Handbook of the Sociology of Racial and Ethnic Relations

Edited by

Hernán Vera

Department of Sociology
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL

Joe R. Feagin

Department of Sociology
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX

Hernán Vera
Department of Sociology
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL
hvera@ufl.edu

Joe R. Feagin
Department of Sociology
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
feagin@tamu.edu

Printed on acid-free paper.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Ruth K. Miller Thompson, Department of Sociology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

Amanda Moras, Department of Sociology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Jennifer Mueller, Department of Sociology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

Eileen O'Brien, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA

Rogelio Saenz, Department of Sociology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

Constance Shehan, Department of Sociology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, NC

Gideon Sjoberg, Department of Sociology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX

Roberta Spalter-Roth, American Sociological Association, Washington, DC

Yanick St. Jean, Department of Ethnic Studies, University of Wisconsin–Parkside, Kenosha, WI

Hernán Vera, Department of Sociology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Lynn Weber, Women's Studies Program, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

David Wellman, Department of Community Studies, University of California–Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA *and* Institute for the Study of Social Change, University of California–Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

Table of Contents

Acting for a Good Society: Racism and Black Liberation in the *Longue Durée*

Rod Bush

While social scientists have played an exemplary role in changing the tenor of the scholarly and public discourse on race, I would like to focus in this chapter on the issues of structure and agency in the formation of racial and ethnic categories and identity. While oppressed groups are categorized in an invidious manner by the more privileged, for the more privileged such invidious distinctions are central in reinforcing their dominance in society. So in this account I will focus both on how oppressed groups form their own sense of racial or ethnic identity and reflect upon and act upon the corresponding issues of racial oppression or ethnic stratification, and on how privileged groups align around the issues of race, racialization, racism, and liberation. I will focus on the issue of white versus Blacks in this essay not because I believe in the essentialism of such a binary, but because of the central role that this opposition has played in the elaboration of the concept of race, first within British North America and later throughout the capitalist world-economy under European hegemony.

In the United States public awareness of race as a societal issue was heightened by the civil rights movement. But if you ask the question, "When was the civil rights movement?" most people, including many scholars, would say it started with the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the murder of Emmett Till, or Brown versus Board of Education, all in the mid-1950s. Recent scholarship on the civil rights movement, however, has increasingly articulated the concept of a "Long Civil Rights Movement," traced back to the 1940s. I would like to view the elaboration of a racial order and of agency among people of African descent in the United States within what Immanuel Wallerstein refers to as historical capitalism or what Fernand Braudel refers to as the *Longue Durée*.

The period of easy expansion of the world-economy after World War II enhanced the bargaining power of the working classes throughout the core zones of the world-economy, ultimately giving rise to a new social compact within the pan-European world, the social democratic welfare state.[1] It is in this context that in the United States a New Deal political

---

[1] Radicals have often referred to this phenomenon as the social democratic compromise to distinguish it from the conquest of power by the working class envisioned by Marx and Engels and those who operate in that tradition.

coalition gained control of the federal government and initiated social policies based on the idea of collective responsibility for the common good. The coincidence of this period of economic expansion with the rise of the United States to a hegemonic position in the world-economy (coined the "American Century" by *Time Magazine* magnate, Henry Luce) and the political competition between the United States and the Soviet Union would create a political opening for people of color to advance up the economic ladder, which was actively engaged by the civil rights movement and its allied movements. The shift (circa 1967–1973) from the expansion phase to the stagnation phase of this long economic cycle undermined the largesse of the global liberalism of that time. But the attempt of the nation to finally incorporate its Black residents into the nation's mainstream is a story that relates to a much larger arc of time with which we must be concerned, a temporality that we might understand not simply in terms of slavery but of what Wallerstein refers to as the "pan-European project of world domination (the expansion of Europe)" (Wallerstein 2000).

The resurrection of the language of the second reconstruction by a number of authors (Bush 2004, Marable 1985, Kousser 1999) helps focus our conceptual tools on the possibilities contained in Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s challenge to the nation in 1963 that we live out the true meaning of our creed, the so-called fulfillment of the American Dream. Later Dr. King began to see the limits of the American Dream, moving him closer to Malcolm X's position. Malcolm X argued that he did not see an American Dream but an American nightmare, and given the increasing power of the Bandung World during this time, he thought that we had arrived at the end of white world supremacy. But the fact that the advent of the Bandung World did not spell the end of white world supremacy, as seemed to be the case at that time, does not diminish the significance of the crisis of white world supremacy.[2] Malcolm X did not invent the concept of the rise of the dark world. It has long been a part of the conceptual apparatus of the intellectuals and activists of the dark world.

The Working Group on Coloniality at the State University of New York at Binghamton (aka Binghamton University) have argued that the modern-capitalist world that has unfolded for the last 500 to 700 years has had as a fundamental element processes of racial formation and domination that have been central to its expansion and organization. These processes have been the focus of social movements who have organized against the multiple forms of this global structure of racial formation/domination. Anibal Quijano has argued that what is now called globalization is the culmination of a process that began with the constitution of the Americas and "colonial/modern Eurocentered capitalism," a process fundamentally anchored in the establishment of a system of social distinction among the world's population based on the "idea of race." (Quijano 2000:533). In Quijano's view the use of racial categories originated in Anglo-America where "so-called Blacks were not only the most important exploited groups" due to their central role in the economy of the time, "they were, above all, the most important colonized race, since Indians were not a part of that colonial society" (Quijano 2000:534). With the expansion of European colonialism to the rest of the world, this pattern

---

[2] Anyone who listened to Malcolm X speaking about the end of white world supremacy during the 1960s would have found his arguments absolutely compelling. The relevant speeches are collected in a volume entitled *The End of White World Supremacy: Four Speeches,* New York: Merlin Press, 1971. See also my forthcoming *The End of White World Supremacy: Black Internationalism and the Problem of the Color Line,* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2007. But people of color are not the only ones who have been preoccupied by the rise of the dark world as can clearly be seen by reading of the classics of white supremacist literature by Lothrop Stoddard (1921), entitled *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy*; and Madison Grant (1920), *The Passing of the Great Race,* both of which are reviewed in the first chapter of my book.

expanded to the rest of the world along with the elaboration of a Eurocentric perspective of knowledge, and the use of race to naturalize the colonial relation between Europeans and non-Europeans. The use of race as the means of justifying the distribution of the world population into ranks, places, and roles in the world's structure of power outlasted the system of formal colonialism.

