the time, and the researchers’ own

susceptibility to transparency suggests that unconscious discrimination may be even more prevalent than the studies acknowledge.\textsuperscript{127}

Another area where race is central to U.S. society occurs when work becomes difficult to acquire. For example, as failure on the part of the dominant group—whites to find adequate work occurs, the substituting of one problem—lack of work, is replaced for another—racist behavior against employed non-white workers. Thus, scapegoating ensues, whereas the members of society used to having privilege, benefit and work before others feel persecuted. In such cases, “Scapegoats must be found, simple targets substituted for complex problems.”\textsuperscript{128}

Ultimately, the discourse on race as a precursor to racism, and as a catalyst for anti-discriminatory practices i.e., Anti-racism and Whiteness theory commenced. Although race was significant in the past instigating discrimination, today civil rights have successfully challenged blatant discrimination. Today, societal differences that segregate groups by class differences, rather than race describe the challenges for Anti-racism and Whiteness Theories capacity to eradicate racism.
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In Chapter I, Race, I have shown that unlike prior to the last decade class separates society more than issues concerning race. Society-constructed race to serve the dominant group; and that in order to eradicate racism, it is first necessary to understand the implications of race as a social construct. In constructing race, society made use of the science of the day, which was also part of the social context of the time—racist. Further, the U.S. social construction of race differs in the composition of racial structure. Ethnicity as well as race influenced the evolution of racism. Language is a symbol and extension of race and culture, and language usage in the U.S. exhibits the significance of race, and racism in culture. The historical and current census usage has both an intended and latent function: keep track of races to ensure inclusivity, in tracking racial groups and maintains racial separatism. The divisiveness of race and racism encouraged on the part of the dominant group helped the forming of bi-racial collectives to force political leaders to serve the needs of the majority. The social construction of race in the U.S. as an antecedent to racism launched Anti-racism and Whiteness theory interventions. To continue the discourse regarding, the social construction of race serving as the foundation for the burgeoning of racism, the next chapter examines the origins, definitions, and manifestations of racism in the U.S., and explores the evolution of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory as practices to eradicate racism.
C. The Current State of Racism

Neither, the U.S. political, academic or societal systems have in the last decade engaged in a serious dialogue regarding the subject of race and racism, in America. As in the past, race and racism have functioned to divide society. Historically, whites comprised majority of the wealthy, today the upper class is more racially diverse. Today people of color represent a larger percentage of the upper class. As well, people of color, (particularly blacks and Hispanics) and poor whites comprise an overpopulated growing underclass. To keep the lower socio-economic class divided, racist rhetoric, on the part of the wealthy serves to keep a bi-racial coalition of the poor, working class and middle class from forming. Historically, the slavocracy used race to divide slaves and poor whites, keeping them from uniting into a bargaining unit, for better wages and working conditions. Today, the wealthy, comprised of 1% of the population, control 90% of the combined wealth. The influence of the wealthy is enormous, as they not only control the economy, but also influence the political system to vote in their favor. Thus, politicians as instruments of the wealthy exploit diversity to enflame the public. Rather than focus on issues vital to the welfare of the masses, such as the economy and restoring work, politicians target immigration, a surrogate of racism, to divert attention from how the wealthy benefits, when the working and middle class loses. As anti-bias programs seek primarily the learning and unlearning of racist practices, in not addressing the economic issues central to the livelihood of society, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory are ineffective to eradicating racism. Without associating anti-discriminatory practices to tangible outcomes, such as, jobs sent overseas, outsourcing to countries that devalue workers, “…in China a garment worker makes approximately
86 cents an hour and in Cambodia a garment worker makes approximately 22 cents an hour, "129 detracts from Anti-racism and Whiteness theories chief objective. Such shortsightedness relegates Anti-racism and Whiteness theory superfluous; as civil rights laws implement egalitarianism. In an attempt to examine the influence of racism on the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory in the last decade, it is the intent of this chapter to explore the origins, and historical manifestations of racism in the U.S.

---
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a. Origins and Definitions

What makes racism unlike all other political problems is that it is the product of the irrational and is therefore not easily dealt with by ordinary discourse. We are all victims of the poison of racial prejudice. Racism is part of the fabric of our history, woven into our imperial past and although we have shed our colonies - or most of them – we have not succeeded in shedding the ideologies and attitudes which underpinned our economic and military subjugation of other races and cultures (Jacob Ecclestone, Deputy General Secretary of the National Union of Journalists, in the foreword of a book produced by the Campaign Against Racism in the Media.130

Racism is a most perplexing system for the major reason that for racism to occur it does so by interjecting into the dialogue about race, a content that is both illogical and tenuous. Thus, for racism to sustain, it incorporates fallacious proclamations based more on creating division rather than concluding on its relevance as a rational phenomenon. The historical significance of racism materialized as a manifestation of western imperialism, and burgeoned as a direct result of a sustained sense of American hierarchal status. Through the manufacture of racism as a methodology to dominate, racist beliefs adhered to culture, replacing myth with fact. In addition, through

colonization racism served as a mechanism for justifying the conquest of other nations and cultures. Today racism endures to subjugate.

Racism developed, “as an assertion of Western cultural superiority,” as early civilizations sought to conquer and dominate other cultures; however, motivation was not attributed to physical difference, which most cultures “attached no importance to.” On the other hand, Europeans considered cultural and ethnic characteristics as justification for colonization, judging cultures that respected nature, crude in their cultural evolution. Thus, the cultural practices of other cultures, Europeans rationalized as inconsequential in terms of respecting their rituals and traditions as equal to their own. The customs practiced by native peoples, i.e., worshiping animals, bare clothing that revealed various body parts, and their unusual diets, to the Europeans confirmed the barbarians were inferior both mentally, and physically, from civilized Europeans. Using their belief in the Biblical scripture of Creation, Europeans rationalized the evolution of man occurred for all races during the same time-period, which for the Europeans explained the industrial progress of the Western world, and confirmed the inferior status of all indigenous ethnics. For Europeans assigning inferior status to tribal cultures comparing them to Europeans was habitual, “one people had palaces and cathedrals and technology…while other peoples rowed about in canoes and shot blow-

---
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darts at each other."\textsuperscript{133} This resulted in one of the many ways in which, the burgeoning of racism as a westernized social construct commenced. Moreover, the affinity on the part of Europeans to classify unfamiliar cultures with inferior status served as an added justification when the need for adventure, fortune “and for cheap labor...”,\textsuperscript{134} arose. Moreover, “…coupled with a sense of manifest destiny, and a claim to racial and moral superiority,”\textsuperscript{135} racist attitudes flourished. Europeans utilized racism as a means to advance their materialistic agendas. Memmi proposed that that the savages would submit to domination, “The European colonists, as the dominate group, literally had to be racist to legitimize their control,”\textsuperscript{136} in the first place. In other words, racism was not just a manifestation of imperialism; it was a component of it. As a condition of the domination, a philosophy of inferiority supplanted into the minds of Westerners sufficed to fuel the duplicity in the disparate relationship. For example, in the case of the Negro, the Europeans capitalized on the physical and cultural differences as justification for enslavement:
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…this perception of the Negro as being distinct from the Englishman must have operated to debase his status rather than to raise it.”\textsuperscript{137}

Subsequently, because of the colonization of America by the English, the source of racism within the context of the United States evolved as a condition of colonialism and imperialism.”\textsuperscript{138} Cultural historians argue that racism evolved as a societal invention inherent within civilizations that commended with colonial pursuit. Moreover, the ideology of race grounded in the premise of race and color inferiority sanctioning surfaced in the United States within the social context of slavery, “…the extraordinary power of Western racism and colonialism fully explain why these ideas are so often associated with the West.”\textsuperscript{139} Conversely, D’Souza suggested that, “it does not follow that slavery can account for the origin of racism.”\textsuperscript{140} His claim relies upon his insistence that Europeans openly practiced racism throughout Europe, therefore to D’Souza, it follows that racism did not serve to justify the institutionalization of slavery in the U.S.,


since slavery practiced in other European countries, in itself does not signify racism. Further, D'Souza contended that slavery was based upon the dehumanization of Africans as a source of enslavement, and since Indians were not enlisted to serve in chattel slavery in the U.S., this exonerated slavery as the motive for racism. Nonetheless, D'Souza\textsuperscript{141} reversed his position as he concluded the following:

Racism is habitually equated with slavery today because the two practices evolved together in America years.\textsuperscript{142}

The origins of the term ‘racism’ appeared in lexicon during the 1930s, “the period when The Oxford English Dictionary (1989) cites the first usage of both racism (1932) and ‘racist’ (1936).”\textsuperscript{143} The expression ‘racism’, an idea indicative of racial superiority and racial inferiority and the denotation ‘racist’ indicating an individual’s supremacist behavior for themselves, and inferior belief for other races; and the idiom ‘racialism’ (which appeared much earlier around 1902) were exploited as sources of condemnation for out-groups. Furthermore, in such cases the terminology of racism, racist, and

\textsuperscript{141} Note: As an academic scholar and college president, Dinesh D’Souza is in a most opportune position to influence the outcome of the debate on race, race relations, racism and anti-discriminatory practices. However, problematic for the discourse regarding the aforementioned issues occurs as Indian born D’Souza, places himself as the self-appointment spokesman for Black/White race relations, where he can be found in more than one occasion siding with the most conservative right-wing. In so doing, D’Souza as a man of color, benefits from both Civil Rights and Affirmative Action enactments, while using this as a springboard to propel him into the ranks of conservatism. As such, attempts to eradicate racism become further challenged. Thus, such divisive rhetoric on the part of D’Souza, are used by ultra-conservative groups to unravel the work done on the part of anti-discriminatory practices, to put an end to discrimination, both at the individual and institutional levels. For that reason, I conclude that such posturing on the part of academics such as D’Souza is unscrupulous and injurious to the goal to eradicate racism.

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid P 517

racialism occurred, in cases where racist antagonists—anti-racist activists felt necessary to chastise racist. Thus, those who opposed it, “anti-racists,”\textsuperscript{144} conceived the concept of racism. Bonilla-Silva ([citing Benedict (1945)] described racism as:

\ldots the dogma that one ethnic group is condemned by nature to congenital inferiority and another group is destined to congenital superiority. \textsuperscript{145}

D'Souza suggested that the origins of racism encompassed three divergent perspectives:

\ldots racism is a universal problem... An alternative suggestion, put forward especially by Marxist scholars, is that racism is a product of slavery and that it developed as a rationalization or excuse for enslaving other people. Some black nationalists and Afrocentrists argue that racism is a peculiar feature of the Euro-American mind, and its roots go back to the origins of Western civilization.\textsuperscript{146}

The research explores the origins of racism's offered by D'Souza. The first—racism ‘as a universal problem’ suggests that racism endemic to the United States is not unique, since racism has existed as a condition in previous civilizations. Further, racism
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considered from a universal perspective, meant that the racism experienced in the United States, society replicated, through similar hierarchal statuses according to color—as in the case of black and white, where whites attained superior status and blacks inferior. As for D’Souza’s second charge, ‘racism as a product of slavery’, construed from a Marxist, perspective served to justify slavery. While considering racism through a Marxian social conflict lens, D’Souza failed to refute the Marxist proposition that slavery originated as an economic venture for profit on the part of the capitalist class. Moreover, presenting a further, conservative explanation for the origins of racism in the U.S. he condemned what he contributed to be in itself racist attempts on the part of black nationalists as a method of disseminating propaganda. I argue that racism was based on a stage of inferiority and superiority describing “intellectual and moral” status and, “…have their origins in biological roots and are therefore unfailingly transmitted from generation to generation—is, historically speaking, a modern idea.” 147

Unlike D’Souza,’s disagreement with Nationalists charge that the origins of racism society constructed and grounded in “…a peculiar feature of the European mind,” 148 Aptheker contended that Europeans considered the differences in races to be


biological, and therefore accessed as a generational divide. Moreover, the ideology of biological racial difference awarding superior status to one group at the disadvantage of another subsisted as a condition and expression which science of that time, as a referendum of authenticity, strongly supported. As a social construction, Albert Memmi concluded that in order for racism to leverage advantage and or disadvantage to constituents, it must occur, “…within a social context,”149 to be considered racist.

Another aspect of racism involved its capacity to distribute advantage and disadvantage to recipients based upon institutionalized and societal estimations of worth. The distribution advantage depended upon which groups were considered superior and therefore worthy, leaving to the other group, a position of assumed inferiority and worthlessness. Decidedly, racism devised so, embodied an overabundance of disreputable qualities, of which all of society suffered because of the socialized construction of race. Alastair Bonnett itemized the ways in which racism functioned:

Racism is socially disruptive; Racism is foreign; Racism sustains the ruling class; Racism hinders the progress of ‘our community’; Racism is an intellectual error; Racism distorts and erases people’s identity; Racism is anti-egalitarian and socially unjust. 150


Thus, how society interacted across the racial divide occurred largely because of the rationalizations for social, political, and economic interactions between the races, which racism provides.\textsuperscript{151} That is not to say that all the members of society are racist, but that since racism presents opportunities to victimize, based on the social construction of race it is possible through the social, political and economic interactions of individuals in society. Thus, racism functioned also on an institutional level. The researchers described racism as an institutional apparatus composed of “…five major components, consisting of racist 1) attitudes, 2) emotions, 3) ideology, 4) practices, and 5) institutions.”\textsuperscript{152} These components embodied socialized constructions of racist practices and institutions that considered racism as a by-product of various individual and institutional states of affairs. These institutional apparatuses comprised school systems, hospitals, the law, the media, politics, and religion. Racism as a socialized invention burgeoned because of society’s failure to address the incidents of racism on an individual and institutional level. As a result, racism flourished due to fear, embarrassment, and individual ignorance as to what really constituted racism. Consequently, finding ways to deflate the escalating dilemma of racism continued to escalate, as the goal of deconstructing racism never quite materialized. Thus, the time is ripe for learning and unlearning, what was “denied us”; and that, “Talking about
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racism lessens its power... Talking about racism is a way to....reclaim our lives and true histories."¹⁵³

b. Manifestations of Racism in the United States

As a major instrument in the discourse central to disparate treatment based on color differences involved racisms’ propensity to function in a ritualistic state. For example in *(E) racism: Emerging Practices of Antiracist Organizations*, Michael Omi defined racism as a racist practicum, by which the objective of racism “…creates, reproduces, and maintains inequitable outcome along racial lines.” It suggested that racism as an individual practice operated as a source of competition, amongst peoples of different races. For example, failure on the part of the dominant group to find adequate sources of work occurs, the substituting of one problem—lack of work, is replaced by another—racist behavior against employed non-whites. As such, the practice of scape-goating ensues, whereas members of society used to having privilege, benefit and work before others now feel disadvantaged. Bayard Rustin advised that in such cases, “Scapegoats must be found, simple targets substituted for complex problems.” Thus, these racist practices, emerge advancing ideologies of white supremacy to pacify the discontented. As a socialized system, racism manifests in other more harmful ways causing “…acts of

---


violence toward people of color.”\textsuperscript{156} Moreover, racist practices are both physically and mentally destructive, “…what the system [racism] does to the subjugated is to destroy his sense of reality.”\textsuperscript{157} Because of the conditioning, when it comes to children, the parental guidance that would sustain the physical and mental development of black children is ultimately in jeopardy, and is therefore the instigator of a legacy of damage: “It [racism] destroys his father’s authority over him. His father can no longer tell him anything because his past has disappeared,”\textsuperscript{158} leaving a legacy of bigotry for those not yet born. A crucial preoccupation of racism was to insert practices such as “the duality of fear and aggression,”\textsuperscript{159} meant to intimidate subjects regarded “…as a central role integral to the structure of all racist practices.”\textsuperscript{160} Thus, racism operates in a strategic manner, inflicting domination over those considered inferior. Racism gains a significant advantage, when it aligns itself with fear. For people of color the situation is calamitous, as the propensity to gravitate toward accepting inferior status grows. Initiators of racist practices, in turn, consider black acquiescence to mediocrity, validation of black


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{158} Ibid P 197}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{160} Ibid P 105}
incompetence, thus, reinforcing racists’ conviction. Now, issues that beforehand openly disadvantaged blacks, as exhibited in *de jure* discrimination are now replaced by covert systemic racist practices—*de facto* discriminatory practices, manifested as “…the racial practices and mechanisms that have kept Blacks subordinated changed from overt and eminently racist to covert and indirectly racist.”^161^ That is to say, where racist practices were concerned, black life chances declined in relation to that experienced by whites.

From a historical perspective racism gained momentum during the 1700s, because of slavery. Racism transpired as a cause and effect of the conditions of prejudice instilled by the relationship, which whites, occupying the dominant position, shared with blacks, inhabiting the subservient status of—slave.

As a result, a race color hierarchy emerged. Winthrop Jordan described, the issues resulting from the practices of slavery, prejudice, and racism resulted because of the symptom, the occurrence, legitimization and institutionalizing of slavery:

...the concept of “prejudice” toward social groups—the very term itself!—came suddenly into wide currency in the years after 1760, Samuel Hopkins, the prominent minister of Newport, asked why white Americans saw blacks as “fit for nothing but slaves.” The reason he explained was that:

---

^161^ Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, “Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation.”

we have been used to look on them in a mean contemptible light; and our education has filled us with strong prejudices against them, and led us to consider them, not as our brethren, or in any degree on a level with us; but as quite another species of animals, made only to serve us and our children; and as happy in bandage, as in any other state...

To highlight the influence of a sustained engagement in stereotypical behavior toward race, researchers compared inter-groups and outer-group behavior, whereas inter-group actions deemed normal, and outer-group related behaviors considered as abnormal. As a result, the actions of individuals within the same cultural/racial group of like-members, the inter-group construes sympathetically, while outer-group cultural/racial individuals, the dominant group interpreted as highly problematic. Moreover, considering this paradigm, there is no point of reference for constructively determining the behavior of the dominant inter-group. Thus, the conditions are ripe for racism to flourish. Tim Wise implied “such behavior doesn’t trigger a pre-existing mental schema, or set of beliefs, that can be applied to explain the behavior,”¹⁶³ of the dominate group. Thus, the dominant group considered the individual behaviors of non-


whites in-relation to those of the entire group, “of whites from a purely,”\textsuperscript{164} rational perspective “while blacks who do anything negative are viewed through a racial group lens.”\textsuperscript{165} Observed in this way, inter-group dominance conceals negative character flaws, while negative deeds on the part of individual blacks translate to all blacks. It is in this way prejudice and racist’ propaganda reinforced discriminatory reasoning and ultimately behavior.

An equally important dynamic regarding racist’ practices entailed the conversational dialogues whites engage in privately about blacks. “One recent study increased the privacy of the settings in which white respondents expressed their views, and found that, as the privacy of the settings increased, so did the expression of negative attitudes toward black Americans.”\textsuperscript{166} Moreover, much more damaging than idle gossip were the incidences of “the racial stereotypes and prejudices are not just about negative thoughts, images,”\textsuperscript{167} or feelings directed at outer-groups, but rather they are usually rooted deeply in a positive sense of the inter-group’s position in the racial hierarchy. In this way racism as a strategy to indoctrinate sustains itself. Reasonably, it would be impractical and unfair to legislate what individuals say to each other in private; however, discourse regarding other racism without a certain level of transparency heightens the
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inevitability for the materialization of which “…damaging dialogues will continue to tarnish, to divide and to bolster the prolongation of racism.”\textsuperscript{168} Private race-related discourses increase the possibility to reinforce racist myths and assumptions. For that reason, endemic and problematic to the discourse is the belief that, “…the dominant group deserves its privileged and disproportionate access to social resources, prestige, and status act, which can exacerbate the tendency to engage racist practices as a result of white on black discourse.”\textsuperscript{169} For that reason this dissertation contends, that underneath the instances of whites’ only conversations occurring in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century transpired as a direct result of the lack of black/white socialization because of segregated schools and neighborhoods. Historically, a major factor causing segregated schools and neighborhoods occurred as banks and the government instituted \textit{redlining} of inner-city dwellings inhabited predominately by blacks and the working class. Today, the inner city and the suburbs are mainly as segregated as they were forty years ago. It is no wonder that whites exhibit a mistrust and awkwardness about blacks. Without adequate opportunities to interact with blacks, majority of whites extract their only source for identifying with blacks from the media. "Lacking much opportunity for repeated close contact with a wide variety of blacks, whites depend heavily on cultural material, especially media images, for cataloguing blacks,”\textsuperscript{170} transferring the statistics presented in the media as typical for all blacks. Consequently, racist practices are often times unconsciously sustained.
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Moreover, inaccurate information adapts to transforming myth to fact passed from generation to generation. Ultimately, misinformation affects everyone:

As influential as they are, even powerful white men are born into a highly racialized society that is not of their own making. Their parents and other key adults, as well as older children among whom they grew up, have likely communicated to them certain negative racial attitudes, interpretations, and ideologies.\(^{171}\)

Additionally, other areas where racist practices negatively influenced society, involved the reality that the press rarely depends upon blacks as community leaders to address issues, which represents the whole of society, i.e., politics, education and economics. In most cases, the media only refers to blacks, as experienced professionals in cases were the subject involves race related matters. Accordingly, whites rarely have the opportunity to consider blacks proficient outside the fields of sports or music. Because, whites rarely experience daily opportunities to interact with blacks, the media’s insistence in consorting with blacks from a stereotypical posture consciously and/or unconsciously fails to dislodge negative images of people of urban color where whites are concerned.

\(^{171}\) Ibid P 26
i. *Miscegenation*

…the tribune Canuleius introduced a bill [445 B.C.] for legalizing intermarriage between the nobility and the commons. The senatorial party objected strongly on the grounds not only that the patrician blood would thereby be contaminated but also that the hereditary rights and privileges of the gentes, or families, would be lost.\(^{172}\)

As Livy indicated, ancient Rome considered the intermingling of groups of people from a position of class rather than by racial or color differences. Once society constructed race miscegenation evolved to ensure, in society’s mind, the purity of the races, and a visual branding to discriminate against.

Webster’s New College Dictionary defined miscegenation as “The interbreeding of what are presumed to be distinct human races, esp. marriage or cohabitation between white and nonwhite persons.”\(^ {173}\) D’Souza implied the incorporation of miscegenation laws appeared as a phenomenon of the country’s fanaticism with racial purity, cautioning people on the danger of race corruption “a single drop of black blood is


sufficient to assure membership in the black race.”\textsuperscript{174} According to the miscegenation edict challengers were insured that not only would the white race be contaminated by engaging in relations with members of the opposite race, producing racially inferior children, but such connections would by measure of the “one-drop rule,”\textsuperscript{175} be enough to lose the protection and privileges enjoyed by those possessing full status as whites. Miscegenation as a social construction insured the separation of the races, and enforced the racist' attitudes of superiority and inferiority based upon color difference. Thus, miscegenation served to endorse racism by sanctioning the segregation of the races. W. E.B. Du Bois considered miscegenation a most elusive concept, and justification for it comprised “the opinions and desires of people and of their deep-seated prejudices,”\textsuperscript{176} in order that it be sustained. At the root of miscegenation was the declaration that the merger of the black and white races caused the contamination of the white race. Consequently, miscegenation considered integration, as racism does, detrimental to the existence of the white race.

Miscegenation laws construed inter-marriage detrimental to the white race’s cultural distinctiveness. Arguments based in miscegenation focused on inclusivity to ensure a particular group—whites—maintained continuance as the established race. For example, Stephen Steinberg concluded the following regarding miscegenation:
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Individuals who freely pass in marriage from one ethnic circle into another are not under the spell of an intense cultural or social consciousness. Consequently, the greater number of mixed marriages, the weaker, broadly speaking, the group solidarity (Julius Draschler).\textsuperscript{177}

Clearly, the rationale presented by Draschler inferred that intermarriage between races considered involved other factors than the pollution of the white race. U.S. miscegenation laws served as a decidedly persuasive factor in determining the complexion of the country. Albeit, naturalization and immigration laws operated to shape the physical appearance of the country’s citizens, miscegenation laws represented a major influence in restricting racial fluidity. Prominence of miscegenation laws had a lasting effect, as they remained part of the country’s posture on race mingling “…until they were struck down by the \textit{Supreme Court in 1967},\textsuperscript{178} which in terms of the time it takes society to catch-up to cultural changes, a form of de-facto miscegenation continues today theoretically. In Virginia, miscegenation laws remained after the \textit{1964 Civil Rights Act}, which revealed dichotomy between egalitarianism in the Constitution, as three years after \textit{Title VII} it was in some states still illegal for whites and blacks to marry.


From a historical perspective, miscegenation did not surface until around the latter part of the 1600s. Before that time, intermarriage transpired. As time passed, miscegenation increased, as a product of the burgeoning economic stability of slavery. At first fines levied against those who engaged in intermarriage with non-whites served as the vanguard of interracial unions; in time intermarriage society considered irreprehensible as it became illegal in some states.

In the early 1660s...when slavery was gaining statutory recognition, the assemblies acted with full-throated indignation against miscegenation... In 1662 Virginia declared that “if any Christian shall commit Fornication with a negro man or woman, hee or shee soe offending should pay double the usual fine... When Virginia finally prohibited all interracial liaisons in 1691, the Assembly vigorously denounced miscegenation and its fruits as that abominable mixture and spurious issue.179

Miscegenation as a social construction in concert with prejudice supported the prolongation of racism. Miscegenation legitimated discriminatory practices advanced against non-whites. In its clearest form, miscegenation was divisive in terms of its ability to render those not considered white, as less important, non-deserving of the constitutional rights, and, inferior in relation to all whites. Miscegenation laws validated one’s right of importance, by authorizing who could enter into marriage contract with

whites. Lopez wrote, “It is no accident that the first legal ban on interracial marriage, a 1705 Virginia Acts, also constituted the first statutory effort to define who was Black.” Hence, miscegenation laws supported the formation and evolution of racism, and the necessity for Anti-racism and Whiteness theory.

Of particular interest involved the fact that U.S. miscegenation laws varied state-by-state. In some states miscegenation laws suggested that to be considered black and therefore inferior, an individual would have one-eighth black blood, which defined one as an octoroon; in other states, those having one-sixteenth black blood where considered black.

Alabama and Arkansas defined anyone with one drop of “Negro” blood as Black… Maryland used a “person of negro descent to the third generation” test… Oregon promulgated a one-fourth rule… Texas used an “all persons of mixed blood descended from negro ancestry” standard; Utah law referred to mulattos, quadroons, or octoroons.  

During the early twentieth century, a pre-condition for naturalization for specifically women barred them from marrying with non-whites; and in cases where white women awaiting legal status, could lose their right to become citizens, if they were married to non-whites. Miscegenation laws defined the demography of the country. As such,

---


miscegenation reinforced the doctrine of racism, encouraging the ideology of white racial superiority.

Of particular interest to the discourse, regarding miscegenation concerned the importance placed upon obstructing in particular the black male, white female unions. As a condition of slavery, white men had access to black women’s bodies, and used black women not only for sexual pleasure, but also as a means to degrade and punish black women as well as their fathers, brothers, sons and husbands. However, relations between white males, and black females, while in some cases were consensual,182 garnered less disapproval as the white female, black male’ relations did. A major obstruction to white female, black male unions concerned during slavery, children inherited the status of the mother; therefore, if the mother were a slave the child would be a slave, if the mother were free, as all white women were, the child would also be born free. Thus, to allow white women to marry black men was not profitable, as children to these unions would also be free. As such, miscegenation supported the rationale of both slavery and racism. Possible feelings of vindication for the treatment black women received from white men may have had an effect on sustaining miscegenation. In addition, white men may have had difficulty in coming to terms with white women being attracted to black men, who was perhaps for white men and sometimes even white women unconscionable.

But it was not just the idea of women being actively interested in sex that scandalized so many American women; It was common

182 Note: Historical evidence does exist that during slavery, and afterwards, and in some cases, black women did have consensual relationships with white men, even to the extent of marriage.
knowledge that black women had suffered sexual abuse at the hands of white men during slavery…described in abolitionist propaganda… The idea, however, that white women might find black men desirable was altogether a different issue.183

Moreover, miscegenation allowed white men free access to black women, while ignoring the inevitability of the opposite occurring, between white women for the black men; “it is death to the colored man who yields to the force and advances of… white women.”184 Lynching curtailed black male, white female contact, when white women were often the initiators. “White men lynch the offending Afro-American, not because he is a despoiler of virtue, but because he succumbs to the smiles of white women.”185 Evidenced in J.C. Duke’s Alabama Newspaper the Herald, the attraction white women exhibited for black men:

Why is it that white women attract Negro men now more than in former days? There was a time when such a thing was unheard of. There was a secret to this thing, and we greatly suspect it is the growing appreciation of white Juliet[s] for colored Romeos.186
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To curtail the possibility of white women consensually engaging in relations with black men, Montgomery whites before coercing Mr. Duke into leaving town forced him into printing a retraction, which he before leaving town did not fully comply:

The editor of "Free Speech" has no disclaimer to enter, but asserts instead that there are many white women in the South who would marry colored men if such an act would not place them at once beyond the pale of society and within the clutches of the law.  

Additionally, there were other reported cases of whites addressing the numerous incidents of white women with black men. One such case involved Lydia Maria Child, white female abolitionist who in 1865 spoke critically "against miscegenation laws." As a result, Child’s support base diminished, as a condition of her tolerant stance. Considered a liberal for her time, however Child in some measure recanted, acknowledging that although the relations she spoke of proceeded quite favorably, they occurred since, “…considered by society to be the lowest class of white women who would consider such a union.” Although Child’s latter remarks contradicted her previous statement, later she claimed there were many “…happy unions between white women and black men.” Such a statement in 1865 was radical, considering the time,
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the mindset of majority of whites, and the social context in which blacks and whites lived.

In 1967, in Loving v. Virginia the Supreme Court removed all remaining traces of miscegenation. Interracial marriages during that time in number were most insignificant considering the total U.S. population, “only sixty-five thousand marriages between blacks and whites were recorded in the 1970 census.” Today intermarriage rates have steadily increased. However, marriages between blacks and whites remain consistently lower than for other racial groups; although, interracial unions are on the rise. In an attempt to explore the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, within the last decade this dissertation examined the influence of miscegenation on the development of racism, as causation for the burgeoning of Anti-racism. In this section, I have shown that miscegenation laws encouraged racial division, and sustained inequality and superior and inferior status for whites and blacks. Thus, the evolution of anti-discriminatory practices, i.e., Anti-racism and Whiteness was inevitable. In an attempt to further the discussion regarding the historical origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory during the last decade, this dissertation explores meritocracy, which is problematic, in terms of the necessity and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to eradicate racism, if the United States is truly meritocratic.

---

ii. *The Conflict with Meritocracy*

Problematic to the discourse on racism is the country’s founding principles of liberty and equality. The country’s historical evolution grounded in racist patterns of exclusion and inequality considered “racism as a stain on an otherwise-healthy…society.” As such, the mainstream avidly believes the myth of meritocracy that everyone is and has always had equal access to achieve political, social and economic success. Accentuating the circumstances of the marginalized, Jensen suggested, “It can be difficult for white Americans to recognize that white supremacy is the rot at the core of the project.” Moreover, an ethnocentric view held by the dominant is that the U.S. is a monolith of opportunity for the hard working obfuscates the fact that, “the country’s formation, economic expansion, and imperial endeavors are,” still today severely unequal.

