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RACE & RACISM

inside this issue
Welcome to this special issue of the *Myriad.*

The articles included in this issue of the *Myriad* will inform, enlighten, and confirm that eminent change is at hand but only with risk, leadership and commitment.

If we are to effectively nullify the damaging effect of racism, the future must include changing, challenging, and modifying institutional policies and practices which continue to be the womb of racism in America. This is not a new approach. In 1967, Stokley Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, in their book entitled *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* coined the phrase “institutional racism.” In that same year, the President of the United States established the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to respond to the racial disorder and civil unrest in American cities which occurred during the summer of 1967. The Kerner Commission Report included the following infamous passage: “Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white-separate and unequal.” The Commission report went on to state that “What white Americans have never fully understood but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it.”

Peace,

*Gary L. Williams*

---
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Concepts and Theories of Race

Most Americans have an opinion about race and racism in America. When participants attending a conference workshop on diversity were asked, “what do you know or think about race and racism?” responses varied from “what does it mean to be white and have privilege” to “racism is real, it exists, it’s hurtful, it’s pervasive and it permeates our entire way of defining ourselves.” Still, others challenge race by stating that it is not a valid concept. Instead, it is simply a social construct that we have created, and that the real issue is color, “colorism,” or color gradation and not race. George Fredrickson (2002), in his attempt at providing what he calls a more precise definition than mere ethnocentric dislike and distrust of the others, concludes that “racism is too ambiguous and loaded a term to describe the [my] subject effectively” (p. 152).

The theme ‘race’ has no uniform agreed upon language which allows us to discuss it comparatively so that we all “know it when we see it.” Race and racism are relative, i.e., specifically and definitively, there is no line of demarcation that clearly distinguishes the so-called “races.” If these boundaries don’t exist, then when will we know that we have crossed them and committed an act of “racism”? And yet, the concept persists and racism perseveres.

At its most basic level, race can be defined as a concept which signifies and symbolizes sociopolitical conflicts and interests in reference to different types of human bodies. Although the concept of race appeals to biologically-based human characteristics (phenotypes), selection of these particular human features for purposes of racial signification is always and necessarily a social and historical process. There is no biological basis for distinguishing human groups along the lines of race, and the socio-historical categories employed to differentiate among these groups reveal themselves, upon serious examination, to be imprecise if not completely arbitrary (Omi & Winant 1994).

Consequently, if our desire is to transcend race and get beyond racism, which Winant (2000) suggests, we probably won’t then we must adopt an approach that allows us to understand it so that we are able to have a dialogue with a shared language and agreed upon meaning. Winant proposes a racial formation theory that: (a) It views the meaning of race and the content of racial identities as unstable and politically contested; (b) It understands racial formation as the intersection/conflict of racial “projects” that combine representational/discursive elements with structural/institutional ones; (c) It sees these intersections as iterative sequences of interpretations (articulations) of the meaning of race that are open to many types of agency, from the individual to the organizational, from the local to the global (p. 182).

Winant concludes by stating that “in this unresolved situation, it is unlikely that attempts to address worldwide dilemmas of race and racism by ignoring or transcending these themes, for example by adopting so-called colorblind or differentialist policies, will have much effect” (Annual Review of Sociology, 2000, p.164).
I think Winant would agree that we must embrace race and rebuke racism for the dehumanizing, stratifying, value laden conditions that it represents.

This places us one step closer to addressing race and racism based on a shared language. For this discussion we turn to the critical race theorist’s notion that racism is normal in American society or, as Derrick Bell (1992) stated, “racism is an integral, permanent and indestructible component of this society” (p ix). Bell (1995) also says that, “Black people will never gain full equality in this country. Even those herculean efforts we hail as successful will produce no more than temporary ‘peaks of progress,’ short lived victories that slide into irrelevance as racial patterns adapt in ways that maintain white dominance. This is a hard-to-accept fact that all history verifies. We must acknowledge it and move on to adopt policies based on what I call “Racial Realism.” This mind-set or philosophy requires us to acknowledge the permanence of our subordinate status. That acknowledgement enables us to avoid despair and frees us to imagine and implement racial strategies that can bring fulfillment and even triumph” (p. 306). Bell urges us to embrace our history and our reality so that we are able to move forward. Moving forward requires us to act and do things differently.

Delgado and Stefancic (2001) define this Racial Realism as the “view that racial progress is sporadic and that people of color are doomed to experience only infrequent peaks followed by regressions” (p. 154).

Bell’s racial realism theory forms the tenets for critical race theory. Three of the more prominent tenets are the following: 1) “racism is ordinary, not aberrational—the usual way society does business, the common everyday experience of most people of color in this country; 2) our system of white-over-color ascendency serves important purposes, both psychic and material (for white people); 3) race and racism are products of social thought and relations. Not objective, inherent or fixed, they correspond to no biological or genetic reality; rather, races are categories that society invents, manipulates, or retires when convenient.” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001 p. 7). Based on Winant, Bell and others who subscribe to racial realism and critical race theory in order to have a more honest, direct and productive dialogue on race, we must discontinue asking whether racism exists and when or how one has experienced racism. Instead, we should ask society how we rid ourselves of the cancer and, in the meantime, how do we live with it. We must identify policies and practices that will take race/racism into consideration and thereby neutralize its ability to effect on outcomes such as injustice and unfairness. Hence, the question we pose to society should be “what are the strategies for unmasking and exposing racism in its various permutations?” (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

For if we believe, as do many, that race is a social construct and not a biological reality, then it follows that “we may unmake it and deprive it of much of its sting by changing the system of images, words, attitudes, unconscious feelings, scripts and social teachings by which we convey to one another that certain people are less intelligent, reliable, hardworking, virtuous and American than others” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001, p.17). The result of which has been the allocation of both tangibles and intangibles such as privilege, status, the best jobs, schools, and other benefits and opportunities.

**Discussion on Race and Racism**

We continue to quantify racism’s existence and qualitatively discuss its devastating and debilitating effect on individuals and groups in America—wasting funds and effort on something we have researched ad nauseum. During the last few years, efforts and resources have been devoted to telling us what we’ve always known—the permanence of racism. From Pew Research Center Publications to polls conducted periodically by CNN, ABC News, Gallup, USA Today, Newsweek or CBS, the message is the same—Racism is alive and well in America today.

In 1995, the Washington Post, along with the Kaiser Foundation and Harvard University, completed a report entitled, “The Four America’s: Government and Social Policy through the Eyes of America’s Multi-racial and Multi-ethnic Society.” Some key findings and conclusions reached were the following: “America’s various racial and ethnic groups differ in their perceptions and assessment of the problems and situations...
faced by members of other groups. Whites stand alone in their misperceptions of the real-life circumstances that African-Americans face. The report concludes that there exists an alarming gap between whites and African-Americans in their understanding and perceptions of the extent of the problems facing minorities in America today. And there exists a great racial divide over whether whites should feel and be held responsible for addressing the problems facing minorities in America. Given these large variations in beliefs and perceptions across groups of Americans it is not at all surprising that almost half (47 percent) of all Americans believe that tensions between racial and ethnic groups have increased over the past 10 years (p 68).

“In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way...the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.”

In June 1997, President William Jefferson Clinton issued Executive Order No. 13050, which created the initiative on race. An advisory board was created and chaired by Dr. John Hope Franklin. The President’s mandated charge to the Board included the following objectives:

1) Because we share common values and shared goals more dialogue is needed to identify common ground.
2) As we continue to struggle with the legacy of race and color and the complexity of racial relationships including the conflicting views on race and racial progress, we must address the impact of past policies and practices and attitudes based on racial differences. This is especially important because the 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.
3) Recognition that the discussion of race in America is no longer a discussion between and about blacks and whites. The complexities, challenges and opportunities that arise from our growing diversity point to the need for a new language, one that accurately reflects this diversity.

In 2001, a national survey by the Washington Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University supported the conclusion reached by President Clinton’s 21st Century Report when findings pointed out the fact that whites have misperceptions of black progress and the relative status of blacks in America on issues of jobs, incomes, education, and healthcare. Specifically, many whites believe that blacks are as well off as whites which belie government statistics. The pervasiveness of incorrect information lies at the heart of the conflicting views which prevent us from having a dialogue with a shared language.

Additionally, the worldwide concern about racism was acknowledged when, in 2001, the World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and related intolerance met in Durban, South Africa and declared that member states would undertake a wide range of measures to recognize and combat racism and discrimination at the international, regional, and national levels. They went on to describe victims of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance as individuals or groups of individuals who are or have been negatively affected by, subjected to, or targets of those scourges. There was recognition that people of African descent have for centuries been victims of racism, discrimination and enslavement, and of history’s denial of their rights. They also recognized that people of African descent, as well as Asians and people of Asian descent, face barriers as a result of social biases and discrimination. Participating in the
World Conference were 2,300 representatives from 163 countries, including 16 heads of state, 58 foreign ministers, and 44 ministers. Participants included Fidel Castro and Yasser Arafat, and representatives from Brazil, Kenya, India, and Mexico and other countries.

Although participants noted progress in eradicating racism and racial discrimination, they warned that contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, although sometimes more subtle, afflicted every country in the world.

In 2005, an annual poll conducted by the Institute for Survey and Policy Research at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee found that trust among residents surveyed in Milwaukee, Wisconsin was low. Specifically, Milwaukee residents were less trustful of members of other racial and ethnic groups. Trust, according to the Institute, depended upon how much we know about others and our ability to damage their reputation if they prove untrustworthy. In summary, the report stated that the levels of social trust in Milwaukee were low compared to both the rest of the state and to national norms. Trust of different racial and ethnic groups was similar in Milwaukee to that found nationwide, but it is significantly lower than that reported by other state residents. In particular, the differences in the summary measure of racial trust indicated that Milwaukee residents are less trusting of racial and ethnic groups other than their own (Moore, 2005).