I would like to survey articulations of the world-systems perspective and the coloniality of power perspective as frameworks for understanding racism as an ideology and structure of oppression, the project of agents (social groups) seeking to protect what they perceive to be their own interests. I would like to take seriously Kelvin Santiago-Valles' admonition that we need to draw on and think through subaltern theorizing in order to pursue theoretically informed historical research as part of contributing to emancipatory struggles. He thus calls for reconstructing both sides of long-term structures constitutive of racial capitalism. This calls for identifying the connections and contradictions between the different moments of capital accumulation and the thousands of assorted facts and everyday details of discursive practices. He follows Sylvia Wynter's lead to an examination of sexually racialized forms that regulate socio-systemic hierarchies such as class and gender in the modern capitalist world order. The principle expressions of these forms for Santiago-Valles are

> racial infantilisation (unruliness, irrationality, the requiring of guidance, supervision, and protection) and /or feminised racialization (the beast within, absence of reason, primordial innocence and heathen influences). While these operations do not reign uncontested, they are vital to the social construction of all subordinate groups, especially the working classes of the "lesser races." (Santiago-Valles 2005:60).

If the expansion of a European-based world-economy relied in part on the social glue of pan-European racism and white supremacy as moral justification for and defense of Euro-North American world hegemony, the path to freedom for oppressed populations could only go forward by constructing alternative visions and strategies. The "rise of the dark world" has been a central theme of African American social thought. Since Blacks constituted a numerical minority relegated to second-class citizenship within U.S. society, there was little hope of a strictly "national" solution, giving rise to the peculiar philosophy of Black internationalism. While many know that at the turn of the 20th century W.E.B. Du Bois said that the problem of the 20th century would be the problem of the color line, far fewer know that he made this statement at the first Pan-African Congress, and fewer still put this together with subsequent events: the emergence of the New Negro Movement, the rise of the Garvey movement, and African American involvement in the world socialist movement.

During the evolution of social movements and national movements in the era of proletarian insurgency of which the Bolshevik revolution was a part, Black internationalists impressed upon the Third International the need to elevate the "Negro Problem" in the United States to a central position in the strategy of the International revolutionary movement and in the strategy of U.S. revolutionaries. Comintern leaders asked the representatives of the Communist Party of the United States, if Blacks were the most oppressed people in the United States, why did they not constitute a majority of the American party? While under pressure from the international body, the CPUSA attempted to rectify the Left's historical neglect of the Negro problem, it was the Black Left who continued to push for the full unfolding of the needed strategy. Some have conceptualized the work of this non-sectarian gathering of the 1930s and 1940s as a Black Popular Front. Among this grouping are familiar names such as W.E.B. Du Bois, Richard Wright, Paul Robeson, C.L.R. James, George Padmore, Ralph Ellison, Angelo Herndon, Claudia Jones, and E. Franklin Frazier. During the 1940s the Black

Popular Front articulated a position holding that the strategic goal of U.S. Blacks should be the struggle for human rights, a struggle against domestic racism, imperialism, and capitalism. The defeat of the broad allied forces within the popular front (finally in the Henry Wallace presidential campaign of 1948) made way for the imperialist project dubbed "The American Century" by Henry Luce of *Time Magazine.* The centrist liberals within the NAACP formed an alliance with the Truman Administration to help with the defeat of the agenda of the Black Popular Front, which was the most radical and vibrant part of the broader popular front, and closely connected to the Black public sphere.[3] The defeat of the Black Popular Front allowed for a disconnect with the past such that the civil rights movement that emerged in the next decade could be framed simply as a struggle for assimilation and acceptance into American society, a much narrower and less critical framework than that assumed by the Black Popular Front. But the radical impulse inherent in this movement could not be long suppressed.

The final outcome of the two world wars is that the United States emerged from World War II as the most powerful state in the world-system, the hegemonic power, which, by definition, had no serious rival. The major opposition to the exercise of U.S. power came from the Soviet Union, a strong military power and ideological rival that stood at the head of a system of allied states known as the Socialist Camp. The oppositional status of the Soviet Union stemmed from its position at the forefront of the world's working classes and oppressed peoples. While this spectre of communism was always more a potential than a reality, the internationalist working-class ideology binding the USSR to a segment of the core zone working classes, Left wing movements, and anticolonial militants was not a situation about which the core zone ruling classes could be sanguine. The requirements of currying favor with the nations and peoples of this dark periphery and maintaining its status as the world's leading advocate of democracy meant that the United States had to demonstrate to the world that it was an open society for all those within its borders, requiring a serious engagement with the issue of domestic racism.

Hegemonic status was defined in part by the concentration of world economic remuneration within U.S. borders. Thus the postwar expansion of the capitalist world-economy which created opportunities for the working classes of the core states to enter into a social democratic compromise (sought precisely against any threat of class war) with their ruling classes applied most of all to the white working class of the United States, which derived enormous benefits from the New Deal. The contingencies of cold war competition in the midst of the most powerful expansion of the world-economy in its history created conditions within which a *limited engagement* with the civil rights movement became a part of U.S. hegemony in the same way as the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress.

But the mobilization of millions of Blacks and their allies in support of civil rights, and of hundreds of thousands organized in or sympathetic to Black Nationalist organizations such as the Nation of Islam during the Malcolm X period, forced the pace of change. When urban rebellions seemed to be the rule rather than the exception in post-1965 Black America, the economic and political elite called for the maximum feasible inclusion of Blacks in U.S. society. But the genie was now out of the bottle, or so it seemed. In response to the insurgencies within Black communities, the social movements operating within these communities became more radical in their outlook. The forces of liberation within the Black community reconnected with forces of liberation outside the Black community and indeed outside the United States.

---

[3] For a discussion of the Black Popular Front, see Von Eschen (1997), Singh (2004), and Biondi (2003).

Black Power became a hegemonic force within the Black Freedom Struggle and influenced movements of other oppressed groups throughout U.S. society and beyond. Ordinary Black folk accelerated the pace of their rebellion against the racial status quo at the sane time that the United States was confronted with the rebellion of oppressed people in Vietnam, Algeria, Cuba, and other locations and the beginnings of an economic squeeze that promised to end the era of easy accumulation that followed the second world war. Since the mature global liberalism of the post-war world could not continue in these circumstances to maintain a stable social order, and a modicum of control over subordinate strata, the trajectory toward social democratization was sharply curtailed, and a counterinsurgency regime came to power to rein in what Samuel Huntington referred to as "an excess of democracy" (Crozier et al. 1975:113).

The shift away from the global liberalism of the era of U.S. hegemony began with the mobilization of a counterestablishment by conservatives who had been badly beaten in the 1964 presidential election when Lyndon Baines Johnson won in a landslide against Barry Goldwater. But the fact that Republicans won the five deep South states for the first time by couching their opposition to civil rights in non-racial language taught them that they could use a "Southern Strategy" to mobilize the resentment of Southern segregationists and many whites outside the South in a campaign that used coded language (such as "law and order" and "states rights") to signal an opposition to the incursion of lower-status Blacks and other "minorities" into the social ranks which were supposed to distinguish them from these groups (Bush 2004).