As such, organized racism permeated the evolution of the country’s conduct, laws and the Constitution. Disparate treatment for those decided to be inferior, upheld racism; conversely, those esteemed white accorded privilege and advantage. Today the residual of racism sustained through precedent “both by law and private practice,”
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in one way or another remains “…for over two and a half centuries”\textsuperscript{196} ago. Problematic to the divisiveness incurred as a result of slavery, racism embodied the founding fathers challenge to reconcile the dichotomy between the venerations professed by the Constitution and the unconscionable actions of its citizens engaged in slave-ownership. At the core of the dilemma was the centrality of the race/color issue at the core of slavery. Du Bois argued that for, “The men who wrote the Constitution,\textsuperscript{197} the inconsistency between the language of the Constitution and the practices legally engaged by the people was complex.” The solution found concealed all “recognition of slavery out of the basic form of the new government,”\textsuperscript{198} although slavery/racism remained a vital component of the economic, social, and political composition of the country. In constructing the constitution the founding fathers found the solution to ensure the maintenance and continuation of slavery, “\textit{All men are created equal, blacks are being bought and sold in America, [and] therefore blacks must not be men}”.\textsuperscript{199} Another way slave-owners sought justification for enslaving humans was in distorting
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their inhumanity as liberating Africans from a savage existence in Africa, to one of Christian instruction and the promise of redemption. Nonetheless, even when slaves embraced the Christian religion and conformed to white customs, whites still considered them savage and “…representing an inferior order of creation unrelated to that of whites.” 200 Throughout slavery, whites incorporated a philosophy of racism grounded in an ideology of black inferiority and insisted on the separation of the two races. Their rationale permitted the justification of slavery, while at the same time the pretentious validations engrained by the Constitution served to legitimate slavery. Evidence of duplicity materialized in the Supreme Court’s 1857 iniquitous Dred Scott decision, which characterized the charter’s legitimization of racism. To sustain economic expansion, the profiteers of slavery mandated the social and legalized construction of racism to maintain, what they considered, their right to a free source of labor. Further, the Dred Scott case endorsed racism, and the inferiority of the black race, denial of due process and “pronounced slave ownership as a fundamental property right.”201 D’Souza inferred the charge of government was to function at the behest of its citizens, and if it citizens wanted the right to own slaves, the government had no right to stand in their way. Thus, to the South, government’s civic duty meant fulfilling the needs of its citizens—i.e., the continuance of slavery: “To outlaw slavery without the consent of the majority of whites would be to destroy democracy, and thus to destroy the very basis for outlawing


Slavery represented the political mandates of the southern populace, which stood united demanding the institutionalization of slavery represented a just means of procuring wealth. In this way, slavery constituted a form of commerce, the same as any other respectable trade. To the profiteers of slavery everything was as it should be; the Constitution protected the rights of white men. Moreover, since legal sanction resolved that blacks were not human, the language of the Constitution was uncompromised. Ultimately, the sovereignty of the nation was at risk, as southern slaveholders were reluctant to relinquish their source of wealth—in slaves.

…the choice facing the men gathered in Philadelphia was not to permit or to prohibit slavery. Rather, the choice was either to establish a union in which slavery was tolerated, or not to have a union.203

For slave-owners, the ultimate objective was the continuation of slavery. Although a modified slavery ended with the Emancipation Proclamation freeing slaves in the states of rebellion, slavery ended, with the end of the Civil War with the 13th Amendment’s abolishing slavery. Racism continued through the socialized construction of race, i.e., the one-drop of black blood ruling, and the myths of inferiority pronounced through the failure of Reconstruction and Jim Crow segregation. Today institutional forms of racism embedded deeply within state and federal apparatuses continue to confer advantage to whites at the disadvantage of blacks.
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For since 1876 the race issue has been like a stave driven into the American system of values, a stave so deeply embedded in the American ethos as to render America a nation of ethical schizophrenics. Believing truly in democracy on one side of their minds, they act on the other in violation of its most sacred principles; holding that all men are created equal, they treat thirteen million Americans as though they were not.  

Thus, racism functioned at levels inclusive of the social context in which it occurred. Racism was a product forged by the need for labor, which in turn influenced society. Whether society embraced racism as an extension of slavery, or if society gradually acquiesced to the submission of racist tendencies, because of a history of slavery is still undecided. Racism apart from its evolution as a product of competition fueled by racist’ commentary organized and induced day-to-day public anxiety, “…was less the result than the cause of racist attitudes.”  

Central to the division between blacks and whites was the antagonism exhibited with rivalry for work, which the capitalist and racist’s sentiment energized. The fundamental debate regarding the cause and effect of a culture of racism is highly contestable, as the discourse suggesting competition for work served to provoke racism. Moreover, white assurance of a right to privilege and

---


advantage resembled early manifest destiny beliefs displayed in the country’s founding when societal attitudes represented the rights of white men only. Problematic to a belief in meritocracy entailed a situation in which, on the one-hand, they supported the premise of a democratic formation, as long as the democratic process bestowed compensation primarily to whites.
Central to the argument that slavery in the U.S., involved the fact that slavery did exist in ancient times. However, what is important to note is that the slavery practiced in early cultures transpired without regard to race or color. Thus, an individual or group’s color or race had very little to do with who was enslaved. In fact, often times, the slave masters, and slaves would be of the same race. The expression slave evolved as a term denoting Europeans, and derives from "Slav," a reference to the large number of white slaves captured from that region of Central Europe.206 Slavery understood in earlier cultures entailed the subordination of conquered peoples, with little or no consequence to the race of the defeated. Slavery has often existed without a trace of racism. Thus, racism can develop and persist in the absence of slavery. However, the slavery practiced in America occurred in direct relation to race and color, and functioned as the foundation for racism based on color difference.

The systemic establishment of slavery by the Western world started sometime around the 1500. Historians concluded that as a conquest of the Moors by Portuguese travelers, captive Moorish peoples were thus enslaved and taken to Portugal and Spain to serve in a lifetime of bondage. As an aspect of this conquest, slaves so captured were sold to Spanish and Portuguese merchants bound for the Americas. “By 1500

European enslavement of Negroes had become a fixture of the New World.207

Because of the disparity blacks experienced as a condition of slavery, Karl Marx contended that as a result society diverged into two unequal systems, “an exploiting and an exploited class.”208 Thus, society in the New World differed from the political and social standards of earlier times, as slavery presented the opportunity to divest from slavery as a materialization of conquest, flourishing into a system of race management based on exploitation in recognition of racial difference. As a result, the institution of slavery enhanced the perpetuation of racist ideology which in-turn encouraged the justification for slavery. Thus, "…race contempt crept in when free men could justify their material interests by the scorn they had for slaves."209 The ideological positioning of slavery in conjunction with racism was circular, as it appeared difficult to frame a hypothesis for the rationality of slavery without a pre-conditioning of inferior status attributed to those enslaved. However, arguably racism functioned, as a justification for slavery, does not eliminate how economic gain provided the rationale to establish both slavery and racism in the New World, differently than the slavery practiced in earlier cultures.


Slavery established by Virginia state officials, during the 1600s mandated laws stipulating lifelong servitude (slavery) for any blacks that ran away; before the 1661 stature was enacted blacks served as indentured servants, the same as whites. Historical accounts of Virginia’s census records suggested other methods were employed singling blacks out, “…often Negroes were listed as such with no personal names—a critical distinction,” that ensured a difference of status for blacks and another added way to label. On the other hand, Englishmen as the first of the early American colonizers sought the acceptance of other early white ethnic settlers into their enclave. This occurred after the English secured higher status above all other immigrants groups:

In 1671 Virginia began encouraging naturalization of legal aliens, so that they might enjoy “all such liberties, privileges, immunities whatsoever, as a natural born Englishman is capable of.”

Blacks on the other hand, lost access to all rights, as society unconditionally considered them the same as possessions.

In Black Reconstruction, W.E.B. Du Bois determined that the provisions of the ‘slave codes’ demoralized hope for slaves, as the laws terminated both self-worth, and citizenship:

---
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They could own nothins; they could make no contracts; they could hold no property, nor traffic in property; they could not hire out; they could not legally marry nor constitute families; they could not control their children; they could not appeal from their master; they could be punished at will. They could not testify in court; they could be imprisoned by their owners, and the criminal offense of assault and battern could not be committed on the person of a slave...  

Clearly, slave laws subjected blacks to disparate treatment, while elevating whites to a higher standard of life. Similarly, if blacks were demeaned in terms of not receiving protection of the law, whites conversely benefited. Absolved from any offenses against blacks, whites found solace in the full protection of the law. The laws accorded whites absolute power over the very lives of slaves: “Masters were given immunity from legal prosecution should their slave die under “moderate” correction.” Thus, white citizens were apt to administer punishment to slave children; it was always their choice. The unbridled power whites yielded over slaves encouraged racist' attitudes rooted in prejudicial authoritarianism.

The rationale behind the slave patrols which “white men were required to serve”... along with slave codes, (included hangings, 

---


impaling the heads of disobedient, run-away and insolent slaves executed to instill compliance, and unconditional obedience—as a reminder to all passers-by that black hands must never be raised against white.\textsuperscript{214}

Jordan’s assessment of racist attitudes imbued in the power whites enjoyed over blacks, demonstrated how the penchant towards racism was so enthusiastically accepted. Placing absolute power in the hands of ordinary men, because they were white, paved the way for the ultimate arousal of the manifestations of racism.

Problematic for the slave-masters entailed what to do about free blacks, whose status threatened the stability of the slave codes, and gave hope to the slave population. Slave-masters foremost concern was the insurance of total submission of which the very mention of free black jeopardized. The white power structures sought above all to preserve their domination over blacks, reasoning that as black men first, and in some cases as former slaves, black men “…in any contest between oppressed and oppressors free blacks would side not with their brethren in legal status but with their brethren in color.”\textsuperscript{215} Slave owners resolved if blacks ever obtained freedom, whites would then become the slaves, to black slave-masters. Perhaps, this is why in freed blacks rarely experienced any better importance than slaves did. The same as slaves, the rights of free black men were dependent upon the attitude of the slave-masters. Moreover, free blacks represented “a contradiction, a threat and a
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menace, to white hegemony. For that reason, whites found great difficulty in the social acceptance of blacks in any other status, than subordinate. Consequently, manumitted slaves received even more negative attention than they experienced in bondage, as more than not freed slaves were educated, property holders and considered competition rather than subsidiaries of white prominence. To whites freed blacks symbolized an abomination. Whites contended that manumission “contradicted and undermined it [slavery].”

From a psychological perspective, slavery had a most devastating effect on its subjects. Entitlement meant the acceptance of substandard existence, which re-emerged day-after-day. Life for the slaves meant subjugation to those deemed superior; regardless of their mental ability, born white confirmed their superiority. Subservience endowed on slaves a way of life without parallel. For the slave it demeaned his right to protect his family, or even himself. “It was the helplessness. It was the defenselessness of family life.” For slaves, acceptance meant life in total
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submission; for slaves the right to choose was not an option. Even after the
*Emancipation Proclamation* and the *Civil War* had ended, the freemen received much
the same treatment. The former state of slavery was deeply entrenched in the minds of
the former masters, and served to foster racism. Even after 1866, when Congress
passed and President Johnson signed a civil rights bill to protect the former slaves, was
the freedmen given a legal claim to autonomy. Moreover, the subsequent events of
*Reconstruction* afforded the impossible—former slaves running and holding political
office took hold “…in the 1870s was to have any lasting effect on the social status of
Negroes.” 219 As slavery ended, the aftermath of racism functioned as a symbol of
victory inciting the conquered south to vengeance. Martin argued that racism in the
U.S. comprised the historical consequences bred out of slavery, the failure of
*Reconstruction* and the “*Jim Crow era* had important antecedents in earlier ideologies
and structures of white supremacy.” 220 The burgeoning of white supremacy, which
Martin eluded were cyclical in that white supremacy endemic in the minds of the fallen
leaders bred racism as a means to regain a spirit of retribution. Racism directed openly
towards blacks embodying the mentality and structure of the *Jim Crow* period. As
Martin suggested the manifestations of *Jim Crow* included:

…severe job discrimination: political exclusion including
disfranchisement; civic disabilities, such as exclusion from juries

---
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and prohibitions against black testimony in courts (typically in cases involving black testimony against whites); social ostracism and residential segregation; exclusion from the public domain of schools, churches, hotels, restaurants, pubs, halls, and conveyances; and anti-black terrorism.\textsuperscript{221}

Jim Crow defined life for the freedmen, comparable to what they experienced under slavery.

An additional benefit to the outward manifestations that embodied Jim Crow involved “the growth of an increasingly influential scientific and intellectual racism.”\textsuperscript{222} Thus, Jim Crow instigation increased interest in combating the possibility of integration between the races, by the introduction of a prototype of slavery, more advanced, and twice as lethal. Jim Crow adhered to the judicial rulings of the demise of slavery by integrating racism as “a king of cultural neo-slavery.”\textsuperscript{223} Consequently, slavery evolving into Jim Crow separatism, entailed an innovative measure for dividing the races based in “Social Darwinism—a crude late-nineteenth century socio-biological rationalization of the status quo,”\textsuperscript{224} sanctioning the division of the races. This philosophy many leading scientist of the day endorsed. Consequently, the ideas brought forward by the Jim Crow period encouraged a proliferation of intolerance. Bonilla-Silva concluded that at the center of
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the racial bias, which blacks encountered during the period from the end of slavery up until the Civil Rights Era of the 1960s, initiated:

…keeping them in rural areas, mostly in the South…maintaining them as agricultural workers…and excluding them from the political process…

The racist philosophy during *Jim Crow* enforced a predisposition that blacks were inferior to whites, and must therefore remain in a state of submission. Nonetheless, Bonilla-Silva argued that as workers blacks complemented the labor pool as much during *Jim Crow*, as they did during slavery and the burgeoning of the country.

---

iv. Title VII

Moreover, well after the Jim Crow period has ended, racism is less discernible. Well after and perhaps because of Title VII, the architects of racism are better equipped to avoid detection. Pitts argued that the Civil Rights Act “drove them [overt racist] underground,” making occasions of racist acts less apparent. Does this mean racism no longer exist? No, it does not, racist acts, which occur now are perhaps more problematic than the overt racism of the past. Thus, racism “there is one area in which it is indisputably harder now: the art of knowing who and where your enemy is.” Distinguishing bias is more complex, as racism obscures the identity of perpetrators. For instance, during Jim Crow, racism was transparent, i.e. one knew at all, times whom the enemy was; after the Civil Rights Movement, everyone had access to the rules of the game, but not everyone used them for the betterment of society. Title VII dictating judicial policy indicated what conventions to uphold. Racist individuals employed Title VII language to reinforce the penetration of racist’ interventions, Title VII instructed adversaries on how not to caught, thereby violating civil law. “It’s enough to make you miss Bull Connor and all the other unrepentant racists with whom Martin Luther King, Jr., and his generation clashed in the South.” In any context, it is unconscionable to

---
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consider the reemergence of pre-Title VII, Jim Crow; however, with progress, come latent functionality and unforeseeable loss. Cynicism arose, as the victimized began to question the intent of particular whites in positions of power:

That job you didn’t get, that grade you didn’t deserve, that cold look you received…was the other person just having a bad day, or did he or she have something against a person like you.\textsuperscript{229}

Skepticism manifested as a circumstance of covert racism, in that those who Title VII was to protect were now unable to distinguish neutrality from bias. In The Philadelphia Negro – Color Prejudice, W.E.B. Du Bois argued that racism did not fade away with the end of slavery, but remained threaded within the fabric of American life:

Every one knows that in the past color prejudice in the city was deep and passionate; living men can remember when a Negro could not sit in a street car or walk many streets in peace. These times have passed, however, and many imagine that active discrimination against the Negro has passed with them. Careful inquiry will convince any such one of his error.\textsuperscript{230}

Today racism survives more institutionally. Through extensive legislation, the government eradicated all blatant forms of racism, which were central to all state,
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federal and private apparatuses. However, various forms of institutional racist practices continue. For instance, what occurs today on many college campuses, are systemic to sustaining racism, “On most U.S. university campuses with a Greek system, fraternities and sororities are segregated… the presence of high-visibility and prestigious groups that remain exclusively or largely whites-only adds to the sense of the university as a white-supremacist institution.” These incidents represent viable incidences for the continuance of racial division. Further, of particular interest was how students adopted clearly racist behavior in re-enactments of “ghetto parties in which attendees’ mock urban blacks, or fake slave auctions,” decidedly characterize institutionalized racist behavior, perpetrated on the grounds of federal, state and otherwise integrated institutions. Such incidents position racism as a pervasive obstacle to the achievement of an egalitarian society.

Fundamentally, the racism considered today is no less virulent than that practiced during the Jim Crow. Vital to the new racism is what Bonilla-Silva labeled “lite” has as its central objective the maintenance of “the racial status quo.”

The increasingly covert nature of racial discourse and practices;

The avoidance of racial terminology and the ever-growing claim by whites that they experience “reverse racism”
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The invisibility of most mechanisms to reproduce racial inequality

The incorporation of “safe minorities” (e.g., Clarence Thomas, Condeleeza Rice, or Colin Powell) [I would also add Philippines’, Japanese, Chinese, (i.e., the Asian class labeled the “new model minority])

The re-articulation of some racial practices characteristic of the Jim Crow period of race relations.²³³

Of particular interest is the “safe minorities” which suggests on the part of business leaders that these workers fared better in relation to blacks benefitting unfairly from the system. For example, the overall goal of racism remains committed to segregating whites from blacks, by attempting to plant the label of “welfare loafer” onto blacks, while establishing white workers as “middle class,”²³⁴ and exploited as a result of black freeloding. Arguments of this nature attempt to instill racism, contrasting to the poor and working class an image of societal leaches “devouring the taxes paid by the employed “middle class” workers.”²³⁵ In this way, racism sustains as an ideology no longer founded on inherent inferiority and superiority, but now functions to victimize the
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poor, the working class, and blacks. Moreover, many conceded the eradication of racism was apparent in the election of the first African American president—Barack Obama, but “…it certainly suggests that overt and old-fashioned bigotry has diminished substantially, hardly speaks to the larger social reality faced by millions of others,”236 poor, marginalized, urban dwelling peoples of color.

---

D. Summary

As the discourse on racism reveals, racism has transpired as part of the founding of America. Western society employed ethnocentricity as a means to suppress Africans. If conquest and exploitation were not the true reasons for the Europeans view of Africans, perhaps the effect of race and racism in the U.S., may have been different. Hence, Europeans used color and cultural differences as justification for enslavement of Africans. As a result, through slavery, racism emerged. Further, shaped by society’s construction of race and visible and easily identifiable physical differences racism in America flourished. Thus, racism founded on color and physical difference served to segregate the black and white races. In addition, other societal constructions such as, miscegenation reinforced the separation of the races, as intermarriage between races served to create a pluralistic society, which was abhorrent to the principles imbued in racism. Today, federal laws, i.e. Title VII forbade any form of racist overtures, racism resides primarily within institutional settings, such as educational, and criminal justice systems. That is not to state that all forms of racism have today been eliminated, as racist incidents randomly continue to occur, evidenced in the Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics for 2009 reporting that within the year there were, “…7,783 criminal incidents”\(^\text{237}\), of which biased towards individuals religion, sexual orientation, 

\(^{237}\) See: [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hc2008/index.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hc2008/index.html). The Federal Bureau of Investigation Hate Crime Statistics; Overall a majority of the related hate crimes were perpetrated more in relation to race and racism than any other factors covered by Title VII: “An analysis of the 7,780 single-bias incidents revealed that 51.3 percent were motivated by a racial bias, 19.5 percent were motivated by a religious bias, 16.7
ethnicity and national origin, disability and race reported throughout the U.S. Thus, racism continues today as individual incidents, rather than as federally sanctioned occurrences. Thus, individuals, carefully use racism, as in the past as a way, to keep society divided. Race instigators fail to point out how they use racism to shield the competition for work as unskilled work continues to be sent overseas to countries, that out-bid American labor, as there are no protections for workers, or minimum wage, in these foreign countries. Thus, racist masterminds incite animosity in an American society, that is already angry about the loss of work, hoping that in doing so, the middle class will overlook the real enemy—the wealthy 1% of the population that control 90% of America’s wealth, and insists that their companies continue to profit, even when work is scarce."238

In this chapter, I have shown how the origins of racism within the manifestations of racism such as miscegenation and meritocracy led to creating a racist state, which created the need for the entrance of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory. In addition, this

percent were motivated by a sexual orientation bias, and 11.5 percent were motivated by an ethnicity/national origin bias. One percent involved a bias against a disability.

238 According to Michael Snyder, editor of theeconomiccollapseblog.com, More than 40 percent of Americans who actually are employed are now working in service jobs, which are often very low paying. In addition, for the first time in U.S. history, more than 40 million Americans are on food stamps, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture projects that number will go up to 43 million Americans in 2011. Today, the situation for the Middle class is reaching a crisis. The country now is experiencing a shortage of 11 million jobs, and the number is expected to grow, if measures are taken to correct the situation by business leaders and the government Richard Trumka The Shrinking Middle Class. At the same time, various political and societal groups are using racism as a method to incite the public into ignoring the real source of the problem. Thus, keeping the members of the middle class, black and white from forming a collective unit to force the president and a bi-partisan congressional leaders to pass laws to support the needs of the majority—middle, working class and the poor.
chapter argued that a latent result of *Title VII*, allowed racist advocates to exploit civil rights language to obscure racist incidences. Thus, this chapter examined *Title VII*, in terms of concepts expressed by critical race theory. As a result, this chapter argues that racism was a manifestation of the social construction of race, and as such, race the social construct, and racism demonstrated the necessity for anti-discriminatory interventions, and resulted in the origin of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory. The next two chapters examine the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to eradicate in the last decade.
Chapter II: Current State of Anti-Racism in the Last Decade 2000 – 2010

The philosophy of Anti-racism suggests Anti-racism acts as a negation of racism. Educational organizations, i.e. K-12, colleges and universities, businesses etc., employ Anti-racism to obstruct racist practices. Organizations, commerce, and the government, employ some measure of anti-racist provisions. In places of work, the Human Resources department initiates anti-racist instructions for company employees. Thus, anti-racist practices employed at places of employment represent Diversity Training, and are inclusive of all members of the organization, such as in cases of racist overtures directed at any employee, sexual harassment, and any aggressive actions occurring between employees. In the business setting, Anti-racism’s most important role is to protect the company from incurring a lawsuit. Thus, anti-racist programs employed by companies serve more in a defensive role, rather than the eradication of racism.

Anti-racist programs used in K-12 are comprehensive of multi-cultural applications, choosing to embrace the diversity represented in the country. Implementations of Anti-racist formats in K-12 are subject to School Board approval, and are therefore not mandatory, nor required by all schools. Thus, Anti-racist applications in some elementary, middle, and high schools have not occurred, as teachers are required to teach only what the School Board mandates. In some schools, an anti-racist education correlates with behavior conditioning, and used as a process to defuse aggression.
Overall, anti-racist education used in schools varies from the way businesses employ anti-racism.

Anti-racism has a long history in the United States, with much of that history evolving because of, slavery, and Jim Crow segregation. Anti-racism has different meanings for different individuals, groups and establishments. In an attempt to examine the facility, and efficacy of Anti-racism to eradicate racism, within the last decade, it is the intent of this chapter to explore the historical origins of Anti-racism, and the individuals, situations and circumstances that informed its development.
A. Origins and Definitions

A racist society breeds and needs a racist historiography. Where the racism was blatant and naked and where the relationship of forces was still heavily weighted on the side of the oppressors, the Veil, in the historical profession, seemed all but impenetrable.239

As a component of undermining racism, anti-racism sought to create a forum by which various educational practices coalesce to eradicating racism. In order for this to occur, Anti-racism must first address how its practices operate, by defining itself and how it includes the means for uncovering and eliminating racism. For example, In Anti-Racism, Alastair Bonnet provided an illustration of what Anti-racism entailed, “A minimal definition of Anti-racism is that it refers to those forms of thought and/or practice that seek to confront, eradicate and/or ameliorate racism.”240 Describing what anti-racist’ practices embody, providing a definition of what it is, and what Anti-racism proposed to do. “Anti-racism implies the ability to identify a phenomenon – racism – and to do something about it…anti-racism cannot be adequately understood as the inverse of racism.”241 Thus, implying that Anti-racism functions as the negation of racism restricts anti-racist practices.

---
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Anti-racism emerged as an unintended result of industrialization and brought forward to advance the life-chances of oppressed groups. Anti-racism developed after the post-antebellum period ended, as a means to address the needs of the freedmen. Moreover, Anti-racism sought the eradication of not only racist practices, but also the practices that sustained the continuance of the status quo. As a western twentieth century innovation, Anti-racism operated to undo inequality within the political, economic and social systems of mostly “English- and French-speaking countries.”\textsuperscript{242} During this period, diverse disenfranchised groups fought for recognition, as various social revolutions occurred, “such as anti-sexism and gay rights,”\textsuperscript{243} which along with civil rights actions fueled a progression of liberated socialized revolutions. Thus, Anti-racism originated not only as a system to negate racist practices, but also to uncover, confront and abolish racism.

Engaging a dialogue on Anti-racisms’ current state warrants first a thorough investigation of its historical origins. Moreover, the discourse will be limited to examining the historical evolution of Anti-racism within the United States only. During the 19\textsuperscript{th} century U.S., legal precedents initiated by the highest court in the country, the United States Supreme Court provided the rationale for the evolution and necessity for the commencement of Anti-racism to function as an inhibitor to racism. For example, during this period, court decisions ruled unfavorably against already marginalized citizens. When the high court decided the 1896 \textit{Plessey v. Ferguson} ruling, in essence
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the court-sanctioned bigotry, “…anti-racist legislation coming from Reconstruction, [the Supreme Court] helps speed and consolidate the affirmative institutionalizing and legalizing of a racist society.”244 Further, Plessey v. Ferguson authorized disparate treatment based on racial difference. If the separate but equal ruling would have been exact, perhaps Anti-racism may have developed differently, or not at all. However, since the court provision of ‘separate but equal’ never materialized, it endorsed inequality, and the right to discriminate. Thus, bias buttressed by legal endorsement, burgeoned. Moreover, proclaimed as the neutralizer of racism, Anti-racism sought to expose, challenge and eradicate racism. In addition, anti-racist practices sought the education and the reeducation of its intended audience on the veracity and tenuous nature of racism.

Another vital area involving anti-racist intervention entailed anti-racism’s quest to confront the multiplicity of ways racism functioned. For example, anti-racists present a united front for the discontinuance of oppression, which the marginalized experience from the intersection of race, class and gender. One of the most salient features imbued in anti-racist education is in Anti-racism’s capacity to provide a forum for undermining racist’ practices. Troyna considered Anti-racism robust means to confront the duplicity of racism’s multi-layered constitution. Troyna wrote:

The starting point of Anti-Racist Education is a recognition of the significance of power relations associated with ‘race’, sex and class [its] rationale, that there must be exposed and challenged in a programmatic strategy of education. 245

Today the relationship for Anti-racism and its nemesis racism is acerbic, as anti-racism subsists assaulted by economic, political and social adversaries. For instance, from the right, comes the insistence that the need for anti-racist mediation is long past, encouraging the public to question the value of Anti-racism. Anti-racism struggles to survive in the twenty-first century, when economic instability is the foremost concern of U.S. society. Such circumstances position anti-racist interventions second to global challenges and at times, not at all, when considering low-income nations more concerned with health, sanitation and survival, and other industrialized nations that do not share the historical consequences of slavery and segregation as the U.S.

Changing racial dynamics are in part the effects of anti-racist movements and of the achievement of democratic reform in the latter half of the twentieth century. They are linked as well to new patterns of globalization, to the unsteady and unfulfilled postcolonial situation that obtains across the world’s south, and to the

tremendous international flows of people, capital, and information around the planet.246

Consider the following: often, what we interpret as encompassing our understanding and ways of interacting where the races are concerned has been self-imposed upon us from the past and are difficult to change, presents to us opportunities to examine possibilities for change. Without any attempt on our part to try, the past remains an invincible force controlling the future. For instance, often educators well versed in instruction on a collection of subjects considered engaging with those different, awkward.

I can’t possibly teach Black women’s writing—their experience is so different from mine, yet how many years have you spent teaching Plato and Shakespeare and Proust. 247

Eloquently, Lourde transformed the meaning of difference into an analogy exposing the irrationalness of the argument: if race, i.e., color denotes difference, then why would the differences involving sex not also construe the same? At issue for anti-racist’ discourse was to examine the context of what represented actual validation of difference. Thus, it was also important to establish the means in which differences


served to divide. For instance, the major problem involved developing a means for recognizing how failure to perceive what was at the core of the problem resulted in the unintentional preservation of racism, “…for it is not difference which immobilizes us, but silence.”
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B. Defining Psychological and Structural Anti-Racist Rhetoric

The Society of Friends

A discourse on the historical origins of Anti-racism in the United States would be amiss without an examination of the pioneer work of the early Quaker abolitionist. The Quakers were the most effective of all the anti-slavery anti-racist advocates. Also known as the Society for the Friends, the Quakers were a force of reckoning. The Quakers were resolute in their fight against slavery, and gaining equality for all men and women. The Quakers as a religious group originated during the middle seventeenth century because of “the social and religious turmoil of the English Civil War in the mid-seventeenth century.” Instrumental to the religious doctrine of the Society of Friends was their steadfast position of fairness for everyone, regardless of their racial and or class status.

… that for the Quakers it was part of the mandates of their denomination that they not only preach justice but they speak as social activists to undermine injustice wherever it would be found: [the Quakers] underwent years of persecution partly for doctrinal heresy and partly for their stubborn persistence in pushing the

---

relational principle of equality into areas which nearly everyone else regarded as of purely temporal concern.\textsuperscript{250}

The Quakers considered it an abomination to consider anyone subordinate, as they respected everyone, “…bear the Image of God, viz. their fellow-Creature, Man,”\textsuperscript{251} as creatures of God. Within the Quaker statue their existed a growing pattern of anti-racist nature, whereas, most other religious groups remained unaffected. The Quakers steadfastly, worked to undue inequality with, “…almost childlike directness at the moral wrong of slavery,”\textsuperscript{252} committed with such expediency and zeal that in 1750 the Quakers organized an unequaled fifteen denunciations of slavery. Moreover, the Quakers above all other religious groups of the time were without doubt instrumental in preparing the groundwork for the development of Anti-racism.

Considering the Quaker movement as a monolithic aspect of the abolitionist movement, the Quakers vested the movement’s motivation on achieving three major objectives, foremost among them being, “to abolish slavery immediately and without compensation to the owners.”\textsuperscript{253} Accomplishing the first part of the goal entailed mounting a cogent battle, since slave-owners steadfastly fought to maintain their free source of wealth. The second task, the Quakers undertook was to admonishment
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slaveholders for expecting compensation for the loss of what they deemed property—slaves. The Quaker abolitionist’ agenda comprised informing society, where the south engaged in slavery, the north indirectly benefited. For the Quakers combating the racist practices in the north equaled the eradication of slavery in the south. Thus, the abolitionists found that within their own homeland—the north, prejudice and bigotry abound. The third function behind the Quaker abolitionist movement encompassed ensuring that once free, slaves would receive the help needed to live productive lives, which the Quakers sought to provide.