The following year, 2006, we didn’t label the issue one of “misconception” or “trust.” Instead, it was about “perception.” The Public Policy Forum surveyed 1,000 white, African-American, and Latino citizens of Southeastern Wisconsin to measure our attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward each other. And while the findings were not surprising, what was disappointing is that the Forum and researchers involved had the opportunity and, did not move us from what we know and where we are, to asking in a very practical, tangible and quantifiable way the following: What strategies and policies must be put in place to address the effect of past racially and ethnically discriminatory policies and practices, defacto and dejure, institutional and otherwise which result in the disparities and injustices experienced by those who are not white or of European descent?

Although participants noted progress in eradicating racism and racial discrimination, they warned that contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, although sometimes more subtle, afflicted every country in the world.

Instead, we have yet another piece of research with familiar findings: “race relations in Southeastern Wisconsin are generally perceived as not good and not changing for the better. This feeling is fed partly by distrust, especially an uncertainty about whites motives by people of color” (Public Policy forum, 2006). This represents another missed opportunity to address racism at the institutional level.

**Conclusion**

In 2002 Senator Barack Obama delivered an historic speech titled “A More Perfect Union.” Obama, much like Clinton, has once again provided the American people with the opportunity to address injustice and impose fairness, and to remove obstacles to opportunity. President Obama, then Senator Obama, made reference to an “unfinished” document—the constitution which, while promising equal citizenship and liberty and justice for all, allowed the institutionalization of a system of slavery unlike any the world had seen. In his speech, Obama said “race is an issue that I believe this nation cannot afford to ignore right now” as we have yet to work through the complexities of race and racism in America. For Blacks who have ‘made it’ he says “questions of race and racism continue to define their world view in fundamental ways and most working and middle-class white Americans don’t feel that they have been particularly privileged by their race.” Consequently, he continues, “This is where we are right now, it’s a racial stalemate we’ve been stuck in for years.”

Obama’s speech begged for action. The question now is what strategies, policies and practices will be put in place to rectify the situation.

However, if what you have read so far is not convincing, then let us turn to the highest court in the land for some wisdom and guidance. Implicit in opinions from two Supreme Court Justices is the recognition that issues of race and racism in our society must be addressed with action.

*Continued on page 28*
Culture & Commissions: NEW WARRIOR TRADITIONS IN MILITARY SERVICE

by Amileah Davis-Stribling
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

On May 28th, 2008 about 800 former Cadets First Class graduated from the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) in Colorado Springs, CO. Among the Class of 2008 were two American Indian cadets. One of them, 2Lt Connie Ambrose (Navajo), was accompanied on graduation day by her relatives and friends, some of which came dressed traditionally. On the evening prior to her graduation, Ambrose officially received her commission as a Second Lieutenant in the active-duty Air Force. Ambrose called on her friend, 2Lt Jukari Davis of the Class of 2007, to read her the Oath of Office. “The commissioning ceremony was a moment just about me,” said Ambrose sounding relieved to have completed the Academy’s rigorous four-year program. “My dad, who was a Marine, was there to pin me on [put on her 2Lt insignia]…and he just had this twinkle in his eye the whole time,” she added.

USAFA is one of the Air Force’s commission-granting institutions where students must balance academic, physical, and military training requirements. Cadets endure a four-year program at this accredited university with a demanding core curriculum in engineering and technical sciences. Every cadet receives the equivalent of a full scholarship during their attendance and commits to five years of service on active duty after graduation.

The Air Force Academy has seen cadets from many Native nations, including: Navajo, Lumbee, Odawa, Cherokee, Lakota, Comanche, Sac & Fox and Blackfoot. Though the Department of Defense acknowledges that American Indians and Alaska Natives join the Armed Forces at significantly higher rates than any other ethnic group, the Air Force Personnel Center reports that less than 0.1% of commissioned officers on active duty and in the reserves self identify as such. For the Native people who do receive commissions, especially those who graduate from institutions like the Air Force Academy, Naval Academy at Annapolis, and Military Academy at West Point, they join a new generation of warrior leaders carrying on ancient traditions of protection and service.

Military Service

Though members of some nations fought alongside the Army in their role as scouts during the colonization of the American West, American Indians most notably began serving the United States Armed Forces in World War I. Thousands of Native men and women volunteered to serve during this conflict, leading Congress to enact U.S. citizenship for American Indians in 1924. This ethnic group has continuously boasted the highest percentage rate of military service in the country (DoD, 1998). For example, American Indians and Alaska Natives represent only 0.6% of the national U.S. population (US Census, 2000) yet constitute 1.6% of the Marine Corps alone; which is 2.7 times their expected enlistment rate (MCCS, 2007). While this statistic points to strong traditions of warrior roles and protection of this land, the USAFA graduates interviewed anecdotally reported that the majority of their friends, family members, and colleagues of Native ancestry who have served, or currently serve, in the military remain among the enlisted ranks and do not seek commissioned officer status.

Though there has been little to no exclusive research done on the social dynamics behind the high enlistment rates of American Indians and Alaska Natives, some studies have indicated the influence of strong warrior traditions in this decision (Ledesma, 2006; Rouse Arndt, 2005). Prior to contact with Europeans, most Native nations practiced highly ritualized forms of warfighting. A pan-Indian definition of this concept includes the vital
role of the protectors of villages and peoples. One who set aside his or her own personal safety and well-being on behalf of the group was highly regarded for his or her sacrifice, honor, courage, and bravery. Most nations involved aspects of this warrior role in the coming-of-age traditions for young men; though many nations have stories of women who fulfilled this role as well. After the reservation system was imposed on every Native nation in the United States, or comparable systems such as Corporations, Pueblos, and Rancherias, the ability to perform these ancient warrior rituals was hampered; as militant actions against traditional rivals were forbidden by federal law. Many hypothesize that American Indians entering the military are doing so in an attempt to carry on these traditions of warriorship (Ledesma, 2006).

Retired Captain DJ Eagle Bear Vanas (Odawa), of the Class of 1992 recounted, “My father was enlisted in the Air Force all my life, but he said to me ‘If you ever even think about coming in, [joining the military] become an officer.’” Why would someone who spent their entire career as an enlisted person be so emphatic about his son earning commission? Many factors influence this preference. Interviews with five Native graduates of USAFA revealed that their path to officership shared the characteristics of a desire to fulfill warrior roles, attain advanced education, and to carry on family traditions of service.

**Warriorship**

The American Indian warrior is one of the most enduring and misunderstood symbols of the people that originally inhabited North America. Europeans who first ventured to this “New World” frequently sent word home regarding the fierceness that people here displayed in battle. Unfortunately, these early impressions have lead to stereotypes regarding American Indians and the role of warriors within their communities. Native soldiers who have joined the Armed Forces still report being falsely labeled as inherently excellent scouts or “genetically dispositioned to warfare” (Rouse Arndt, 2004). When asked what his people’s traditional definition of a warrior is, 2Lt Jukari Davis (Navajo) replied, “Warriors are those who protect the people. They take it upon themselves to sacrifice their health and lives to protect their loved ones and relations.”

Centuries ago, a warrior was not simply one who fights wars. Instead, these revered individuals were courageous representatives of their people who stood for selflessness and sacrifice. Central to their role was the very necessary task of protection. Villages and bands frequently fell under attack from rival groups. As women rushed to gather up children and belongings in an ambush, young men would go out to confront their attackers so that the rest of the village could escape. As a result such confrontations, those who displayed the most courage and who took the most from the enemy were highly regarded. Since these types of battles no longer take place between sovereign Native nations, many believe this ancient tradition to be continued through military service. On the other hand, 2Lt Lindsay Freeman, of the Lumbee tribe of North Carolina, interpreted her people’s current warrior concept simply as, “someone in the military.”

Though the stereotypical warrior is usually portrayed as a young Indian male, the important role of women who fulfill this ideal is not to be overlooked. 2Lt Connie Ambrose remarked, “Traditionally for us [Navajo], women were warriors too, but they protected their homes and families.” If a village was attacked while men were away hunting or trading, Navajo women would be known to pick up a shield and lance to fiercely defend their homes. Elders passed down the skills of weapon use and fighting techniques to ensure that their women would be prepared in case of such an attack. Many nations also have stories of women who chose to pursue a more masculine gender role; often meaning that they chose a life of warriorship instead of taking a husband. This could happen by personal choice or if the woman was seen as becoming a warrior in a vision or prophecy. According to recent figures released by the Department of Defense, there are about 4,111 American Indian and Alaska Native women currently serving in the Armed Forces (Dollarhide, 2003). In fact, the first American woman to be killed in action during Operation Iraqi Freedom was Specialist Lori Ann Piestewa of the Hopi Nation. Whether male or female, each of the USAFA graduates interviewed commented that their people’s traditions of warriorship had strongly influenced their choice to attend the Air Force Academy; signaling that the influence of these ancient traditions is alive today.

**Education and Indian Country**

One of the most chronic problems facing American Indians is the startling rate of poverty and unemployment on reservations.
nation-wide. Between the years of 1998 and 2000, the average poverty rate for American Indians and Alaska Natives in the United States was 25.9% higher than any other racial/ethnic group (Fogarty, 2007).

Jobs are rare as many reservations are located in rural areas. American Indian tribes are sovereign nations with tribal and cultural regulations complicated by federal regulations, making entrepreneurship difficult and highly variable from tribe to tribe. Nation-wide, American Indian and Alaska Native high school students have a graduation rate of about 51.1% compared to the White population’s 74.9% (Orfield et.al., 2004). American Indians and Alaska Natives are similarly unlikely to attend or graduate from college.