While the Nixon administration continued to adhere to some of the principles of the New Deal, by the 1980s the Thatcher/Reagan tandem had dramatically changed the course of the core states. Reaganomics lead to a policy of disinvestment and withdrawal of the state in the inner-city areas where Blacks and Latinos resided. This devastated these areas as the conservative forces used the ensuing reactions of residents of the inner city to this devastation (dramatic increases in participation in the informal economy and reliance on public benefits) as a justification for their policies of disinvestment and the withdrawal of the state in favor of supply-side remedies (code for the transfer of resources to wealthy property holders). At the same time they used this as a strategy to mobilize the more privileged sectors of the population (especially whites) who resented the incursion into their privileged status by these dishonored groups. The line of argument was why should those (read whites), who had played by the rules, be penalized to benefit the lazy and criminally inclined (read Blacks and Latinos), who did not want to play by the rules, but to obtain handouts in the form of affirmative action, public relief, etc.?

The demonization of young Blacks in the public discourse led almost inexorably to the elaboration of a counterhegemonic discourse among Blacks that emphasized the assertion of identity politics against the insulting rhetoric against them in the public discourse. The Left (including much of the Black Left) railed against "identity politics" as a mystification of oppression, an essentialist obscuring of the deeper structural roots of racial oppression. The centrist elements in the Black Power movement who had not been widely targeted in the counterinsurgency against the Black Power movement of the late 1960s and 1970s had largely relied on a strategy that emphasized identity and pride more than the need for overall structural change in the society. They were in the best position to lead the movement that emerged in the 1980s. Minister Louis Farrakhan and Reverend Jesse Jackson were the best-known leaders of that genre who came to the fore in the 1980s.

Farrakhan had benefited from the boost that he got from being an alternative to Malcolm X's revolutionary nationalism, and later to Jesse Jackson's call for a Rainbow Coalition (a much tamer version of the Rainbow Coalition initiated by Black Panther Party leader

Fred Hampton, but nonetheless viewed as dangerous by centrist political officials). Farrakhan, like Jackson, was skilled in oratory, but his sharp rhetoric had greater resonance with Black youth, who were held in utter contempt by much of the white public. Jackson admonished them to "keep hope alive"; Farrakhan argued that the white man's system offered no hope, that they had to "do for self."

Even Huey Newton had indicated that he had some difficulty contending with cultural nationalists and religious nationalists despite his undisputed claim on the honor of the Black Street. While it seems obvious to me that Malcolm X got it right, Left Black Nationalism has not done as well as would have been predicted by our sociological concepts, wherein the concepts of Weber and Marx could explain the power of a working-class nationalism based in the most excluded parts of the working class, as the Comintern projected in the 1920s.

Has Marxism been a mixed blessing for African American social movements? From the time of W.E.B. Du Bois, Hubert Harrison, Cyril Briggs, Claude McKay and others, Marxism has enlarged the analytic capability of Black intellectuals. But despite the very careful attention that Marxism gives to building mass movements, and to locating the power of transcendence in the working classes of oppressed groups, the Black Left has consistently been sidelined in the competition with centrist Black leaders who either curtailed their strategies to the parameters of what is approved by the white power structure, or effectively used rhetorical militance to engage the Black masses with no ambition beyond the framework of the capitalist organization of society.

While Du Bois' critique of the problem of the color line in the *Souls of Black Folk* reflected the misguided optimism of the movement of that time, the New Negro Movement that emerged during the period of the first great migration and the Great War posed an uncompromising challenge to white supremacy. Hubert Harrison, often called the father of Harlem radicalism, clearly articulates the orientation of this group:

> The Nineteenth Christian Century saw the international expansion of capitalism—the economic system of the white peoples of Western Europe and America—and its establishment by force and fraud over the lands of the colored races, black, brown, and yellow. The opening years of the Twentieth Century present us with the sorry spectacle of those same white nations cutting each other's throats to determine which of them shall enjoy the property which has been acquired. For this is the real sum and substance of the original "war aims" of the belligerents; although in conformity with Christian cunning, this is one which is never frankly avowed. Instead we are fed with the information that they are fighting for "Kultur" and "on behalf of small nationalities." (Harrison 1918, subsequently published in *When Africa Awakes,* 1920:116)

Clifton Hawkins (2000) dates Harrison's conversion to the Race First position to his experiences within the Socialist Party and the white Left milieu of that time. These experiences, Hawkins argues, disillusioned Harrison with cross-race organizing not only because of the pervasive racism of whites, but also because of the defensive race consciousness of Blacks. Hawkins quotes Harrison as follows:

> "Behind the color line," Harrison sadly acknowledged, "one has to think perpetually of the color line, and most of those who grow up behind it can think of nothing else . . ." *Race, not class, was the organizing principle of American life"* [emphasis added]. (Hawkins 2000:51)

By 1916, Hawkins argues, Harrison embraced the *American* [my emphasis] doctrine of Race First (Hawkins 2000:51). This is clearly a defensive position, but it has been a consistent position among a substantial section of the Black radical intelligentsia and among much of the Black working class, in opposition to the class first position articulated by a smaller segment of the New Negro Movement lodged mainly in the Messenger Group and associated with the

U.S. Socialist Party. The Race First radicals were the backbone of the Garvey Movement and operated within a larger intersection between the New Negro Movement and other segments of U.S. and world society, very notably with advocates of world revolution in the Third or Communist International.

Recent literature about the New Negro Movement (James 1998, Makalani 2004) and their relationship with the World Left provides us with an important entrée in rethinking the race-class question as an issue not only of theory but of praxis. The Race First trend within the New Negro Movement identified something very fundamental about the social reality (not nature) of the United States and about the capitalist world-economy that I have previously identified with the works of Anibal Quijano, Immanuel Wallerstein, and those associated with the Working Group on Coloniality at Binghamton University.

Quijano and Wallerstein (1992) argue that the creation of the geosocial entity called the Americas was the constitutive act of the modern world-system in the 16th century. Because of the near destruction of the indigenous population at the birth of the modern world-system, Americanity has always been associated with Modernity. The imperialist nature of this venture has often been set aside so that we view it not as conquest but as the founding of a "new world." The elements of newness that distinguished the Americas from the "old world" included coloniality, ethnicity, racism, and the concept of newness itself. "Coloniality was essentially the creation of a set of states linked together within an interstate system in hierarchical layers" (Quijano and Wallerstein 1992:550). While the colonial states were at the bottom of the hierarchy, coloniality continued after the system of formal colonialism had come to an end in the form of a socio-cultural hierarchical ranking between the European and Non-European. Quijano and Wallerstein contend that the "hierarchy of coloniality manifested itself in all domains—political, social, and not least of all cultural (Quijano and Wallerstein 1992:550). The hierarchy reproduced itself over time though there was always some mobility for the few. Coloniality was also essential to the integration of the interstate system, creating both a rank order and sets of rules for interaction among the states.