As freedom fighters, the Quaker abolitionists sought the elimination of racist practices and physical and Christian intervention for the slaves. A central element of the abolitionist movement that has not always been obvious involved the demographic composition of its membership. The generalized perception suggested the membership to be comprised of only whites, when in fact the movement was quite diverse. For example, the membership “was a black-white movement,” comprised of not only color diversity, but women of both races were active within the movement. Generalizations concerning the movement determined that for it to be successful the strategic positions, “as inspirers…and leaders,” would necessarily have to be white. However, if the movement were to be truly effective the membership would have needed the assistance of blacks, as former slaves, and freedmen to enlist the trust of the slaves seeking
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assistance. Together men and women both black and white comprised the rank and file of the abolitionist movement sought a monumental goal—the defeat of chattel slavery. In order to achieve these goals Quaker abolitionists took on the difficult charge to overthrow the slavocracy, the implicit royalty in need of subjects, i.e., slaves to complement their hegemonic status.

Of the early slavery, i.e., anti-racist activists, Anthony Benezet and John Woolman were the revered champions of the Quaker movement. Benezet as a publicist used journalism as a forum to disseminate antislavery principles; and Woolman considered by most historians as the “the man who as much as any other moved the Quakers to action.” Woolman wrote eloquently of the position that slavery had reaped upon the slave, and of the disadvantages, which subjected Black people to a subservient existence.

Suppose then, that our Ancestors and we had been exposed to constant Servitude, in the more servile and inferior Employments of Life...that while others, in Ease, have plentifully heaped up the Fruit of our Labour, we had receiv’d barely enough to relieve Nature, and being wholly at the command of others, had generally been treated as contemptible, ignorant Part of Mankind: Should we, in the Case, be less abject they are now?  

---
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As early antislavery, anti-racists’ the Quakers sought the education of the community illustrating that the temperament and disposition of Black people was civil, rather than to educate the public to ignore color difference. They accomplished their goal by undermining the myths and prejudices unceremoniously awarded to the slaves. Quakers were quick to resolve, all this done by the slave-owners purely for rendering slaves suitable for the station of slave. Quakers applied the same language to label Blacks as uncivil; to educate society the rationale used to identify whites as superior and blacks as inferior, “...the Negro’s immorality and ignorance could be completely transformed by saying that these qualities were not a reason for, but the result of, enslavement.”\textsuperscript{258} It is in this way, Quakers understood the rationale and justification of slavery, and sought to undo the image, which slave-owners spread about slaves. These pioneer anti-racists confronted and re-educated the position held by many, particularly in the south, “…that blacks were inherently stupid and unfeeling.”\textsuperscript{259} Thus, the job for the Quakers was monumental, as most importantly, “…they need[ed] to create a climate that undid the myths,”\textsuperscript{260} while keeping with their mandate to defeat the subjugation of the black man. Today foremost for modern day abolitionists involves the unraveling of institutionalized forms of racism deeply hidden with the structure of organizations. Thus, modern day anti-racist activists have perhaps a much more difficult time in trying to undo racism.

\textsuperscript{258} Ibid P 116  
\textsuperscript{259} Ibid P 116  
\textsuperscript{260} Ibid P 116
Black Anti-racists

Initially, Black anti-racist organizers sought to found a coalition of anti-racist imbued with diversity. In time, black anti-racist fundamentalist embraced a position of separatism, with white anti-racists active in the struggle. The black nationalists contended white involvement would limit black ability to govern the movement. The radical black leadership rationalized that the establishment of a positive black identity was unachievable through a history of black existence in America was in itself central to Anti-racism. Soon afterwards, the issue of identity gave way to calls for the achievement of “black solidarity”\textsuperscript{261} that for the nationalist outweighed the importance of black white unity. Conversely, white anti-racist activists saw their roles eliminated from the ranks of the black movement. In time, the leaders of the Nationalist groups advised whites that their presence was unnecessary to furthering black equality. In his autobiography, Malcolm X explicated the position of black nationalists toward white involvement in the anti-racist movement:

I tell sincere white people. “Work in conjunction with us—each of us working among our own kind.” Let sincere white individuals find all other white people they can who feel as they do—and let them form their own all-white groups, to work trying to convert other white

people who are thinking and acting so racist. Let sincere whites go
and teach nonviolence to white people.\textsuperscript{262}

Malcolm’s instructions encompassed racism as a white’s only phenomenon, and black only activism. The centrality of racism as a white attribute emanated from whites as the dominant group commanding tremendous power over political and economic enterprises. For that reason, nationalists concluded that racism was systemic to hegemony and power. As a structural anti-racist activist, Malcolm inferred that racism was pervasive among whites, believing that being born white, endowed those with access to wealth, and inevitable capacity for racist tendencies. Thus, the negation of racism would only occur when whites avidly targeted racist whites, whom they alone were more aware of the existence of:

The Negroes aren’t the racists. Where the really sincere white people have got to do their “proving” of themselves is not among the black victims, but out on the battle lines of where America’s racism really—is among their own fellow whites.\textsuperscript{263}

Stokley Carmichael concurred, suggesting that undermining the movement’s success was the reluctance on the part of whites to confront the racism rampant in their own neighborhoods “…they are afraid to go into their own communities—which is where
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the racism exists…and work to get rid of it.” Thus, for black anti-racists, the whites whom were more at home assisting blacks in the struggle were not to be trusted, as it was possible for them to reclaim their anonymity at the end of the day. Thus, black anti-racists’ nationalists were suspicious of whites they considered overly attentive to issues directly affecting only blacks. He confirmed his trepidation of the whites exhibiting what he determined to be excessive attention to the black cause:

I sure don’t want to hurt anybody’s feelings, but in fact I’ll even go so far as to say that I never really trust the kind of white people who are always so anxious to hang around Negroes, or to hang around in Negro communities. I don’t trust the kind of whites who love having Negroes always hanging around them.

Certainly, not all black radical anti-racist nationalists professed the same vigor as Malcolm X. However, the Nationalist movement chose to challenge the status quo of racism in the 1960s as it also challenged the sincerity and necessity of incorporating whites as allies. On the other hand, to whites the philosophy of Black Nationalism represented negativism routed in needless revenge.

---


A central tenet of the black anti-racist, Black Power Movement involved Adam Clayton Powell’s infusion of his own rhetorical style with historical references of the movement’s capacity to advance black self-empowerment. For that reason, the community of black extremists utilized Black Power advocacy as a source of counter-resistance to white domination. Years before, Marcus Garvey and his Universal Negro Improvement Association UNIA provided a similar guideline to establishing black, self-improvement, pride and identity. A major pre-occupation of Black Power involved the insistence on the part of the leadership that association with the organization did not denote violence, unless in a last resort. Additionally, the movement grounded in principles of fostering black pride symbolized advocating “black is beautiful” unlike how black had been equated under slavery and Jim Crow. For Black anti-racists, Black Power signaled a monolith change with the past. Interestingly, Powell Jr. intimated that acceptance of Black Power doctrine included a break not only with whites, and pessimism in terms of black potential; it also demonstrated that blacks were to strive for “a complete separation from Negroes, especially the Negro bourgeoisie…”266 For the Black Nationalists the black appellation—Negro confirmed black subservience. Moreover, in the separatist membership “Negro bourgeoisie” caste symbolized black self-hatred and an aspiration to use their access to wealth as a means to sever association with the black community for acceptance in the white. Ultimately, Black Power characterized an unconditional separation from white leadership and the white community at large. In 1967, the Conference on Black Power demonstrated the influence of the Black Power movement on promoting the ideology of movement into
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seeking reparation remedies to transform the movement’s discourse into an action plan. The revolutionary charter entitled “The Case for Black Separatism” was self-explanatory. Perhaps to temper the terseness of the document, the architects conveyed that their objective sought “not for separation but merely for dialogue,” even though, their position was unmistakable—black secession. The article indicated that not only would dividing the country physically serve black interest, it would also “appeal to…the Southern white racist…” In the end, the resolution espoused the support of the same form of racist tactics embraced by racist adversaries.

Perhaps, peace activism advanced beforehand by pacifist inspired the radical factions of the Black Power Movement. At issue for this pacifist resistance, endorsed peaceful insurgent activism dispensed through actions meant to expose discrimination and marginalization. This group challenged segregated restaurants, hotels, employing sit-ins, and marches to disrupt Jim Crow establishments. The renowned leader of the pacifists’ movement, Dr. King exploited non-violent resistance actions for its power “to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension…” as a methodology to insuring the negation of racism and discrimination. Non-violent resistance epitomized

---
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the foundational principles encompassing structural Anti-racism activism. The central objective of direct action exemplified an avid usage of Anti-racism ideology. The disciples of Black Nationalism although exuberant in their separatist stance also embraced anti-racist philosophy, characterized in their desire to detach as they considered the prospects for integration “has been a disastrous failure… of which the only sensible recourse being—the partitioning of the country into two segments—one for blacks, one for whites.”

Proponents of peace focused on utilizing radical anti-racist advocacy to considering that to defeat racism, a collaborated effort from both blacks and whites should occur. For these activists discrimination affecting only blacks was a myth. A major portion of society thought racism disadvantaged only blacks, implying only black people should fight racism. However, the eradication racism depended upon advancing a united front, where both blacks and whites recognized that racism affected the whole of society, and to overcome racism, it was important to recognize the pervasiveness of racism, “racism is the main weapon of reaction and the negation of humanism itself.”²⁷⁰ Hence, black-white unity revealed concurrence and a shared interest in halting racism. Black-white merger to eradicate racism interjected structural anti-racist action fundamental to overcoming institutionalized racism.

To reverse these negative trends, workers—white, Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American, and Asian—must unite in a struggle

to end the crime of rampant racism and to achieve an approach to
economic equality, housing, and education equality through
definitive affirmative-action demands. Such a united struggle is a
necessary, central part of working-class efforts to reverse the
deterioration in the living standards, civil and human rights, and
power of American labor.  

Structural anti-racist activists indicated that institutionalized/structured racist
perverseness subsisted because of society’s inability to consider racism as a
manifestation residing outside of individual behavior. Thus, “…racism continue[s] in a
society or organization, even if individuals are not overtly racist.”  
In fact, institutionalized racism entrenched in school systems affected the distribution of access
to wealth as the monies schools in affluent neighborhoods received from property taxes
far outweighs that received from schools in poorer districts. As a result, “the United
States… [is] still overwhelmingly segregated in terms of housing,” and access to
wealth diminishes for the children of the poor residing in marginalized school districts.
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Steinberg insisted, “The sheer existence of a vast black underclass is prima facie evidence of institutionalized racism.”

Proponents of Anti-racism remain divided on recommending the best anti-racist model for eradicating racism. Some suggested that racism structured on racial inferiority and superiority, determined that to undo racist practices society needed the re-educating society of the history of American racism. Thus, there are those that, “…view racism as a system of racial discrimination, seeing its key site of operation not within individual consciousness, but in social processes that lead to racial inequality.” Perhaps, more important is resolving what is the best method to engage anti-racist education; converges on whether one believes the damage offered by racist behavior is more catastrophic from its existence in the minds of its perpetrators or within the institutional systems operating within society. In either case, the question centers on resolving the same argument embraced in the discussion of guns: “do guns kill people or do people (who actually shoot the guns) kill people? Hence, do institutionalized systems operate to discriminate and marginalize certain groups, or are the people who establish and control these systems guilty of racist conduct? Concluding relevance on the validity of Anti-racisms’ various practices reside in first connecting Anti-racism to an adequate explanation of what racism really is. Thus, employment of anti-racist endeavors are enlisted as what he described “a ‘just do it’ imperative that privileges

---


action as the soul of the movement.” 276 In such cases, the labor of Anti-racism becomes active employed at the grass-root level. Moreover, the philosophy of Anti-racism embraced a common sense practice, which in the past was in itself problematic. For example, once society considered blacks inferior because of the manner in which society constructed race, which society substantiated in their assessment of dominant group’s common knowledge.

A central obstacle to utilizing anti-racist preventive measures involved society’s reluctance to acknowledge and recognize the existence of racism. Ultimately, racism gained strength when rationalized as occurring infrequently or as a phenomenon belonging to the past. To anti-racist, the most effective approach to defeating racism necessitated engaging racism directly, via anti-racist practices. Tatum insisted that problematic to the eradication of racism was when fear of uncovering racist sentiments of the past contributed to the abatement of anti-racist dialogue. For Tatum, fear and apprehension on the part of engaging anti-racists’ rhetoric demonstrated that “…something is wrong in our approach,”277 in attempting to eliminate racism.

Moreover, entertaining anti-racist practices seldom occur as the average American usually engages issues of race from a distance—through the media, rather than directly. In other words, society rarely engages one-on-one discourses on race. In order that racist’ activism diminishes; ant-racist infer, dialogue must occur. Thus, the first action in the anti-racist process is the acknowledgement that racism exists. If this first step
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manages to occur then the foundation for unraveling racism through anti-racist interventions has a good chance of occurring.

To say we are not at fault for the stereotypes, distortions, and omissions that shaped our thinking as we grew up does not mean we are without responsibility. While we may not have polluted the air... 278

---
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Psychological

But be not deceived, friends, Let us, like brave men and women, face the stern reality of our situation. We are where we are. We are in the midst of a bitter and hitherto an invincible race-prejudice, which beats down into dust all of our rights, all of our attainments, all of our aspirations after freedom and excellence.279

Anti-bias scholars regard Anti-racism as a practical method for dismantling racism. Moreover, anti-racist programs function to address the psychological and structural manifestations of racism. Arguably, racist behavior as a demonstration of prejudice and intolerance affects the physical as well as the mental well-being of the individual. At the institutional level, racism penetrates the core of institutions, embedding racist practices within. Racism assaults the mental stability of its victims, as racist practices occur most often undetectable and therefore far more difficult to defuse. Because of the bureaucracy in organizations, racism manifests as a problem of monolithic proportion. In the opening, vignette Theodore Grimke’s speech was a rallying cry for anti-racist activists towards the pervasiveness of psychological racism. Grimke construed “race-prejudice” [racism] highly problematic when not contested.

Katz contended that other societal moral and controversial dialogues where at stake, “ranging from women’s equality to lesbian, gay, and bisexual civil rights, from religion to political ideologies…” have a better chance of transpiring when racism and its adversary—anti-racist discourse receive serious attention. Moreover, even when anti-racist discourse does occur it does so “mired in misinformation and miscommunication, which could underscore the efficacy of anti-racist intervention. Thus, ethically speaking, community building demanded that at the individual level, “… [Every] one must find some way to be antiracist.”

Jensen challenged whites to acknowledge how the system unfairly advantages them and to do something about it. Additionally, an added benefit to engaging anti-racist practices occurred in challenging racism, whites; recapture a sense of integrity in anti-racist activism. By not confronting racism, permits the malignancy of racism to plague the mental stability of all of society. In the process, the overall well-being of society racism damaged. Equally so, racism-embodied characteristics which when left uncontested affected mutually both blacks and whites.

In his renowned *I Have a Dream* speech, Dr. King warned of racisms’ capacity to obfuscate by dehumanizing both oppressed and oppressor:

---
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In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence…

To anti-racist advocates as King it was vital to the survival of Anti-racism that anti-racist practices exposed the volatile nature of racism, in order that the way to achieving equality occurred. Consequently, anti-racist observations require transparency, and a vigilante approach, replicating the opposition to anti-racism’s tactics—racism. Thus, it is essential that the language of anti-racism exclude utilizing adversarial aggressiveness to eliminate racism. For example, during the 60s and the burgeoning of the nationalist movement, anti-racist philosophy grappled with a more aggressive approach to dislodge racism at the individual and institutional level. The anti-racist activists attracted to interventions of peace embraced a more moderate posture on what eliminating racism meant. Unlike the hard-line stance of the nationalists, the negative peace advocates understood the reversal of racism demanded cooperation from the ranks of both black and white activists. As Dr. King resolved that without a collective front, destabilizing

King wrote, “...their destiny is tied up without our destiny and they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.”

---

Structural (Synthesis)

By making a fundamental distinction between personal and structural violence, it can be seen from two angles… this is exactly the same as peace, which is understood as the absence of violence. A more expansive concept of violence leads to a more expansive understanding of peace: peace defined as the absence of personal violence and the absence of structural violence. These two forms of peace are referred to as negative peace and positive peace.285

Johann Galtung proposed that a connection existed between peace and violence, whereas personal peace represented negative peace, or an absence of violence, and structural violence inferred positive peace, and/or social activism. Thus, considering anti-racist practices in relation to Galtung’s constructs of positive and negative peace, suggests that when racism occurs from individual behavior, anti-racist intervention engage negative peace—the absence of personal violence, thus conducting educational practices to discourage racist behavior are warranted. Racism detected at the institutional level required anti-racist commitment to employing positive peace—the absence of structural violence, requiring engaging in social activism to dismantle racist practices embedded within organizational bureaucracy. Thus, utilizing the analysis of

anti-racism practices to positive and negative peace presents opportunities to eradicate racism at the personal and institutional level, for achieving peace.

Anti-racist practices from the perspective of structural violence address engaging structural institutional racism from a position of advocacy, and anti-racist applications from the perspective of personal violence indicate contesting personal racist behavior from an instructive posture. Galtung suggested that violence perpetrated at the structural or institutional level is quite different from the personal violence individuals initiate. Moreover, as an aspect of both personal and structural violence, Galtung indicated that peace was the antithesis to violence and deescalated the potential of violence. Thus, the analogy of positive peace, i.e. structural violence represented positive occasions to employ anti-racist’ practices to terminate institutionalized racism, which negatively affected marginalized groups. Efforts to address the incidences of structural violence warrant actively engaging positive peace—represented in political, economic, social and grass roots activities to expose institutionalized racism in private and public organizations. Thus, utilizing structural anti-racist practices assist in defining the best practices for confronting racist practices embedded in institutional settings.

Marilyn Frye compared the manifestation of structuralized institutional racism to a birdcage, which uses bureaucracy to bind the marginalized:

It is perfectly obvious that the bird is surrounded by a network of systematically related barriers, no one of which would be the least hindrance to its flight, but which, by their
relations to each other, are as confining as the solid walls of a birdcage.

In addition, various societal mechanisms contributed to the development of institutional racism. For example, books used in schools and libraries disseminating information, incorporate benign and sometimes deliberate racist propaganda inserted within “such as one textbook.” Macionis indicated that evidence of structural/institutional practices are rampant with “…schools, hospitals, the police and the workplace.” Moreover, researchers found examples of other instances of institutionalized racism within the banking system. Statistical research substantiated the disparate treatment people of color received when banks, rejected mortgage applications at a higher rate for minorities than for white applicants, in the same neighborhoods and incomes. Accordingly, radical anti-racist activism supported applying a more aggressive stance towards dismantling racism, than the “reformist 288 anti-racism prescription. Whereas radical anti-racism denoted an aggressive counter-activism directed at racism, demonstrated in educational and the total elimination of racism, Bonnett argued that, reformist anti-racism “…is naïve, doomed to fail and preoccupied with racism as the cause of inequality in modern societies.” Thus, reformist Anti-racism proposed restructuring society, to educate and therefore end racism. In contrast, radical Anti-racism advocated engaging in social activism at the
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grass roots level, for promoting change. Moreover, radical anti-racist considered racism the maturation of capitalism embodied within private and public institutions, which dismantling racism would necessitate engaging in activism associated with an educated public as to the true reasons for racism, and the problematic of Anti-racism to eradicate racism. What Anti-racist advocates fail to acknowledge is that in failing to embrace issue of race and class in their quest to eradicate racism, Anti-racist prescriptions are ineffective.
Critiques charged Anti-racism served as a pedestal and stepping-stone for opportunists, anti-racist advocates. The following section includes an examination of the various ways in which activists exploited Anti-racism. As a moderate Booker T. Washington, insisted segregation was the best intermediary to black societal acceptance. His speech delivered at the Atlanta Exposition of 1895 confirmed Washington’s position on black accommodation to whites and the negation of anti-racist activism as a precursor to black egalitarianism. Washington’s position represented an example of the black bourgeoisie willingness to comprise black equality to promote their own personal agendas.

Washington asserted:

…I but convey to you, Mr. President and Directors, the sentiment of the masses of my race when I say that in no way have the value and manhood of the American Negro been more fittingly and generously recognized than by the managers of this magnificent Exposition at every stage of its progress. It is a recognition that will do more to cement the friendship of the two races than any occurrence since the dawn of our freedom.  

\[290\]

---

For Washington black acquiescence to white rule represented a beginning, which was much more important than interjecting clear anti-racist activism. Washington’s ambition characterized an attempt at shielding whites unaccountable for the conditions of blacks. In so doing, Washington sought to foster accord between the two races. As such, he surrendered the values of the black race in hopes of placating white temperance. His words subdued true anti-racist advocacy, inferring gentle pacifism and an overall tolerance of white domination. Hence, Washington's actions refrained from interjecting anti-racist doctrine intended to educate and dismantle racism. His words delicately chosen advanced the status of whites, while lowering that of blacks. In the end, the course Washington chose served his own purpose of becoming the self-professed leader of the black masses, and functioned to promote not deter white supremacy.

Not only this, but the opportunity here afforded will awaken among us a new era of industrial progress. Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom that; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention of stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.²⁹¹
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Unfortunately, the course Washington chose for black equality, interpreted by whites’ signaled black acceptance of a subservient, submissive existence—defunct of employing anti-racism to procure black equality. As the self-professed leader of the black race, Washington’s words were clear, to both the black man and the white—the black man accepted his lot in life:

…Cast down your bucket where you are… Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is will to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man’s chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this.

Ultimately, what Washington considered a moderation of racism, symbolized to whites an acceptance of subjection. Many considered Booker T. Washington as a revolutionary leader working to advocate clandestinely antiracism; others argued Washington’s work epitomized an assault on anti-racist ideology.

As well as Booker T. Washington, other African Americans considered the direct promotion of anti-racist advocacy unnecessary. Harlem Renaissance writer Zora Neale Hurston wrote the following, “Africans were not uniquely unfortunate to be taken as slaves; their descendants were uniquely fortunate to be born in the only civilization in
the world to abolish slavery on its own initiative.”292 Thus, Hurston considered conquest for blacks fortuitous, as she construed slavery and conquest, as rescue and a helping hand. As the researcher of Hurston’s words, and as an avid conservative, Dinesh D’Souza may have used Hurston’s words out of context. Perhaps, since the information on the state of Africa during the 1920s, (which reflected the period Hurston wrote) was limited, information on Africa was perhaps scarce. In addition, Hurston’s praises of the U.S. for ending slavery, omitted the fact that abolishing slavery did not occur without conflict—the Civil War in which more men died than in the combined American wars. Moreover, Hurston failed to consider the work done on the part of the abolitionists and the subsequent state of Jim Crow segregation that followed Reconstruction, which placed the freedmen in a renewed state of slavery. For Hurston and D’Souza antiracism was redundant, as slavery was over. Thus, to the opposition Anti-racism inflated the practicality of its use. Zora Neale Hurston described her stance on initiating antiracist practices:

…my ancestors who lived and died in it are dead. The white men who profited by their labor and lives are dead also. I have no personal memory of those times, and no responsibility for them. Neither has the grandson of the man who held my folks. . . . I have

no intention of wasting my time beating on old graves. . . I do not belong to the sobbing school of Negroes who hold that nature somehow has given them a low-down dirty deal and whose feelings are all hurt about it. . . . Slavery is the price I paid for civilization, and that is worth all that I have paid through my ancestors... 293

Booker T. Washington took a similar position:

Think about it: We went into slavery pagans; we came out Christians. We went into slavery pieces of property; we came out American citizens. We went into slavery with chains clanking about our wrists; we came out with the American ballot in our hands. . . . (We the Slave-owners: In Jefferson's America, Were Some Men Not Created Equal? 294

In both examples, the author of the research, Dinesh D'Souza exploited other’s words to support his conservative position. While the text demonstrated evidence of Washington and Hurston as conservative supporters of Anti-racism, D'Souza obfuscated their analysis by evading the social context of their statements and the lack of information, Washington and Hurston may have had on the state of Africa, which they both so negatively spoke. In Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America Steinberg highlighted the error of not considering the social context, of Hurston and
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Washington’s statements, asserting that the conditions, which Africans lived, represented culturally stable societies that conducted commerce, harvested crops and lived under societal governance much like other civilizations:

Apologists for slavery had also contended that blacks had been rescued from “barbarism and paganism,” but not only is such an argument based on a false assumption—Africans lived in stable and highly developed agricultural settlements—the circumstances of blacks in Africa can hardly mitigate the inhumane aspects of slavery.295

Additionally, Europeans as well made unfair comparisons with Africa, based on ethnocentric standards, placing European culture as the standard for judging other civilizations from an idealized European benchmark. Conversely, Gallaher contended that today manifestations of white standardizations demonstrated the tendency on the part of whites to ignore racialized appearance, opting instead to embrace a colorblind society, “that has learned to look beyond “the color of the skin” to “the beauty within.””296 However, as Lipsitz indicated, the new color-blind culture of today suggested that black social incompetency resulted in “…unrestrained sexual behavior and childbirths out of wedlock, crime, welfare dependency, and a perverse sense of group identity and group


entitlement that stands in the way of individual achievement and advancement.”

Thus, to conservatives Anti-racism obfuscated the real reasons for black economic deficient. In both cases, the authors resolved that anti-racism detracted from getting to the source. In concurrence, to conservatives, Anti-racism was spent, in the new color-blind society; everyone was equal. Further, Lipsitz suggested that the real culprit was the apathy on the part of blacks to change unproductive lifestyles. To these antagonists, Anti-racism hindered resolving the cause of black marginalization—black apathy and liberal-white enabling.

In contrast, conditional to right-wing officials, “…such as Pat Buchanan, David Duke, Jesse Helms, and Pat Robertson, their role was germane in instigating and replacing the history of racial inequality in America. Further, conservatives overlooked the evidence of historical as well as contemporary, “ongoing burden of racial injustice endured by African American and other minorities in the United States,” when blaming blacks for their situation.

---
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Another negative area of contention for Anti-racism entailed the unconstructive criticism from whites, feeling that black disadvantage surpassed white hardship. Described as reverse discrimination, whites become “increasingly angry and resentful,” in relation to what they viewed as an assault on their existing status. Winant maintained that to whites’ Anti-racism extended inclusivity for the black issue, while ignoring the problems of whites. For that reason, many whites interpreted anti-racist activism as affirming white marginalization and as such, “…was viewed as an attack on their sense of individual and collective consciousness.” Ultimately, as a condition of the weakened state of Anti-racism under assault by the new-conservatives “many Whites began to identify with the “new racism” epitomized by right-wing conservatives, such as talk show host Rush Limbaugh.” Thus, conservatives charged Anti-racism with being injurious to national stability; while at the same, white dismissal of the presence of white privilege, and assertions of “color-blindness’ masked the same privilege it disavowed. “The discourse of “color-blindness” provides a way to preserve privilege, while disavowing explicit racial appeals.” Moreover, conservatives
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maintain blacks distance themselves from whites, placing themselves in an isolated, marginalized state. On the other hand, conservatives are quick to consider themselves removed from racist behavior, while at the same time, what they say hardly corresponded to where they choose to live, and the friendships they choose to procure. Because of their comprehension of the color-blind script, whites construed black overuse of anti-racism unwarranted, while viewing their own inclination toward color-blind conservatism essential. Alternately, blacks considered white’s argument of reverse-racism lacking in teeth, as blacks rarely command situations of power that might strengthen racist acts.

In *An American Dilemma* Gunnar Myrdal situated the issue of race problematic for whites, but rarely acknowledged, “he discovered there was no Negro problem but rather a "white man’s problem."" Alternately, whites contended that the issue of race and Anti-racism was overly accentuated to what whites considered important. For blacks’ race inclusive dialogues were endemic to black existence, “…our problems are so fundamentally human that they often underlie the broader but more abstract problems,” causing blacks to engage in race related dialogues, which most whites find distracting. Yet, race discourse intended to infer discrimination is minimal where blacks are concerned. Often, whites construe black engagement in racial discourse as opportunities to ‘play the race card,’ which whites consider testament of how badly

---
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blacks abuse race. In fact, unbeknown to popular thinking blacks rarely make a case of contesting unfair treatment, “…black and brown folks typically “stuff” their experiences with discrimination and racism, only making an allegation of such treatment after many incidents have transpired about which they said nothing for fear of being ignored or attacked. Moreover, African Americans as targets of racism rarely disputed racist attacks, as the opposition rarely accepted responsibility for negative behavior and therefore, “either routinely [denied] or minimize[d] it.”

Interestingly, adversaries contended that while racism transpired in the past, introducing anti-racist propositions convoluted American resilience to accomplish its founding principles of justice and equality for all its citizens, inferring that the history of racism is just that, and that anti-racist’ programs halted racial stability. The right wing enlists opinions from whites and, for confirmation as to whether racism continues today, rather than contacting blacks, as victims of racism and anti-racist activists. By following this course, their actions sustain racism.

---


A majority of whites indicate in surveys that they sincerely believe that racial discrimination is no longer a serious problem for black Americans.\(^{308}\)

Moreover, the position of majority of whites considered blacks as not only being better off, but also having better access to education, health-care, and ultimately jobs than whites have. As such, research findings concluded that a large number of white Americans believe this to be true, while in itself fosters the need for anti-racist intervention, “…yet the data clearly show that white Americans are significantly better off than black Americans in such areas.”\(^{309}\) Such thinking, on the part of antagonist promotes a sense of black entitlement, which many believe marginalized blacks demand, in the first place.

Moreover, anti-racist opponents considered anti-racist activist as opportunists and provocateurs introducing Anti-racism as a means to insure distress and tension, so that anti-racist interventions become the redeemer-assuring anti-racist practitioners a job. For example, in his significant work on the history and substance of intolerance, *Racism* Alastair Bonnett cited the following:

…for Palmer, ‘those whose profession it is to combat racial conflict have a vested interest in promoting it’ 1986, p. 82). Marks concurs: ‘the hidden agenda of the anti-racists’ includes the adoption of
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policies, practices and attitudes which increase polarization 
heighten racial tensions and make racial conflict more probable.\textsuperscript{310}

Consequently, proponents of Anti-racism insisted the need for anti-racist ventures 
have long past, and that Anti-racism prevaricated random instances of racism. 
Opponents determined that additionally problematic to the philosophy of Anti-racism 
occurred from the insistence on the part of anti-racists’ to place racism as a phenomena 
characteristic of only “Western society.”\textsuperscript{311} Conversely, anti-racist contributors 
conceded the essence of history is rife in various forms of xenophobia, for them what is 
characteristic to Western racism commenced as a by-product of greed buttressed by 
capitalistic hegemony, in the form of racism founded on color. The opposition, on the 
other hand contended that Anti-racism embraced political agendas in place to promote 
the ulterior motivations and bias embodying “a liberal or left-wing political agenda.”\textsuperscript{312}
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C. Anti-racism Doctrines in the Suburban and Urban Educational System

...Jean Anyon argues that to be successful, educational reforms in the public schools have to be part of a larger effort to address the problems of poverty and racial isolation in our inner cities. Anyon calls for a more comprehensive vision of school reform, one that would move beyond attempts simply to change the system of education and instead address more fundamental problems in “the city environment itself,” which creates failing schools and destroys the hopes not only of the students and their families but of the teachers and administrators as well.313

For instance, a major dysfunction in not engaging racism occurs in the education system. Often, teachers rather than incur a racist label, refrain from critically evaluating the work of students of color, leaving students less opportunity to grow by-way of critical educational evaluation. Conversely, in other cases educators are reluctant to evaluate critically the work of students of color, as many white educators possess an overall low expectation of the academic abilities of students of color. Thus, students of color receive a second-rate education, whereas white students, in the same situation, critically assessed, excel.