Most Native veterans, and those currently serving, would concede that the general lack of opportunity on the reservation contributed to their choice to join the military (Ledesma, 2006). The USAFA graduates interviewed revealed this trend as well. “You don’t see many veterans on the rez homeless or unemployed,” admitted 2Lt Ambrose. Furthermore, they emphasized that the advent of advanced education would help them to improve their overall quality of life. “[Earning a commission] was the road less traveled. I wanted to be successful in my life and go a different path than my friends on the rez who were getting in trouble,” said 2Lt Davis, “You don’t hear much of a Navajo going to school and taking a commission!” 2Lt Freeman commented, “I looked forward to the challenge of going to college...especially at a service academy...I could get an education and come back home to help my community.” For most of the graduates, the ability to complete a college degree would not only help them personally, but would allow them to be a benefit to their people.

A commission adds to another role, that of a leader. Capt(ret) Vanas defined his people’s concept of a leader as, “someone who leads by example and holds those traditional virtues... Crazy Horse, Pontiac, and Tecumseh had those values and we continue them today, but with different means.” In many Native societies, a leader is someone who is trusted by his or her people to make important decisions on their behalf. Hence, it is not merely the person with the most power, money, or assertive control that is allowed to hold this position (Marshall III, 2007). American Indian officers, by nature of their job title, are told that after receiving their commission that they are leaders. In the words of 2Lt Davis, “[Traditionally, a Navajo leader] would be leading people that were all from the same group. Usually our subordinates are not the same; they do not share the same values or lifeways.” In this way, the difference in demographics and even physical location of one’s unit can present a dilemma unique to American Indians who hold higher rank in the Armed Forces since traditions of warriorship don’t always reflect such diversity or distance from home. However, for the USAFA graduates interviewed, coupling the Academy’s thorough training with cultural values helps them to be successful as commissioned officers.

“An Extension of my Family’s Service”

Major Lawrence Yazzie (Navajo, Comanche, Sac & Fox) found it easy to cite exactly why he initially chose to enter the Armed Forces. “My career was a natural progression of my ancestors and relatives,” he said. Members of his family have served during every major armed conflict since WWII. “The US Air Force Academy was an extension of my family’s service,” he continued, “and complimentary to our warrior culture.” A graduate of the Class of 2000, Maj Yazzie eloquently outlined one of the most significant trends common to nearly all American Indians in the military. Because Native people have been over-represented in the Armed Forces for decades (DoD, 2003), traditions of service have been engrained in many families (Ledesma, 2006). Every USAFA graduate interviewed named at least one relative whose prior service or preference for military careers strongly influenced their decision to attend the Air Force Academy. 2Lt Ambrose remembered always wanting to be in the military as a young girl after seeing how her father and other veterans were so highly regarded by her community. For 2Lt Davis, it happened to be a last wish of his...
late grandfather that one of his family members become a professional in the Armed Forces.

It is common in many Native cultures for families to pass down various traditions. Families can be known as good weavers, medicine people, horse breeders, dancers, singers, beadiers, etc. Due to the traumatic experience of colonization, some aspects of indigenous cultures were lost or forced to rapidly adapt. As some young men chose to enter the military in order to fulfill a traditional warrior role, their actions instilled values in their families and kin networks that visibly persist today.

Even at the Air Force Academy, some families have begun sending more than one child through its intense program. Maj Yazzie attended the Academy at the same time as his younger brother, Lamoni. Both played basketball for Air Force’s Division I team and made headlines with their success. Their younger sister Desbah Yazzie, whose name in Navajo refers to a woman returning from war, plays rugby for the Academy. On the same night that 2Lt Ambrose received her commission, 2Lt Lindsay Freeman was reading the Oath of Office to her younger brother, Kyland. 2Lt Lindsay Freeman’s older brother, James, also graduated from USAFA. These new family patterns of attending service academies are beginning to confirm new family traditions.

Leaders of Warriors

Having successfully completed USAFA’s officer training program, these American Indian graduates have become the latest in a new generation of warrior leaders. Native nations have preserved essential aspects of their cultural beliefs, such as the warrior tradition, as they continue to thrive in today’s America. Each of these graduates voiced a sense of gratitude for their ability to experience what the Air Force Academy and service as an officer had to offer them and their loved ones. Unfortunately, the ability to remain near home and family, a traditional preference, is a real conflict cited by those interviewed. “I completed two deployments and numerous other travel requirements,” said Maj Lawrence Yazzie, “I missed 3 out of 4 Father’s Days, 3 out of 4 birthdays for [my] oldest son, first birthday parties, steps, words, etc. for both boys, anniversaries and wife’s birthdays.”

As a word of advice to any young Native person who might be interested in pursuing a commission, 2Lt Jukari Davis offered, “You should try to maintain your sense of personal identity…and your spirituality…and how that fits with the big picture, your goals.” Each Native USAFA graduate has been honored by his or her family and community through events like ceremonies, powwows, gourd dances, and blessings. The ability to withstand four years at a service academy is a notable achievement for any young person; Native or non-Native. However, the codes and values of military service resonate uniquely with American Indians (Dollarhide, 2003).

The advent of officerhood further represents timeless values of integrity and selflessness central to warrior cultures. As these USAFA graduates employ the training provided them at the Academy while maintaining the cultural values of their ancestors, they will be assets to their people and our country.

As some young men chose to enter the military in order to fulfill a traditional warrior role, their actions instilled values in their families and kin networks that visibly persist today.
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Nit’shiik’shinii’taki!
Educators are integral to the successful development of the next generation of citizens. A large body of research overwhelmingly supports the impact of the quality of PreK-12 teachers on student achievement. The National Council on Teacher Quality (Walsh & Synder, 2004) conducted a comprehensive review of the impact of various teacher quality variables on student achievement. They found that variables such as teaching experience, quality of teacher preparation, teacher exposure to a combination of content and pedagogical coursework, and teachers’ literacy and verbal abilities significantly influenced student achievement.

Out-of-field teaching, defined as educators who are teaching subjects for which they do not possess either a major or a certification, is one measure of the qualifications of teachers to instruct in a specific content area. Indicator 28 of the Condition of Education report (U.S. Department of Education, 2003) gave an account of the status of out-of-field teaching in middle and high school during 1999-2000. A greater percentage of middle school students were taught by out-of-field teachers of science compared to their high school peers. Significantly higher percentages of secondary students in high-poverty and high-minority schools were taught science by out-of-field teachers compared to their high school counterparts. These resources allow for more exciting and engaging interactions with science than the text books found in most schools or the prepackaged science kits used by schools that can afford to purchase them. As noted by Bybee, “Having out-of-school learning experiences is recommended worldwide for addressing the personal and social needs of students as well as improving their scientific literacy,” (in Tal & Morage, 2007, p.749).

For urban minority youth, in particular, in addition to fostering more sophisticated epistemologies of science, it is imperative to aim to cultivate sustained interest or enduring dispositions toward science (Basu & Calabrese Barton, 2007). Informal learning settings offer myriad possibilities for personal and social interactions that can lead to increased scientific literacy, more positive attitudes toward science, and increased interest in professional careers in the sciences. For example, Gerber, Cavallo, and Marek (2001) conducted a study designed to assess the impact of student experiences in informal learning environments mediated by formal classroom instruction on students’ scientific reasoning skills. They found that students with enriched informal
learning environments had significantly higher scientific reasoning abilities compared to those with impoverished informal learning environments and that students in inquiry-based science classrooms showed higher scientific reasoning abilities compared to those in non-inquiry science classrooms.

The University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee (UWM) School of Education Departments of Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Psychology, and Exceptional Education, the UWM Manfred Olson Planetarium (MOP), the UWM Great Lakes Water Institute, the Milwaukee Public Museum (MPM), and the Friends of Milwaukee’s Rivers (FMR) formed a partnership from 2006-2008 called, “Informal Settings for Learning and Achievement: Museums in Action (ISLA: MIA).” ISLA: MIA’s overall goal was to promote diverse urban students’ and their families’ and teachers’ acquisition of science content knowledge and positive attitudes towards science.

This study targeted pre-service teachers in a preparation program designed to serve diverse students in urban settings, in particular students in Milwaukee Public Schools, which, for the 2006-2007 school year, was 58.4% African American, 20% Hispanic, 13.3% White, 4.5% Asian, .8% Native American, and 3% Other (Wisconsin State Legislature, 2006). It is important to have a broader understanding of the quality of preservice teachers’ access ILEs to determine potential professional development activities that could encourage engagement in meaningful visitorship in support of their science teaching. Specifically we investigated preservice educators’ attitudes and conceptions towards science and patterns of ILE visitorship. The analyses reported on in this paper address emergent findings from a questionnaire regarding subjects’ access of ILEs and their conceptions of the nature of science.

Background

The annual Condition of Education report describes academic performance results from the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), a national assessment measuring student knowledge in a variety of subject areas at grades 4, 8, and 12. Indicator 13 of the report detailed the national science performance of students overall and for students grouped by specific demographic characteristics (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). The results present a somewhat dismal picture of the academic science achievement of our nation’s children. Based on a scale of 0-300, students in 4th grade made a four point gain in their science achievement from 1996 to 2005; their scores rose from 147 to 151. In comparison, 12th graders’ science achievement dropped during the same time period from 150 to 147. No significant differences in the percentage of 4th and 8th grade students being reported at proficient or advanced achievement levels were reported.