The phenomenon of stateness in the Americas made it possible for ethnicity to emerge as a building block of the modern world-system, a communal identity that located groups within a given state. Quijano and Wallerstein argue that ethnicity served to delineate the social boundaries corresponding to the division of labor, and thus justified the different forms of labor control that came to exist within the Americas: slavery for Black Africans, various forms of cash crop labor for Native Americans, indentured labor for European workers. While forms of labor control evolved with changes in the capitalist division of labor, hierarchy remains as a constant of the system. Furthermore the movements for independence assumed more often than not the form of efforts of white settler populations frightened by the spectres of Black ex-slave republics as in Haiti or in rural Amerindian claims to upsetting the ethnic hierarchy such as the Tupac Amaru rebellion (Quijano and Wallerstein 1992:551).

With the ending of formal colonialism and slavery, ethnicity came to be reinforced by a conscious and systematic racism, explicitly theorized during the 19th century. The purpose of this new racism was to shore up culturally an economic hierarchy some of whose political guarantees were weakening in the post–1789 era of "popular sovereignty." During this period racism was not explicitly elaborated in Latin America, it tended to be concealed within the pre-existing ethnic hierarchy. In Latin America there was no formal segregation or discrimination, according to Quijano and Wallerstein.

It was the 19th-century United States that was the first state in the world-system to enact a system of formal segregation, as well as the first to place indigenous people on reservations. Quijano and Wallerstein argue that it was precisely its strong position within the world-economy

that made this practice necessary. In the United States the upper strata as a percentage of total population was growing much faster than in any other country, thus providing more opportunities for upward mobility. In such a situation "informal constraints of ethnicity" seemed not to be up to the task of maintaining "workplace and social hierarchies" (Quijano and Wallerstein 1992:551). Formal racism is then an important further contribution of Americanity to the world-system.

But as we will see later this system of formal racism was not compatible with U.S. social and geopolitical realities after its ascension to the hegemonic position within the world-system after the second world war. These circumstances created the opening for the African American-led civil rights movement to overcome the limits of the Jim Crow system of de jure segregation. Wallerstein had contended heretofore that the more enduring form in which privilege is maintained is the creation of de facto but informal privileged access to non-state institutions (education, occupation, housing, health care), optimally through the operation of a totally individual attribution of advantage. By refusing to discriminate in particular situations, the institution abstracts the totality of social factors that account for differential performance, and hence widens rather than narrows existing inequalities (Wallerstein 1979). The expansion of the United States into economic spaces throughout the world-system and the strength of its economic position also made it necessary that the United States permit widespread legal and illegal migration from non-European countries. The combination of the internally colonized populations of African descent, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Native American, and various Asian populations with the new immigrants created the phenomenon that came to be called "the third world within."

But this situation also called for a more subtle practice of racism. Quijano and Wallerstein thus argue that racism subsequently took refuge in what seems to be its opposite, universalism, and the derived concept of the meritocracy. This may seem quite incredulous to our commonsense notions, but their case is not at all far-fetched. They argue that any examination system within an ethnic hierarchy will inevitably disproportionately favor the upper ethnic strata. In such circumstances, racist attitudes are justified without the need to verbalize them. Those ethnic strata that perform poorly are said to do so because they are inferior. This is said to be a self-evident fact. It is simply statistical, and therefore verified by "scientific" proof.

The reification and deification of "newness" is an additional element of Americanity that justifies inequality. Since the new world was not tied down to tradition, the privileged strata of the "old world" and the traditions which they incarnated carried no weight. This sense not only added to the idea of the meritocracy, but it also led to the denial of the worth of historical depth. "Modernity became the justification of economic success, but also its proof." The circularity of this argument has continued to escape the attention of many. "The appearance of offering a way out of the inequalities of the present, the concept of 'newness' encrusted them and inserted their inevitability into the collective superego of the world-system" (Quijano and Wallerstein 1992:552).

The contradictions of Americanity have generated substantial politico-intellectual turmoil over the history of its existence. Therefore Quijano and Wallerstein argue that it is no accident that core-periphery analysis (dependency theory and world-systems analysis) was propelled onto the world intellectual scene by the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA). By the same token it is no accident that anti-racist political mobilization received its earliest and greatest impulse in North America.

This indicates that those of us who have understood the temporality of the cultural wars and the demonization of inner-city Blacks in the public discourse in conjunctural (middle run)

terms have simply not paid sufficient attention to the manner in which the demonization of Black skins was both constitutive of the current world order and foundational to the stratification processes of both the United States and the world-system. This explains the persistence of nationalist strains among African Americans even as U.S. society becomes more diverse. To dismiss the nationalist aspirations of the most oppressed elements inside our borders—as do some elements within the Left and Progressive intelligentsia and activists, even among the Black Left—is unacceptable, not only because dogma is counterproductive but because it undermines the agency of those groups. We need to collectively engage in the construction of a broad and inclusive vision and praxis adequate for the period of global transition from capitalism into which we have entered, recognizing that we are now fighting for the future. Although we do need a sophisticated understanding of social time and thus a mix of short-range, medium–range, and long-range strategies, we cannot and should not attempt any kind of short cut that will (temporarily?) put aside the grievances of the most aggrieved to placate some portion of the more privileged strata, because again we undermine the agency of the most oppressed.[4] The agency of those at the bottom of the social order is central to the creation of a system that is democratic, egalitarian, and just.

RACISM AND HISTORICAL CAPITALISM

I think that one source of such a vision can be found in the work of scholars working within the world-systems perspective (Wallerstein, Hopkins, Amin, Arrighi, and Frank) who themselves have drawn from a number of intellectuals and revolutionaries from the periphery and the internal colonies including W.E.B. Du Bois, C.L.R. James, Frantz Fanon, Kwame Nkrumah, Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara, and Fidel Castro.

I will focus here on a limited sampling of Immanuel Wallerstein's writing. In his 1983 book *Historical Capitalism,* Wallerstein argues that historical capitalism developed an ideological framework of oppressive humiliation that had never previously existed: sexism and racism. For Wallerstein racism created the justification for low reward for productive labor, despite its importance in defining the right to reward. It accomplished this task by defining work with the lowest remuneration as remuneration of the lowest-quality work (Wallerstein 1995:103). Sexism and racism frame the structural inequality of the capitalist world-economy and thus cannot be dismantled without dismantling the entire historical system.

The logic of racism within historical capitalism is fundamental in Wallerstein's analysis of the system. He argues that it is in the interests of those who wished to facilitate the accumulation of capital that workforces be created in the right places for those who are available for work for the lowest wage possible. One way that such households were created was via the ethnicization of community life under capitalism. Wallerstein defines an ethnic group as sizeable groups of people to who were reserved certain occupational/economic roles in relationship to other groups living in geographic proximity (Wallerstein 1995:76). Such groups are often marked outwardly in Wallerstein's conception by their culture, religion, language, or values.