In a recent study, white reviewers were more likely to praise a mediocre essay when they believed the author black, and more

likely to criticize the same essay when they believed the author white. A related study, however, showed that white reviewers communicating their impressions to a third party are more critical of blacks than whites. The implication of these findings is that, as some educators seek to avoid charges of racism by withholding negative feedback, some black students (and perhaps other students of color) are in danger of having their work evaluated negatively and never hearing about it.314

Denial of candid feedback denies the student the ability to assess his/her academic standing and the chance to improve. Moreover, inadequate analysis of the student’s work, by teachers subjects the student to an overall inferior education. Such proceedings are in themselves racist as such; singular treatment disadvantages black students from the educational experiences received by whites, constituting in essence discriminatory behavior on the part of teachers. As teachers are in a unique position to act as change agents, teachers should examine the possibility of bias in their educational practices. It is vital that teachers, acknowledge their own prejudices as possible transmitters of a history of racism. Ultimately, the question centers on, are teachers opposing a system founded on institutionalized racist practices by “seeking to

314 Daniel-Tatum, Beverly “When You’re Called a Racist.” Education Digest, 0013127X, Sep99, Vol. 65, Issue 1)."
challenge them”? By focusing on the issues of perpetuation and reinforcement of negativism demonstrated in not working with students of color for reasons that protect more the interests of the teacher, opportunities to destabilize racism diminish; whereas opting to challenge institutionalized racist practices characterizes possibilities for radical change. Teachers engaging their own prejudice signify a break with the past and immeasurable prospects for implanting Anti-racism as a viable solution to destabilize racism in the classroom environment.

Unless we engage in these and other conscious acts of reflection and reeducation, we easily repeat the process with our students. 316

The danger of teachers failing to challenge racism by proffering anti-racist practices affects the life chances of their protégées, and ultimately negatively affects the future of all of society. Thus, choosing to engage personal prejudice encourages teachers, “…to interrupt this cycle [of racism].” 317
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D. Summary

In this chapter I have shown, advocates defined Anti-racism as a variety of concepts and practices in which the major objective was to seek out, confront and eradicate racism. As such, a foremost argument of Anti-racism was to ensure its recognition as more than just the opposite of racism. Whereas racism indicated a belief in racial superiority and inferiority, Anti-racism regarded racial traits as inconsequential. Moreover, some Anti-racist scholars such as Troyna were concerned with issues of ethnicity, gender, and class as well as race, the majority of anti-racist limited the discourse to education, and reeducation only. Historically, anti-racists’ resolved that race was used by the elite to suppress and control certain members of society. For that reason, Anti-racism sought not only the eradication of individual racist acts; Anti-racism functioned to eliminate the racist practices, which sustained the continuance of the status quo. Thus, Anti-racism inferred, racism occurred because of capitalist manipulation and exploitation of the working class for the capitalism’s pursuit of profit. As well, Anti-racism sought to educate society on the historical origins of Western racism, because of slavery, and color differences as the deciding factor in establishing a system of privilege and advantage for whites, and disadvantage for peoples of color. Anti-racism sought the further education of how the planter class during slavery exploited both poor whites and blacks, using race and color to divide. Thus, the ruling class controlled the work, and in essence, the livelihoods of both poor whites and blacks.
Problematic for Anti-racism involved the American creed—the myth of meritocracy, which contended, everyone has an equal chance to succeed. Anti-racism contended, meritocracy concealed racist practices embedded within various institutional practices. As such, many white Americans, felt Anti-racism was unnecessary and passé as Civil Rights laws removed the last vestige of discriminatory practices. Anti-racist insisted, fortified by meritocracy, racism burgeoned. Further, whites suspected black assertions of racism as attempts at ‘playing the race card,’ or even worst, laziness. For that reason, many considered Anti-racism as nothing more than nourishing black indolence and self-absorption.

Conservative right-wing theorists view Anti-racism as disruptive. Further, they insist racism is no longer salient, and therefore neither is Anti-racism. They contended most blacks are better off today than the average white person is, even when the statistical research proves differently.

During the last decade, Anti-racism received greater challenges as to its relevancy, than in earlier years, when racist acts openly transpired. During the last decade, racist incidents have largely been random. During the 1960s, Anti-racism along with the Peace Movement and Title VII were highly respected. Afterwards, a division occurred that split bi-racial antiracist’ coalitions. The tension came as Black Nationalists chose to close the ranks for white entry during the Civil Rights Movement, leaving Anti-racism hostage to a movement that incorporated the racist tactics of exclusion, while spouting antiracist activism. In time, diversity used by institutions replaced anti-discriminatory programs; more as a method to avert company lawsuits, than to create egalitarianism. Lacking in applicable substance, Anti-racist activism plummeted. In order that Anti-
racism function as a viable practice, it is necessary that it align with the current state of society. Thus, because of the current economic situation in the U.S., Anti-racism would have a better chance of employment if aligned with demonstrating to the population how utilizing Anti-racism would provide jobs, education, better housing, etc. Explaining to the poor, working class and middle classes how eliminating racism would lead to a strong bi-racial coalition, that would possess the power to compel political leadership to address the needs of the masses, would in turn strengthen the relevance, employment and efficacy of Anti-racism.
Problematic for whiteness theory involves how to abolish whiteness, without abolishing white people. Moreover, Whiteness theory resolves that because of being born into the white race, white people receive privilege, status, and benefit not provided to others. These benefits and privileges endowed on whites occur through better access to jobs, education, salaries, living conditions, etc. Those whites occupying the lower socioeconomic classes scoff at Whiteness theories speculation of privilege as a provision of being born white, as they comprise the largest number of the poor. Taking into account the last decade, the black middle class is growing, while overall the middle class shrinks. Statistical research reveal the number of blacks comprising the higher income bracket, in relation to whites is small, suggesting that the increased number of blacks in the middle class misrepresents the overall picture of a growing black middle class. These contradictions further challenge Whiteness theory’s supposition regarding white only, benefit, privilege and status. In an attempt to examine the origins, conflict with identity and implications from labor, it is the intent of this chapter to explore the validity of Whiteness theory’s claims, and the usefulness of utilizing Whiteness theory interventions. Moreover, this chapter argues that identity politics within Whiteness theory does not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade, as a result, accounts for the failure of Whiteness theory to eradicate racism,
A. Origins and Definitions

Barbara J. Fields recounts the apocryphal story of an American journalist who once asked Papa Doc Duvalier what portion of the Haitian people was white. Duvalier answered unhesitatingly, “Ninety-eight percent.” The puzzled reporter asked Duvalier how he defined white. “How do you define black in your country?” Asked Duvalier in turn. When the answer came back that in the U.S. anyone with any discernible African ancestry was considered black, Duvalier replied, “Well, that’s the way we define white in my country.”  

Noel Ignatiev provided an interesting account of the Haitian leader’s interpretation of the social construction of race. Duvalier’s response challenged the American construction of what defined race. For instance, in the U.S., the one-drop of black blood rule established membership in the black race, and ineligible for privileges, advantage and the same consideration that whites received. Thus, this was how society constructed race in the U.S. Additionally, society constructed the white race with significant status, superior intellect, and exceptional leadership traits, all instigated by the elite. Theodore Allen described the basis for the evolution of racial discord,

---

“Throughout much of the seventeenth century conditions in Virginia were quite similar for Afro-American and Euro-American laboring people and the “white race” did not exist.” 319 The elevated establishment of whiteness appeared much later, since during this period lower class whites and blacks lived and worked together. In fact, blacks and whites banded together in-group solidarity to dispute labor injustice. Thus, a major stimulus behind the formation of a white race involved a plot to dissolve the unity between the white and black working class cohesion, by creating class and race division. Allen inferred the existence of the white race occurred, because of, “…the systematic extension of a privileged status by the ruling class,” 320 to only the working class peoples of European descent. An equally important incentive for the ruling class was to segregate whites from blacks to prepare the foundation for the enslavement of those not considered white. For the working class the portioning into races, those people who had formerly labored side-by-side, undermined “…class interests of working people and workers’ own position, vis-à-vis the rich and powerful.” 321 In time, status and conditions for the white working class changed as their numbers diminished. Without a collective membership to bargain effectively against the capitalist class, the white working class suffered. Further, the capitalist instigated the divisive strategy of racial difference creating an exclusive white working class, it could control, while at the same time reminded white workers of their superior status, in relation to blacks.
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Moreover, capitalist’ controlled the white working class wages, by using black workers, as strikebreakers, to insure hegemony over all workers.

Originally, only immigrants of English descent received benefit and privilege. In time, society classified other European immigrants, i.e. Germans, Irish, Italians and others, white. Upon first arriving in America, many of the white ethnic groups had been enemies either through conflict in their native countries, and later as settlers struggling to survive in the land of freedom. Wise inferred the creation of the white race, “…emerged as a term of concept to describe Europeans as a group in the late 1600s.” Thus, the construction of the white race occurred as a rationale to establish a system of class and racial division primarily to support the economic position of the wealthy. Capitalists used the domination they had over blacks as a free source of labor, together with the exploitation of the white working class to construct whiteness as the instrument to control both blacks and working class whites. Considering the exploitation of workers, it is difficult to conclude which capitalists exploited more—blacks in chattel slavery or the white working class deluded into believing in a sense of white supremacy.

In 1700s Virginia, whiteness gained status, as whiteness became a condition for citizenship. “By 1790, the conception of the “white race” was strong enough for the passage of the Naturalization Act, which made being white a prerequisite for U.S. citizenship.” As such, the division between what whiteness represented in relation to

---
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blackness acquired a new meaning. In the past, the creation of whiteness occurred solely to create division between black and white worker solidarity, now whiteness took on a new meaning—citizenship. A major requirement for citizenship during the period from 1780 (the same year the *Naturalization Act* passed, until the year 1952 citizenship was confined to whites only) required candidates be of the white race.

Another interesting circumstance occurred with the construction of whiteness occurred because of Bacon’s Rebellion. In 1676, white revolutionaries lured by the British into receiving, “…rights and privileges,”\(^{324}\) accepted, thereby breaking the solidarity forged with blacks who had fought alongside them, during Bacon’s Rebellion and the quest for liberty from England. Moreover, afterwards, with their new status intact, whites complicit with the British, benefited from black, white racial disparity. For example, Wise argued, whites were instrumental in serving as gatekeepers for the British landowners, “…serve[ing] on slave patrols, the elite gave poor “whites” a stake in the system that had harmed them.”\(^{325}\) Eventually, the inducement for white duplicity, in forsaking their black comrades, included compensation in the form of land ownership, which the English gladly paid “…rewarding them with fifty acres of land upon release from bondage.”\(^{326}\) In the process, white indenture dissolved, as the English allowed some whites the privilege of voting, enticing poor whites to disengage prior relationships.

---
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with blacks, and bond to the interest of the capitalist. Hence, whiteness, defined by white European ethnicity burgeoned. The overall rationale undermining the construction of the white race involved capitalist justification for obsession, greed and manifest destiny in profiteering from the appropriation of Indian land and African slavery.

Gilborn proposed that the ideology embodying whiteness studied as a socialized construction was grounded in uncovering the significance associated with whiteness and its inherited standing as a source of, “...political, cultural, and social mechanisms through which whiteness is both invented and used to mask its power and privilege.”

Thus, deconstructing the origins of whiteness reveals how whiteness has come to represent status, power and positive identity. As such, the evolution of whiteness derived from a merging of various ethnic groups advanced to conceal the evidence of manipulation, materialism and hegemony. Moreover, ethnic merging occurred to divide the solidarity of the white and black working classes. Voting rights, land ownership and the end of indentured servitude, generated a sense of authority over their once black comrades. For that reason, whiteness came to embody elements of privilege, advantage, superiority and status all manipulated to achieve hegemony for the capitalist class.

Peter McLaren defined whiteness as the historical relationship between “…dominant and subordinate groups.” For that reason, whiteness constructed by society emerged concurrent to the establishment, “…of capitalism [and] colonial rule.” Of major importance to the conceptualization of whiteness involved its capacity to function as a component of capitalism by encouraging other groups to imitate the “…social practices of assimilation and cultural homogenization,” demonstrated by the dominant group. The inception of the whiteness paradigm activated the growth of capitalistic economies’ “…production and consumption of commodities.” A central aspect of whiteness theory concerned its requirement to consider hegemony central to white people in particular erroneous, while, “…opposing whiteness is not the same as opposing white people.” For that reason, the theory of whiteness considered the construction of whiteness peripheral to whites as society members. Moreover, whiteness evolved as a condition and a manifestation of capitalistic exploitation and manipulation to create division between blacks and whites, insuring capitalistic domination of both groups. Thus, whiteness evolved as a form of opportunistic advantage underwriting supremacy over
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those unlike the white capitalist class, and white people in general. Mckinney and Feagin contended that whiteness developed for the purpose of generating a, “system of racism,”\textsuperscript{332} by dominant whites to safeguard their political, social and economic worth. Further, a significant number of whites today are oblivious as to the occurrences that have supported white identity, status and domination.

\textit{Whites of this generation have no knowledge of the disciplined, systematic, and collective group activity that has structured white identities in American society.}\textsuperscript{333}

Thus, whiteness evolved “…over the past two hundred year,” \textsuperscript{334} and, was accepted tacitly configured in conjunction with “…a varying set of supremacist assumptions sometimes cultural, sometimes biological, sometimes moral, sometimes all three.”\textsuperscript{335} For that reason, most whites today remain ignorant of the privileged status endemic to whiteness, which most non-whites as non-recipients are aware, and therefore disadvantaged. Theodore Allen indicated the importance of destabilizing whiteness as a symbol of capitalistic hegemony, “…the white race must be understood…as a ruling
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class social formation,”\(^{336}\) in order to insure equality be realized for everyone. For that reason, in an effort to undermine the dominance of whiteness, Whiteness theory contended that it is necessary that identity be evaluated appropriately by its “…history of defining self both through the symbolic construction of the other and through the actual domination of others.”\(^{337}\) Thus, the evolution of whiteness, and consequently the stature of white social, political and economic domination reveal unwarranted and perhaps not fully earned prominence. As a social construction, the development of whiteness provided unjustified privileges established by adherence to theories of Social Darwinism.

In the context of the U.S. racial system, “whiteness” evolved from a relatively nebulous descriptive term to a basis for the rights and privileges of citizenship and – the rise of scientific” racism—a claim to superiority on the basis of “biological” differences.\(^{338}\)


Moreover, a major cause of white amnesia regarding the creation and substance of white identity, dominance and hegemony resulted as a condition of positive typecast, which whites inherited. “The white race is a club that enrolls certain people at birth, without their consent, and brings them up according to its rules.” Thus, whites mechanically accepted gratuitous status, while acknowledging and justifying the disadvantaged positions of the marginalized. Whites questioning the causes for the unequal distribution of societal resources faced a barrage of reasons as to why such inquiries are at best injurious to their own position as recipients of whiteness. Continuance of this line of questioning could result in serious chastisement, “…officers are quick to remind them of all they owe to the club, and warn them of the dangers they will face if they leave it.” Further, attempts to challenge the status quo, white efforts, white society quickly confronts. In this way, Whiteness theory contends, white superiority sustains its superiority and dominance unchallenged. Paul Kivel offered the following as accounts of intimidations liberal whites received, when contesting white privilege:

Labels such as “nigger lover,” “race traitor,” “un-American,”
“feminist,” “liberal,” “communist,” “unchristian,” “Jew,” “fag,”
“lesbian,” “crazy,” “terrorist” and “thought police” have all been used to isolate and discredit people and to imply that they are somehow

---

340 Ibid P 10-11
outside the territory of whiteness and therefore justifiably attacked.341

The intended affect for challengers of racism transpire to intimidate, insuring loyalty to white hegemony. Moreover, aggression administered against challengers served to suppress opposition, where racism was concerned. Building a frame of reference for appreciating white’s sense of repudiation emanated as, “…white Americans are encouraged to invest in whiteness to remain true to an identity that provides them with resources, power and opportunity.”342 Unfortunately, the structure, content and hegemony of whiteness continue.

Since race, racism, and whiteness are socially constructed, whites as members of the dominant group are in the best position to abolish whiteness and the unequal privileges they receive as beneficiaries of whiteness. Problematic to ending racism and the stature of whiteness occurred when whites defend white benefit, privilege and status; safeguard inequality, white supremacy and racism, in the process. Moreover, protecting whiteness prompted white beneficiaries to acquire “…a possessive investment in whiteness,”343 demonstrated in the instances of race division in American
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culture. Moreover, whiteness represented various tangible assets, which all of society covets. Lipisitz provided an extensive inventory of the benefits stimulating white’s to accept racial intolerance:

Whiteness has a cash value: it accounts for advantages that come to individuals through the unequal education allocated to children of different races, through networks that channel employment opportunities to the relatives and friends of those who have profited most from present and past racial discrimination, and especially through intergenerational transfers of inherited wealth that pass on the spoils of discrimination to succeeding generations. ³⁴⁴

Accordingly, materialism proved a worthy adversary for attempts to undermine the social construction of whiteness. White acceptance of the benefits, privileges and advantages incurred from being born white demanded that recipients disavow knowledge of disparate treatment for non-whites, relinquishing a continuation of advantage for themselves. Problematic for Whiteness theory is how to abolish whiteness, “…in a nondemonized fashion.”³⁴⁵ Thus, the next chapter examines identity and its consequence for the abolishment of whiteness.

³⁴⁴ Ibid P 670
B. Conflict with Identity Politics

For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man. Some critics will take it on themselves to remind us that this proposition has a converse. I say that this is false. The black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man.

It is the racist who creates his inferior… And yet, in order for racism to be resisted, in order for a post-colonial identity to be forged, the ‘black soul’ must be fabricated and asserted, given shape and definition as a site of resistance and revolution. 346

Fanon’s analysis of identity for the black man was profound in how it defined the binary relationship between identity as construed by the black man and identity as construed by the white man for the black man. Important to the discourse, concerned examining the relationship of otherness and identity in terms of how theories of whiteness affect and are affected by identity politics. Barlow contended that within the paradigm of otherness, “The act of defining a people as “different” also defined other

people as non-ethnic, or “normal” and privileged.” Thus, how society defined an individual or group had a major effect on the social construction of the individual and or group, and in essence, allocated status to those representing the standard. Within the status of identity a direct relationship existed between what individuals thought of themselves, which may influenced “…negative or positive emotions of self-esteem.” Sociological symbolic-interaction theory construed identity in terms of “…how a person is treated does not depend so much upon what he is as upon the manner in which he is defined,” suggesting that identity on the part of individuals reflected society’s view of the individual. As such, identity politics and definitions of the other depend to a great extent on the determination society constructed for the individual. Katz conceptualized “racial identity,” affected by the way in which the individual responded to the world in which he was a part of. Thus, identity is affected by how society constructs a position for individuals to inhabit, as well as in the way in which the individual then intercepted and was responsive to his or her surroundings. From a structural functional aspect,

society determined the issue of identity and other status for groups, and attempts to change status, society penalized. Of particular interest to identity involved identity’s reference as a constant and permanent state. Identity based on color and recognized as belonging to a certain ethnic group accorded membership to individuals based upon the societal ranking according to what society relegated for the group. In this way, as society constructed, race and ethnicity, society also constructed identity.

Thus, there existed a correlation between identity and race. Moreover, identity, race and defining the other involved the particular perspective in which groups considered their situation:

In American culture, “race” has been far more an acknowledged component of black identity than white; for good or bad, whites have always seen “race” as a minority attribute, and blacks have courageously and persistently agitated on behalf of “the race.” (Fuss, 1990:93).351

Consequently, identity varied dependent upon the context in which society defined identity for a particular group. As Fuss argued, the situation for identity resided more problematic for blacks, than for whites. A major reason stemmed from the history blacks and whites experienced during their arrivals to America. Whites came as settlers wanting to carve out a new beginning, in the rich new world. Blacks arrived as captives

---
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sufficing as the backbone and the foundation for richness for capitalists and the newly arriving settlers. Thus, I argue the identity that developed for both groups was relational to the manner of their arrival. Whites forged a sense of manifest destiny taking what they felt necessary to sustain themselves and future generations. Africans inherited the status of other as an appendage to whiteness. Verification of identity for blacks resided in blacks' constant awareness of black identity. “Yet whites rarely if ever are asked to articulate or to examine either their racial identities or their positions within racialized institutions.”

Because of the way blacks first came to America, “…black or African American identities have an excuse for appearing in contexts that would appear to have no interpretive room for them.” Thus, the complexity of black identification is justified. Thus, the dissertation argues that identity politics embedded within whiteness theory does not address issues of class and race… Central to the fixed status of black identity and the state of other resided within the context of the conditions developed because of slavery, “…founded and fixed the meaning of blackness more than any transparent and trans-historical meaning of black skin founded the category of slavery.”

Thus, the status of black identity evolved in relation to the consequence and manner of arrival and

---
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living under a social construct of the black race as inferior. Consequently, the discourse involving the state of black identity grounded in slavery, and black identity originated from a status of chattel—property. Myrdal reminded, “When slavery disappeared, caste remained.” As a result, black identity from the beginning suffered as a direct result of slavery, Jim Crow and racism.

Instrumental to the status of identity involved the construction of whiteness. In order that whiteness obtains superior status, society constructed ‘other’ position for blacks. Black identity encompassed sinfulness, filth and immorality, and whiteness represented beauty, good and virtue. Black identity inherited the reverse status from whiteness. In the construction of black identity as inferior to whiteness, sustained the inevitability of racism, “The fact remains that difference is the principal notion around which the racist enterprise revolves.” Barbara Flagg furthered the discourse adding that white identity was to “…no longer be conceptualized in racial terms; he became effectively race-less”. Lopez argued that the situation was far from coincidental as, “…Whites fashion an identity for themselves that is the positive mirror image of the negative identity imposed

on people of color.” In so doing, whiteness achieved and sustained its superior status.

A major factor in the issue of race, identity and other status for blacks involved a direct response between what whiteness accorded to black status. In other words, determining explanations for aspects of black identity, involved the relationship experienced by blacks consignment of identity by whites. Thus, the issue for young black males directly related to the way in which the dominant group in society—whites, through comparison to whiteness characterized blacks:

Why do black youths, in particular, think about themselves in terms of race? Because that is how the rest of the world thinks of them. Our self-perceptions are shaped by the messages we receive from those around us, and when young black men and women reach adolescence, the racial content of those messages intensifies.

Ultimately, identity involved the collective group identity of a particular group, and the “…historical and structural forces that contributed to its formation.” Again, the issue
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centers on the development of identity experienced from the manner in which society prescribed and constructed the identity labels for groups. Thus, collective identity affected the individuals’ impression of themselves. Sigenthaler Sr. recounted societal identity structuring for blacks in the South:

To grow up white in the South at that time was to see black people in streets every day and yet (as Ralph Ellison’s Invisible Man explained) never to see them; it was to ignore the gross unfairness that was so starkly visible; it was to believe the lie of “separate but equal”; it was to deny the emotional pain suffered by blacks; it was to adopt the myth that racial segregation was permanent, proper, ordained by God, and endorsed by government; it was to laugh hilariously at Stepin Fetchit, Hattie McDaniel, and Amos ‘n’ Andy, as if they were proto-typical. 361

Thus, southern society constructed black identity, by disregarding black people. Black identity acquired negative status from white labeling. “It also was to hear every day the word “nigger” from the lips of somebody—and most days from several some bodies—in the workplace and in most homes.”362 In this way, black identity assumed aspects based on characterizations, determined by how white society judged black identity. Through white construction, white identity sustained prominence as the
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standard for all other ethnic groups. White identity represented the benchmark “…since it was the definitive social value against which all others were measured.”\footnote{Rubin, Lillian, “Is This a White Country, or What: In Taking Sides: in Families on the Fault Line.” In Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study, edited by Paula S. Rothenberg, 92-100, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998. P 56}

a. White Identity

White identity demonstrated a propensity towards marginality when whites found themselves in situations where there were few whites. When this occurred, whites underwent a new awareness of their white status, and the status of other ethnicities as a result, occurred due to the, “anxiety often associated with this experience.” As such, white identity suffered from encountering for this momentary period a sense of marginal status. Thus, whites as the dominant group embodied the major potency of whiteness. However, identity, white or black also possessed strength when observed in the majority position in situations of diverse groups.

Alastair Bonnet implied whiteness originated sometime during the, “twentieth century (Banton 1977:1987)” and whiteness characterized “…an individual's or group’s skin color.” Whiteness involved interpretations of identity attached to the color white, rather than societies understanding of the white race as a biological being consisting of indisputable ethnic qualities. The construction of a white race gained strength by associating all the ethnic groups from European descent. By amalgamating European ethnicities into a collective, established as white, fortified the hegemony of whiteness,


while creating, “a problematic one,”368 for all the non-white groups. As a result, white identity represented to whites the model for all other groups. The situation for whites and the establishment of whiteness as the benchmark for whites and others entailed a standardization of status embodying, “whites are not of a certain race; they’re just the human race.”369 The infatuation with whiteness established by whites developed into a contest for establishing less in determining the race of individuals as white, “but who may be considered white,”370 which exposed society’s penchant to construct race. Consequently, whiteness evolved as a process related to the collection of European ethnicities coalescing into one white group established around patterns associated through a system of Americanization cultivated in the new land.

The ideology of whiteness manifested to whites’ absence of racialized attributes, as race, and racism existed unattached to white status. Whites are unaffected by conversations on racism, as whiteness denotes status, rather than race. However, Bergerson resolved, “Whiteness is a race,”371 inclusive of racial characteristics the same as other groups. In disavowing whiteness as a race, whites benefited from “…the
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privilege to not think about race.\textsuperscript{372} Moreover, whites considered issues of race exterior to them, furthering privileging their status. More importantly, whiteness permitted whites to consider race, only when they were either in the minority, or when they perceived non-whites to encroach white domain. The ability to elude racial distinctions provided whites with advantages to the disadvantage of other ethnicities. The ability whites enjoyed in disassociating attachment to race allocated privilege to them while confiscating from non-whites the same opportunities.

\textit{…any system of differentiation shapes those on whom it bestows privilege as well as those it oppresses. White people are “raced,” just as men are “gendered”.}\textsuperscript{373}

As the dominant group, whiteness developed disconnected from any attachment to race characteristics. In so doing, whiteness represented the criterion that all other ethnicities should emulate. Thus, whiteness acquired significance from disassociating with race and its neutral status that all other groups must copy, thereby delimiting the opportunity for self-actualization to occur. Further, the neutrality, which whiteness evokes transpired because of the disassociation to whiteness, which if whites plan to change starts with, \textit{“…a carefully conceived race consciousness, one that begins with whites’ consciousness of whiteness.”}\textsuperscript{374} In not choosing to alter the status of white

\textsuperscript{372} Ibid P 53


neutrality that bestowed unearned privilege on whiteness, at the advantage of non-whites, in the end, equally disadvantaged whites, in the same manner it disadvantage non-whites. Thus, in order that whites inherit the unearned privileges and benefit of whiteness, whites must exist in a state of denial. Moreover, denial induces hidden guilt, which prohibits the cultivation of morality and integrity. Immersed in the privileges and benefits of whiteness, causes whites to further deny status, replacing status with a “…victimized one.” In this way, denial provided the basis, for whites to switch positions with non-whites becoming the scapegoats.

Without minimizing the economic struggle that this young man [white male student who felt he was as disadvantaged as black students because he was from a low socioeconomic status] had experienced, classmates, both white and of color, pointed out the benefits that come simply by virtue of skin color—when dealing with police, when shopping at the mall, when sitting in a class with white professors. Accordingly, matters of race may surpass experiences attributed to class. As the socioeconomic status of individuals in certain situations is undetectable, society uses group racial identity characteristics to identify individuals. That is to say, higher
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socioeconomic status people of color, particularly when prominence is unidentified experience the same lack of respect, and ill-treatment, as members in the lowest socioeconomic status racial group.
b. Black Identity

The relationship between white identity and black identity exists in a binary state. A major rationale for the dual relationship between black and white identities occurred because of the social construction of race. The social construction of whiteness i.e. the white race symbolized superior status and the absence of racial personification. Societies’ construction of the black race represented the oppositional position; stigma as inferior to whites in all ways, whites construed whiteness positively, and blacks as negative. To whites, blacks needed to identify with race and racism as they alone are affected by it. As examples, of race neutrality, whites refute issues of race, and racism.

From a historical perspective, because of their history in chattel slavery blacks recognized the importance to counter the negative stereotypes that slavery assigned to them by working to change societal opinions’ of their degraded and inferior status. “This interpretation of their social reality further motivated them to forge collective solutions to their collective status problems that reinforced their oppositional identity.” 377 Thus, African Americans after slavery thought it possible to distance themselves from negative societal descriptions of them, by altering both their behavior and manners. They were unaware that the establishment of whiteness was deficient incomplete without a negative alter ego. Gunnar Myrdal indicated that problematic for the American black was the absence of cultural identification with a homeland, which negatively affected

377 D’Souza, Dinesh, Walter, E. Williams, Michael Meyers, Harry V. Jaffa, Michael Burlingame, “Deliberations on the End of Racism.” Williams, Walter E., Academic Questions, 08954852, Fall96, Vol. 9, Issue 4

202
their identity and gave them no protection against the assaults whites launched against them. Myrdal wrote:

> It is more difficult for them [Negros] to answer prejudice with prejudice and, as the Orientals may do, to consider themselves and their history superior to the white Americans and their recent cultural achievements. The Negroes do not have these fortifications for self-respect. They are more helplessly imprisoned as a subordinate caste in America, a caste of people deemed to be lacking a cultural past and assumed to be incapable of a cultural future.\(^{378}\)

Society constructed black identity to be consistent with the deeds and conduct of individual members; white identity positions the deeds and conduct of the individual to the individual. Following Nat Turner’s uprising, “…the collective blame and punishment which increased their [blacks] sense of being a separate people with a collective identity,”\(^{379}\) originated. As a result, of Turner’s insurrection, where over forty white, men, women and children were killed, whites developed a fear of blacks, and restricted black assembling. Thus, whites transferred to other uninvolved blacks, the fear and feelings, they had for Nat Turner. Thus, black identity inferred a collective status where

---
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whites were concerned, punishing and labeling the black community for the behavior of the individual. As a result, the collective of black identity diminished, with individual negative actions. Thus, the status of black identity evolved through the period of Booker T. Washington, and his insistence on separate but equal to Marcus Garvey, and his insistence on structuring black positive identity, as Garvey insisted on developing black unity and respect of the cultural aspects of blackness. Black identity traversed through periods where the appellation for African Americans evolved from the ‘N’ word, to ‘Colored’ to ‘Negro’ to ‘Black’ to Afro-American and to African-American. Because of the variation in identity designation African Americans experienced life in chattel slavery as property, to freedmen under Reconstruction, to the new slavery under Jim Crow, to the turbulent 60s and the Civil Rights Movement, Black Power and the protest movements. Thus, identity as well as black identification evolved to periods where visible symbols, in terms of hair shape, clothing—Dashikis represented status and change, in the eyes of both blacks and whites.
c. Legal and Social Construction

In terms of obtaining citizenship, the legal construction of whiteness started as a direct result of *de jure* court cases ranking specific immigrants below native born European whites, and consequently above people of color i.e. “…African- and Asian-Americans.”\(^{380}\) Whiteness achieved status via other mediums—“slang, songs, films, cartoons, ethnic jokes, and popular theatre,”\(^{381}\) which fortified the official prominence of whiteness. The legalized functions of whiteness served to bolster, “…the possessive investment in whiteness,”\(^{382}\) which as well aggregated whiteness as a source of power, for those society determined to be white. Another vital area that bolstered white status occurred because the legalization of whiteness afforded to whites, “…aspects of citizenship that were all the more valued because they were denied to others.”\(^{383}\) For that reason, not only did whiteness acquire official sanction provided by its legalized status, whiteness acquired prominence since not everyone society considered white,
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enjoying the benefits and privileges inherited from white status. Whiteness as a legal construct originated because of the *Naturalization Act* of 1790 that restricted citizens to those of good character, residing a minimum of two years in the U.S. and those considered white. Buttressing whiteness with legal status assigned whiteness top position in the social echelon, ascribing to even the poorest of whites superior status. Ian Lopez argued that the legalization of whiteness provided identity status to whiteness originating from “common knowledge held as which groups would be considered white and therefore superior.” The significance of the social construction of whiteness, and consequently whites as superior endowed whiteness with self-imposed identity, ascribed by law, mandated by whites, for those the ‘common knowledge’ of whites endorsed as white, and consequently exceptional to all others. Ultimately, the residual effect accorded to whites a positive “…racial identity,” construed as innate to whiteness, “as their facial features and skin color.” Thus, reinforcing whiteness as superior entailed visible characteristics such as eye shape and color of skin than “…about where the line was draw[n],” in terms of what benefits received for those considered white, and non-white ineligibles.