Students are less likely to achieve when they have underqualified, inexperienced teachers (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). Knowing this, it is particularly problematic in high-poverty districts where there are many minority students, second language learners and students with disabilities who are being taught at significantly higher rates by teachers with emergency or provisional licenses many of whom have little experience in the content areas they are teaching (Peske & Haycock, 2006; Walsh & Snyder, 2004). In order to close the significant achievement gap for disengaged, diverse students so that they may successfully transition into the workforce and society, educators must be qualified to deliver meaningful, content-rich, standards-based learning experiences that transform their students’ perceptions of themselves as learners and their views about themselves as valued citizens of a broader community.

The Commission on No Child Left Behind (2007), supported by the Aspen Institute and other foundations, conducted a comprehensive review of the implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2002, which brought subject matter knowledge to the forefront of the nation’s education agenda. The Commission identified several challenges to ensuring that middle and secondary students in particular are being taught science by a highly qualified teacher, primarily defined in NCLB as a teacher.
with a deep knowledge of the content area taught. One of the Commission’s strong recommendations involves the systematic use of federal funds to support ongoing, high quality professional development to support content knowledge acquisition and pedagogical skill development.

Methods

Setting and participants
The study employed a semi-structured questionnaire administered to preservice educators in an education certification program at a Midwestern university. The university has a strong commitment to the concept of Urban Education and Equity as a cornerstone of all teacher certification programs in which preservice teachers are expected to show knowledge of urban contexts and keep in mind the issues of poverty, race, culture, class and language that can form a part of institutionalized racism. While accepted as part of the organizational framework for the School of Education, this principle can be unequally integrated in certification programs across various grade levels and content areas.

Preservice/student teachers were recruited from introductory courses in educational psychology. Of the 117 pre-service teachers in the pool of potential participants, 108 (92%) were White. Only 9 students or less than 1% identified themselves as African American, Latino/a, American Indian or Multiethnic. Half the pool were students in either the Early Childhood Education (birth through age 8) or Middle Childhood through Adolescence Education (grades 1–8) programs, two certification programs which require teachers to have a broad content knowledge including Math, Science, Social Studies and Language Arts. To date, 69 individuals completed the questionnaire. Eighty percent of respondents ranged from 19 to 25 years old.

Instrument
Subjects received the ISLA: MIA questionnaire, which incorporated questions developed and agreed upon by UWM faculty and staff from partnership organizations who wanted to learn more about participants’ interests in terms of science and leisure time activities. The questionnaire was also designed to elicit visitation patterns, such as type of museum visited and activities at same, and included questions adapted from a nature of science interview protocol developed by Carey and colleagues (see Smith, Maclin, Houghton, & Hennessey, 2000). These questions probe more deeply the concepts of science and the role and characteristics of scientists. Because of limitations of space, for this paper, we focus only on responses to questions having to do with the Goals of Science.

Data Collection and Analytical Procedures
The questionnaire was administered during the spring, summer, and fall semester of 2008 to sections of an introductory course in educational psychology. Students were offered the opportunity to complete the questionnaire in order to receive a nominal amount of extra credit points toward the final grade. Students were given the questionnaire and consent forms, which described the study, and were allowed to take the questionnaire home, complete it and return it within several weeks. Descriptive cross-tabs were conducted on the closed-end questions. In addition, a qualitative content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) was conducted on selected open-ended responses on the nature of science measure. The unit of analysis was each response in its entirety. We matched responses to categories (Clusters) identified in the Nature of Science Coding Guide. Responses to Goals of Science questions were coded in accordance with 4 levels and corresponding sublevels, including: 1a, which focused on goals related to concrete activities and products of science; 1b, goals involving finding or discovering new information; 1.5 id, thinking about ideas or data; 1.5 hiwe, finding out how things work, unelaborated; level 2, differentiating between scientists’ ideas, experiments and experimental results, including finding explanations,
testing ideas, understanding ideas, or developing ideas; and 2.5, which included more sophisticated understanding with interrelation of two or more level 2 ideas in one response, including articulation of more sophisticated ideas like assessing the fit between initial ideas and a pattern of evidence or the process of developing ideas, e.g. revising an idea. The Coding Guide did not include a level 3, which would include discussion of the development of explanatory theories as the main goal of science and we found no responses that would fit a level 3 category.

Results
The majority of respondents (59%, n= 41) have visited museums and science centers sometime during their lifetime. Only 30% of respondents visited a museum 15 or more times. Respondents tended to attend activities at established traditional museums (e.g., 90% visited the Milwaukee Public Museum and 91% visited the Milwaukee Public Zoo) rather than activities sponsored by environmentally focused ILEs (e.g., 3% visited the Friends of Milwaukee’s Rivers). When at ILEs, the majority of respondents tended to visit exhibits within the ILE rather than participate in activities requiring them to interact and engage with exhibit content and museum staff. For example, only 36% participated in a hands-on workshop and only 22% heard a lecture.

The results of the qualitative coding, where we achieved an interrater reliability of 69% and higher agreement on all codes, indicated the following. In all, the majority of these students/pre-service teachers do not demonstrate sophisticated epistemologies of science in their responses. They talk about the goals of science in terms of scientists’ ideas, experiments, and experimental results in an undifferentiated fashion. They do not demonstrate an awareness of the role of ideas and thinking about ideas in science; they do not demonstrate that they differentiate between ideas, experiments, and experimental results; they do not talk about assessing the “fit” between one’s initially held ideas and a pattern of evidence, and they do not talk about the development of ideas as a complex, multi-stepped process.

Discussion and Implications
Science is taught in schools to provide most students with a basic kind of scientific literacy and some students with a preliminary kind of training for future work in the sciences.
In order for students to understand the nature of science, they must understand the purposes of scientific work, the nature and status of scientific knowledge, and science as a social enterprise. Educators can and should incorporate into their institutions access to information learning environments to support the promotion of more sophisticated epistemologies of science based on increased understanding and use of specific science-based skills and practices. Sustained interaction between ILEs and the educators will help educators learn how to better serve the needs of these underserved groups through access to rich resources, scientists and engaging interactions amongst the two.

The fact that the preservice students at our Midwestern university are by vast majority White, in contrast to our public schools does not stop us as teacher educators from challenging our students to be advocates for "other people’s children" (Delpit, 1995). Poor, urban students must have challenging content and high expectations from their teachers who themselves must be innovative in the methods and approaches to engaging students with STEM content in their everyday lives. It is imperative for ILE sites to become more accessible to and familiar with diverse groups such as minorities, English language learners and students with disabilities as well as novice and out of field teachers.
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Reducing the Mismeasurement of Multiculturalism in Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs:

MY VISION FOR THIS DECADE

by Festus E. Obiakor, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Exceptional Education
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

Multiculturalism, in theory and practice, has become an important educational phenomenon in today’s schools, colleges, and universities. It seeks inclusive avenues that equalize opportunities for all individuals. To a large measure, it incorporates multiple voices, including those of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) persons and communities in solving local, State, national, and global problems. As it appears, in some of the largest school districts in the United States, CLD learners are the majority (Grossman, 1995, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Obiakor, 2004; Obiakor & Beachum 2005). For instance, Ladson-Billings noted that these learners “represent 30 percent of the public school population. In the twenty largest school districts, they make up 70 percent of total school enrollment.” (p. x).

Today, the aforementioned trend has not changed, especially since the composition of educational professionals and service providers still does not reflect the changing cultural and linguistic compositions of children in schools (Obiakor, 2007, 2008; Williams & Obiakor, 2009). This major challenge has far-reaching implications for teacher are recruited, prepared, or educated in the United States. Yet, my experiences tell me that traditional teacher preparation programs have directly or indirectly downplayed the benefits derived from practicing true multiculturalism in our schools, colleges/universities, and communities. As Ewing (1995) pointed out more than 15 years ago, traditional teacher education programs continue to prepare ethnocentric teachers and administrators who serve as major barriers to improving school outcomes for African American students. It is a major responsibility of schools, colleges, and departments of education to ensure that knowledge and information applicable to culturally based learning and behavioral styles, teaching styles, culturally sensitive proactive educational practices, and family and community values be incorporated in teacher education programs. (p. 191)

Soullessness of Teacher Preparation Programs: The Heart of the Matter

In today’s traditional teacher preparation programs, multiculturalism has been somehow misrepresented, abused, and bastardized. There appears to be some soullessness in these programs. From my perspective, responses to current demographic changes have been half-baked, half-hearted, disingenuous, and somewhat retrogressive (Obiakor, 2004). For example, these traditional programs have soullessly responded to multiculturalism by:

1. Practicing Tokenism (i.e., when a CLD faculty or staff is hired as a figure head to appease requests for inclusion and equanimity).

However, having the knowledge is not enough anymore—knowledge must be followed by measurable commitment and action.
2. **Engaging in Suicide Missions** (i.e., when a culturally sensitive faculty or staff, especially White, is intentionally made irrelevant, destroyed, or victimized because he/she dared to support equity).

3. **Playing the Divide- and-Conquer Game** (i.e., when CLD faculty and staff are set up to fight against each other based on the White supremacist idea of “goodness”).

4. **Encouraging the Crab-Bucket Syndrome** (i.e., when proactive efforts are made to pull down or devalue high-performing CLD faculty or staff).

5. **Favoring Quotas** (i.e., when an incompetent and mediocre CLD faculty, staff, or administrator is hired in place of qualified ones).

6. **Engaging in fraudulent multiculturalism** (i.e., when multiculturalism is discussed in a half-hearted fashion to appease the masses or accreditation bodies and create a phony sense of community).

7. **Silencing of Voices** (i.e., when the White supremacist strategy of one-person-one-vote is adopted to impose majority views on a situation).