---

[4] Here I am referring to the declining significance of race thesis and also of a too-rigid formulation that counter poses race specific against universal policies.

Wallerstein argues further that ethnicization facilitates the reproduction of the labor force, provides for the socialization of the young into the economic roles appropriate for their group, and has encrusted the ranking of occupational roles in an easy code for income distribution, clothed he argues in the legitimacy of "tradition."

Racism is precisely the ideological justification for the hierarchization of the workforce. For this reason Wallerstein maintains that racism is one of the main cultural pillars of capitalist civilization. But racism is also central to the construction and reproduction of appropriate workforces. These workforces must be managed by cadres, who however have to be created, socialized, and reproduced. The primary ideology used to create such cadres is universalism.

For Wallerstein universalism is an epistemology, a set of beliefs about what is knowable and how it can be known. It posits that there exists a set of general statements about the world that are universally and permanently true, and that the objective of science is a search for these statements. Universalism is said to be a faith as well as an epistemology. It requires not merely respect but reverence for the elusive but allegedly real phenomenon of truth. Truth in historical capitalism is a cultural idea without peer. We are taught that the search for truth is a disinterested virtue. But if we look at the empirical evidence of social practices under historical capitalism, we are just as likely to conclude as does Wallerstein that the search for truth is a self-interested rationalization (Wallerstein 1995:82).

Since the workforces of historical capitalism are drawn from and are located in every corner of the world-economy, cadres must be created, socialized, and reproduced across the ghettos of the capitalist world-economy. They had to be taught the requisite cultural norms and engaged in such a way as to eliminate competing cultural norms. These cadres were also westernized, or in the case of internally colonized groups bourgeoisified, so that they were separated from their masses and less likely to revolt, or organize their masses to revolt. Wallerstein argues that this was a monumental miscalculation, but the logic of this position seemed unassailable.

> The concept of a neutral "universal" culture to which the cadres of the world division of labour would be "assimilated" (the passive voice being important here) hence came to serve as one of the pillars of the world-system as it historically evolved. The exaltation of progress, and later of "modernization," summarized this set of ideas, which served less as true norms of social action than as status-symbols of obeisance and of participation in the world's upper strata. The break from the supposedly culturally-narrow religious base of knowledge in favour of supposedly trans-cultural scientific bases of knowledge served as the self-justification of a particularly pernicious form of cultural imperialism. It dominated in the name of intellectual liberation; it imposed in the name of skepticism. (Wallerstein 1995:83)

Scientific culture was a form of socialization of the cadres of the world division of labor. It was a means of class cohesion. It created a framework within which it was possible for individual mobility to thrive without threatening the very real hierarchal workforce allocation. Indeed Wallerstein argues that meritocracy reinforced hierarchy. The emphasis on the rationality of scientific activity shaded from public view, and most of all from public understanding of, the irrationality of the endless accumulation of capital. Those cadre from the peripheral zones and internal colonized populations tended to be ambivalent toward this ideology of universalism, alternatively viewing it as a tool of true liberation and empowerment of their populations, as means of personal mobility for themselves within the world-system, and as a trap set by the elites of the world-system to trap them as a subordinate group within the world-system with no means of even seeing the truth since they have been suckered into using the "master's tools." We know that Marx used a similar tactic (with the

same dangers) in distinguishing his views from other 19th-century socialists by using the designation "scientific socialism."[5] It is in this way that Wallerstein argues that "anti-systemic movements have often served as intermediaries of the powerful to the weak, vitiating rather than crystallizing their deep-rooted sources of resistance" (Wallerstein 1995:88).

But beginning in the 20th century and with increasing power since the 1960s, the theme of civilizational assertion and cultural resistance has been increasingly important in the theorizing of the anti-systemic movements and its intellectuals. Wallerstein argues that the basis of this shift in ideology among the anti-systemic movements is the increase in recruitment of strata more economically and politically marginal to the functioning of the system.

> Compared with the profile of the membership of the world's anti-systemic movements from 1850 to 1950, their profile from 1950 onwards contained more from peripheral zones, more women, more from "minority" groups (however defined), and more of the work-force towards the unskilled, lowest-paid end of the scale. (Wallerstein 1995:90)

There is thus a cultural crisis wherein the anti-systemic movements are questioning the premises of universalist ideology, such that the movements are taking seriously the search for civilizational alternatives. Furthermore the whole intellectual apparatus that came into being during the 14th century is being slowly placed in question (Wallerstein 1995:92).

In assessing the balance sheet of capitalist civilization, Wallerstein explains how the ethnicization of the workforce has been required for the optimal functioning of historical capitalism. Widespread and continuous migration of people (both forced and voluntary) has been necessary in order to fill the labor force requirements of particular geographical regions. Throughout the history of the capitalist world-economy there has always been a high correlation between ethnicity (however defined) and occupational or class location. While there is some benefit to societal functioning via the process by which youth are socialized to accept and expect their role in the social structure, such ethnicization is also the structural basis of continuous social conflict between upper and lower ethnic strata (Wallerstein 1995:121–122).

It is precisely this ethnicization in Wallerstein's view that requires an ideology of racism such that large segments of the world's population are defined as members of an underclass, as essentially inferior beings whose behavior has earned for them the marginal social position to which they have been relegated. The ferocity of the antagonism that exists between these underclasses and the normal class structure of a given state or region has often led to civil wars, which have become more, not less, frequent, more oppressive, and more deadly (Wallerstein 1995:122).

Despite the hierarchical ethnicization of the work force across the entirety of the world-system, a central claim by the defenders of historical capitalism is that it alone has changed the allocation of reward from one based on inherited privilege to one based on merit. While historical capitalism is unique in the sense that meritocracy has been widely proclaimed as an official virtue rather than merely a de facto reality, it is also true that is has given rise to an increase in the proportion of people for whom socioeconomic ascent is possible. Yet we cannot afford to miss the meaning of the very significant caveat that in the midst of our celebration of the achievement of our official ideology of the meritocracy, this number is still a minority. We would do well to ponder the implication of this fact. For Wallerstein the meaning is quite

---

[5] Here Marx uses the prestige of science on behalf of the workers' movement and to enhance the ability of the workers' movements and allied intellectuals to understand the world in order to change it. But this claim also lodged the false claims of science raised throughout Wallerstein's work in the heart of the epistemology of the workers' movement.

unambiguous: the meritocracy is a false universalism that is by definition only meaningful in the structures of our social world precisely because it is not universal. For Wallerstein the " . . . meritocracy is intrinsically elitist" (Wallerstein 1995:132).