---
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As a result, whiteness achieved status from legal sanction and as a condition of common knowledge of those considered white and therefore eligible for the privileges, benefit and status conditional to citizenship. A major component of legalizing whiteness imbued whites with a positive identity sanctioned by the white majority. The major contribution of legalizing whiteness transpired as non-whites locked out of the process suffered as a result. The process of disassociating non-whites from legalized status—citizenship, allowed a greater significance to whiteness, thereby engendering to whites, and whiteness elevated superior status.
Property as a Legal Construct

Central to the discourse of the legal construction of whiteness entails the principles property being foundational to the basic enhancement of “class situations.”\(^{388}\) The importance of class to the discourse of property as a legalized construction and consequently to the legalization of whiteness encompassed the relation of legalizing whiteness supported by the development of white class position. As whiteness evolved, the status of whites in terms of class also benefited, as the class status position for non-whites stagnated. Max Weber determined class as a condition conferred status to the proprietors of property, representing class, and disadvantage to the property-less:

The effect of naked possession per se, which among cattle breeders gives the non-owning slave or serf into the power of the cattle owner, is only a forerunner of real ‘class’ formation.\(^{389}\)

The synthesis of possession and class stated by Weber demonstrated homogeneity to the equation of whiteness, the same as property achieved through law. For that reason, the character of whiteness, although intangible in essence bestowed advantages that contributed to class status for whites. Thus, whiteness conferred to whites the same conditions evident within status as class ranking provided. The legalization of whiteness endowed whiteness with class, status, rank and rights.

---
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attributed to property rights, which “…the law has established and protected an actual property interest in whiteness itself.” Moreover, an added aspect of whiteness as property furnished whiteness with a sense of identity, contributing to the stability of not only the collective properties of whiteness, but to the individual as well. Accordingly, legitimating whiteness permitted whites to access and successfully employ the various components endowed within whiteness—“identity status, and property,” in combination extending additional power to whiteness. Harris listed the various ways which whiteness endowed benefit and advantage to whites:

…included not only external objects and people’s relationships to them, but also all of those human rights, liberties, powers, and immunities that are important for human well-being, including: freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, freedom from bodily harm, and free and equal opportunities to use personal faculties.

A major impetus of the abolitionist movement was to depose slavery and the slavocracy, whose strength determined their entitlement and connection to power as property, land and slave-owners:
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…it sought the overthrow of the ruling class in the only way in which a ruling class can be overthrown; i.e., it sought the elimination of that form of private property the ownership of which defined that ruling class and gave it its power.  

Legalizing whiteness established the status and collateral of white privilege, authorizing racist behavior. "One of these privileges and benefits of property is the absolute right to exclude." Consequently, legitimating whiteness provided advantages that presented whites with not only materialistic advantage, but also a sense of security, and unquestioned confidence because of their superior status. 
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Understanding the legality of whiteness required examining the composition of the legal system and the de jure association to the establishment of whiteness. Weber defined the law in terms of its authority to regulate behavior and administer punishment, “…with the intention of obtaining conformity with the order, or of inflicting sanctions for infringement of it.” In the legalization of whiteness, the law served to approve status to whiteness, while denying status to non-whites. An example of the legalization of race determined the difference, “…of a person as slave or free.” In addition, whiteness emboldened through legalization-required adherence to “…a strict standard of proof,” which meant that individuals needed societal and or legalized sanction to receive the benefits of whiteness. Thus, the status of whiteness escalated, when the Immigration Act of 1790, “…require[d] that a person be white in order to become a naturalized citizen.” Interestingly, the extent of whiteness was never an automatic consideration for all whites. Initially, only the whites possessing property that were members of the
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“…political community,”399 were granted full political rights. Katz indicated that included in this group were only the “…white adult males-and not all of them.”400 Thus, class issues demonstrative of property ownership established the constitutionality of rights, regardless of color. The situation for whites of the lower social classes remained disadvantaged in many ways the same as non-whites. The situation for immigrants was perplexing, as they sought to obtain the resources afforded to whiteness, “…in order to turn arguments over immigration from the question of who was foreign to the question of who was white,”401 it was necessary for immigrants to prove their association to whiteness. In some cases, providing the rationale for establishing white identity proved ambiguous:

As Robert T. Devlin, United States Attorney at San Francisco understated it in 1907: “There is considerable uncertainty as to just what nationalities come within the term ‘white person’.402

The ambiguity surrounding the status of whiteness centered on determining the factors resolving an individual’s identity as white. Accordingly, two particular cases
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reached the *Supreme Court* during the 1920s, both requiring judicial resolution regarding racial identity. As a result, of the cases, “the courts were required…to articulate rationales for the divisions they were creating.”\textsuperscript{403} In essence, the courts faced a two-fold dilemma, first, to determine what made one white; and secondly, what factors determined individuals considered already white.\textsuperscript{404} The *Supreme Court* litigated fifty-two cases involving establishing white identity. In 1952, the higher court removed all language pursuant to citizenship based on white racial identification.

The first major court case *re Ah Yup* heard in California in 1878 found common knowledge of racial identification as the determining factor in deciding white identity. At stake for whiteness was citizenship. The findings of the court held on the case of the state, denying a Chinese claimant residency, “because of the popular understanding of the term “white person.”\textsuperscript{405} Along with common knowledge, the court increasingly applied scientific evidence to establish white identity required for citizenship status. The court in failing to distinguish the incongruity between resorting to science to define racial categorization and common knowledge, “…set the terms of a debate about whether race was a social construction or a natural occurrence.”\textsuperscript{406} Prior to this, biological determinations factored as the summation of racial difference. The idea that society engineered the construction of racialized concepts was unheard of. Rather, the courts as well as the community attributed racial difference, interpreted by common knowledge
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and scientific evidence, “...both measured the same thing,”\(^{407}\) namely, that natural physical differences divided humankind into visibly different races. As such, the courts faced deciding on observable factors to determine race, and/or scientific assessment would determine the race of applicants. Alternately, those considered, “to be Unfit for naturalization—that is, to be non-White,”\(^{408}\) the courts construed as degenerate and therefore deficient in qualities necessary to contributing positively to society.

Of the fifty-two cases the court heard, the two most important in the discourse of obtaining citizenship by first establishing merit occurred with the *Ozawa v. United States Supreme Court* and the *Thind v. U.S. Supreme Court* cases. In the Ozawa case, the Court applied both the common knowledge theory involving societal recognition of whiteness as well as scientific evidence concluding that Ozawa of Japanese heredity, and the Japanese people were not white. As the petitioner, Ozawa asserted that his color, which he deemed whiter under his clothes, was in appearance white making him white. Ozawa applied arguments advanced by the leading anthropologists of the time, to buttress his conviction that his white skin made him white. Ozawa argued, “…in Japan the uncovered parts of the body are also white”; “the Japanese are of lighter color than other Eastern Asiatic[s], not rarely showing the transparent pink tint which whites assume as their own privilege.”\(^{409}\) According to Ozawa, determination-concluding whiteness related to observable color distinctions. Alternately, the court reasoned that there did exist color variations within races, “…even among Anglo-

\(^{407}\) Ibid P 6-7

\(^{408}\) Ibid P 16

\(^{409}\) Ibid P 81
Saxons,”⁴¹⁰ inclusive of differences, “…from the fair blond to the swarthy brunette, the latter being darker than many of the lighter hued persons of the brown or yellow races.”⁴¹¹ Decidedly, the court held that Ozawa’s contention of whiteness was irrelevant. In addition, the rationale used by the court concluded in favor of skin color alone did not indicate racial identity. In the final analysis, the court’s position favored both common sense and scientific validation, resolving against Ozawa and the Japanese race as external to the white race, and therefore, “…the words ‘white person’ are synonymous with the words ‘a person of the Caucasian race,’”⁴¹² of which excluded Ozawa and the Japanese people of being white. As such, the court held that Ozawa of Japanese descent, regardless of skin color, was not white, since only Caucasians are white, and therefore ineligible for citizenship. In fact, Lopez inferred the belief that American born peoples of Asian descent society considered as alien even today, “…and in the certainty that Japanese persons are not White.”⁴¹³

The second important case, which the Supreme Court heard regarding race, and color conditional to citizenship was in 1920, the Thind v. U.S. Supreme Court case. Thind born in Punjab India petitioned the court for citizenship based upon, “…anthropologists classified Asian Indians not as “Mongolians,” but as “Caucasians.”⁴¹⁴ Thind argued first before a district court, which granted naturalization status to Thind.
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However, Thind’s case appealed by the federal government to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, sought judicial directive from the Supreme Court whether Thind qualified for citizenship, because he was white. In support of Thind’s argument, the leading anthropologists of that period, “…classified Asians Indians as Caucasians.” While the court was willing to concede with science, that a link existed between the Hindu Indian and Caucasoid whites, the court stopped there in using common knowledge as a prerequisite for decision, as the court contended, “…the average man knows perfectly well that there are unmistakable and profound difference between them today.” Consequently, the court ruled that Thind was ineligible for citizenship, since as a non-white Hindu Indian Thind’s status negated inclusion in the white race. In essence, the court ruling reversed position from what it stated in Ozawa’s case citing science as the prevailing factor in determining racial inclusion. However, the court ruled in the case of Thind that arguments presented by science as to the status of Eastern Indians as white was immaterial. The presiding factor that the court used to decide the case exercised the notion of common knowledge, held by society to determine whiteness. Moreover, the court ruling consigned by society the authority to make the determination as to which groups’ society considered white, and therefore entitled to privileged status and ultimately the right to citizenship. Thus, the court in assigning society’s common knowledge of whiteness, as a means of establishing citizenship provided the validation
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of common knowledge “…was made into the touchstone of racial division.”

Ultimately, common knowledge replaced scientific knowledge in court proceedings.

The court in employing common knowledge to determine racial inclusion legitimated racial division, and the construction of whiteness as a racial classification endowed with privilege, advantage and benefits unfamiliar to groups not construed as white. In so doing, the court endorsed the status of whiteness confirmed by white society.
The Social Construction

Whiteness achieved its status of superiority and hegemony as a socialized construct. The dominant group in society—whites provided whiteness with importance to secure for themselves their position of dominance. Race as a socialized construct society grounded in divergences of, “white versus non-white.” A major component of whiteness functioned as advantage for whites involved white status achieved “…in the context of the denial of opportunity,” for the oppositional group—blacks. Thus, in order that whiteness successfully impart privilege to whites, whites must comply with whiteness, by receiving concession based on whiteness, while denying the same provisions for people of color. Moreover, the benefits incurred by whiteness required whites to deny the privilege they received. In essence, the social construction of whiteness began with the social destruction of blackness.

As a social construction, theorists inferred that, whiteness was not biological and therefore society could eliminate the associations, status and benefits entitled to whiteness. A foremost contention surrounding Whiteness theory entailed deciding; what are the best approaches for eliminating the rewards associated with whiteness? Problematic to dismantling whiteness entailed determining, “…not when and how to “stick to,” “preserve” or “save” whiteness, but when and how whiteness should be
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opened up, torn apart, made slippery.\textsuperscript{420} Moreover, a two-fold goal existed in establishing the best strategy for educating society, as to the reasons whiteness should terminate. Without white community involvement, dissolving whiteness would be at best arduous. Further, problematic to resolving whiteness involved educating society as to the detriment whiteness caused for whites and people of color. Whiteness conferred to whites’ unearned significance, while undermining black contributions to society. Thus, whites exist in a false reality, receiving unearned concession, which consistent to whiteness, whites deny. Conversely, people of color stagnate disadvantaged as a direct result of the advantages whites collect through whiteness.

A major rationale for the social construction of whiteness revolved around the cultural manifestations in place during slavery that defined the way blacks and whites were to interact:

For example, they had to use certain prescribed forms of address that expressed the “ritual.” Blacks addressed White slave owners as master (massa), mistress (mistis), miss (missy), boss or buckra, with or without given names. Slave owners addressed Blacks as aunt, uncle, mammy, sometimes daddy, boy.\textsuperscript{421}
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In this way, language combined with cultural distinctiveness structured whites as beneficiaries of superior status in relation to blacks. Thus, slavery functioned as the central incentive for the development of whiteness. During slavery, the positioning of black inferiority occurred as the rationale to enslave Africans. Moreover, in order for slavery to succeed, it was necessary, to debase the enslaved, and consequently, exalt slave-owners. Whereas, during slavery, a few blacks owned slaves, blacks by no means owned whites. Along with the vernacular of the day required of blacks during slavery, advancing the position of whiteness and necessitating behavioral interaction, further reinforced whiteness. Thus, the subservient way, in which blacks were required to address whites, also socially constructed whiteness. Slaves were required at all times to limit communication, eye contact and act in a subservient manner to all whites. In relation to whites slaves were to “stand attentively, respond politely, bow servilely to the extent, at times, of extreme evasion and deceit,”422 regardless of the age, gender or class of the white person, or the black person. For that reason, whiteness was socially constructed during slavery through the relationship society demanded of blacks, as whites as superior and the standard for emulation.

Hence, whiteness evolved as the binary of blackness. That is whiteness inherited all the positive attributes attributed to race, while blackness and black people obtained the derogatory. The inferior characteristics assigned to blacks, by white society, (and some of black society as well), transformed from fabrication to reality, “…that Black Americans

422 Ibid P 7
belonged to a race that was inferior to the White race biologically, culturally and socially.

Moreover, in order that a docile workforce was made of the African slaves, slave-owners prohibited slaves from speaking their indigenous languages and from engaging in cultural practices. Thus, slave-owners insured the stability of white supremacy, and ultimately whiteness, as, “They forced the slaves, to adopt superior White culture.” For slave-owners the major rationale was in replacing the slave's attachment to the value systems endemic of his culture, with those of the white culture, which owners “…presented as correct or proper.” Ultimately, the substitution of cultural values functioned to bestow propriety and superiority to whiteness, thereby undermining black cultural values. Thus, ramification occurred because of whites restructuring black cultural patterns. D’Souza intimated the following regarding black resistance to white assault on black traditions:

Black Americans became bi-cultural and bi-dialectical during slavery because they lived and worked in two different worlds which expected them to think, act and react in a particular way, depending on where they found themselves. In the Black community and among themselves, most Blacks felt at ease to talk and do things they would never attempt in a White environment. Conversely, in a White environment, Blacks talked and behaved as White people.

---

423 Ibid
424 Ibid
425 Ibid
expected, which would be inappropriate among the Black community (Becknell, 1987; pp. 30).426

However, D’Souza assumed that Blacks traded their humanity for survival; without realizing that it was possible to maintain one’s values, while at the same time, outwitting the fox, as blacks did to sustain both their cultural identity and humanity.
C. Implications from Labor

It must be remembered that the white group of laborers, while they received a low wage, were compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological wage. They were given public difference and titles of courtesy because they were white.427

Du Bois asserted that workers as labor contributors divided along racial lines. Because of their self-appointed superior status, whites received benefit because of their white status, other than the wages they received. Black workers disadvantaged by the social construction of race, experienced marginalization through the convalescing of white ethnic groups into a collected white majority. Although workers as union activists merged for bargaining issues, management employed divisive tactics, using whiteness as a line of demarcation, to break union solidarity. Karl Marx contended that within labor the worker provided “labour power,”428 to sustain his existence. As such, labor functioned to provide a living for the worker and for the capitalist it provided a work force, which the capitalist exploited for profit. As an additional scheme to increase his profit base, the capitalist utilized whiteness to divide the collective effort of the workers. Thus, the capitalist classes possessed an additional motivation and means to exploit the


workers. Marx argued that the workers attached to the capitalist classes must sell their labor not for profit, but in order to live; thus, workers responsible for their existence were forced to bargain, “to find a purchaser within this capitalist class.” As a result, wage earners lost the ability to bargain for wages, when solidarity weakened. Capitalists sought to expose areas of weakness and used every measure to exploit workers to the capitalists’ advantage. On the one hand, workers and capitalists were tied together; the latter for profit, the former for livelihood. For capitalists the ultimate objective was the exploitation of labor to augment their profit base. Interjecting whiteness as a means to divide the work force, capitalists utilized the ideology embodying whiteness—a status of superiority for whites, to achieve its goal. The ingenuity of the capitalist class furthered their own personal objective—to increase profit base, using the racist suppositions of whiteness to achieve their goal. This the capitalist achieved by distinguishing the treatment of white workers from others, “They were given public difference and titles of courtesy because they were white.”

Of particular interest in the capitalists plot to exploit workers began as a ramification of abolishing slavery. The Emancipation Proclamation, at the end of the Civil War guaranteed to the complement of workers an additional source of workers—the freedmen. The freedmen viewed as competition by many of the white laborers in the north, changed the philosophy of those who had just fought to emancipate the slaves, to

429 Ibid P 205

the recognition that now they must compete against the freedmen for work. In essence, the status of the freemen challenged the ideology of union solidarity, “No single thing has cost the white American worker more and nothing has hurt the trade union movement more than boss-inspired white supremacy.”\textsuperscript{431} Thus, the capitalist classes saw in this, a way to exploit the mentality of the white workers. Unfortunately, rather than bond with the freedmen forming an invincible collective of workers, white workers viewed black workers as rivals. James Baldwin inferred that for black workers the situation proved arduous:

There has never been a labor movement in this country, the proof being the absence of a Black presence in the so-called father-to-son unions. There are, perhaps some niggers in the window; but Blacks have not participated in the labor unions.\textsuperscript{432}

While Baldwin’s indictments incorporated an element of racist’ characterizations, it was this aloof position the unions’ revealed toward blacks, that the capitalists appreciated, as it provided the capitalists with opportunities to exploit. However, there were instances when unions stood resolute against owner instigated attempts to divide the workers along racial lines. For example, during the 1930s, the Congress of Industrial Organization CIO coordinating efforts represented steadfast union resistance,


“…white workers have, at times, been willing to surrender their potential racial privilege in favor of multiracial, multinational working-class unity.”\textsuperscript{433} Although, the CIO presented a united front, historical findings concluded for unions this was not always the case. Capitalist company owners exploited racial division to abate union solidarity; and white workers most often allowed the misuse of group solidarity, for the right to white supremacy. Du Bois maintained that at stake for white workers, involved better pay for individualistic gain. Du Bois wrote:

\begin{quote}
The successful, well-paid American laboring class formed, because of its property and ideals, a petty bourgeoisie ready always to join capital in exploiting common labor, white and black, foreign and native.\textsuperscript{434}
\end{quote}

As a result, the collective potency of unions declined, “Slavery, racism and …white supremacy,”\textsuperscript{435} all functioned fundamental to capitalist domination. Moreover, the capitalist class initiated and exploited opportunities to divide workers along race lines,
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“...in order to define and establish the “white race” as a social control formation.”

Ultimately, the goal to destabilize the unions reached fruition, since not only was the situation devastating for black workers, but inevitability the union and the plight for white workers deteriorated.

Another way in which whiteness functioned to subvert labor occurred when various ethnic groups vied for work. Of these ethnic groups, the newly arriving, much discriminated against Irish competed with freed blacks for work in the north. Company owners perceiving the competition between the two highly marginalized groups, used it to their advantage, exploiting both groups by lowering the price of labor. The Irish failing to recognize how capitalists used blacks and the Irish played into the hands of capitalists and “…blamed blacks for the cheap price of labor.” Thus, capitalist exploited whiteness as a means to reduce union solidarity and divide workers along racial lines.

Thus, capitalists exploited workers along racial lines, through a merging of white European ethnicities into a white race. White bonding “…became party to strategies of social closure that maintained black exclusion and ensured more stable employment
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and better wages for others of their own kind." Moreover, white workers failed to realize that in not forming a total collective of ethnicities to strengthen union membership, and by abandoning black workers, they compromised the full amalgamation of union solidarity. Unfortunately, white workers perceived black workers as rivals, rather than as comrades, manipulated the same as they were by company owners. Thus, there existed, “two labor movements,” one comprising the black workers pushed to the edge by racism and white supremacy, and the immigrant workforce that enjoyed both better wages and working conditions than black workers. The capitalist classes manipulated labor by instituting difference for workers based on race, conferring better pay and working conditions for whites, weakening union solidarity; and consequently, enhancing capitalistic hegemony and profit.

---


Capitalism

Capitalism functioned to support the status of the wealthy. As such, capitalism provided prominence to the status quo, which in turn supported the existence of a capitalistic system of government. Moreover, capitalism served to support the hegemonic position of the status quo that was and still is mostly comprised of whites. A major provision of whiteness involved its ability to utilize, “social practices of assimilation and cultural homogenization,” much in the same way as capitalism utilized production and commodities to further its continuation. Capitalism represented white domination, as it is white, along with, “…hegemony of institutions and practices of racial dominance,” which supported the continual practices of white supremacy that undermined the inclusion of peoples of color. Whiteness originated, “as a project of American capitalism and labor organizations.” The proponents of whiteness theory resolved the only way to achieve true meritocracy would occur when whites agree to call for white “abolition.” In calling for the abolition of whiteness, the objective is not to execute white people; the goal of eradicating whiteness indicated a termination of
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whiteness as a symbol of superiority and standard, which other groups must imitate by rendering whiteness no more significance than any other ethnic group. Moreover, the goal of ending whiteness required the participation of whites as anti-racist activists, to acknowledge, and contextualize the historical consequences of whiteness in relation to other groups, the ultimate goal of opposing and deserting association to whiteness, must occur.
White Privilege

Man does not strive for power only in order to enrich himself economically. Power including economic power, may be valued ‘for its own sake.’

Problematic to eradicating whiteness and privilege which whites inherit as heirs of whiteness entailed deconstructing privilege as a source of power. With power, and privilege comes a basis for individuals to esteem power as an end in itself. Thus, relinquishing power is difficult, as it provides advantages that not everyone acquires. As such, whites received privilege because of whiteness, which symbolized white racism, “…White racism,” signaling undeserved allocation of economic substances provided to whites only. A major function of whiteness involves its capacity “…to convey the material relations and social structures that reproduce white privilege and racism in this country.” In this way, whites benefiting from privilege supported whiteness in a continued relationship. Embodied in whiteness is the impact of privilege, which again


supported the maintenance and continuation of whiteness, and, “the very term “white race” is a definition of status, not genetics.”447 The fact that most whites do not acknowledge the privilege they as whites inherit, sustained whiteness. “At all social class levels, most whites underestimate the extent of the racial resources and privileges passed down from distant and proximate predecessors.”448 Consequently, whites benefit from privilege distributed across generations, representing unfair advantage mainly because whites are the only ones that profit. Moreover, when conditions repeatedly present advantage for one group, other groups are affected directly, as they do not receive benefit. In turn, whites receiving benefit do so doubly. The situations in which whites only benefit occur, “…because of the oppressive systems of slavery, segregation, and informal discrimination targeting Americans of color.”449 Additionally, whites benefit from “…a great fund of cultural capital, including prestige, a chance at an education, self-esteem, a sense of place, mobility, even (in some cases) a flair for giving orders”450

Rather than individual racist manifestations, which are now illegal, currently, white privilege represents institutionalized racist functions operating, “…in workplaces, [footnotes]
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housing, schools, and politics. Again, the premise of privilege resides within the embodiment of racialized practices that distribute benefit, privilege and advantage to whites founded on principles of whiteness. Another way in which whites benefit and receive privilege involved “…the absence of race-related economic, social, and emotional costs suffered by people of color.” An example would involve the racial profiling blacks receive from police and the questioning of professional ability, which black academics receive in the classroom from white students. Chaisson indicated the following regarding the disadvantage black academics experience:

The assumption that minority professors ‘don’t know what they’re talking about’ is deeply ingrained in white consciousness… the underlying assumption is that racial minorities, regardless of their credentials and experience, cannot possibly be as competent or as qualified as Whites. In his 1995 study on white working class college students. Gallagher states that the students’ sense of identity is tied to their ‘presumed superiority.453

In addition, whites receive other sources of benefits and privileges that they fail to attribute to their status in whiteness. Invariably, whites dismiss the privilege they
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receive as good luck. Accordingly, whites considered the disadvantaged status of
blacks as representative of their not trying hard enough. In other words, the benefits
that whites receive manifest to whites as earned and promoted by their hard work.
Whites receive the largest share of privilege, and insure the inevitability of continued
benefit enhanced by whiteness, by suggesting that everyone has an equal chance to be
successful.

Another area where whites are privileged involves the amount of daily control of their
lives, which most whites take for granted. For instance, whites demonstrate control
over their lives, in terms of where they live, work and transact business; whereas people
of color experience a great deal less control over the decisions under their control.
These control issues demonstrate a level of privilege, as only whites experience it.
Jensen wrote:

In most cases, white people can decide whether or not they want
predominantly black neighborhood. In most cases, black people
have no choice but to deal with a predominantly white world. If they
[black people] want to get a job or secure a bank loan or buy a car,
they will have to deal routinely with white people in a white world…
That’s part of white privilege-the privilege to ignore the reality of a
white-supremacist society when it makes us uncomfortable, to
rationalize why it’s not so bad, to deny one’s own role in it. It is the
privilege of remaining ignorant because that ignorance is protected.  

Consequently, whites received benefit in their disavowal of privilege, and in their assessment of discrimination and its effect on blacks. A major portion of the problem resides as whites often ignore, “…the centuries of slavery and segregation as bringing whites substantial socioeconomic benefits.” Blacks in turn, often suffered from repressed anger for the denial on the part of whites. Alternately, whites in denial of privilege, construe black behavior as unnecessary as slavery is long since over. In this way, whiteness advantages whites to avoid conversations of privilege as bygone occasions, while disadvantaging people of color, well aware of the disparate treatment they continuously receive. In fact, a major component in the structure of privilege involves the fact that whites rarely need “…to think about race at all,” thereby resolving themselves of taking responsibility for the unearned benefit they receive.

---


Problematic to dissolving whiteness—racism entails the naïve awareness most whites exhibit regarding white privilege.

One of the most powerful and dangerous aspects of whiteness is that many (possibly the majority) of white people have no awareness of whiteness as a construction, let alone their own role in sustaining and playing out the inequities at the heart of whiteness.457

As a result, of disavowing privilege, whites internalize a sense “…of being good people and of not being racist.”458 Assuming this provides whites with another way to receive privilege while disclaiming responsibility for it. Conversely, whites construe people of color negatively and through “stereotypical” lens. Again, such behavior on the part of whites serves to absolve them of preferential treatment, while condemning people of color as presumably undeserving. In fact, rather than consider the existence of whiteness as providing privilege to whites, and consequently disadvantage to people of color, Bonilla-Silva contended that to the average white person, “…evidence of racial disparity in income, wealth, education, and other relevant matters becomes evidence
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that there is something wrong with minorities themselves.” Interestingly, the arguments presented by whites in disavowing privilege, while benefiting from whiteness, all serve to support the maintenance and preservation of the very subsidy, they deny.

The situation in the case of poor whites is much the same—privilege construed through whiteness:

…privilege is not merely a monetary or absolute concept, rather it is also relative… The white poor, for example clearly reap certain privileges vis-à-vis the poor of color, beginning with the more positive ways in which they are typically viewed (Wise Speaking Treason Fluently).  

The situation amounts to how society elevates status for them above blacks, and thereby relinquishes to them greater community support than people of color. The relationship between race and class are significantly different however, for poor whites as unstated heirs to whiteness their status elevates them, and consequently, once removed from their economic position, benefit much the same as other higher socioeconomic class whites. Whiteness insures its subsistence by isolating poor working class whites, who have more in common with the black working class, “…since

---


such a system encourages those whites to think of their race as all they have, when their economic condition is so miserable, thereby segregating the two like groups, while contributing to the hegemony of whiteness.

White privilege entailed more than unearned benefits, as everyone experiences some sort of privilege, from being prettier, taller, younger, and smarter. The major difference white privilege distributed to whites in whiteness involved the issue of the social construction of race, and the, “privilege or disadvantage,” imbued within racialized societal construction. The major point of contention residing in the fact that when society constructed racial difference it did so “…only because people with power create and maintain the privilege for themselves at the expense of others.” Ultimately, more attention must be given to creating an egalitarian society where we determine, “…success by other people’s welfare as well as,” our own.

Ultimately, the goal of dismantling whiteness entailed white acknowledgment of white privilege. A major component in “critical whiteness studies” involved the propensity of
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whiteness i.e. white privilege, power and status to “…operate… by being, “invisible,” ubiquitous and entrenched as to appear natural and normative. In the end, the goal of destabilizing whiteness must involve white acknowledgment and white refusal of unearned privilege.