8. **Playing the Revolving Door Game** (when a CLD faculty or staff is hired to serve a major purpose and let go after that purpose is achieved).

9. **Making Visible Talents Invisible** (i.e., when talented CLD faculty and/or staff are made invisible by underutilizing them or pretending that they do not exist).

Clearly, these traditional practices are soulless, archaic, racist, and not prudent; however, they continue to be reintroduced and repackaged in different forms even as they produce the same retrogressive results (Algozzine & Obiakor, 1995; Williams & Obiakor, 2009).

We have heard time and time again that college/university folks are very liberal in their practices. The conservative or liberal labels are meaningless constructs that seem to masquerade quality and equity and/or what truly takes place in traditional teacher preparation programs. One thing is clear—these programs are Eurocentric in their modus operandi; and they find it difficult to respond to multicultural or racial issues. Even though we have seen a handful of positive efforts to recruit, retain, and promote scholars and leaders who come from CLD backgrounds, college/university folks are no different from people in the society in their socio-behavioral patterns. If educators who work in traditional teacher preparation programs are that liberal, why do they continue to rely on standardized tests that have reliability and validity problems for many CLD students in the entry and exit of their programs? Why do they continue to struggle with the recruitment, retention, and promotion of CLD faculty, staff, and administrators? Why do CLD students continue to be misidentified, misassessed, miscategorized, misplaced, and misinstructed by those prepared by them? Why do they continue to struggle with collaborating, consulting, and cooperating with CLD communities in which they are located? Finally, why do they continue to mismeasure human talents and attributes in their programs? These critical questions will continue to haunt these programs as long as they continue to resist visionary voices and contemporary imperatives.

**Beyond Tradition: My Vision for this Decade**

It is common knowledge that multiculturalism is here to stay. The election of President Barack Obama, the first African American President of the United States is an historic fact. This is not a fad that will soon disappear. It is also clear that the world is getting smaller and smaller and that technology is playing a key role in this. However, having the knowledge is not enough anymore—knowledge must be followed by measurable commitment and action. The “business-as-usual” mentality has not yielded positive results in traditional teacher preparation programs. As a consequence, proactive steps must be taken to truly incorporate multiculturalism at all levels of teacher preparation. We must present and use new models of instructional and leadership strategies; and we must recruit and retain quality faculty, staff, and students who come from different racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. The old theory of biological determinism (i.e., the belief that all human attributes are genetically and biologically based) has failed. As a result, we must avoid the...
myth of socioeconomic dissonance (i.e., the belief that poverty leads to “poor” intelligence, “poor” self-concept, and “poor” zest for life). Additionally, we must recognize that (a) no brain is a tabula rasa (i.e., blank slate); (b) nobody is born to be “poor” or “rich;” and (c) gifts and talents go beyond racial, cultural, and linguistic boundaries.

In fact, to remain competitive and relevant in this decade, teacher preparation programs must get out of the human marginalization business and get into the human valuing business. They need to have souls to develop souls and try to reduce the poverty of the teaching spirit. As Sue (2006) remarked, “marginalized groups are not necessarily asking for equal treatment. Rather they desire equal access and opportunity. The blind application of a single policy or standard may not only be unfair but oppressing as well” (p. 767). In his classic book, The Mismeasure of Man (my inspiration for the title of this commentary), Gould (1981) was right when he concluded that “we pass through this world but once. Few tragedies can be more extensive than the stunting of life, few injustices deeper than the denial of an opportunity to strive or even hope, by a limit imposed from without, but falsely identified as lying within” (pp.28-29).

Conclusion

Multiculturalism, in theory and practice, has been remarkable in building bridges of collaboration, consultation, and cooperation in school programs. It has been instrumental in bringing people and communities together for the common good. It believes in creating the goodness of purpose and ideas in educational and leadership vision. However, it has not received its deserved attention. To a large measure, it has been mismeasured and abused by many educators and leaders. As a result, our children, our parents, our schools, our communities, and our governments have suffered. It is time we started taking advantage of the benefits of multiculturalism in our schools and society. We can no longer afford to play the same traditional games in teacher preparation programs. If we do not change, we will be consumed by change.
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If we do not change, we will be consumed by change.
Race & Racism: TOWARDS A GLOBAL FUTURE

by Howard Winant, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, University of California

What is the future of the race concept, of racially-based social structures, of racial identities? How should we understand the meaning of race and of racism in a post-civil rights, post-apartheid, postcolonial world? For a long time—indeed most of modern history—such questions would not have seemed logical. Race was once thought to be a natural phenomenon, not a social one. It was considered eternal, not transient. While its meaning might have varied in practical terms (among nations and empires, say, or over time), the concept of race retained its character as an essence. The supposed naturality of race, its givenness, was barely ever questioned. Race was understood as an ineluctable and natural framework of difference among human beings.1

That was then; this is now.

Today the race concept is more problematic than ever before. Racially-based social structures—of inequality and exclusion, and of resistance and autonomy as well—persist, but their legitimacy is questioned far more strongly than it was in the past. And racial identities also seem to be less solid and ineffable than they did in previous ages. While racial identity remains a major component of individuality and group recognition, it partakes of a certain flexibility and fungibility that was formerly rare.

This essay is framed by the perception (but it is not only mine) of a developing worldwide crisis in the meaning and structure of race. The age of empire is over; apartheid and Jim Crow have been ended; and a significant consensus exists among scientists (natural and social), and humanists as well, that the concept of race lacks an objective basis. Yet the concept persists, as idea, as practice, as identity, and as social structure. Racism perseveres in these same ways.2

Enormous discrepancies and contradictions continue as well, notably between official racial rhetorics and the actual dilemmas of racial experience and social organization. To list just a few major examples:

- Increasing mobility, both geographic and socio-economic, among subaltern racialized groups, coexists with ongoing patterns of exclusion and superexploitation of these same groups.
- Postcolonial states and national societies display substantial continuities with the ‘bad old days’ of empire, in both political-economic and cultural forms of domination and subordination.
- Post-apartheid South Africa, the post-civil rights US, and postcolonial Europe, perhaps the most significant national/regional stages upon which the postwar racial drama was played, have not significantly altered the ‘life-chances’ of their racially-defined subaltern populations. Similar statements can be made for other nation-states and regions. Although more racially democratic than their despotic earlier incarnations, these countries have by and large incorporated and ‘normalized’ their racial conflicts over the postwar years. Yet in many respects the conditions of blacks, Muslims, indigenous peoples, and undocumented migrants/denizens have also worsened in these settings.
- The extensive deployment of non- or anti-racist rhetorics and policies (multiculturalism, diversity, racial pluralism, equal opportunity, etc.) has not significantly altered long-prevalent patterns of racialized identity-formation and cultural representation.
Increasingly visible and complex transnational racial ties (diasporas, ‘panethnic’ movements and cultural forms, etc.) conflict with and undermine frameworks of citizenship and rights grounded in the logic of the nation-state.

The reassertion of imperial geopolitical patterns, whether tacit or explicit, with embedded racial dynamics intact, casts the United States, still the world’s hegemonic power, in a particularly ambiguous racial role.

This is the present racial crisis. ‘[C]risis,’ Gramsci wrote, ‘consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born: in this interregnum, a great variety of morbid symptoms appear’ (Gramsci 1971, 276). The enormous advances made since WWII in overcoming such entrenched systems of racial despotism as apartheid in South Africa and segregation in the US, and the tremendous accomplishment of dismantling the various colonial archipelagos (British, French, Dutch, Portuguese, etc.), coexist with a system of ongoing racial stratification and injustice that substantially if more ambiguously manages to reproduce most of the conditions that have supposedly been abolished. What this suggests, if nothing else, is that the global racial situation remains volatile and undertheorized.

Although the intellectual endeavour required to rethink global racial conditions obviously exceeds the capacities of any single scholar, the task of framing the key problems presented by the contemporary situation is not beyond our grasp. Indeed, we must not desist from trying to make sense of the current world racial situation and of our role within it. A new account of race and racism is possible, one that addresses the emergent racial conditions of the twenty-first century. We can catch a glimpse of the global racial future by trying to reinterpret the racial present.

The racial present

We confront a contradictory combination of progress and stasis in racial institutions. This is paralleled in social life and personal experience by a similar unstable combination: that of resilience and confidence on the one hand, and disappointment and vulnerability on the other. This situation is intelligible: it is the variegated outcome of a complex process of mobilization and reform. It is the result of a cultural and political-economic shift that has been counterposed, over the post-WWII period, to the centuries-long tradition of racial domination, discrimination, exclusion, and violence that shaped colonialism and empire, and through them the world sociopolitical system tout court. To sort out the innumerable variations of this worldwide set of dilemmas is more than the present article can accomplish. In lieu of that sort of inventory-taking, I propose to devote my attention to a set of five themes in contemporary patterns of racial formation on a world scale. These five issues, I suggest, play a significant part in the making and unmaking of worldwide patterns of race and racism. By grasping the contradictory sociopolitical forces at work in these five thematic areas, we can begin to visualize emerging parameters of the race concept, and to retheorize racism as well, as twenty-first century phenomena.