Wallerstein's powerful critique of Western "universalism" is complemented by an equally devastating critique of the myth of Western democracy. If democracy is defined as the maximization of participation in decision making at all levels on the basis of equality, then we must ask what the constraints are on such democratization. Wallerstein argues that there are two. One is the demand for privileged access, and the other I would see as the closely linked demand (or rationalization of privilege) for competent performance. Both demands run counter to democracy by fostering hierarchy. The existence of two constraints rather than one explains the enormous gulf in the interpretation of reality. If one gains access via a process that accrues to one because of a position of advantage (for example, greater access to educational resources, experience in certain activities, etc.), which then are reflected in greater performance in some screening measure, this is a clear violation of democracy from the point of view of the losers in this process though the winners tend to feel that their reward stems not from their position of advantage but is rather what they justly deserve and have earned by virtue of their performance on these measures of merit.

Given the entrenched inequalities that we have observed, how do we explain the positive evaluation of capitalist civilization by so many?

The ideology of the meritocracy has indeed resulted in considerable individual mobility, even of specific ethnoracial groups, or at least portions of some ethnoracial groups. This did not transform the statistics of the world-economy since individual mobility was countered by incorporating new populations into the world-economy or by differential demographic rates of growth. Second, there has tended to be a concentration on that 1–15 percent of the population who consumed more surplus than they themselves produced. Within this sector there has been a dramatic flattening of the curve between the top 1 percent and the other 14 percent. Third, over the last 20 years, under pressure from the antisystemic movements, there has been a slowing down of absolute polarization (Wallerstein 1995:104–105).

Approximately 15 years later Wallerstein broaches the subject of racism as practiced more explicitly within Europe. Here Wallerstein seeks to understand the crisis in Austria with the showing of the racist right wing in Austria, and the censure of Austria by the E.U. To do so Wallerstein proposes to examine racism in the world-system in four time frames: since 1989, since 1945, since 1492, and after 2000.

Wallerstein is concerned that the almost exclusive focus of world social science since 1989 has been on the so-called phenomenon of globalization. He argues that much of world social science talk about globalization is "dust in our eyes." For Wallerstein the term "globalization" is fundamentally misleading, for it is nothing more than a passing rhetorical device in the continuing struggle over the degree to which trans-border flows should be unimpeded. So also, Wallerstein argues, is the litany about ethnic violence. Not that such violence is not a terrible reality, but the implication that such violence is the domain of some less fortunate, less wise, less civilized group outside the mainstream of western society is most certainly misleading and disingenuous. Such violence should more appropriately be viewed rather as the absolutely normal result of the deep and growing inequalities within the capitalist world-system.

The year 1945 marked the end of the Nazi horror. But anti-Semitism was not new. It was the major internal expression of the deep racism of the European world. While almost everyone in the pan-European world had been happily racist and anti-Semitic prior to 1945, after 1945 they hesitated because almost no one intended this racism to result in the genocidal

practices associated with the holocaust (*the Endlosung*). The object of racism is not to exclude or exterminate people; it is to keep them within the system as an underclass. Yet the practice of racism had always been a delicate game, and the line had been crossed in the past, but never to such an extent and so visibly in a central arena of the world-system. In coming to terms with the holocaust, the pan-European world banned public usage of racism, and primarily of the public usage of anti-Semitism. It became taboo language.

In the post 1945 pan-European world the nations of the core zone sought to emphasize their internal virtues as integrative nations unspotted by racist oppression, lands of liberty against the Soviet "evil empire," whose racism became a regular theme of Western propaganda. But racism was still a structural necessity by which the pan-European world could obtain a low-wage workforce, an underclass. This was necessary because during the post–World War II period the countries of the pan-European world underwent a dramatic demographic transition that resulted in radically reduced birth rates, so that the labor force had to be supplemented from abroad. This role fell to Mediterranean people in non-Mediterranean Europe, Latin Americans and Asians in North America, West Indians in North America and Western Europe, Black Africans and South Asians in Europe, former socialist bloc residents in western Europe after 1989. When the world-economy entered into a B-phase in the 1970s and unemployment increased for the first time in the post–1945 period, the immigrants were a convenient scapegoat and gave rise to a significant increase in the size of the far right within the pan-European world for the first time since 1945. Wallerstein thought the attempt of the E.U. to distance itself from Austria was suspect not because of the "good intentions" of the E.U. but because the historical practice of these nations clearly demonstrated that the universalist values of Western Europe are "deeply encrusted with the chronic, constitutive racism of the pan-European world" (Wallerstein 1990:6).

Wallerstein offers not even faint praise for the efforts of social scientists on this front, as they echoed rather than unmasked the deeply encrusted and the chronic, constitutive racism of the pan-European world. Samuel Huntington's thesis of "the clash of civilizations" is held up for particular scorn.

Wallerstein locates the origins of racism in the encounter between the Europeans who traveled to the Americas and the indigenous peoples. Some of the Europeans who were acquiring vast lands wanted to enslave the Amerindians since they were barbarians and worthy only of being subjected to servitude and the harshest treatment. There were others, mainly Christian evangelists, who objected to this treatment and insisted upon the possibility of saving the souls of the indigenous peoples. Bartolome de las Casas was the most prominent representative of this position.

While Las Casas was initially able to prevail with Emperor Charles V with these views, the emperor had second thoughts and convened at Vallodalid in 1550 a special Junta of judges to hear a debate between Las Casas and Juan Ginas de Sepulveda on these issues. Sepulveda argued that enslavement of the indigenous people was justified because they were barbarians, they practiced idolatry and human sacrifice, intervention was necessary to save lives, and this type of intervention would ultimately facilitate Christian evangelization. Las Casas argued in turn that no people should be forced to submit to another on the basis of cultural inferiority, that people should not be punished for committing a crime of which they are unaware, that one is only justified in intervening to save innocent people if the intervention does not cause even greater harm, and that Christianity could not be propagated by the sword.

Las Casas indeed argued quite pointedly that no one is unable to locate a barbarian to dominate, reminding the Spaniards of their own treatment at the hands of Rome. While the outcome of this debate before the Junta de Vallodalid is unclear, and though Wallerstein

points out that it is inconclusive whether Las Casas was an anti-racist defender of the down-trodden or someone who sought to institutionalize a "good colonialism," henceforth racism was established as constitutive of the capitalist world-economy, which used racism as a justification for the establishment of a hierarchical system to the benefit of the pan-European world.

Though there were always people who sought to alleviate the worse features of the system, there have also been brutal massacres or *Endlosungen* before the *Endlosung.*

For Wallerstein one of the most striking things about social knowledge throughout the 19th century and up to 1945 is that the social sciences never confronted the issue of racism directly (Wallerstein 1990:9). From historians who studied only "historical nations," to economists who viewed any and all political behavior that could be considered racist as "economically irrational," to political scientists whose study of comparative governments consisted only of the five major pan-European countries, to sociologists who either directly supported white supremacy or who sought sympathetically if patronizingly to explain the deviant behavior of the poor (who are ethnically distinguishable from the middle class), social scientists have not established a record of serious scholarly analysis of the phenomenon of racism.