---

D. Scarcity of Whiteness Scholarship

Many academics believed that involving a diverse group of scholars in the discourse of whiteness theory strengthened the validity of the research. Since the primary directive of whiteness theory engages the abolishment of whiteness, researchers and scholars contented activism should be inclusive of whites and non-whites. Often, race-based disciplines, such as African American Studies, Black Studies, and Sociology of Race are taught by scholars of color, “…suggesting to Whites that they are not welcome,” 467 as they perhaps have little first-hand account of racial issues. In addition, the situation for which scholars exclusively teach, research and compose the ranks of cultural studies disciplines stem from administrative pressure, “where White scholars are directed away,”468 and on the other hand administration consider black scholars capable of only mastering race-related disciplines. In either situation, the discourse suffers both in its goal of adding to the scholarship practices to eradicate whiteness and equally by the exclusion of scholarship from a united front composed of both white and non-whites. The administration in directing black scholars to only race related disciplines is in itself representative of institutionalized racist practices. In order that Whiteness theory achieves its mandate to abolish whiteness, theorists conclude that the ranks of academic activism must be inclusive of both people of color, and whites. Central to engaging whiteness studies involved incorporating whites at both the
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academic level as teachers and researchers, but also, “whites who both recognize and live,” the circumstances of whiteness revealed as a source of both power and benefit furnished only to whites. Leaving whites out renders Whiteness theory powerless to affect inequality, as white involvement at all levels reinforced the resilience of abolishing whiteness. Moreover, instrumental to the goal of achieving egalitarianism, Dyson contented in *Giving Whiteness a Black Eye*, the following:

Black survival depended on black folk knowing the ways and souls of white folk. It’s only fitting now that we turn to African American and Latino, Asian, and Native American scholars, workers, intellectuals, artists, and everyday folk’s to understand whiteness.470

Conversely, many scholars contended that the overall initiative of abolishing whiteness, disconnected whites from possessing racial identity, and therefore is symbolic of, “…more wishful thinking than carefully thought-out strategy.”471 Again, the issue of dismantling whiteness suffered from within the camp of Whiteness theorists debate the issue of dismantling whiteness wrestles with whether to abolish whiteness or

---


to replace abolishing whiteness with, "the necessity of creating a positive, proud, attractive, antiracist white identity."\(^{472}\) To buttress their argument on creating a positive white identity, whiteness theorists argue calling for the abolishment of whiteness, supported the oppositions' assertion that whiteness is counter to white interests, "Warning of conservative efforts to capitalize on feelings of white victimhood."\(^{473}\) Notably, the argument presented by whiteness identity theorists' is in direct opposition with that offered by whiteness theorists contending placing whiteness at the core of the discourse damages the goal of creating equality and eradicating racism. However, for whiteness identity, advocates would lose a major portion of whites, as allegiances to abolish whiteness, weaken the ability of Whiteness studies to dismantle the power, privilege, benefit and status whites received through whiteness. Consequently, the possibility of achieving true equality diminishes.

Whiteness theorists agree both blacks and whites must collectively band together as activists, teachers and supporters of whiteness studies in order to achieve a more fair society. Thus, many whiteness academics reason whites as a matter of issue must involve each other in the struggle, white people need to develop the skills to take on some of this work,\(^ {474}\) in so doing committed white scholars bolster white racial awareness. By developing ways, to change society, as they enlist the help of others whites help develop and change each other. Whites must accept the responsibility for

\(^{472}\) Ibid P 169

\(^{473}\) Ibid P 169

change by admitting, “...that in the racial arena, we are the problem.” In most situations, this is not what occurs. Whites are quick to suggest they are not responsible for what happened long ago during slavery, and blacks are not working hard enough. Rarely, do whites acknowledge the privilege, status, and benefit that come with whiteness. Denial of privilege allows whites to collect benefit without feeling guilty about the inequality built into institutionalized racial practices. In *The Heart of Whiteness: Confronting Race, Racism and White Privilege* Robert Jensen wrote the following:

> Our burden is to do something that doesn’t seem to come naturally to people’s impositions of unearned power and privilege: Look in the mirror honestly and concede that we live in an unjust society and have no right to some of what we have.476

---
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E. The Danger of Placing Whiteness at the Center of the Discourse on Eradicating Racism

A major contention in studying whiteness centers on the fact that to study whiteness—one must study whites. Although, Whiteness studies is vested in the abolition of whiteness, anti-racist activists worry that placing whiteness at the core of the discourse, circumvents the rationale entailed in achieving equality. For that reason, many consider Whiteness theory irrational, as it focused on the dominant group, even though to condemn their superior status. Within Whiteness, theory comprised the components necessary to subvert white hegemony.

Against the major tendency of anti-racists to reify whiteness, a genuinely new and original counter-tendency may be emerging. The writers and activists with this group offer an interpretation of whiteness characterized by three things:

(a) An analysis of the historical and geographical contingency of whiteness.

(b) A critique of the category white, as currently constructed and connoted, as racist (but not necessarily a belief that all those people commonsensically assumed to be, or labeled, “white” are, ipso facto, racist).
(c) A sensitivity to the hybrid nature of contemporary “racial” identities.477

To proponents, Whiteness theory demonstrated the needed elements to rid society of the social construction of whiteness. Whiteness scholarship engages a thorough examination on the chronological review of the establishment of whiteness; a disclaimer for negating from the pool of whiteness, those whites assumed to be racist; and the significance attributed by the amalgamation of European groups determined at one time or another as white. In this way, Whiteness theory sought to absolve itself from substantiating the status of whiteness. Whiteness theory employed at the scholarly level proposed presenting a rationale grounded by theoretical practices to exploit white privilege and status, thereby re-channeling the emphasis from people of color as others, to whites as benefactors by way of privilege, advantage and status. At the heart of Whiteness theory involved a re-education in particular for whites, that “…focus[ed]…upon the racialization process that produces whiteness.”478 While at the same time, even Bonnett contended that for whiteness studies placing whiteness at the center of the discourse is “problematic,”479 as placing whiteness at the core places the discourse on the already advantaged group. Research suggested that establishing,
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“...a new race-consciousness tied to the elaboration of a “positive” self-image,”\textsuperscript{480} confiscated prior characterizations of whiteness as superior. However, the argument falls short of de-centering whiteness, since establishing white identity, encouraged attention directed towards whites, rather than assisted in destabilizing whiteness. Additionally, Lopez insisted that, “...elaborating a positive White racial identity seems at best redundant.”\textsuperscript{481}

Additionally, another aspect of placing whiteness at the center of the discourse involved how society defined people of color, in relation to whites. Thus, using terms like “...people of color,”\textsuperscript{482} to refer to blacks, Asians, Latinos, and others, “...takes the focus off white people.”\textsuperscript{483} In this way, the term, people of color symbolized an oppositional state to white people, much in the same way; whiteness and supremacy are oppositional to blackness and inferiority. On the other hand, placing whiteness at the core puts the focus on whites—the progeny of unwarranted privilege—who better to point the finger at? Jensen argued removing whites from the center of the discourse, “...who dominate society and can so easily drown out the voices of non-white
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people. Moreover, placing whites at the center through whiteness scholarship further conferred status on those already endowed. The argument is robust, placing whiteness at the center of the equal opportunity discourse, reinforces the stability of whiteness, “And using the terms white/non-white reminds us of that.” In that sense, placing whiteness at the center of the discourse on whiteness confiscates significant attention, from already marginalized groups. Whereas whiteness studies signifies the abolishment of whiteness, rendering white people equal in status to all other members in society, placing whiteness at the center of the discourse without doubt puts the focus on whites, however, for reasons other than what Whiteness theory imagined.

Consequently, the debate surrounding placing whiteness at the core ramified the stated rationale—placing the focus on whiteness, forcing whites through the abolishment of whiteness to relinquish their exalted status, in confronting the gratuitous privilege, benefits and advantage whites receive from birth, as a condition of whiteness.

Doane suggested that to accomplish the goal of abolishing whiteness the focus should involve “Whiteness cannot and should not be studied apart from white racism and racialized social systems.” Whiteness examined in this way negates identity and
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social construction of whiteness, which occurred as a super reinforcement of white supremacy. As such, whiteness would then engage the racist provisions of whiteness, which reveal individual and institutionalized racist practices.

Other whiteness theorists argued taking the focus off whiteness, detaches valuable opportunities to address the critical areas that sustain whiteness. Removing whiteness from the nucleus censures Whiteness theory stratagem from contesting the placement of whites at the top thereby allowing whites to be on the receiving end of privilege. In other words, by not placing whiteness at the core of the discourse white privilege goes unchallenged.

But there are also tremendous risks in not critically engaging whiteness… first, a continued failure to displace the “unmarked marker” status of whiteness…Second to leave whiteness unexamined is to perpetuate a kind of asymmetry that has marred even many critical analyses of racial formation and cultural practice…Third…critical attention to whiteness offers a ground not only for the examination of white selves, (who may indeed be white others, depending on the position of the speaker) but also for the excavation of the foundations of all racial and cultural positions.487

Thus, placing whiteness at the center of the argument construes whites as the creators of inequality, placing the responsibility for attaining equality in the hands of the usurpers. As race is a social construction, racism, inequality and whiteness are social constructions of the dominant group—whites. Moreover, what society constructed, society also has the power to terminate.


Ultimately, for whiteness scholars the goal of abolishing whiteness amounts to “…demoralizing whiteness,”489 in order that whiteness acquired center stage denoted an

---


attack on whiteness, rather than an elevated status. In order that the centrality of whiteness be understood as the target it must be reiterated to the community, both black and white. As Kincheloe and Steinberg suggested, “The analysis of whiteness that we call for involves a cultural reassessment, a cultural commitment,” 490 thereby placing whiteness at the center represents a disbanding of the status of whiteness.
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F. Summary

In this chapter I have shown that Whiteness studies derived from the issue of white European hegemony. In particular, Whiteness studies describe the prominence whites in the United States obtained from the amalgamation of European ethnic groups into a collective group recognized as white people. As a result, white immigrants entering the country during the early industrial period abandoned their ethnicity in favor of acquiring white identity. The process of integrating into a new racial classification was far from easy, but whiteness was established more by which groups would be denied by the privileges, benefits and advantages whiteness conveyed, than which groups would. In time, all white immigrant groups were permitted into the collective. Only the groups of people of color—blacks, Indians, Asians and others, whiteness rejected. Ultimately, membership into the whites’ only alliance confirmed dominance, privilege and supremacy that the others, were expected to strive to emulate, but considered inferior, were never presumed to attain.

Thus, whiteness materialized as an expression illustrating a coalescence of white European ethnic groups into one collective race—the white race. Moreover, whiteness occurred as a justification for establishing a system of class and racial division primarily to support the economic position of the wealthy. For that reason, whiteness founded and confirmed capitalism, as well, as capitalism created and endorsed whiteness. Central to the mandate of whiteness was to ensure that the others—people of color, would not receive the benefit, privilege and advantage whiteness guaranteed to whites. Thus, the others—particularly blacks in slavery as share croppers during the newly
initiated slavery of the Jim Crow era comprised the free sources of labor, which contributed unbridled profit to capitalists and furnished superior status to whiteness. Together with the exploitation of the white working class, capitalists’ constructed whiteness as the mechanism to dominate both enslaved, free and working class blacks.

At first, it was difficult for the white Europeans to abandon their cultural identity, but it was an incentive materialized by way of citizenship. During the 1700s whiteness gained status, as a condition of citizenship emphasized that all candidates be white, thereby luring white immigrants, to collude with whiteness, so that through citizenship they would be eligible for the privileges whiteness conveyed. As such, whiteness provided status not only because of the merger of white ethnic groups, but in denying access to people of color membership for whites became even more advantageous. Moreover, whiteness inferred that even the poorest of whites sustained superior status over the most articulate wealthy persons of color.

Hence, whiteness theory is grounded in deconstructing the various power sources whiteness represented in terms of the social, political and cultural arenas, and further to expose the socialized construction of whiteness as a means to dominate, subjugate and conceal the privileges which whiteness entails. Thus, central to whiteness involved a facility to oppress, in order that whiteness prevailed. While at the same time, it is crucial to whiteness as a demonstration of capitalism’s influence that whiteness function in compliance with the principles incorporated by the U.S. Constitution and the American Creed of meritocracy. Thus, the centrality of Whiteness theory requires the termination of white privilege.
Problematic for the study of whiteness entails the mandate by theorists call for the abolishment of whiteness. As such, spectators construe the abolishment of whiteness as the elimination of white people. In contrast, whiteness theorists describe the abolishment of whiteness as dismantling the privilege, benefit and advantages associated with whiteness, and not annihilation of white people. Critiques contended Whiteness studies fails to provide the manner by which abolishing whiteness would occur, as relinquishing privilege, advantage and benefit, (which in most cases whites either deny or are unaware of), would at best be tenuous. The goal for Whiteness theory then becomes educating the public as to how capitalism created whiteness to sustain capitalism’s quest for profit and to justify its oppression of people of color. Thus, whiteness evolved as an instrument to acquire opportunistic advantage underwriting supremacy over those different from the white capitalist class—people of color. Consequently, whiteness as a development of capitalism spawned a system of racism by dominant whites to sustain and safeguard their political, social and economic worth. Further complicating whiteness theory involves the fact that most whites today are oblivious to the extent of the “…disciplined, systematic and collective group activity that has structured white identities in American society.” 491 For that reason, most whites today remain ignorant of the privileged status endemic to whiteness, which most non-whites as non-recipients are fully aware, and disadvantaged as a result.

Further, problematic for whiteness theory entails the mandate requiring white club loyalty. Whiteness theorists insist that without prior permission, whiteness enrolls whites by virtue of being born. Thus, if whites try to refuse the conditions of whiteness, white society labels them ...un-American and a race traitor. As such, whiteness maintains its jurisdiction over whites as recipients of benefit, privilege and advantage, recognized through access to the best schools, networks channeling better employment opportunities and via transfers of status and wealth passed from generation to generation. Consequently, through whiteness greed inspired capitalism held whites ransom. Ultimately, whiteness scholars conceded that true meritocracy would only occur when whites consented to the abolition of whiteness.

Moreover, critiques suggest placing whiteness at the center of the discourse, is counter to dismantling racism, as whites through whiteness would continue to appropriate the dominant position. Thus, this chapter argued that identity politics embedded within Whiteness theory does not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade, as a result, Whiteness theory, (and Anti-racism) attempts to eradicate racism are futile.
Chapter IV: Comparison of Whiteness Theory to Anti-Racism

A. Contrasting Ideologies

Whiteness theory embodies the same objective as Anti-racism, the eradication of racism. Whiteness studies differ from Anti-racism in its stance on the abolishment of whiteness, i.e. the foundation of power, privilege, benefit and status bestowed on whites as a condition of innate whiteness. Whiteness studies like Anti-racism demands racism end within institutional practices, as well as re-educating individuals to cease engagement in prejudice and personal racist practices. Thus, whiteness studies and Anti-racism share very similar missions. Kincheloe and Steinberg indicated that whiteness studies, consistent with anti-racist practices “...involve[s] the unlearning of racism,” with the added charge to dismantle whiteness as the process to achieve a racism-free-society. As such, Anti-racism and Whiteness studies imply a re-education process ending with a dismantling of racism. In an attempt to examine if correlation exists between the two anti-discriminatory practices, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, it is the intent of this chapter to explore the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to eradicate racism, to establish if Whiteness theory is an ancillary of Anti-racism, and therefore superfluous.

Tim Allen, David Roediger and Noel Ignatiev advocated that whiteness originated, “…as a project of American capitalism and labor organizations.”⁴⁹³ These advocates of Whiteness theory resolved the only way to achieve true meritocracy would occur when whites agree to call for white “abolition.”⁴⁹⁴ In calling for the abolition of whiteness, the objective is not to abolish white people; the goal of eradicating whiteness indicated a termination of whiteness as a symbol of superiority and standardization, which other groups must imitate by rendering whiteness no more significance than any other ethnic group. Whiteness theorists contended that in order for whiteness to impart privilege on whites, whites must be compliant, accepting the gratuitous power, status and benefit in whiteness. Moreover, that racism would end only, when whites declined the concessions whites received by way of privilege, benefit and advantage, denied people of color.

Problematic for Whiteness theory is its charge demanding whites to disconnect from the attributes, power, privilege and benefit, Whiteness theory insists whites only have jurisdiction over, without disclosing exactly how to accomplish it. Problematic for Whiteness theory is its indifference in addressing the last decade, where civil rights laws, and affirmative action redresses resulted in an increased number of black college graduates creating a rising black middle class. On the other hand, globalization, and un-skilled work sent overseas to countries with no regard for the working conditions, or competitive salaries of its workers, created a shrinking white middle class, composed of
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formerly highly paid white factory workers. Moreover, as Whiteness theory calls for the abolishment of white status, power and privilege, by not acknowledging the economic situation in the last decade, Whiteness theory destabilizes its capacity to eradicate racism, by alienating the same group—whites, that it insist must join the club of race traitors, denouncing the privileges of whiteness. Failure to address the significance of the country’s economic circumstances over the last decade results, in Whiteness theory never converting from theory to practice.

Additionally problematic for Whiteness theory is its redundancy to Anti-racism. Whiteness theory calls for the abolition of whiteness to eradicate racism; similarly, Anti-racism’s sole purpose is the elimination of racism. Whereas Whiteness theory contended that racism would end by eliminating the benefits, status, advantage and privilege associated with whiteness, Anti-racism suggested educating society regarding the historical presence of racism’s origins and evolution, advanced the social, political, educational and economic standing of all groups, and as a result ends racism. Clearly, within the operating structures of both paradigms, the goal was the end of racism. Thus, it is in this way that Anti-racism and Whiteness theory demonstrate homogeneity. Moreover, solely relying on Whiteness theory’s call for the abolishment of whiteness is not enough to eradicate racism.

Racism cannot simply be removed from cultural, social, and political arenas by calling for its abolition or by appealing to calls for justice. Because of the entrenched nature of the ideology of whiteness, racism
remains an active part of the cultural, social, and political configuration of group relationships that characterize life in the United States.\textsuperscript{495}

Another area problematic for Whiteness theory is the conflict existing between race and class, and identity politics, within Whiteness theory. This dissertation argues that the implications of identity politics in Whiteness theory are incompatible with eradicating racism. As identity politics entail focusing on racial inequality and marginality to advance equality, Whiteness theory overlooks the inconsistency with race and class, particularly over the last ten years. Previously, society used race as a means to define status, as whites and people of color—blacks and Hispanics were more separate, in terms of economic status. Over the last ten years, there has been a significant change in the economic statuses of blacks and whites. As the country witnessed the loss of work to overseas countries, whites have suffered, in terms of the availability of work. Although, there is a significant number of a growing black underclass, while at the same time there has been a considerable number of talented blacks that have acquired middle-class status, as well. In the meantime, the white middle class has diminished, due primarily to loss of un-skilled work outsourced overseas. In not factoring the economic consequences of the last decade on identity politics within the ideology of its philosophy, Whiteness theory is remiss. Thus, the dissertation argues, dismantling racism requires taking a serious look at the dialectical relationship between class and

race, central to the history of the last decade, before attempting to interject anti-discriminatory practices as the primary method to eradicate racism.

Whiteness theory resolved that the eradication of whiteness was possible, with the abolishment of whiteness; however, the elimination of racism was at best tenuous as the structure of whiteness was indicative of America. On the one hand, advocates considered Whiteness theory and the eradication of racism, by concerned well-wishing whites improbable; on the other, Whiteness theory received serious critique for not engaging racism from a pragmatic stance, as Anti-racism does. Still other researchers suggested that Whiteness theory constructed an undoing of racism different than Anti-racism implying, “...“whites” need to “face up to” their own, and other “white” people’s racism in order to successfully expunge it from their psyche.”

Whiteness theory, in its quest to abolish whiteness, functions by appealing to the kindness and generosity of the dominant group—whites. Moreover, Whiteness theory’s appeal to whites to disarm whiteness correlated to Anti-racism theory, in methodology and practice, “... [The] confessional dynamic remains a potent force within anti-racism, including white studies,” which demonstrated the homogeneity of philosophy evident within Anti-racism and Whiteness theory paradigms. Moreover, other Whiteness theory activists

---
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contented it would be better utilized by labeling it, “…studying white racism,” which better defined whiteness as a practice less associated with the nature of whites, than as an anti-racist practice. In not associating whiteness to white racism, removes the historical personification of whiteness as a vehicle of racist political, economic and social hegemony constructed by whites, for white people. Whiteness theory, when advocating the abolishment of whiteness, the dissertation argues should enlist discourse on the historical occupation of white privilege, centering current debates on class differences. Thus, rather than consider only race issues, Whiteness theory should incorporate the significance of class into the equation. Doing so, may increase interest in employing Whiteness studies, as a vehicle to challenge racism; not doing so, accounts for Whiteness theory, (and Anti-racism) failure to eradicate racism.

Accordingly, Whiteness theory demonstrates a conditional relationship to the stated objective detailed in Anti-racism. Where Whiteness theory advocated the abolishment of whiteness to displace racism, Anti-racism inferred the re-education of society, to dispel the myth of meritocracy, the capitalistic profit venture exploitation of the working class, society and capitalisms’ relationship with racism as a means to advantage one group over another, purely to sustain capitalism. Thus, without engaging these manifestations of racism, Anti-racism contended, racist practices remain embedded within institutional apparatuses. Hence, Whiteness theory prescribed a particular

---

approach to eradicating racism, Anti-racism characterized the fundamental basis for eradicating racism. Although, other practices, like Whiteness theory, such as diversity theory, and critical race theory, all claimed to be exclusive theoretical practices for the eradication of racism, all such practices depended on Anti-racism for its stature and contribution, as the fundamental system for conquering racism. Thus, this chapter argues as well, Whiteness theory is indeed an ancillary of Anti-racism.

---

499 Diversity and critical race theory indicate different manifestations to eradicate racism and racist practices. Although, both paradigms, (as well as Whiteness theory) employ different philosophies, and different actions, both practices rely on the original contentions incorporated in antiracism, to destabilize racism. Whereas diversity inferred pluralism and inclusion of all issues of difference, age, race, sex, color, disability, etc., Critical race theory maintained, Title VII and the court systems enhanced opportunities for discriminatory difference. Title VII informed racist exactly where racist actions manifested, and therefore avoided, and the courts in prescribing different indictments based on race.
F. Summary

Employing a scientific analysis to explore the connection existing between the two paradigms, suggest that both Anti-racism and Whiteness theory function as the independent variable in a hypothesis fundamental to eradicating racism, and the capacity for achieving a destabilized racist state, as the dependent variable. Thus, manipulating the independent variables—anti-racist programs producing a change in the dependent variable—representing the destabilization of a racist state. Thus, Whiteness theory, (and Anti-racism) serve as the variable(s), which causes the change; and the destabilization of racism assumes identity as the dependent variable, the variable that changed, converted by anti-racist acts, deeds and behavior. Thus, cause and effect supposition indicate change in one variable—Whiteness theory, as a subsidiary of anti-racist treatments underwrite the probability for initiating change in another variable—racism. As such, evidence for correlations in related areas may also as a result occur, i.e. discrimination, prejudice and intolerance. To insure that the research efforts are scientific, all other variables that may contribute to change, i.e., acquiring anti-racist states require control of all other variables, which may demonstrate change in the dependent variable—racism. Most problematic, in terms of controlling the exactness of the research involves the contamination that may incur from researcher participation. In order that accuracy of the research conclusions occur, the researcher need engage from a position of neutrality, refusing to allow personal convictions to bias.
the research findings. Max Weber considered “…value-free,” research to be the hallmark of un-biased scientific investigations. Thus, the purpose of the research was to be apolitical, since more important than controlling the research social scientists should strive to interpret the reasons for the manners, which caused society to act in various ways. Weber termed interpretive sociology as Verstehen—understanding. Conversely, Marx considered paramount to sociological research, critical sociology endowed society with the parameters to seek socialized change, for the betterment of society. Thus, research for any other purpose, than the transformation of society suggested, that there were those in society that exploited society, to keep society unchanged for their own motives. Enhanced in this ideology embodies leaving society in an unalterable state was accommodating to only the status quo. Marx advocated for socialized change characterized by critical rather than scientific sociology. Being less inclined to belief in understanding why people do what they do was important; Marx advocated the reasons for conducting research was to make society better for all people; “…to change it in the direction of democracy and social justice.”

Consequently, whereas scientific sociology advocated a distancing from the politics of judgment and positioning on one side or the other, as to do otherwise, creates subjective conclusions; Marx insisted, “…all research is political or biased—either it calls for change or it does not.” Thus, applying a scientific explanation for understanding the necessity for anti-racist applications may assist with unraveling the
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rationale, uses, and expected results for anti-discriminatory practices ending with the eradication of racism. However, it does little to dispel the fact that concealed within the structure of all issues is politics and bias. Whiteness theory demonstrates a conditional relationship to the stated objective detailed in Anti-racism, educating society regarding racism, and the eradication of racism. Where Whiteness theory advocated the abolishment of whiteness to displace racism, Anti-racism inferred the re-education of society, to dispel the myth of meritocracy, the capitalistic profit venture exploitation of the working class, and capitalisms’ relationship with racism as a means to advantage one group over another. Thus, this dissertation argues, by not focusing on the dialectical relationship between race and class central to the history of the last decade, both paradigms fail in their missions to eradicate racism. As Whiteness, theory emerged as a branch of Anti-racism, reliant upon the same foundational principles and practices inherent in Anti-racism; the dissertation contends that Whiteness theory is an ancillary of Anti-racism.
Chapter V: The Dialectics of Race, Class, and the Intersection of Identity Politics

It is the intent of this chapter to examine the dialectical relationship between race and class, which Anti-racism and Whiteness theory prescriptions fail to connect with their anti-discriminatory practices. Thus, an examination of the demographic trends currently transpiring, in which racial tension exacerbates, on the one hand for political interests, dividing the population, and on the other placing blame for the country’s declining economic state on peoples of color. This chapter also seeks to investigate the factors causing the shrinking middle class, such as globalization sending jobs overseas, because of American worker’s inability to compete with foreign countries that do little to enforce, better wages, and work conditions for foreign workers. Additionally, this chapter examines the rise of the Black Middle Class, and the reasons behind it. Further, because of discrimination in the U.S., the Black Middle Class emerged. Composed of black doctors, lawyers, teachers, undertakers, and Postal workers, this professional force became the advocates and practitioners for the needs of the growing black urban communities. The passing of the Civil Rights Act, along with affirmative action, “… as an enforcement mechanism resulted in a sea change for the black community,”503 thus, it was in this way that the black middle class grew significantly. Today blacks occupy a higher number of white-collar jobs than whites, although, “…the proportion of blacks in the middle class is still about 30 years behind that of whites.”504 In addition, this chapter
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explores the results of the 2010 Census as a reference point for determining the legitimate status of the current black underclass. In an attempt to examine the findings of data from the 2005 U.S. Civil Rights Commission briefing, “The Economic Stagnation of the Black Middle Class,” it is the intent of this chapter to explore, the status, explanations and causes of the growing black underclass. For instance, conference findings suggest poor graduation rates represent significant reasons why urban blacks represent the growing black underclass. In addition, the factors that obstruct the ability of urban and rural whites from succeeding are also as relevant, to that experienced by urban blacks. This chapter also seeks to underscore the significance of affirmative action redresses to determine, if such programs are divisive, or if the use of affirmative action redresses should represent occasions to focus on representing those on a “need basis,” rather than race.

Lastly, it is the intent of this chapter to examine the politics of identity and its intersection with Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory. As identity politics indicate that only oppressed marginalized minority groups, i.e., women, African Americans be in control of articulating their oppression, in terms of their own lived experience, the situation is highly problematic for Anti-racism and Whiteness theory discourse.

During the last ten years, the country has seen a change in its economic, social and political development. Whereas in the past neighborhoods were highly concentrated with members of the same ethnic, racial groups, today the appearance of America has changed. Today, a vast number of people of color reside in suburban areas, occupy a significant number of the middle and upper class white-collar jobs, and enjoy a higher
standard of living, than in the past. Through civil rights, and affirmative action rulings, blacks and other people of color have received better educational opportunities, which have elevated them higher in society. Today, the country’s economic situation is far different than it was twenty years previously. Currently, unemployment is high, jobs are few, and society in general is suffering because of it. Today, low skill work in manufacturing experienced significant replacement by service industry work in fast food restaurants, and nursing homes. Previously, blacks and people of color filled the ranks of low skilled work; whereas whites worked in factories, such as Ford, and GM, making an equitable income, with little education. Today, the situation is different. Now, blacks and people of color compose a large number of a growing middle class; and whites comprise the members of a middle class that is shrinking. Consequently, discourses concerned with racial inequalities are at best convoluted. This does not infer society eradicated racism, but that because of the economic growth of the black middle class, correlated to the shrinking white middle class, the last decade has witnessed a significant change in the significance of race. Nor does this imply that all blacks and people of color occupy the ranks of middle class, since unlike the shrinking white middle class, the black underclass grows exponentially, in comparison to the black middle class. Much of this growth devastating the black underclass occurs for the same causes, which affect the shrinking middle class numbers, loss of jobs overseas to countries paying lower salaries, devoid of labor compliance laws, globalization, and control of the country’s economic resources in the hands of banks and the wealthy. Thus, the middle and upper classes include a significant number of blacks and people of color; the issue of race inequality is no longer as relevant. Thus, anti-discriminatory
practices, which fail to include discourse on the dialectical relationship between class and race, central to the history of the last decade are pointless, and failing to do so accounts for the ineffectiveness of anti-discriminatory practices, as the middle and upper classes represent a more pluralistic occupancy.
A. Conflict with Identity Politics

As both anti-discriminatory practices advocate ensuring the eradication of racism, it is essential that a collective bi-racial community of practitioners be part of the fight. Identity politics, on the other hand, insist that only those victimized can provide a coherent dialogue regarding the significance of the offense, on the individual or group. While many consider identity politics as divisive, in terms of its ability to segregate groups by ethnic, racial or gender differences, others suggest identity politics is the only way to resolve past wrongs. Arthur Schlesinger as an antagonist of identity politics suggested that African Americans will never be totally accepted in America until they are, received and welcomed by those who already think they own America.\(^{505}\) Thus, Schlesinger adamantly insisted that all forms of identity politics, be they ethnic in flavor, detract from national unity. In *the Disuniting of America* he wrote,

> What happens when people of different ethnic origins, speaking different languages and professing different religions, settle in the same geographical locality and live under the same political sovereignty? Unless a common purpose binds them together, tribal hostilities will drive them apart. Ethnic and racial conflict, it seems

evident, will now replace the conflict of ideologies as the explosive issue of our times.\textsuperscript{506}

For this reason, identity politics represents a collapse in national unity, and a move to segregate marginalized groups based on the group’s specific variation. Conversely, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory refrain from engaging whether marginalized individuals or group should be in control of expressing the extent of their oppression. Instead, Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory suggested the enlistment of everyone into the collective to overthrow racism. Referencing the current unemployment rates of blacks 15.6\%, Hispanics 12.7\%, to whites 9.3\%, that the current economic correlation of color to unemployment rate underwrites the inevitability for the continuance of identity politics, in that, “As long as inequality is apportioned by identity, we will be concerned with identity.”\textsuperscript{507} Identity politics as an anti-discriminatory program is not only necessary, but whereas Anti-racism and Whiteness theory profess to address racism, identity politics vested its resources for the concerns of the marginalized ensuring that their needs will be adequately addressed. Further, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory in their attempt to make the playing field less anti-racist, support groups other than those marginalized by color, such as women, and the gay community. Which in the end, elevates the economic, political and social position of women, specifically white women, and the homosexual community composed of white women, thus, advancing
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the needs again of the community less marginalized to the detriment of peoples of color.
The ultimate wrongdoing occurs when anti-racist prescriptions, such Anti-racism and
Whiteness theory, apply their sustenance to engaging, arguing, and theorizing on the
wrongs of racism, while doing little to undo the inequality that the marginalize
experience as a condition of their color; thus, “fighting discrimination has nothing to do
with fighting inequality.”508

For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in
relation to the white man. Some critics will take it on themselves to
remind us that this proposition has a converse. I say that this is
false. The black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of
the white man.