Nonracialism v. Race Consciousness: The production of racial categories, the classification of people within them, and the quotidian experience of living within such classifications, are all complex processes that link macro-level societal dynamics—censuses, the spatial organization of housing, labour, transport, etc., and social stratification in general—with micro-level ones, such as acculturation and socialization, the ‘testing’ of attitudes and beliefs and risk-taking in everyday life, shifting interpretations of difference and identity, ‘styles’, etc. In the post-WWII era, the postcolonial era, it has been possible to claim that race is less salient than before in determining ‘life-chances’; this is the nonracialist or ‘colourblind’ argument. At the same time social organization continues to function along racial lines; ‘race consciousness’ operates in the allocation of resources, the dynamics of social control, and the organization of movements for equality and social justice. At both the micro-and macro-social levels, in both cultural and political-economic frameworks, race must be signified and organized. On what ground—however shaky and uncertain—do nonracialism and race consciousness meet? US Supreme Court
Justice Harry Blackmun famously said that ‘In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race’ (Blackmun, 1978). The 1955 South Africa Freedom Charter (the key programmatic document of the African National Congress) condemned racialism, but the post-apartheid ANC government must struggle every day with issues of state racial policy (African National Congress, 1979 [1955]). How can we both take account of race and get beyond it, as the present situation seems to demand?6

**Racial Genomics:** Racial science has advanced and retreated in historical ‘waves’. Before the current DNA-based breakthroughs there was the approach of eugenics (Duster, 2003 [1990]). Much as genomics does today, the worldwide eugenics movement also claimed that it was a dispassionate advance over the benightedness of the past. Though particularly dangerous in the hands of right-wing and fascist movements and governments, eugenics also had left-wing and feminist adherents. Tainted by its adoption by Nazism, eugenics ‘retreated’ (Barkan, 1992), but has resurfaced under neoconservative and new right sponsorship in recent decades (Herrnstein and Murray, 1994).

Today’s racial genomics is at pains to distinguish itself from the eugenics of the past. Indeed it has dual effects that would have been unimaginable in the heyday of eugenics: it renders racial identity more fungible and flexible, quite the opposite of what occurred in the era of Fisher, Pearson, or Stoddard. Yet at the same time racial genomics is pressed into service for ‘profiling’; it is harnessed to old and repressive practices (Duster, 2004). Thus it simultaneously reinforces the same stereotypes its advocates profess to debunk. Recognizing the sociohistorical context in which the race-concept developed and in which it has been explained, it seems, does not prevent the periodic recurrence of biologically-based accounts. To what extent is current scientific knowledge about race distinct from previous scientific knowledge?

**The Nation and its Peoples: Citizens, Denizens, Migrants:** In the past, the commonsense view of ‘the nation’ was inflected by race (and to some extent by gender as well). The US, for example, was perceived as ‘a white man’s country’, a herrenvolk republic, as David Roediger (1991) called it. South Africa explicitly institutionalized the herrenvolk model, first piecemeal, and then systematically after 1948. All the European empires struggled to distinguish between metropolitans/citizens and colonials/natives, especially as mixed-race populations expanded, miscegenation became commonplace, and ‘creoles’, ‘kaffirs’, and ‘wogs’ established themselves in London, Paris, Lisbon, Amsterdam, and elsewhere (Stoler 2002). Recurrent nativism was directed against immigrants, while anti-black racism and contempt for indigenous peoples underwrote state racial policy in both colony and metropole.

In the US, for example, Anglo-Saxonism and ‘anglo-conformity’ shaped the national culture in various ways, sometimes relaxing and sometimes tightening the boundaries of membership, but always reflecting restrictive norms. Blacks only became citizens in a practical sense in the 1960s; many Asians only achieved naturalization rights in the 1950s, and native peoples only received their citizenship in the 1920s. Today new nativist rumblings can be heard in the US as the spectre of a ‘majority-minority’ society looms. (‘Doesn’t a declining pool of middle-class manufacturing and service jobs endanger the US economy itself? Where is effective demand supposed to come from? Who will finance baby boomers’ social security outlays?’) The new threat to the norm of whiteness comes, we are told, from the Latinization of certain areas (Huntington, 2004); the west coast is being transformed into ‘Mexifornia’ (Hanson, 2003); and border-oriented vigilantism (the “Minutemen”) receives grudging support from mainstream politicians. Yet California voters have also punished those who promoted anti-immigrant initiatives, and many corporations too oppose heightened restriction. How lawns will be mowed, dishes washed, vegetables picked, or laundry done in a highly restrictive immigration regime remains an unanswered question. Meanwhile, economists differ markedly on the costs and benefits for the American
economy of immigration, both low-and high-skilled, both capital-bearing and capital-deficient.

In Europe as well, citizenship rights were only gradually extended (and even more gradually granted in practice) to immigrants, Jews, and nonwhites. In Germany *jus sanguinis* policies were continued from the formation of the nation, through the Nuremberg Laws and Holocaust, and into the establishment of the EU, when they were finally relaxed (only in the 1990s!). French ‘racial differentialism’ (Taguieff 2001 [1988]) struggles in vain to reconcile the exclusion and despair of the banlieues with the Jacobin/Napoleonic legacies of assimilationism and secularism (Wieviorka 1995; Noiriel 1996; Silverstein 2004). The Front Nationale in France, the German Republikaner, the Austrian FPO, the Belgian Vlaams Blok, the Northern League in Italy, and many ‘mainstream’ parties as well habitually associate racially-designated immigrants with crime and unemployment. In many of the Pacific rim countries, Chinese communities are attacked by nationalists as ‘middleman minorities’ and as agents of globalization, of the neo-imperialism of the IMF and its structural adjustment policies (Chus 2002).

These examples could be multiplied. Most ‘developed’ countries (and not a few LDCs as well) maintain unstable and contentious immigration, citizenship, and naturalization policies.

**Race/Gender/Class:** Race/gender/class ‘intersectionality’ (Crenshaw, 1994; Collins, 1998) is the name we now give to the complex of deep attachments and conflicts among anti-racist/anticolonial movements, women’s movements, and labour-based/anti-poverty movements. In the US (Lerner, 1972; Davis, 1981; Zinn and Dill, 1994; Hine, 2005), in Britain (Rowbotham, 1992; Ware, 1992; McClintock, 1995), in France (Guillaumin, 1995), and elsewhere these linkages have connected struggles for racial justice, women’s rights, and labour rights for nearly two centuries. Today these intersections cross the whole racial spectrum. In postcoloniality approaches, notably in the ‘subaltern studies’ school, feminism has come to play a central role (Spivak, 1987), not only in relation to colonial and postcolonial South Asia, but in regard to Latin America (Beverley, 1999; Franco, 2001) and Africa (Urdang, 1989; Seidman, 1993; Amadiume, 2000).

The explanatory framework for intersectionality studies, however, remains elusive. Unquestionably a general parallel exists between racial and gender-based oppressions and emancipatory claims. De Beauvoir explicitly modelled her pioneering account in feminist theory, *The Second Sex* (1989 [1953]) on working-class and anticolonial struggles for emancipation. The key parallels she stressed, along with many others, included: rule through chattelization, the assignment of political status based on corporeal characteristics, ‘isolation effects’ and alienation, and the internalization of domination. Numerous other common experiences link these axes of power and resistance. Yet race-based, gender-based, and labour-based movements have always teetered between convergence and divergence, both in the US and elsewhere. That’s at the macro-social, institutional level.

At the micro-social or experiential level a similar uncertainty operates: involvement in ‘multiple oppressions’, for example, often forces women of colour to ‘choose their battles’. They confront competing demands for solidarity, often across race-, class- or gender-lines. White women, too, must often choose between gender, race, and class solidarity. Rather than lamenting these dilemmas, we should learn from them about pragmatism and the instability in practice of the race-concept. Theorizing intersectionality requires a hefty dose of pragmatism, a strong recognition that ‘self-reflective action’ shapes the production and transformation of both individual and collective identities.7 This phenomenon—of situatedness and strategic reflection in practice—is not necessarily problematic for emancipatory purposes; it may indeed be unavoidable, a prerequisite, for all efforts (men’s as well as women’s) to create an emancipatory political framework.

**The Trajectory of Empire, Race, and Neoconservatism:** Empire has been a racial matter since the rise of Europe and the founding of the ‘modern world-system’. It involves subduing ‘others’, tutoring them in the ‘higher values’ of advanced ‘civilization’, and also squeezing their resources and/or labour out of them. Though often justified by free-market ideology, this process is basically coercive; indeed some political economic and economic history approaches reject the idea that the extraction of mass labour and the drive for natural resources at the periphery are fundamentally market-based processes at all. This dimension of imperial activity—‘extra-economic coercion’ (Laclau 1977; Mann 1988; Brenner 1993;
Mamdani 1996; Polanyi 2001 [1944];)—is regaining its centrality in the supposedly postcolonial, but perhaps re-imperializing,* twenty-first-century world.

The divestment of the old European empires took place in the decades after WWII, sometimes peacefully and sometimes as a result of bloody conflict. The transition to a postcolonial world was accompanied by a rhetoric of anti-racism, democracy, and self-determination that had roots not only in revolutionary movements but also in Wilsonian principles (Singh, 1998).

The global dismantling of European empire was paralleled by a fierce battle within the US. The connections between civil rights and racial freedom movements, on the one hand, and anticolonial ones on the other, have been extensively studied. But the US, as the leading global power, also defended the European empires during the decades after WWII, notably in Southeast Asia but elsewhere as well. Only after the end of the Vietnam war did that practice come largely to a halt.

This was roughly the same moment that the civil rights movement was being incorporated and institutionalized, a process that was shaped by neoconservatism. That viewpoint took shape in the 1970s as a disillusioned domestic racial liberalism that deplored segregation and redistribution of resources along racial lines in approximately equal measure.

To what extent is current scientific knowledge about race distinct from previous scientific knowledge?