So as we enter a period of chaotic transformation of the world-system in which the world's people have struggled for 500 years, we must finally come to grips with the "deeply encrusted" and the "chronic, constitutive racism of the pan-European world." In building a good and beautiful and more livable world, we may then begin to eradicate the deep racisms that lie within us (Wallerstein 2000:13). But what of those in the extra-European world (including the third world within)?

THE MODERN WORLD-SYSTEM
AND THE COLONIALITY OF POWER

Ramon Grosfoguel, a co-organizer of the aforementioned 1998 Conference on "Historical Capitalism, the Coloniality of Power, and Transmodernity," argues that while the capitalist world-system has historically depended on the supply of cheap labor from the periphery of the world-system, the core zones also "maintained a cheap labor force from the internal colonial periphery within the empire" (Grosfoguel 1999:410). As an example from the 18th and 19th centuries, Grosfoguel makes the point that there were Scottish and Irish workers in London, Bretons in Paris, and African slaves in New York. For Grosfoguel this means that racism was a central mechanism for the maintenance of a disenfranchised labor force. Following Wallerstein, Grosfoguel argues that those colonial populations with metropolitan citizenship were relegated to the status of second-class citizens via the geoculture of racism in the capitalist world-economy. Racism served the function of relegating a population to serve mainly as cheap labor or to exclude a population from particular sectors of the workforce.

The social power of white males is said to have expanded along with the incorporation of new zones into the capitalist world-economy. Grosfoguel points out that the privileged position of white males in the capitalist system fostered hierarchical relations structured around race, sex, and gender.

For Grosfoguel the racial/ethnic hierarchy at a world-scale implied a global colonial/racial formation of discourses and meanings about race. This has been the case since the 16th century. For most of the time race was defined by biology. But the Nazi occupations in Western Europe delegitimized biological racist discourse. The civil rights movement in the United States and Britain are said to have also challenged the use of overt racist discourse,

forcing the expression of the continuing inequality structured along racial lines to be expressed in what Grosfoguel refers to as "cultural racism." It was in this way that "cultural racism" became a part of the geoculture of the post–1960s capitalist world-economy (Grosfoguel 1999:411).

To understand this process Grosfoguel focuses first on the issues of nation, race, and coloniality. In the core zones, Grosfoguel argues, the nation is frequently "imagined" as being white, thus the construction of national identity is entangled with racial categories. These racial categories were initially defined in biological terms but came to assume cultural form after the Holocaust against the Jewish people in Europe and the civil rights movements in the United States and Great Britain. But the line of reasoning constituting cultural racism, and the use of the culture of poverty as an explanation for inequality, sound suspiciously like the reasoning behind the way that the nation is imagined in the core. The rise of the white nation then was essential to the stratifying processes of the capitalist world-economy.

Like Quijano, Grosfoguel argues that the end of formal colonial structures did not entail the end of the coloniality of power and that social power has continued to be structured along the same lines as in the colonial relationship. Thus the colonial/racial/ethnic hierarchy continues in the postcolonial world. "The representation of colonial subjects as lazy, criminals, dumb, inferior, stupid, untrustful, uncivilized, primitive, dirty, and opportunist have a long colonial history" (Grosfoguel 1999:415).

Grosfoguel briefly surveys the melting pot approach to incorporating ethnic groups into U.S. society, and the manner in which African Americans and Puerto Ricans came to be classified in the same manner as European ethnic groups, referring in particular to Glazer and Moynihan's 1963 classic *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and the Irish of New York City.* The basic premise of the Glazer and Moynihan classic is that all groups experienced some degree of discrimination, but through the acquisition of experience and skills are able to be incorporated into the mainstream of U.S. society. If one fails to be incorporated, it is because of their own shortcomings, which came to be defined by some as "a culture of poverty." But for Grosfoguel and indeed for a significant body of scholarly commentary, "Puerto Ricans and African Americans are not simply migrants or ethnic groups, but rather colonial/racialized subjects within the United States empire" (Grosfoguel 1999:417).

Grosfoguel's theorizing summarized above represents a gathering trend among intellectuals concerned with the impact of the coloniality of power on the geopolitics of knowledge. Some of the concerns of these scholars are summarized in Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez (2002), to which I will now turn.

Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez (2002) call for the unthinking of a series of mythologies that have unfortunately molded our thinking during the process of the formation and consolidation of the modern world-system. The candidates for unthinking are objectivist/universalist knowledges, the decolonization of the modern world-system, and developmentalism. The three are intertwined with each other and tied to Eurocentric conceptions and systems of knowledge production. The discourse on the superiority of the West or Occidentalism is the common denominator of the three myths. Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez hold that these myths serve to mystify the roots of the hierarchical system in which European hegemony is embedded and the "global designs" upon which the system rests. These myths have served to control the imaginations of the oppressed and have eclipsed their representations of alternative ways of life, political options, and epistemologies (Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez 2002).

Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez follow Wallerstein (1974) in situating the formation of the capitalist world-economy in the expansion of the Spanish and Portuguese to the Americas in the long 16th century. The foundations of what they deem the racist/colonial culture and the global capitalist system were established during the first modernity (from 1492 to 1650). This is not controversial to my mind, but then they add to this insight a point of emphasis. The expansion to the Americas in 1492 occurred at the same time as the expulsion of the Arabs and Jews from Spain in the name of "blood purity" (*pureza de la sangre*). Thus following Mignolo (2000), they contend that an internal border constructed to keep the Arabs and Jews at arm's length was built simultaneously to the "external border," separating the peoples from the peripheral geographical zones. They follow Quijano and Wallerstein (1992) in arguing that the Spanish and Portuguese expansion to the Americas was crucial in the construction of the racial categories that would later be generalized to the rest of the world.

During the second modernity (1650–1945), the core of the world-system shifted from Spain/Portugal to Germany, the Netherlands, England, and France. Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez argue that the emergence of Northwestern Europe as the core of the world-system deepened the internal imaginary borders constructed against Jews, Arabs, and Gypsies and the external imaginary border against the Americas, and expanded to include Africa, the Middle East, and Asia (Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez 2002:xiii). But the second modernity added a new border, between Northwestern Europeans and the Iberian peoples. Hispanic/Latin/Southern European cultures were constructed as inferior to that of the Northwestern Europeans. In extending this notion to North America, Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez argue that Anglo-Saxon Protestant [6] hegemonism was the ideological basis of the annexation of half of the Mexican territory in 1848 as a consequence of the Mexican-American War, the political annexation of Puerto Rico, and the formation of a protectorate in Cuba in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War of 1898. Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez argue that these imperial conquests established the regional foundation for what would later become U.S. global hegemony. But these events are also considered to be the historical core of the "ethnic" conflict "regardless of place of origin of those called 'Hispanic' or 'Latino/a'. . . . From there on, within the context of the United States, 'Hispanic Cultures' of the Americas were subalternized, and the notion of "Whiteness" would be further distanced from its meaning in Latin America" (Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez 2002:xiii).