It is the racist who creates his inferior’… And yet, in order for
racism to be resisted, in order for a post-colonial identity to be
forged, the ‘black soul’ must be fabricated and asserted, given
shape and definition as a site of resistance and revolution. 509
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B. Demographic Trends in the last Decade

William Julius Wilson contended that through the essence of a split labor market, whereas whites receive higher pay and black workers lower pay, “…class antagonisms[s] are transformed into racial antagonism.”\(^{510}\) Thus, the inevitability for racial conflict, in reality encompassed class related conflict. The Marxist orthodox labor theory argued to fulfill the capitalistic objective of the pursuit of profit, “…efforts will be made to suppress workers’ demands for increased wages and to weaken their bargaining power by promoting divisions within their ranks.”\(^{511}\) Thus racial partitioning occurred, in terms of how workers received benefits, keeping a black labor force subjugated, in reserve and “…encouraging racial prejudices and ideologies of racial subjugation such as racism,”\(^{512}\) further encouraging a reserve army of black workers. Addressing the Institute of Politics, earlier this year, at Harvard, Richard Trumka, President of AFL-CIO warned that a major impetus behind racialized instigation occurred, “…to convert justifiable anger about an economy that only seems to work for a few of us into racist and homophobic hate and violence.”\(^{513}\) Thus, certain factions in
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society today initiate racism as a tactical maneuver to obfuscate the fact that the rich are getting richer, and as a result, the working and middle classes are getting poorer. Because of the current economy of bank bailouts, globalization sending unskilled work overseas, the country has lost a significant amount of work, as unemployment continues to grow. Statistics provided by Michael Snyder, editor of theecomiccollapseblog.com suggest that a major problem for American workers comes as a result of, “…61 percent of Americans "always or usually" live paycheck to paycheck, which was up from 49 percent in 2008 and 43 percent in 2007; approximately 21 percent of all children in the United States are living below the poverty line in 2010, the highest rate in 20 years; and, this is what American workers now must compete against: in China a garment worker makes approximately 86 cents an hour and in Cambodia a garment worker makes approximately 22 cents an hour." Snyder, Michael, “The Shrinking Middle Class.” http://theeconomiccollapseblog.com All of these factors are calamitous for the American worker, whereas the wealthy have experienced an economic growth in comparison to what workers receive. Thus, dialogues grounded solely in resolving racism without addressing the current economic trend, are powerless to cease racism, and detract from uncovering how racism obscures the real problem of the economy: racist jargon introduced to keep workers divided from forming bi-racial coalitions to force Congress to represent the needs of workers, the agents of the wealthy infuse dialogues addressing economic problems with racist rhetoric to disrupt unity, and take the focus off of them. The overall objective of the wealthy is to keep the workforce manageable, fighting each other rather than demanding that Congress enforce the needs of the underclasses.
a. The Shrinking Middle Class
A central cause for the current state of the shrinking middle class occurs because of the current economic state in America. Within the last decade, the middle class declines in direct correlation with the financial growth of the wealthy. As globalization, spiraled, multinational companies sent jobs overseas; increased trade policies between countries, benefitting either multinationals or those with large stock portfolios; and as a result, the middle class stagnated. Moreover, the U.S. considered an industrial nation, continues on its present course of manufacturing fewer and fewer products. Within a major part of the last decade, the outlook for future work is mainly considered to be in service related industries, rather than manufacturing and production. During the period of 2003 to 2006, the job industry saw a major gain in service oriented fields of health care, education, entertainment, i.e. hotels and resort industries, accounting for over 60 per cent of the job growth, during that period. The increase in health care related commerce increases, in direct relation to the needs of the aging baby-boomer generation, needing additional medical care community care; in addition, health care projections suggests that health care service jobs will require a significant rise in the residential treatment care facilities for the elderly, and mental and substance abuse care, and facilities. More specifically, during the same period, jobs in the manufacturing fields began a steady decline, represented in the current situation of a vast proportion of the production work is now done over seas. The 2010 U.S. Census indicated that out of a population of 307,006,550, those 16 years and over accounted for only 153,989,802 in the labor force. The total number of males, (over the age of 15) working

---
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were 61,245,287 and 59,338,572 were female. Thus, the combined number of the working population represents, again only 120,583,859, out of a total population 307,006,550, (barring children, the elderly, and the incarcerated), in the workforce.

The situation for the unskilled members of society is further complicated, as of the 29,636,552 eighteen to twenty-four year olds, 17% have less than a high school education; 32% have either attained a high-school diploma or GED, 41% have some college or at least an associate degree; but only 9% have attained a Bachelor’s degree. For that reason, a vast majority of these unskilled workers have trouble finding work.

The situation for older workers educated earlier during much different times, is considerably different. Of the 197,794,576 twenty-five years and older, 6.4% have less than a 9th grade education, 9.1% have a 9th to 12th grade, (no diploma) education, and, 29% are high school graduates, or have achieved a GED, 20% have some college, but no degree. This demonstrates that the economic prospects of those without education, and skill attainment are challenging in an economy where both education and unskilled work is sparse. Looking back, “More than half of the two-hundred and twenty-nine million persons in civilian non-institutional working-age population in 2006 were employed full time.” The economic changes over the last decade changed significantly, as a substantial number either were part-time workers, or defined as “marginally attached” workers—individuals that desired work, but because of pessimism in not finding work, or change in family needs altered their continuing looking. In any

516 Note: the 2010 U.S. Census records the total number of children under five years as 20,672,826, eighteen years and over as 227,431, 128, and those over the age of sixty-five as 37,980,216.

event, such individuals were of a fewer number, than what is currently seen in high unemployment numbers of eleven million. Ultimately, the Department of Labor contended that during the 2006 work forecast, “the vast majority of persons not in the labor force do not want to work”;\textsuperscript{518} this is hardly the case today. Today, the rise in skilled labor represented in the Information technology fields continues to rise, which explains the rise in the education field, as those that can seek educational advancement to compete in this rising field, are doing so. Thus, education reveals a direct correlation with job prospects, as education rises individuals’ chances of procuring work, while lack of education attainment handicaps workers from being insured fulfilled high salary work. As a result, college attendance has risen during the last decade, as 2006 Economic Census Report reveals:

The proportion of persons 25 to 64 years old with some college (or an associate degree) more than doubled between 1970 and 2006. The share with a bachelor’s degree and higher also more than doubled over the period. In contrast, the share of the labor force with less than a high school diploma declined markedly.\textsuperscript{519}

Moreover, the more educational opportunities individuals have, the better their prospects of finding work. As opportunities to obtain unskilled factory work has declined within the last decade, because of trade, such as NAFTA, unskilled work sent overseas to lower paid workers, the trend today envisions an absence of work for all unskilled
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workers, contributing to the rise in unemployment, and the decline of the American middle class. Thus, the status of work declined significantly, over the last ten years, as pre-2010 unemployment for workers between the ages of twenty-five and pre-retirement age, without a high school diploma was 8.3 percent, while the unemployment status for college graduates was only 2.3 percent. Moreover, even when race entered into the equation the significance between unemployment correlated with low educational attainment, and vice-versa, a positive correlation sustained as high educational attainment exhibit[ed] a high propensity with job access.520 Thus, the major significance of the loss of work comes as a consequence of loss of unskilled work for the uneducated, while the employment status of the educated “…has held fairly steady over the long term,”521 further, increasing the distance between the decline of the middle class into a growing state of poverty, while elevating the wealthy. As a result, class stratification in the U.S. society steadily increased. Thus, engaging in anti-

520 See the 2006-2007 U.S. Economic Census Reports, unemployment rates regardless of race or ethnicity, where whites, blacks and Hispanics are concerned decline with higher levels of education. Hence, Hispanics, whites and black college graduates earn twice as much (in 2006 $886) as Hispanic, white, and black dropouts. However, the report does suggest that blacks more than any other racial or ethnic group experience a greater likelihood towards labor market problems. During the 2006 fiscal year blacks comprising eleven percent of the population, accounted for twenty-two percent of the unemployment, and twenty-eight percent of what the Economic Labor Census considers long term unemployed—those out of work for more than twenty-seven weeks, or longer. Additionally, blacks comprise a high level of those considered marginalized, as available for work, and no longer looking. Both blacks and Hispanics are less likely to be employed in management, and professional occupations, and more likely to be employed in construction, and maintenance jobs. Thus, blacks as a smaller number of the population than whites or Hispanics incur a greater disadvantage where employment status is concerned; as Hispanics include a higher number than whites of the unemployed, they as the second largest racial/ethnic group’s joblessness is lower than blacks. Perhaps due to educational status, unemployment rates for Asians, is similar to that of whites, even though Asians comprise a smaller share of the population. The median weekly earnings of white workers were 2006 $690, $554 for blacks, $486 for Hispanics, as Asians earned $784.
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discriminatory programs, as Anti-racism and Whiteness theory without responding to the significance of the economic outcomes of all workers in the last decade, fails to get the attention of a society concerned with the disappearance of work, and the shrinking middle class; ultimately leading to the failure of anti-discriminatory practices capacity to eradicate racism.

Currently, a more important societal issue is the devastation of the middle class, than the subject of race, racism, and anti-discriminatory practices. It is not that racism no longer exists, nor is it that society has turned its back on inequality. The current and major focus of the poor, working and middle classes is focused on the widening gap between the wealthy and all others. As the bank bailouts came, the wealthy benefited; the unemployed and the targets of high interest jumbo loans continue to lose their homes, and their access to credit. No longer, can society exist as it did in the past with, “…low-wage, high-consumption society…”522 Today, the demarcation between race and class is obscured, as talented blacks benefited by civil right laws and affirmative action occupy a signify number of the middle class. While whites as former occupants of a shrinking middle class decreases, in response to the loss of high-paying low skilled work sent overseas. It is in this way that conducting a thorough understanding of the dialectical relationship between race and class is needed by both anti-discriminatory practices, in order that a more accurate account occurs. Thus, society today is more vested in understanding which political official has their best interest at heart, rather

than, “...seeing the middle-class Americans as overpaid and underworked...”\textsuperscript{523} embracing agendas that, “…fails to see the connections between downsizing, outsourcing, inequality and homelessness, and the homeless,”\textsuperscript{524} in the process promoting the objectives of the rich, over workers.

Presently, the overall goal of society is to attain an egalitarian society, but reaching the goal becomes near impossible, when Anti-racism and Whiteness fail in addressing the conflict between identity politics and the dialectics between race and class, the significance of both paradigms become further ineffectual.

\textit{b. The Rising Black Middle Class and the Growing Black Underclass}

Michael Snyder contended, “The American worker who was formerly well paid especially in areas such as the auto industry where unions gained many benefits for workers is now competing with workers on the other side of the world where wages are very much lower and regulations fewer or non-existent.”\textsuperscript{525} A major number of these
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workers comprising the ranks of highly paid unskilled workers were the white members of society. Thus, the economic situation for these workers is today calamitous, as work in manufacturing is to a large degree vanishing, resulting in the dismantling of the middle class. Conversely, the ranks of the black middle class are increasing. Talented blacks benefited by enforcement of civil rights laws, and affirmative action redresses to obtain higher educational advancement, and as a consequence, higher skilled work.

According to the *U.S. Civil Rights Commission: Study the Stagnation of the Black Middle Class*, charged to study and collect information relating to discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws, and to submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and Congress, “…the black middle class was growing percentage-wise, growing over-all in absolute terms.”

Interestingly, while the committee findings resulted in establishing a significant growth in the development of the black middle class, the research considered that overall the black middle class was stagnated, because of reaching a highpoint during the 80s. Moreover, the research findings reported that discrimination played a limited part in the stagnation, the overall problems occurred because of family structure and lack of educational attainment. The lack of education, which Douglas Besharov of the Civil Rights

---

Commission addressed stemmed from the numbers of the growing underclass, which suffered because of:

...difference in educational attainment to:

- Poor high school counseling, whereby high school counselors recommend students attend colleges for which they are not academically prepared.
- Unsupportive college cultures for those from disadvantaged backgrounds.
- Financial aid formulas tiled in favor of the middle class, rather than direct to low-income families, and students.

In this way the black underclass and the development of the black middle class is encumbered.\textsuperscript{527}

A major reason for the difficulty the members of the black underclass experienced as college dropouts comes, in many cases because of their being first generation college students, lacking in the cultural and social capital, which many white students benefited from. Thus, many white students have parents that have attended colleges

\textsuperscript{527} Besharov recommends that higher education financial aid programs and policies take into account families’ wealth and assets, including home ownership, so that financial aid becomes more available to low-income students, rather than a middle class entitlement program. Thus, financial aid access would proportionately benefit those it is intended for, the marginalized.
and pass on to their offspring the intricate details surrounding achieving academic success. Such information includes how to choose classes, how to maneuver through financial aid forms, and just overall how, when and the best methods for studying. Without access to the social capital, in many cases black students fail. Parents with a college education understand the educational system better than those without and therefore can negotiate with colleges on their child’s behalf.\footnote{Besharov, Douglas, Holzer, Harry J., & Landry, Bart, Conference before the United States Civil Rights Commission, The Economic Stagnation of the Black Middle Class: A Briefing Before The United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C., July 15, 2005, A transcript of the briefing is available on the Commission’s website, www.usccr.gov, and by request from Publications Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 624 Ninth Street, NW, Room 600, Washington, D.C. 20425, (202) 376-8128, publications@usccr.gov.} Although, the outcome for the black underclass is catastrophic it hardly comes about because of racist action, lowering their success in the classroom, and in procuring work. The factors that cause the most detriment to black and white economic stability result from the lack of work, caused by globalization, and work sent overseas. Without a doubt, educational attainment does further the life chances of all recipients, but it does not preclude that everyone possess the same skill set, nor the tenacity to succeed in college. Thus, a large share of every culture relies upon non-skill work to live, and when work disappears, all those at the bottom of the economy lose. Thus, issues of economic stability override all other attempts to provide racial change. As a result, offering anti-discriminatory programs, when the demands of society involve resolving the status of work, colors such agendas pointless, vacant and subjective.
c. Increased Concentration of Wealth and Increased Stratification between Rich and Poor

Alternately, to the status of the shrinking middle class, and the growing underclass, the wealthy are enjoying a higher rate of economic success. Benefactors to the exploitation of foreign workers, in foreign countries, the wealthy have profited immensely. Snyder contended that, “…83 percent of all U.S. stocks are in the hands of 1 percent of the people.”\textsuperscript{529} Moreover, this stratification contributed to the decline of the middle class, and the underdevelopment of the black underclass. Continuance on the current course creates an economy were only the
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wealthy are able to live comfortably, at the benefit of the ninety percent of working, middle and poor classes. Thus, the life chances for those members of society have been set back to the difference in paycheck representing, “…300 to 500 to one,”\textsuperscript{530} compared to sixty years ago, when the difference was not as significant. Thus, life styles between the wealthy and the poor have changed drastically because of the wealthiest control of banks, and ability to influence government leaders to advance their agendas over those of other Americans. Moreover, the economic interest of the wealthy are inclusive of a more diverse group than in the past, of which the rising black middle class now occupies, makes addressing the dialectical relationship which exist between race and class extremely important for Anti-racism and Whiteness theory’s goal to eradicate racism.

\textsuperscript{530} Ibid
C. **Affirmative Action:**

What determines the status of Black people in this country is not common customs: but common oppression. If one equates white ethnics: with Black and other oppressed minorities, the special struggle to remove the racist barriers facing the oppressed can be dispensed with. The concept of “ethnicity” sets an ideological atmosphere in which affirmative action programs for jobs and education of Blacks can be twisted into “racism in reverse.” When one substitutes “ethnicity” for class, one projects race against race—instead of projecting struggles of the multi-racial, multi-national working class and the oppressed minorities against the white ruling class. 531
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Affirmative action discourse has failed as an instrument to disengage earlier racist intentions lodged into institutional practices i.e. schools, governmental establishment, commerce both private and public. While highly contested, Affirmative Action in its language and ideology is not to blame. The ensuing attacks on Affirmative Action derived from the way in which opponents launched aggressive assaults meant to underscore the importance of oppressed ethnic groups. Conservatives argued Affirmative Action legislation fostered disparity by its manner of creating equality for one group, while disadvantaging another. The rhetoric pitched by these new enforcers of egalitarianism sought to dismantle prospects for the dawning of equality using the language of Affirmative Action to buttress the position of the status quo. Their chosen method charged the reversal of racism, which alleged a reinstatement of the same past discrimination that continued to marginalize oppressed groups. The charge of reverse discrimination on face value contested reenactment of the U. S. history of past discriminatory practices. What failed to occur was a discussion grounded in dislodging ethnicity as an alternate infraction equal to that experienced by the racially exploited. As such, attempts to merge ethnicities into a collection with the marginalization experienced by racial minorities rationalized Affirmative Action as unnecessary and divisive to American egalitarianism; while at the same time such attempts underwrote the inevitability of “…the white ruling class.”

532 Edari, Ronald S., “Introduction: Racial Minorities and Forms of Ideological Mystification.”

Conservatives contested the rationale behind Affirmative Action legislation, while liberals contended that without judicial implementation of it past indiscretions of prejudice, racism and bigotry flourished. As such, opponents prepared for battle. As one side asserted the outcome would provide full equality as professed by the U.S. Constitution, antagonist argued such language derailed parity, as they sought the eradication of Affirmative Action policies as creating a new sense of entitlement and partiality for a category of people, which in turn burdened another. The latter group’s argument grounded in right-wing traditionalism regarded such programs redundant as *de jure* law, such as *Title VII* prevented occurrences of discrimination. In such cases, what was believed about the impact of the *Civil Rights Act* differed for whites as that understood and experienced by blacks. Most whites exhibited faith in the American political systems which centered on a belief based in “the U.S. social system as fair and egalitarian”\(^533\) Conversely, supporters of Affirmative Action insisted that a central ramification of *Civil Rights* laws transpired when detractors utilized law as a disingenuous guide to intentional advantage certain groups, which adjudicated *Civil Rights* laws to authorize and endorse hypocrisy. Alternately, whites fought back insisting that more detrimental to social equality was what whites characterized as black insistence that, “…black Americans do not see the country in the same way,”\(^534\) which to whites represented a representation of black entitlement—affording blacks undeserved dispensation. Ultimately, such thinking on the part of whites provided the rational to
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conclude the importance of defeating demonstrations of overt racism while countering, “...a full-scale racial integration of the society by means of antidiscrimination programs.”

Thus, the research objective focuses on presenting the positions of both factions—supporters and challengers of Affirmative Action with the goal of resolving the veracity of Affirmative Action to function as a condition and/or contradiction for egalitarianism as demonstrated by anti-racist strategies.

- The Right

Dinesh D’Souza presented one of many avid problems of Affirmative Action programs. Affirmative Action was founded as a policy to counter discriminatory practices for minorities—women and peoples of color, particularly in respect to employment issues and education (principally in higher education). Consequently, opponents like D’Souza contended that the centrality of Affirmative Action remunerations circumvented parity by advancing that which it alone sought to provide. The major contention of adversaries’ inferred the antithesis of intolerance—categorically defined as reverse racism. Colleagues of D’Souza agreed the adversarial outcome of Affirmative Action transpired when issues of race superseded equality, as a system of marginalization, “Blacks from middle-class and affluent families are routinely granted
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preference at the expense of poor whites with stronger academic credentials. In such instances, calls to dismantle Affirmative Action policy by opponents established Affirmative Action as the catalyst of disparity. Moreover, many radical conservatives concluded that Affirmative Action created disparity for other ethnic groups, considered minority and marginalized. For example, conservatives concluded Asians were also racially victimized, while Latinos categorized more as white Americans than as oppressed minorities received certain claims to “…preferential treatment.” The rationale presented by the opponents of Affirmative Action considered problematic to enhancing societal civility and impartiality resided in the dismantling not the promotion of Affirmative Action principles. In such instances, challengers argued Affirmative Action disrupted the actual principles it vowed to overcome—egalitarianism for one group over others.

Alternately, charges against Affirmative Action indicated that it undermined the capacity to become successful, academically, socially and economically. Opponents contended that affirmative policies represented opportunities to mitigate issues of low self-esteem, academic indifference, and a state of career apathy cushioning the African American capacity to compete. Whereas, conservative conceptions of the prospects for black Americans seemed bleak, many capitulated in the assertion that, African Americans endured as slaves, freedmen through the Jim Crow era; however, is where
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the empathy ended. To moderates Affirmative Action strategies were “...outdated and dysfunctional today.”\(^{538}\) For conservatives' continuing anti-racist practices such as Affirmative Action only served to invalidate the already self-stigmatized:

Among these cultural traits are a reflexive racial paranoia that blames racism for every problem, even those that are intensely personal; a heavy reliance on government, both for jobs and welfare; a neglect of entrepreneurship; a hostility to homework and academic success, which are viewed as "acting white"; the valorization of the outlaw or "bad Negro," whose incivility and irresponsibility are viewed as forms of courageous resistance to white oppression; and the normalization of illegitimacy and single-parent families.\(^{539}\)

As a result, of this tendency of conformist to view Affirmative Action as a pretext to absolve African Americans from effectively competing were through already in-place legislation available to all. Still others contended that any attempt to criticize the rationale behind black deficiency at the academic, social and economic level, on a macro, rather than individualized level demonstrated racism. “All criticism of black culture is dismissed as a form of \textit{racism} or "racialism" or a callous way of "blaming the victim."\(^{540}\) In such instances, the prevailing attitudes of dissenters depicted the accusations as unwarranted. For opponents advocates of Affirmative Action failed to
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present a defensible argument that challenged the need for additional democratic directives.

Another interesting component regarding resistance to implementation of Affirmative Action directives occurred as conservatives’ proposition the need for such engagement more the responsibility of the victim than the society that imposed the culture of societal iniquity. Moreover, the constituents of dismantling equity initiatives insisted that such plans inadvertently demonstrated the existence of subtle racism when indicting blacks for their problems. In *Deliberations on the End of Racism*, D’Souza corroborated the argument of his conservative compatriots suggesting that, “Indeed, if white racism were to disappear overnight, many of the most serious problems plaguing the black community would remain.” Consequently, within the supposition of black apathy, D’Souza unwittingly acknowledged the existence of racism, by attempting to chastise efforts to eliminate racism. Ultimately, the charge of eliminating Affirmative Action the superfluous are levied against the fatalities of racialized indiscretion rather than society responsible for creating and sustaining it. In such cases, rather than supporting the mandates of Affirmative Action that addressed correcting past racial bias, what occurred suggested imposing the responsibility for coping belonged to the victims, “Blacks, then, must take primary responsibility even for cultural traits they did not freely choose but that were to some extent imposed on them.” In the final analysis, tantamount to the argument, which conventionalists seek to overturn demonstrated the contradiction for implementation of such equitable programs.
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Lastly, the right wing suggested swapping Affirmative Action programs, for newly, created programs better served the individual needs of all the members of society, rather than policies, which advantaged racial and ethnic groups. In such cases, right-wing activists contended what would better fulfill the needs of all members of society would be inclusive of instituting, a public policy that is strictly race neutral, and second a program of cultural restoration. For Affirmative Action opponents the issue for such propositions provided benefit to all of society, regardless of historical exploitation and cultural repression.

- **The Left**

The need for Affirmative Action policies gained momentum during the period of the 1960s and 1970s as attention turned to addressing past practices of racial discrimination and the then current marginalization blacks experienced because of disparate treatment that accounted for a lagging behind affect educationally, politically, socially and economically. Consequently the goal for the establishment of the reparable programs of Affirmative Action sought “…to compensate for past wrongs and to overcome persistent racial barriers.”\(^{543}\) Moreover, whereas societal conviction

considered individual bias as problematic for creating a society grounded in egalitarianism, Affirmative Action policies functioned to address racism pervasive in institutional practices, such as housing, education, and employment. In addition, other instance of institutional racism occurred because of the actions of some federal government agencies such as Social Security. For example, institutional bias within the structure of the government provided benefits to workers based on race and sex during the 1930s, which advantaged some, while directly disadvantaging others:

Because key Congressional committees in the 1930s were controlled by Southerners with all-white electorates, they did not allow the supposedly universal entitlement of Social Security to cover the largest categories of black workers—agricultural laborers and domestics. Social Security excluded 80 percent of employed black women, who were forced to depend for a safety net on the much less generous “welfare” system.544

In such cases, institutional racist practices operating within government agencies allowed the disenfranchisement of some workers that considered on the whole, affected not only the lives of the black workers but their families, their access to and acquiring capital, opportunity to purchase a home thereby affecting the positive outcomes of the worker as well as their offspring. Affirmative Action as a highly contested issue gained

momentum as an aspect for delivering socialized change efforts, which blacks on the average supported. Conversely, the majority of whites considered Affirmative Action only from the standpoint of how it negatively affected them, and therefore considered it detrimental to white interest. Overall, the goal of supporting the affirmations embraced by the plan fell on deaf ears when whites considered that affirmative measures “...seem[ed] to seriously endanger white resources, privileges, and social comfort.” Consequently, whites overall supported readdressing Affirmative Action policies as long as the programs exhibited neutrality.

At issue is discovering the origins and therefore the necessity for Affirmative Action solutions. As a result, advocates construed Affirmative Action as essential to the mandates of egalitarianism addressed by the Declaration of Independence:

...We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. Preamble Declaration of Independence 1776

Supporters considered Affirmative Action and any other attempts to remedy past practices of attaining equality empty gestures. Moreover, the question begged an answer, what served as the impetus for the origination of Affirmative Action
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ameliorations? To consider the question, we turn first to analyzing the response provided by D'Souza’s on the programs’ insignificance:

University affirmative action admissions policy is counterproductive in another important way. If there is a more effective way to sabotage black academic excellence than the current public school system in most cities, it has yet to be revealed. Black students often graduate from high school anywhere from two to four years, and more, behind white students. In some cases, black students may simultaneously have a high school diploma and be functionally illiterate. The fraudulent education black youngsters receive is reflected in their performance on academic achievement tests, their need for college admissions criteria other than academic merit, and their need for remedial classes and retention programs.  

Michael Meyers offered an equally significant retort to D'Souza’s characterization of African Americans as unworthy of Affirmative Action antidotes. “It does not acknowledge that "low-status," low-life blacks are, in fact, a tiny percentage of blacks.” Meyer’s considered Dinesh D’Souza’s reasoning fallacious; as D’Souza
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inferred that the actions of a few represented the larger community of African Americans. Additionally, such inferences suggested the fabrication of myths and encouraged bigotry.

Why assail a whole racial group with the label of an aberrational subculture, which, if applicable at all, characterizes a subgroup that is ensnared by poverty and illiteracy and underemployment.\(^{548}\)

Altogether, portraying the total complement of African Americans as menaces to society and therefore undeserving of Affirmative Action remedies failed to invalidate the existence and pervasiveness of racism, and consequently the necessity for employing anti-racist measures such as Affirmative Action.

Moreover, Walter Williams argued contending Affirmative Action redresses defined the origins of Affirmative Action proposals as fundamental to social consensus as such remedies are the by-product of what Williams’s labeled “cultural relativism,” which considers all cultures equal. The salient issue required the acknowledgement that all cultures have not, nor are they now dealt with equally in American society, and therefore required the assistance of Affirmative Action restorations to address and correct the past and current state of affairs. Ultimately, for advocates like Williams, cultural relativism provided solutions to the origins and motivation of Affirmative Action.
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Action—acceptance of the doctrine enhanced by cultural relativism “…no culture is regarded as superior or inferior to any other.”

Advocates of Affirmative Action measures contended the viability of such policies fall into a regressive state as society once responsible for constructing race and racism, now resolved the eradication of racialized differences and racist’ discrimination have sub-sidied; society no longer need invest in equitable programs, which seek to readdress that which has been eliminated. However, widespread statistical trends suggested the opposite; “…a review of the evidence clearly indicated that discrimination continued to be persistent and widespread.”

Further problematic to the discourse of uncovering racism and thereby the need for anti-racist interventions—i.e. Affirmative Action occurred as the antithesis to racism operative today, which functioned differently than in the past when racist activism openly transpired endorsed and sanctioned by the public-at-large and law. Today, racism covertly maneuvers within institutional practices undetectable to the casual observer. For that reason, many consider institutional racist practices eradicated, thereby declaring Affirmative Action programs excessive. However, anti-racist activists maintain that the need for assistance programs still exist, because of the fact that, “…discrimination is abhorred in theory but frequently practiced, often in disguise—the
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continual existence is undeniable. In such cases, what replaced charges of racism raised by vigilante conservative activists on the right, are pretentiously bent on leveling affirmative redresses, by the insistence on, “…the speeches hailing a “colorblind” society.”

Conversely, General Colin Powell most eloquently elaborated the need for Affirmative Action, as he addressed California’s Proposition 209 Proposal, which sought and overturned the state’s Affirmative Action plan in higher education. Powell’s line of defense rested on the need for Affirmative Action initiatives to address the relevance of disparity, which has not fully been achieved:

My concern with Proposition 209 [California initiative] is that it essentially says we’re there—that there’s no longer any need to take [color and gender] into considerations. I don’t think our rhetoric has yet matched our reality.

Alternately, supporters of Proposition 209 intimated Affirmative Action redresses discrimination against qualified students in favor of less qualified applicants in terms of race. To supporters, the passing of the bill inferred the state’s discontinuation of Affirmative Action directives in favor of a restoration of what activists considered a return to equality, not utilized since the passing of the Civil Rights Act. Opponents resolved the bill’s passing would negatively affect, not only recruitment practices for
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women and minorities, but in addition tutoring and mentoring for the fledgling minority population. In 1996, California’s Proposition 209 passed into law. Statistics reports for the 1996 freshman class reported one hundred African American students in a class of over four thousand whites. Supporters of the bill pointed to the fact that enrollment and graduation rates for other students of color, i.e. in particular Asians increased after the passing of the bill, which they insisted allowed for a more equitable system for post-secondary education.

Other areas which advocates of Affirmative Action determined the need to redress extended to economics in which African Americans are significantly behind whites. Thus, Conyers Jr. concluded on the frequency of the disproportion:

In November 1995, the bipartisan Glass Ceiling Commission found that 95 percent of top corporate jobs in America are held by white males, with African-Americans holding less than 1 percent of top management jobs and women holding 3 to 5 percent of senior-level positions. Black unemployment was also found to be twice that of white unemployment.\textsuperscript{553}

As such, advocates insisted Affirmative Action programs provided the necessary elements to equalize the playing field, in terms of education, employment and other societal areas of difference. In this way, affirmative measures connected with the philosophy of anti-racism.
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In addition, other instances in which Affirmative Action redresses deemed necessary, advocates insisted transpired in the criminal justice system, were administering justice disproportionally ruled unfavorably for minorities. For instance, the penalty for possessing crack cocaine, which blacks more readily use because of its street availability and modest cost, bestows a much greater federal prosecution, than pure cocaine more expensive and used mostly by whites.

…white Americans account for more than half of the crack/cocaine use but only 4 percent of the federal prosecutions for the offense. Only 38 percent of crack users are black, but they represent nearly nine out of every ten prosecutions. 554

For this reason, advocates contended institutionalized racism disproportionately discriminated against blacks, required affirmative measures to address past racist practices.