Originally formulated as a set of social scientific and policy-oriented principles, neoconservatism developed into a grassroots racial ideology (‘reverse discrimination’ etc.). Later still it developed an imperial cast, avowing US empire for the first time since the turn of the twentieth century (Kaplan, 2001; Kagan, 2003; Ferguson, 2004). In its advocacy of US intervention in Iraq, neoconservatism drew both on the civil rights legacy and on the older imperial presuppositions: of tutelage, uplift, religious messianism, etc. These ‘others’ have waited too long for liberation; the US has an obligation to help them understand the ways of democracy and freedom; we must, in short, promote our ‘way of life’ and ‘enlighten’ our subjects abroad. Empire tends to have a racial subtext.

In university classrooms in the US today many of our students (especially but not only white students) tell us that they ‘don’t notice race’, and that they ‘treat everyone as an individual’.

Their rejection of racism is no doubt genuine in its adoption of ‘colourblindness’ or nonracialism; but it also tends to ratify the existing inequalities and injustices that descend from the ‘bad old days’ of segregation. These positions reflect the dominant racial ideology in the US—neoconservatism—a view that seems more concerned with ‘reverse discrimination’ than with unchanged black and Latino poverty rates, infant mortality, or heightening, not declining, racial stratification (Oliver and Shapiro 1995). Thus domestic neoconservatism both undermines an older, more familiar racial mindset and reinvokes it.

In respect to Iraq and the ‘war on terror’, US foreign policy operates in parallel fashion, once again reflecting the contradictions of neoconservatism. ‘Welcome to Injun country’, Robert Kaplan (2005) quotes US officers telling him in Iraq. Leading US foreign policy intellectuals have spilt a great deal of ink on the theme of ‘getting used to the American empire’. An effort is made to distinguish the US approach to ‘projecting power’ from that of the British or French a century ago. Unlike our predecessors, we bring democracy and freedom. But is the US (and its allies the British) not committed to its ‘great game’ in the Middle East every bit as much as were the British a century ago (Meyer and Brysac, 1999)?
In short—to lapse into Bourdieu-ese for just a moment—
neoconservatism today combines a habitus of domination over
the racialized other with a doxa of incorporation and respect for
those who are no longer formally recognized as other at all.9
And from the standpoint of those others—who are in practice
still racially identified—there is a combination of responses as
well: as we have already noted, not only a new resilience, but
also a continuing vulnerability. It is the height of perversity that
the civil rights legacy has been harnessed to the cause of global
domination and ‘pre-emptive’ war, but the fact remains that
some of its key tropes have been preserved by the neocons
who once represented its ‘moderate’ wing.10

Towards the racial future
These contradictions are indications of the uncertainties of the current moment in
racial politics. The necessarily brief review
presented here suggests that a new racial
hegemony has by no means been secured.
There are fundamental instabilities in the
ideologies of colourblindness, racial
‘differentialism’, and ‘nonracialism’. Racial
biologism is prospering; is it still a ‘backdoor
to eugenics’ (Duster 2003, [1990])? Race/
gender/class ‘intersectionality’ denotes the
instability in practice—both at ‘micro-social’
and at ‘macro-social’ levels—not only of race
and racism, but also of other axes of
oppression. The link between racism and
empire was wrongly considered terminated;
instead it has been reinvented, principally
through US neoconservatism. In fact none
of the ‘posts’—post-civil rights, post-apartheid,
post-coloniality—is sufficiently ‘post’; none denotes a full break
with the conditions their very names contain; all necessitate
uneasy and continuous adjustments, both on the level of policy
and politics, and on that of personal experience and identity,
to the ongoing operation of racial conflicts.

So what is the meaning of these racial contradictions for
the future? What do they suggest about the development of
a new racial justice agenda, both globally and locally? Although
the intellectual endeavour required to rethink global racial
conditions is rather daunting, the political and personal
commitments we ‘movement scholars’ have undertaken do
not permit us to desist from trying to make sense of the current
world racial situation and of our role within it. Neither do they
allow us to ‘stop thinking about tomorrow’, as the popular song
would have it.

Simply reasserting the continuing significance of race, while
not mistaken, nevertheless has serious limits. Such an approach
is insufficiently pragmatist, as well as deficient in its democratic
commitments. As we learn from racial formation theory and
critical race theory, race is a flexible concept that is constantly
being reshaped in practical political activity. That the civil
rights movement and the racial nationalisms of the 1960s
were absorbed and rearticulated in a new racial hegemony
was not only a contradictory outcome, one
that combined some real achievements with
some painful defeats; it was also a valuable
lesson about racial politics.

Question: what happened to the civil rights
movement ideal of a colourblind society?
Answer: it morphed under the pressure of
neoconservative politics into an abstract
concept of equality, becoming available to
the respectable racial right. Ironic, isn’t it—
downright annoying in fact—that the
rearticulation of ‘colourblind’ racial
ideology served to shore up the inequality
and structural racism of US society. This
was after all the same phenomenon that
movement advocacy of nonracialism
had originally aimed at overturning!

Similar pitfalls awaited ‘nationalist’
concepts of racial emancipation. Originally
developed under conditions of colonial (or quasi-colonial)
rule as the effort to restore democracy and ‘self-determination’,
nationalist movements have proved susceptible to autocracy
and caudillismo of various types: plagued by corruption,
religious authoritarianism, and sexism, dependent upon
charismatic leaders, they are often incapable of fulfilling in
practice the democratic and emancipatory ideals that
originally inspired them (Gilroy, 2000).

Such is post-civil rights, postcolonial, post-apartheid racial
hegemony. But is that the end of the story? Is this the end of
the trajectory of racial politics? After the emancipatory insights
of a movement have been absorbed and reinterpreted, after its
radicalism has been so to speak bleached away, then what
happens? What happens to a dream deferred?
By way of answer—for space here is limited—it is worth noting how unstable and problematic the ideas of colourblindness, nonracialism, differentialism, and postcolonialism are proving to be. Of course there is a significant movement critique of these supposedly post-racial positions, one that insists on the fulfilment of the still-incomplete agenda of the earlier post-WWII decades; demonstrates the continuity and depth of US racial injustice (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Brown et al., 2003); and notes the links between globalization and racism (Macedo and Panayota, 2005). But this critique, for all its merits, has not yet developed a theoretical account capable of resolving the various contradictions of twenty-first-century racial dynamics—nonracialism, intersectionality, etc.—that are the central subjects here.

Meanwhile, back at the plantation, twenty-first-century racial hegemony has not been secured. Once again ironically, its major challenges originate, not from the critiques just mentioned, and not from the anti-racist left or from civil rights advocates or racial nationalists based in the global South or global East. Rather they have emerged from the ongoing instabilities and conflicts of racial rule itself. Taking the US (the world’s only ‘superpower’) as a central case: the post-civil rights US racial regime must frequently negate its own insistence on colourblindness. This regime apparently cannot dispense with its practice of ‘racial profiling’: not only for reasons of national security but also in carceral, policing, and welfare state practices. It has made substantial investments in racial genomics, which is now a big scientific enterprise as well as a developing system for social control. Driven by paranoia about immigration, the US is reviving nativist practices on the Mexican border and in the Pacific.

Not only because it has failed to fulfil the promise of racial equality and justice, but also because it defaults, so to speak, to racial rule as a key component of hegemonic rule, the contemporary US regime must violate its own racial norms, themselves the products of post-WWII civil rights and anti-imperial political struggles.

What does the foregoing analysis suggest about twenty-first-century movement politics oriented towards fomenting racial justice and expanding democracy? Instead of insisting on the fulfilment of twentieth-century demands, movement activists and theorists have to pose new questions about the actually existing and deeply conflicted dynamics of racial politics and racial identity; in short, we have to think about racial formation processes as they are unfolding today and in the future. Here I briefly (and artificially) distinguish the experiential dimensions of racial politics (micro-level raciosity, the personal or small-scale aspects of racial formation) from the social structural dimensions of racial politics (macro-level raciosity, the institutional, governmental, and world-systemic aspects of racial formation).11

At the micro-social, experiential level, we all experience race in a contradictory fashion. We must recognize once again, a century after DuBois introduced it (1989 [1903]), the importance of ‘double consciousness’. His exploration of that contradiction in Souls (‘An American, a Negro: two warring souls in one dark body . . .’) points more than ever to the situated and flexible character of raciosity as a practical matter. It applies to everybody, not just blacks, albeit in varying ways. This duality or even multiplicity is what shapes our racial identities really, not some ideal of a nonracialist world or of an undifferentiated, racially-defined group solidarity. Life is more complicated than that.

In the racial future, I venture to predict... the global racial crisis will intensify, not diminish.

We know both that in the US—and across the whole planet—race continues to matter, that it shapes identities and ‘life-chances’; and that racially-based identity can be problematic, uncertain, or overridden by other forms of solidarity. Racial identity can be called into question by mixed-race status, by strong ties that cut across racial lines, or by multiple identities (for example, racial and class-based identities can conflict). In real life-experience we are often forced to ‘choose our battles’ or make distasteful tactical alliances; we are sometimes uncertain what the racial meaning of a given situation or utterance might be (‘Was that a racist remark, or not?’).