Considering Affirmative Action, circa the last decade, the significance of race is not as astute as it has been. Today, the middle and upper classes are no longer comprised solely of whites; within the last decade, there is a rising black middle class, although, there is a growing black underclass, in particular because of the loss of low-skilled work. Since civil rights laws, buttressed with Affirmative Action redresses allowed the advancement of talented blacks, race and class issues are somewhat blurred. This does not suggest that racism has ended, but more that for society in general; racism has largely been confined to random acts at the individual level. Thus, society now
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under attack by the loss of low skilled labor to overseas countries, lacking in labor laws, allowing the economic exploitation of their workforce, is more concerned with loss of work to support their families. As such, Affirmative Action redresses based on race, which were in the past, a needed action, are now detrimental to unifying a society needed to press Congress to be responsive to the economic needs of the working and middle classes, than the needs of the already wealthy. In this light, Affirmative Action redresses represent a hazard to forming bi-racial coalitions to gain political, social and economic change. Thus, in forming racial coalitions the poor, working class and members of the shrinking middle class would have the means to compel political leaders to address such issues as, lack of and loss of work, underdevelopment in the urban areas inhabited by the lower socio-economic class, and insufficient and in some cases, non-existent social services. Thus, in Anti-racism and Whiteness theory’s failure to consider the possibility of multiracial coexistence, within their arguments on racism, society itself pays a considerable price. Areas which multi-racial coalitions share in common are inclusive of affordable housing for urban dwellers in particular, the best public schools, and adequate work. As such, issues like Affirmative Action based on race serve to divide society, rather than strengthening it. Considering affirmative action policies as disruptive to multiracial coalitions, many suggest that an affirmative action policy based on need, rather than race would be corrective to issues of class stratification, and would be less unsettling for all disadvantaged members of society—the poor, the shrinking middle class, and the out-of-work working class. William Julius Wilson suggested, relabeling affirmative action, “affirmative opportunity”, would be inclusive of affirmative change whites would find less entitlement based. This
affirmative opportunity program would be realized as schools in black neighborhoods, preschool and early education programs, job training, and college scholarship based on work ethic and individualism. Thus, consistent with the status of class within the last decade, a newly revitalized Affirmative Action redress would explain the development of a rising black middle class, differently than prior to the last decade, when it was in its original form greatly needed. Ultimately, Affirmative Action policies based solely on race penalizes other members of a growing poor, which are also disadvantaged and marginalized.

D. Summary

In this chapter, I have shown that the middle class is now comprised of a growing number of blacks; that whereas the racism that openly transpired in the past is no longer particularly salient. That racist incident occasionally still occurs, but less as overtly as in the past. That Affirmative Action redresses while still needed are disruptive to forming multiracial coalitions to force policy makers to address the needs of the masses. Moreover, that Affirmative Action policies need restructuring, to be more inclusive of the needy, and therefore race-neutral, to assist with the building of multi-racial coalitions. That identity politics within anti-racist programs are inconsistent with issues of class and race, central to the history of the last decade, and account for the
deficiency within anti-racist programs in-general to mount a serious attack on racism.

That the economic situation within the last decade obscures the significance of the
dialectical relationship between race and class; and as a result, of Anti-racism and
Whiteness theory glossing over this important fact, accounts for the failure of Anti-
racism and Whiteness theory to eradicate racism.

Chapter VI: Conclusions and Recommendations

Noblesse oblige: “From everyone to whom much has been given,
much will be required; and from the one to whom much has been
entrusted, even more will be demanded.” (Luke 12:48)

Challenging the Efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness Theories
With conflict comes change. Thus, it is through conflict that present statuses amend. Moreover, it is in this way, in order for change to occur, requires the intervention of some form of conflict. This conflict may occur as a dialogue between individuals, to settle a personal disagreement, or as a border dispute between countries, where diplomats intercede to ward off the escalation of full scale war. For that reason, conflict is beneficial to the progression of life. However, this does not suggest that peace should be avoided; but rather that in order to maintain peace, and to insure peaceful balance, it is most often necessary to engage in congress, where conflict is vital, to insuring that all voices are heard. Thus, peace in itself requires more than the absence of violence, but the intervention of social, political, educational and economic activism to insure the elimination of all forms of structural violence, such as racism exhibited through the exploitation of society. Therefore, since change implies attaining a state of difference, and conflict entails engaging difference, to arrive at a new state requires that conflict must precede change, in order that a desired state is realized. Thus, in order that change occurs, conflict must not only accompany change as an ally of progress and not an uninvited adversary of tranquility, but be understood as well as such. For Anti-racism and Whiteness theory comprehending the connection between conflict and change appears particularly problematic. In explicating their ability to eradicate racism, both models fail to address the correlation between change and conflict, occurring by first resolving the true source of the conflict, as conflict has often been used to obfuscate, when consistency and uniformity is desired, such as in cases to maintain the motives of the status quo. Conflict exploited accordingly, obscures the true reasons of the conflict, and the capacity to achieve change. Conflict transpiring without taking an
accurate account of the possible justification, motivation and beneficiaries involved, takes on a different meaning. Thus, to effectively eradicate racism it would be necessary for Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to investigate the rationale behind the occurrence of racism, before advancing poorly supported anti-discriminatory rhetoric. Moreover, in order to present a worthy assault on racism, Anti-racism and Whiteness theory need acknowledge that eradicating racism requires engaging reasoning dialectically, which involves oppositional analyzing of the facts. Moreover, employing dialectical reasoning to eradicate racism, involves resolving difference, between those that benefit from keeping racism alive, and those that are harmed in the process. Additionally, resolving difference, and the rationale, motivation, and justification for conflict and change requires analyzing, and examining the evidence, and then attaining reasonable conclusions based on sound logical interpretation of the argument presented. As its name implies dialectical reasoning occurs with the examination of the events, which produced the conflict that resulted in change. Problematic for the discourse concerning Anti-racism and Whiteness theories occurred as both paradigms failed to consider what other issues impact the issue of race, racism and anti-racist programs. Both plans rely more or less solely on creating rhetorical arguments to eradicate racism, which more or less equate to, chiding the public that engaging in anti-racist overtures, is just not the right thing to do. Other opportunities missed come as rarely do anti-racist programs offer any measures to unite society, such as the creation of multi-racial coalitions to unite society. Moreover, rarely are there attempts made to align Anti-racism and Whiteness theory to concrete issues, such as, the economic conditions of the poor, the working class and the shrinking middle-class. Because of
their short-sightedness, both models fail to achieve their mandate to eradicate racism, and waste the opportunity to transcend their philosophy, more appropriately to social activism.

In using the dissertation as a forum to research Anti-racism and Whiteness theory it was my goal to resolve the efficacy, the origination, and the development and rationale of both programs. Proceeding so, it was necessary to conclude if indeed a best practice existed in terms of each model's ability to eradicate racism, and to determine if this was not the case, what both paradigms had overlooked in their zeal to conclude preeminence. As the research findings suggested, central to the idea of studying Anti-racism and Whiteness theories was to uncover the best practices for eliminating racism. In order to conclude best practices for eliminating racism, a mandate of the research objective was to examine the content, structure, origination and evolution of the concept of race, as a precursor to the development of racism. What was uncovered in the research indicated that race originated as a social construction, and as such, the goal was to determine if it would be for society to rid itself of the problem it created, in socially constructing race. Further, as a socialized construct, race provided society with two options: whether to divide society, and/or whether to unite society. In exploiting difference, society used both: applying physical characteristics as a means to both include, and to exclude. Physical features such as hair color and texture, nose and eye shape, and most of all skin color, society used as a marker of exclusivity, where individuals were either accepted or rejected. Added to this, in their quest to analyze race, scientists advanced the ideology of racial difference, by dividing racial groups, aligning racial superiority and inferiority to color differences. Thus science reinforced
society’s social construction of race, by employing racial difference as a means to elevate and subordinate various races and ethnicities. It was in this way, society socially constructed race, and as a result, led the way for the development of racism.

As well important to the discourse regarding racism, in the U.S. were freedom is revered, Civil Rights laws do little to prevent bias, prejudice and intolerance, sustaining racism. As a result, implementation of chiefly theoretical anti-discriminatory practices is highly problematic. Specifically problematic is Whiteness theory’s mandate to abolish racism by abolishing whiteness. To many, Whiteness theory is absurd, as it implies the annihilation of white people. In support of their highly contested philosophy, whiteness theorists contend that eliminating the power and status incorporated in the status of whiteness is the only way to eradicate racism. Whereas, supporters regard the abollishment of whiteness fundamental to dismantling racism, white society (in particular), as subjects, regard Whiteness theory as radical, unfounded and in itself racialist. In concurrence with Anti-racism, without appending its philosophy to issues that might enlist societal support, Whiteness theory comes across as deficient. By appending their mandates to eradicate racism to areas to that are more of a concern for society, such as addressing the economic instability of the middle class, lack of unskilled work as jobs are out-sourced overseas, and the growing wealth of the upper classes, both theories are ineffectual. This is not to say, that racism no longer exist, but that Whiteness theory, (as Anti-racism) would be more effective in eradicating racism, if both practices acknowledged and were proactive in terms of addressing the true reasons why special interest groups incite racism—as a means to obfuscate the economic growth of the upper class, to the disadvantage of the lower classes.
Moreover, evidence of racism occurs today, albeit, for different reasons, than the color-inspired racist acts of the past. Whereas in the past, whites inhabited the majority of the middle and upper classes; today, blacks comprise a rising number of the middle class, while whites inhabit a significant number of a shrinking white middle class. In the past, few measures existed to advance black livelihood. However, because of civil rights laws, and Affirmative Action, talented blacks received entrance to colleges and universities and as a result have joined the ranks of middle class. Within the last decade in particular, whites on the other hand, comprising a large number of the middle class due to respectable factory work, have lost economically, due to out-sourcing of work sent to overseas countries. Today, for different reasons than in the past, antagonists use racism to divide society; and for this reason, enlisting the aid of only anti-racist rhetoric to overcome racism proves to be futile. Thus, the racism observed during the last decade, transpired, often by special interest groups to keep society from uniting. As well, from an historical perspective, dominant-capitalists used race-inspired racism to keep workers, black and white from creating bargaining power. As in the past, exploiting racism concealed the wealthiest manipulation of political leaders to advance their interests over that of the masses. At stake was the upper class’s objective to create more wealth for them and their cohorts, controlling banks, and sending work overseas, while strangling the economic development of American workers in the process. In this way, racism served to keep members of the poor, working and middle classes from forming multi-racial coalitions compelling Congress to enforce legislation to support their needs, over those of the wealthy. As such, special-interest groups instigating racism functioned to separate and dominate the masses. Problematic for
Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, as anti-bias plans arisen as failure on their part to acknowledge the dialectical relationship between race and class evident, in particular within the last decade, resulting in inconsistency towards ensuring both programs capacity to destabilize and eradicate racism. This does not infer that racism no longer exists, but rather to insist that without directing attention to uncovering the accurate rationales, motivation and beneficiaries of racism, but for them, applying only anti-discriminatory action plans was ineffectual.

Divisive Language

As a consequence of a history of racism, and adversaries willing to use racism as a means to divide society, the dissertation offers the following recommendations. As a means to eradicate racism, that racist words, rhetoric and jargon be regarded as insignificant. Moreover, that in order that racist language is relegated to devices of the weak, words currently understood as demonstrative, such as, ‘Nigger’ be demoted and consigned to lower-case gradation and vocation. That said, in relating significance to demonstrative verbal attacks, anti-racists are in essence supporting, and adjudicating
importance to the unimportant. Although radical in content, in following such a course, it is without doubt, that compliance will not be easily achieved, but in time, will deflate the objective of the ignorant, as silence has often served as a conquering rebuttal. For too long have the ignorant led the way in creating history, in a country that has on paper, all but already eradicated racist provisioning. Whereas, the previous recommendation may appear conservative, it is meant to attach an analysis of the provisions set forth by both conservatives and liberals, to undue the negativity of the past. Left unchanged, history’s imprint has the ability to determine the future. Without a doubt many will consider any attempt to overlook random racial attacks as evidence of weakness, and conservative in nature, or as a form of negative peace—disputing conflict with only the absence of violence. Many will contend that racism manifested in racial slurs require direct aggressive action. However, successfully getting to the bottom of what is the justification, rationale, motivation and who are the benefactors of the aggressive act are, may require that the negation of one negative act, does not demand the instigating of another. In addition, there will be those that insist that simply addressing language as a contrite manner in which to unite is too simplistic, and more attention should be given to asserting well planned rhetorical punch-lines to delimit aggression. However, it is usually the simplest formulas that are the most successful, that are the most overlooked. Thus, in de-emphasizing the importance of negative language, and refusing to inherit the negativity hurled, individuality is preserved. Thus, outcomes manifest as the less attention paid to racial differences, the less probability that racial difference can be used to divide. It is in these ways, change begins; change in thinking, in attitude in reality.
Relativism v. Universalism

Not only is overlooking negative language a way to undo racism, but the dissertation contends that a means to invalidate racism involves considering the homogeneity embraced by universalism, rather than the heterogeneity of relativism. Whereas, universalism implies achieving an appreciation for the similar human characteristics, relativism places importance on acknowledging difference, to insure inclusion. While uniqueness is what makes individuals who they are, overemphasizing difference allows opportunists occasion to divide. For example, employing relativism by underscoring
racial and/or ethnic difference, conditions aggrandize for the enhancement of racism. Engaging the homogenous position of universalism reduces the chances that racial and ethnic difference can be used to divide, as universalism endorses attributing foremost importance to building on the commonality of humanity. For that reason, I argue that in lending importance to relativism demonstrated in racial slurs, racism exacerbates. Thus, in order to confiscate from perpetrators the divisiveness of racism, it is necessary to refrain from giving undue attention to racial slurs, and incorporate universalism as a means to unite.

The Effect of the Census

Detracting from the analytical association with the census is another way to avoid divisiveness and racialized separation. Whereas the census evolved as a system for population tabulation, and a technique to decide congressional districting, census usage had other unintended uses. Continuance of the census, demonstrated how various races, ethnicities, and genders were marginalized in society, without providing any mechanism to alter the situations of the marginalization. If census records sought to re-align differences, by simply recording significant tracking differences for the purpose to
redistribute wealth, educational opportunities, and economic conditions accordingly, census tracking would result in more than satisfactory strategies. However, what census tracking currently offers is simply a constant reminder of racial and class difference, without suggesting, or providing mechanisms to realign said differences. Thus, the same society that census tracking suggested needed assistance, were offered up as leverage for politicians to use to reassert their career goals of remaining in office. The point being, rarely does anything occur as a result of census tracking accept, an every ten year influx of jobs for a small number of the population—politicians; whereas census results lie dormant, until the on sought of the next ten year collection.

When census tracking is considered from its earlier usage during slavery, it becomes clear as to the reasons why census tracking has inspired a negative connotation. Employed during slavery to award the south more congressional representation, the census provided more political clout to the South, as a result of their vast amounts of southern land, and conducive crop harvesting climate, in need of a cheap source of labor—slaves. The census augmented the southern slavocracy insurance of the continuance of slavery, and ultimately their hegemony not only in the south, but in Washington. It was the north that insisted the slaves be counted as three-fifths to lessen the congressional dominance of the south in counting slaves along with all others as full citizens. It was in this way that special interest gerrymandered the census to fulfill its own purposes. Today, census records document population, in terms of race, education, gender, business, housing, and economic status; while offering little else to either explain or align the conditions experienced by the more marginalized members of the population. Thus, the recommendations of the research warrant either a
reassessment of the usage of census and a way to alter the economic, political and social development of society manifested by the census. In this way census tracking would serve more than as a way to enhance the ulterior motivations of those in need of a platform to support their own particular political reasons.

Racism is Natural Controversy

Opponents to anti-discriminatory practices suggested that racism was a natural occurrence of human nature, and therefore groups’ wanting to elevate status over other groups was normal, as well. Thus for the racism is natural camp, various factions such as, “…economic competition; urges and fears for social status; and sexual drives, fears, jealousies…” underscore the inevitability of racism, confirming the evidence of racism as a naturalized societal manifestation. Moreover, there are many reasons that
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account for the existence of bigotry, in proportion to rationales to disengage racism. Of the afore-mentioned categories, “economic competition and social status” conspicuously differ from the rest. As such, the residual aspects of the two, demonstrate a tendency towards race prejudice, i.e., “sexual drives, fears, jealousies, and inhibitions,”\(^{556}\) descriptive of behavioral traits conditioned by individuals; whereas the qualities enhancing “economic competition and social status” manifested as socialized constructions grounded in profit-instigated motivations. The dynamics embodying both appear homogenous when occasioned by the individual. Issues such as; sexual drives, fears, and jealousies and inhibitions denote psychological behavior, whereas economic competition and social status infer external collective group consciousness. Whereas, the former relates to aspects controlled by the individual and are of a personal nature, the latter represent formal group situations, as in organizations, which often demonstrate ulterior motives. As such, many consider that racism happened as a result of difference, whereas groups from a historical perspective solidified together, as during the hunter-gatherer period for the good and sustenance of the collective. In this way, racist behavior was portrayed as a means to protect like group members. Thus, according to this analysis racism manifested as a protective device for the group being threatened, rather than as an incentive to discriminate. Pursuant to historical continuance, the social construction of race fueled the development of racism as a means to subjugate. In this way, racism served as a means to divide society, long since evolved from early hunter gathering societies. Racism evolved as a means during industrialization as a mode of the division of labor.
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Whereas labor divided after the group collective functionality of the hunter gathering period, as observed during the horticultural societies, with the advancement from a survival state to an economic surplus economy based on agricultural development. During the next stage of societal development—the agricultural period, where food production doubled by way of animal labor, more skilled tools, and the evolution of urban centers, education, art, trade allowing society to branch off into other areas than survival, allowed the division of labor. During the industrial period, mechanical, fossil-fueled, and electrical energy displaced human and animal labor. Specifically, it was during this period, in the U.S. that the dominant wealthy aristocracy exploited racism as a wedge to divide the working class members of society. In so doing, the working classes, and slaves as the servants of the wealthy never realized their capacity to revolt, and bargain for better wages, working conditions, and livelihoods. Thus, it is in this way that racism as a natural occurrence is challenged. Within the context of American society, racism occurred as a result of human manipulation, as a tool of the wealthy. Moreover, racism served to further the economic stability and hegemony of the wealthy. Thus, the debate regarding racism as a natural occurrence, within the context of the history of the U.S. is tenuous, at least

Another aspect alleging that racism is natural comes because a majority of society disapproves of racism, rationalizing that racism is natural explained the necessity for the separation of the races. Thus, for those that abhor racism, association with the racism is natural camp, regarded racism only as a manifestation of the uneducated—skin heads, and other neo-Nazi organizations. Whereas white supremacists employ racism as a tactic to influence, control and stimulate solidarity amongst its constituents, the wealthy
exploit divisionary stratagems as a means to keep society separate, advancing their exploitation of the working and middle classes to secure hegemony and personal wealth. In both cases, racism is leveraged as a means for hegemony: supremacists incite racism as a means to influence membership growth to further group economic sustenance, and the wealthy charge racism as a means to keep the populace divided, and therefore unable to petition congress for economic and political justice. Thus, the ideology of racism as a natural occurrence is flawed, as special interest groups—the wealthy resort to applying racism as a means to keep society segregated along racial lines, as a means to exert power and influence over society, while other groups exploit racism to influence group control. Thus, I argue racism occurred as a means of exploitation rather than from a naturalized state. Employing racist action to subjugate launched racial prejudice; whereas in time, race prejudice fueled fear and suspicion, in the dominant group that the subordinate race harbored designs on the prerogatives of the dominant race."557 For these reasons, the dissertation resolves racism is indicative of the societal construction of race, and racism transpired as a result of ulterior personal and group manipulation, rather than as a natural occurrence. Moreover, that the centrality of the social construction of race, in essence manufactured racism as a means of class division, thereby insuring the hegemony of the wealthy capitalist class. “It [racism] functions… to preserve the integrity and the position of the dominant group."558
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Another interesting aspect regarding racism as a natural occurrence entails racism as a phenomenon of the marginalized. The central issues involving whether or not marginalized members of society being racist, possess the power to affect negatively others; or, does racism only demonstrate significance for only the dominant. In this case, racism as a natural consequence falters, as racism and prejudice exercised by minorities without access to power, i.e. wealth, political power through majority membership in high political office, demonstrated by holding political offices, and controlling economic power by way of owning banks and as stock holders in banks and multi-national corporations, lack the ability to exert racist pressure to harm others. This does not infer that because one is marginalized one cannot be racist; rather that without wealth and political power, in most situations, racist acts are powerless to directly affect others. Thus, as a natural occurrence, for the marginalized, like others in society, racism is a learned behavior.

As well, a monolithic issue for the racism is natural issue resides in the fundamental reality that if racism was truly natural, how was race socially constructed? In resolving this issue, it is necessary only to see how society worked so diligently to construct an ideology of race that functioned to provide status, not just for a particular racialized ethnic group, but as a means to support the wealthiest members of society. By so doing, those that had control of the base—the economy, used it to dominate all matters of the superstructure—the police, the church, the schools etc. It was in this way that the social construction of race served to legitimate hegemony over not just the members of other racial and ethnic groups, but to preserve power over the members of the wealthiest’ own racial group. Thus, the wealthiest secured a state of division that kept
the poorest members of its own racial group, as checkpoints for other possible challengers seeking to further economic stability from succeeding. Arguing such, the research contends that certain groups constructed race as a means to dominate. Moreover, the social construction of race, by the wealthy capitalist classes created a barrier that served to protect continuity for them and their prodigy. Thus, it is in this way that historically, and today, the wealthy manipulated and exploited racial difference through the social construction of race, rather than from an organic state of race and racism as a naturalized phenomenon. For these reasons, the dissertation resolves that racism is not subject solely to the wealthy, as marginalized groups can exhibit evidence of racism, but marginalized groups do not command the power to negatively affect society. However, racism as a tool of the wealthy served not as a natural occurrence, but to maintain the status quo of the wealthy. Ultimately, instigating racist ideology transpired as staged instances by the dominant group, for a twofold purpose, to disrupt any chance of coalition amongst minority groups, and to provide stability and continuation to dominant group status.

...prejudice is used as a tool by powerful people to oppress others....all elites benefit when prejudice divides workers along racial and ethnic lines and discourages them from working together to advance their common interests (Geschwender, 1978; Olzak, 1989).\textsuperscript{559}

Ultimately, the dissertation explains racism employed by skin-heads, and neo-Nazi members occurred more as a result of learned rather than innate behavior. In this way, racist and prejudicial manifestations most often originated in the home environment. As a result of how children were raised, children learned and were taught to respect or disrespect other races from their parents. For instance, homes in which the parents insisted upon absolute obedience was critical “…to prepare the groundwork for group prejudice.”\textsuperscript{560} Thus, children reared in maturing homes where parents awarded mistakes with criticism, unlike those where children were allowed a caring attitude toward trial and error, found that in the latter case, children were less prejudicial regarding judging the differences of others. As a result, critical parents taught children to regard the differences of others critically, and therefore as uncharacteristic and prejudicial. Conversely, children rose in nurturing families regarded racial differences as just another unique and interesting aspect of life, and considered others’ human traits to be respected as all other remarkable phenomena. Under this premise, the issue of racism as an innate and natural collapses. Thus, the incidents that place individuals in the position of adhering to issues of prejudice and racism occurred more when children reared in homes were affected by “…suppressive, harsh or critical,”\textsuperscript{561} chastisement learn racist attitudes because of their lack of parental nurturing.

Ultimately, children brought up in such environments mimic behavior characteristic of
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substituting a sense of influence and dominance for acceptance and reliance, which in turn, created circumstances in which, “The stage is thus set for a hierarchical view of society.” For that reason, the dissertation concludes prejudice and racism function as learned conditions, rather than as natural occurrences; and that as a result, the social construction of race initiated racism. Thus, I argue racism is not a natural occurrence, and those that adhere to acceptance of this ideology, as a result are in doing so, supporting the continuance and existence of racism.

A. Delimitations of the Research

a. Critical Race Theory

As Critical Race Theory entailed the legality of racism, the dissertation engaged in discourse regarding Title VII in Chapter I – the Current State of Race. In addition, as Critical Race theory concentrated on the significance of Title VII as injurious to African Americans, the research contends that Critical Race theory, practices identity politics, whereas the significance was placed on insuring only the rights of African Americans over that of other racial groups. Whereas specifically during slavery and during Jim
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Crow segregation periods racism flourished, Critical Race theory suggested that in creating legalized status for black people, the full autonomy of black people was, as a result lessened. In determining the reality of anti-racist programs, the goal of the dissertation was to research models that appeared to demonstrate likeness in their theoretical philosophies. As Critical Race concentrates primarily on legalized reforms such as the *Civil Rights Movement*, the research concludes that Critical Race theory diverged from the fundamental practices embedded within the principles brought forward by either Anti-racism or Whiteness theories. However, the research does conclude that whereas Critical Race does exhibit some beliefs that are demonstrated within the two models, such as racism as a manifestation of the social construction of race, Critical Race theory was more concerned within the legalized sanctions that advanced the arguments regarding racism, than those pronounced by Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, such as re-educating society on how to prevent racist ideology. Thus the research examined one area in which Critical Race theory failed to state where it places importance—and that is the significance it demonstrates for supporting the singularity of identity politics. Thus, it was for these reasons, that I in researching the dissertation considered Critical Race theory irrelevant to examining the methodologies, practices and assertions of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, and as such, refrained from including and examining the theoretical ideologies entailed within Critical Race theory in the same light in which I explored Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory.

For a discussion regarding Identity Politics see Chapter III, Current State of Whiteness Theory. For an analysis of the socialized construction of race, as entailed in
Critical Race theory, (although for different rationales than those discussed by Anti-racism and Whiteness theories), see Chapter I the Current State of Race, iii. *Title VII.*

b. Marxist Theories of Anti-racism and Whiteness Theory

Marxist philosophy considered Anti-racism as a positive mechanism to derail racist ventures, at both the individual and institutional levels. Moreover, Marxism characterized racism as a manifestation and invention of capitalism, which initiated the use of racism as a rationale to justify slavery—a guarantee for profit and wealth for the capitalists. Slavery signaled an opportunity to practice the white capitalist classes’ right to manifest destiny. Hence, racism burgeoned as a derivative of slavery, and suggested, “Fortified by racism from the beginning, American slavery itself fostered and
institutionalized bigotry.\textsuperscript{563} Additionally, Marxist researchers considered education as the best proponent to undermining racism. Utilizing it thus, offered opportunities to engage “…eliminating its [racism] systemic roots.”\textsuperscript{564} As such, a condition for utilizing Marxists’ anti-racist policies required the incorporation of educational practices into the discourse to re-focus racist myths that were injurious to all of society. For that reason, researchers considered Marxist anti-racist activism as a monolithic proposition to undermining racism, even when Marxist instruction waned, “…an attempt is made to reassess its contribution to our understanding of racial and ethnic relations in contemporary societies.”\textsuperscript{565}

On the other hand, some Marxists scholars suggested that anti-racism was a sub-field of racism, and considered it to exemplify “Marxist theorization of social conflict,”\textsuperscript{566} theory, which addressed the divergence between advantaged and disadvantaged groups. In such situations Anti-racism as a demonstration of the Marxist social conflict theory inferred the opposition evidenced between the bourgeoisie and proletariat classes, which in Marxist philosophical terms can only be remedied through the
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overthrow of the ruling—capitalist class. Thus, true Marxist anti-racist scholarship declared a total distancing from one ideology, “…to assert that to be a real anti-racist is to be anti-capitalist,” and therefore vested in both Marxism and anti-racist ideology. Thus, Marxist anti-racist principles inferred an aversion of capitalism as a by-product of racism, and as a total detriment to full equality. Moreover, “…anti-racist practice in capitalist societies becomes inseparable from the subversion and destruction of the social-economic status quo.” In this way, Marxist anti-racist methodologies determined capitalism as the ally of racism.

There are those Marxist scholars such as Noel Ignatiev and David Roediger that considered Whiteness theory and Anti-racism as valuable vehicles to eradicate racism. For them, central to the creed of Marxism entailed cutting a clear path to eradicating capitalism as the source of all subjugation of the masses, rather than focusing on attacking the limbs of discrimination, which Marxism demanded was necessary for the conquest of what it argued was the root of the masses problem—capitalism.

As the dissertation rests upon resolving the impact on the eradication of racism, in terms of the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, within the last decade, the research concludes that Whiteness theory is indeed a component of Anti-racism theory, and functions accordingly as an ancillary. Additionally, the dissertation argues that identity politics embedded within Whiteness theory does not address issues of class and race salient over the past decade; as a result, Anti-racism


568 Ibid P 104
and Whiteness theories’ attempts to eradicate racism are futile. As the dissertation thesis rests upon uncovering historical and sociological rationales of Anti-racism and Whiteness theories, the objective of the research was not to engage in an extensive Marxist perspective on the theoretical interactions of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory. As such, a delimitation of the research is the deconstruction of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory through a full Marxist lens, which further research could attempt.

In Conclusion

What this study has attempted to demonstrate is the influence of special interest group on the origins, facility and efficacy of Anti-racism and Whiteness theory. As such, the dissertation resolves that as a result, both paradigms in not acknowledging the economic aspects in the last decade in the U.S. are problematic to both theories ability to eradicate racism. That society constructed race, and in doing so, constructed racism as well. That, society, and special interest exploited race and racism to keep society
separate, and today the wealthy manipulate race and racism as means to incite the public, for the purpose of keeping multi-racial groups from forming. In the event that such the working, poor and middle classes would merge, they would amass the power needed to petition political leaders to be more concerned with their needs over those of the wealthy. Because of the wealthiest control of political leaders, banks, and multi-national companies, the poor, working and middle classes are without work, because of jobs out-sourced sent overseas, for low wages. Thus, the dissertation recommends that Anti-racism and Whiteness theory amend their mandates to be more in-line with the status of the economy, work and the needs of society, in order to insure that racism ends.

When I first started this search to uncover the meaning, implications, and origins of race, racism, and anti-discriminatory practices, I did so with a clear vision in mind that attaining a state of relativism, where each race and ethnicity was to be respected, viewed and appreciated for the essence of the group’s specific difference was what was needed. In the process, I learned a great deal about how race functioned in relation to its social construction. As a result, what in the beginning started as a search to uphold my view for what I already believed, became a quest to resolve how race as a social construct supported the separation of humanity, of which all races and ethnicities already comprised. Thus, what I considered an evolution into teaching others what was important, in terms of methods to deconstruct and exterminate racism, became a prolific search for the best practices and for truth. As much as it was important to leave a legacy regarding race, racism Anti-racism and Whiteness theory, it left my research with a clear understanding of what these policies as well concealed. That is in highlighting
racism as the enemy of unity, anti-racist practices obfuscate the separation, and purposelessness, which resides within their unverified, poorly supported rationales. Thus, in suggesting that racism is more or less the total problem, anti-racist practices ensured themselves a permanent place of employment, rather than as an adequate charge to eradicating racism. Let me be clear, rather than append anti-racist rhetoric, as secondary issues to undercover the real reasons behind the instigation of racism, I contend that what actually occurs is Anti-racism and Whiteness theory interject arguments that serve more to position themselves as important, than to discover the true reasons behind racism—the division of the populace as a way for the wealthy to maintain its hegemony. Thus, I conclude that rather than support reaching for a state of relativism, where group difference is emphasized, I submit, that it is far more important and significant that work commence to create coalitions of unity, brought forth by the initiation of universalism, in which people build upon the homogeneity of groups suffering from loss of work, and loss of the right to attain a state of peace because of their lower socioeconomic position. Thus, it would in this way be important to build upon these connections, and pay less attention to the divisiveness of anti-discriminatory programs that do little to undo the economic instability witnessed in the last decade that obfuscates those groups and situations that exploit racial and ethnic difference, as a means to maintain their own domination.

Although this dissertation is merely a beginning of such an inquiry, and not a final assessment, my hope is that this analysis will help educators, activists, community and political leaders, and the community at-large to see the need for creating more effective
ways to eliminate bias, hate, prejudice and racism, within all forms of educational, social, and political organizations.
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