At the social structural level, the macro-social level, we must recognize again, a century after DuBois, that we still live in an unfolding racial history, in which racial dynamics are linked to the struggle for democracy, for a socially just distribution of resources, and for the overcoming, if not of capitalism itself, at least of the wretched, cruel, and despotic excesses of capitalism. Racism is a variety of despotism. When we contemplate race and racism as global or national social structures, we are immediately struck by the extent to which they still stratify national societies and the social world as a whole. Yet we cannot operate effectively, we cannot think effectively, if we deny the significance of the racial transformations of recent decades.
If it is true that both at the ‘micro-social’ and at the ‘macro-social’ levels racial experience is now more patently contradictory than it was in earlier historical moments, this should be considered more as an opportunity than as a dilemma: a chance to develop new forms of political practice, and new theoretical insights as well, in pursuit of racial justice and racial democracy. Although the scope of this argument obviously exceeds the space presently available, in my view we must embrace and build upon pragmatist sources to help us realize this opportunity to advance a new racial theory for the twenty-first century. Pragmatist racial theory comes to us through DuBois, whose concepts of ‘double consciousness’ and of the ‘veil’ laid the foundation for an understanding of race that is radically democratic. From the standpoint of the radical pragmatist account of ‘double consciousness’, we can begin to grasp the improvisational and self-reflective processes that racial awareness demands in the post-civil rights, post-apartheid, postcolonial era. From a radical pragmatist position we can better understand the heightened flexibility required of the racially oppressed and their allies as they conduct their freedom struggles in that ‘post-’ era. To be sure the pragmatist tradition has tended to emphasize the micro-social dimensions of action, which has been a limitation. Nor are pragmatist approaches uniformly liberatory; pragmatist principles are also invoked by such conservative thinkers as Richard Posner (2005). But as I have argued elsewhere (Winant, 2004, 188-204), promising radical pragmatist approaches to race are available; they are concerned with linking the micro-social and macro-social dimensions of race; and they are being applied to such issues as the racial state, race-based social movements, and the racial dynamics of globalization.

Thus we are compelled to ask, what would a racial justice-oriented set of policies, what would a racial justice-oriented political programme, look like in the twenty-first century? Let us not dismiss that as a rhetorical question, but instead attempt to respond from a radical pragmatist viewpoint, one that takes its commitments seriously. Clearly such a programme would require redistribution of wealth/income nationally and globally via democratically selected means. This might take various forms: a ‘global Marshall Plan’ has been suggested (Rademacher et al, 2004), the ‘Tobin tax’ scheme continues to attract attention (ul Haq, Kaul, and Grunberg, 1996; Patom ki, 2003), and various reparation initiatives have been proposed (Yamamoto, 1999; Feagin, 2000; Thompson, 2002; Bittker, 2003 [1973]).

‘Now hold on a moment!’ I hear my readers cry. ‘Is all that stuff race-based? You’re talking about big global issues!’

Perfectly true, but as a few moments’ reflection will confirm, most of the ‘big global issues’ (as well as the big national ones) have significant racial dimensions. That is a logical consequence of global development in our postcolonial, post-Cold War epoch, which takes clear North-South (and now West-East) forms.

Continuing to take race and racism seriously is particularly logical in the aftermath of the vast wave of racial conflict and racial reform that succeeded WWII. That set of conflicts linked ‘southern’ anticolonial and ‘northern’ anti-racism very clearly. Thus, as the racial state has incorporated the demands of anti-apartheid, anti-Jim Crow, and anticolonial movements—in suitably ‘moderate’ form of course—it has become a more difficult target for racial justice movements.

Put another way, while movement activity on behalf of racial justice and racial equality must continue to address its demands towards the nation-state, it must also shift attention, as movements have frequently done in the past, away from the framework of the national and towards both local and transnational spheres of mobilization.

The racial future remains uncertain. The concept of race and the social practices we designate as racism and anti-racism are in transition, for we are passing through a period of crisis when ‘the old has died but the new cannot be born’. Today these conditions demand that we clarify the circumstances under
which contested concepts of race, racially-based social structures, and race-based identities continue to operate. Yes, the accomplishments of the post-WWII movements for racial justice and the end of colonial rule were significant; yes, the reforms achieved and revolutions carried through changed the global racial system. But these accomplishments, for all their importance, also had the perverse effect of reinforcing some of the very institutions they sought to overcome, of inoculating them, so to speak, with tolerable doses of their own oppositions, and thus immunizing them against the more severe ‘diseases’ of radical change. Hegemony operates, Gramsci said, by incorporating resistance.

The analysis presented here recognizes the pervasive contradictions and uncertainties of the post-civil rights and postcolonial era. This is fully consistent with noticing the ongoing social injustices and ‘human waste’ that remain at the core of the race-concept, and of racism as well, in all their forms: attitudinal, practical, and structural.

In the racial future, I venture to predict, there will be a combination of greater flexibility in the understanding of racial identity on the one hand, and a deepening structural racism on the other. That is to say: the global racial crisis will intensify, not diminish. The trend towards heightening disparities in ‘life-chances’ by race, towards increasing racial stratification on a planetary scale, is in large part congruent with general global tendencies towards mounting inequality. People around the world, and ordinary Americans as well, cannot long escape these troubling contradictions. In different ways, DuBois’s ‘double consciousness’ now divides us all. This is itself both a great achievement and an injunction: to look deeper into our disciplines, our social institutions, our political activity, and ourselves.

Notes
1. Race is concept which signifies and symbolizes sociopolitical conflicts and interests in reference to different types of human bodies. Although the concept of race appeals to biologically-based human characteristics (so-called phenotypes), selection of these particular human features for purposes of racial signification is always and necessarily a social and historical process. There is no biological basis for distinguishing human groups along the lines of ‘race’, and the sociohistorical categories employed to differentiate among these groups reveal themselves, upon serious examination, to be imprecise if not completely arbitrary.

2. Racism consists of one or more of the following: (1) Signifying practice that essentializes or naturalizes human identities based on racial categories or concepts; (2) Social action that produces unjust allocation of socially valued resources, based on such significations; (3) Social structure that reproduces such allocations.

3. For more on the global racial ‘break’ that took place during and after WWII, see Winant 2001.

4. For some examples of such inventories, see Gurr et al 1993; Gurr and Harff 1994; Chaliand and Rageau 1995.

5. As I have written elsewhere, the micro-macro distinction is merely analytical as it applies to racial formation; see Winant 2004, 200-202.

6. See the discussion of DuBoisian ‘double consciousness’ below.

7. This argument, which receives greater attention below, applies as well to other axes of oppression and resistance, quite obviously. Here I confine myself mainly to discussion about race.

8. Forgive this neologism: I refer to the resurgent imperial character of North-South (and to some extent West-East) international relationships and organizations such as the IMF and the WTO.


10. ‘We should never indulge in the condescending voices that allege that some people are not interested in freedom or aren’t ready for freedom’s responsibility. That view was wrong in Birmingham, and it’s wrong in 2004 in Baghdad’ (Condoleezza Rice, Commencement Speech, Vanderbilt University, May 13, 2004).

11. See note 3, above, in respect to the micro-macro distinction in ‘levels’ of racial formation.

12. I am thinking here of Mead’s (1967 [1934]) concept of self, and of the performative dimensions of identity in Blumer’s (1969) work and its legacy, as well as in the ouevre of Erving Goffman.

13. Radical pragmatist approaches to racial theory are finally receiving the serious attention they deserve. Much of the credit for this advance belongs to Cornel West, whose early work on this theme (1989) remains indispensable. See also West and Mendieta 2004. Herbert Blumer’s later work on race is indispensable; see his classic article of 1958; see also Blumer and Duster 1980. Fraser’s (1998) work on Alain Locke should also be noted.

14. Reparations and redistribution projects have much to recommend them, but also must be approached with caution. Race/class intersectionality comes into play here; in other words, who pays for them counts as much as who benefits by them. Unless they can be structured as transfers not only from the racially privileged to the racially subaltern, but also as transfers from capital to labor, they will have the effect (intended or unintended) of heightening class divisions even as they reduce racial ones. As a general rule, reparations should be funded by wealth taxes rather than by transfers from general funds. See Winant 2004, 126.

15. The US civil rights movement did this quite consciously, shifting its political leverage from the state level, where segmentationism and ‘state’s rights’ arguments held greater sway, toward the US nation-state, where such matters as Cold War imperatives, northern voting and labor patterns, and liberal cultural norms were in play. Today, with the federal state under the control of reactionary and anti-democratic groups, we see movement activity emphasizing local and state-based political venues.

References
In 1978, Justice Harry A. Blackmun, in Regents of the University of California vs. Bakke, stated, “In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way.” And in the 2007 case, Parents Involved in Community Schools vs. Seattle School District No. 1, Chief Justice John G. Roberts concluded that “the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.”

In both cases, there is a clear acknowledgement that racism exists and that it affects us all negatively, and that we must act. Consequently, I disagree with U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder who in a speech commemorating Black History Month in 2009 referred to us as a ‘nation of cowards’ when it comes to talking ‘about things racial.’ The rhetoric of race and racism is exactly what we excel at, it’s the action where we are a nation of cowards.

It appears to me that we have two options at this point:

Option One: Continue to refine or redefine behaviors, opinions, and attitudes as variations or manifestations of racism. Option one refers to a new racism-racism without racists, i.e., aversive racism. This new racism is unconscious and is the result of socialization. The so-called “Bradley effect” may be an example of these forms of racism, or is this new racism what Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2002) calls simply the linguistics of color-blind racism (See writings by Phillip Atiba Goff, and John Dovidio).

Option Two: Agree that we have adequately defined the social problem called racism—that, in fact, enough evidence has been gathered, enough causes have been identified, and take the next step to evaluate policies and practices and develop solutions to address the undesirable condition in our society called racism. Option two forces us to act—do something—beginning with institutional change; including policies and practices.

So where are the evaluative surveys and polls on institutional policies and practices that continue to protect and perpetuate racism? For example, what are the implications for health care, education, corrections, and the private sector if we begin to evaluate and modify or change policies and practices, one social institution at a time, to address racism in our society?

What we should be addressing is not whether racism affects us since we already know the answer to this inquiry. Now the challenge is who has the courage to make the next move forward.
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