Henceforth Latin American independence from Spain and Portugal is said to have been hegemonized by Euro-American elites. They argue that it was not a process of social, political, cultural, or economic decolonization. White Creole elites continued to dominate the power relations of the newly independent countries of South and Central America in the 19th century, but they were excluded from the notion of whiteness that held forth in the United States, and thus "Hispanics" were constructed as part of the inferior "other," not a part of the superior "White," "European" races. In the United States the notion of whiteness would eventually be extended to what Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez refer to as groups who "were internal colonial subjects of Europe under Northwestern European hegemony (e.g., the Irish, Eastern Europeans, and the Jews), which would emphasize class as a major social marker within these groups, while the Indians and the Blacks would continue to be racial/colonial subjects" (Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez 2002:xiv). It is the history of the second

---

[6] It may seem curious that Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez omit any racial designation here. I resisted the temptation to insert "white" in brackets here, but the omission is pointed as becomes clear later in the article.

modernity that Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez hold to be key to the racialization of the immigrants from Latin America and their descendents.

> While categories of modernity such as citizenship, democracy, and nation-building were acknowl-
> edged for the dominant Northwestern Europeans, the colonial "Others" were submitted to foreign
> military presence, forms of political tutelage, coerced forms of labor exploitation, and subjected to
> authoritarian rule in their countries as a way of granting the systemic equilibrium required for the
> development of the intertwined processes of nation building and global expansion. (Grosfoguel
> and Cervantes-Rodriguez 2002:xiv)

While sociobiology and eugenics were forms of knowledge used to justify racist discourse, in the 20th century these forms of knowledge were replaced by what Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez refer to as "neo-culture of poverty" approaches, or "cultural racist" discourses. While the crude racism of the sociobiologists was not different in substance from cultural racist discourse, Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez call our attention to the manner in which the colonial experience leads to complex translocal scenarios that shape the production and dissemination of knowledge, including subjugated knowledges, subaltern forms of knowledge, and "border thinking." Border thinking is a product of people who move back and forth between former colonizing countries and their respective colonies, and refers principally to the in-between location of subaltern knowledges, critical of both global hege-mony and local power relations. These forms of knowledge are said to yield critical insights and political strategies from the subaltern side of the colonial difference, which could serve as a point of departure to move beyond colonialist and nationalist discourses.

Working within the coloniality of power and world-systems traditions, Santiago-Valles provides us with an important angle of vision on a component of coloniality that focuses on the social construction of whiteness as a concept that encapsulated global power relations. He argues that the Spaniards, the Dutch, the French, and the English "discovered" (invented) "their respective nations" in the course of discrepancies (economic, gnoseological, and mili-tary) over how they each expressed and lived their "Europeaness" -as -"whiteness" by which he means who best represented the white world of Europe and hence who was best fit to rule the world (Santiago-Valles 2003:54).

Over the 19th and 20th centuries the term "whiteness" was applied alternatively to the "propertied and educated summits of European societies and to a community of white people which enabled the ruling classes to mobilize the laboring classes in support of colonization and slavery" (Santiago-Valles 2003:54). But the pressure of the more restrictive sense of whiteness coexisted with the physiologization of class polarizations within European and Euro-diasporic populations. The aristocracy and the bourgeoisie were recasting urban labor-ers and peasants (including Christians) "as an alien race of fraudulent 'Europeans'/'whites.' " Examining these conflicting notions of "Europeaness"-as-'whiteness" should give us a sense of how the concept of race stemmed partly from and was deployed within the operations of the coloniality of power.

As we entered the post–1945 period, the social blocs of the pan-European world had been transformed:

> . . . assembling the white and near white laboring classes, and the propertied and educated classes
> within the European and Euro-diasporic nation-states (North –and partly-Latin American and
> Caribbean, as well as South African, Pacific, and Israeli) against "their natives" (infantilized and
> feminized, overseas and domestic). This was part and parcel of the reorganization of Western
> imperial social formations and their colonial (external and internal) and neocolonial "regional hin-
> terlands." (Santiago-Valles 2003:58)

As a result of this 150-year transformation:

> the European and Euro-diasporic sites of the coloniality of power would increasingly be marked by "the distinction between the objects and subjects of power not within the national body, but as organized by the many rhetorics of imperialism"—and colonialism (external and internal)—between that body and other, "non-civilized" peoples upon whose bodies the effects of power were unleashed with as much theatricality as had been manifest on the scaffold originally deployed to spectacularly punish the insolent rabble and undeserving poor, that degenerate and fraudulent "Europeans"/"whites" from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries." (Santiago-Valles 2003:58)

Later Santiago-Valles agrees with Quijano that it was the pivotal and interwoven advent of "race" and capitalist accumulation on a new (world) scale that generated modernity and defined the colonial character and structure of its forms of power (Santiago Valles 2003:61). But Santiago-Valles holds that the decisive shift in the invention of "race" and the emergence of a historically racialized capitalism was the metamorphosis of Mediterranean island sugar plantations based on the domestic labor of children and women into the expanded sugar plantations of the Eastern Atlantic and West African coastal islands and then the Caribbean Pernambuco relying on adult male labor.

Additionally Santiago-Valles argues that "by being able to position themselves vis-à-vis 'savages,' 'heathens,' and 'infidels' within this new (world) geography of conquest, colonialism, and chattel-slavery, 'Christians' did not merely become 'European,'" they also became white, viewed as the embodiment of reason, order and agency (as naturalized masculinist categories of social adulthood) vis-à-vis the increasingly feminized and infantilized "natives" (Santiago-Valles 2003:62).

Sylvia Wynter charts the transformation of the nature of the coloniality of power in the modern world-system in a similar manner. Wynter (2003) argues that our conception of the human (Man) overrepresents the Western bourgeois ethnoclass as though he is synonymous with universal humanity. Wynter argues that any attempt to unsettle the coloniality of power will call for the unsettling of this overrepresentation as the second and now purely secular form of what Quijano identifies as the racism/ethnicism complex. She explains the process of moving from a religious to a secular justification of the coloniality of power by reviewing the clash between Las Casas and Sepulveda mentioned earlier. She holds that the clash was over whether human identity should continue to reside in Las Casas's theocentric Christian or that of the newly invented Man of the humanists, as the rational (or ratiocentric) political subject of the state (represented by Sepulveda). The enslavement of non-Europeans was initially justified on the basis that they were "Enemies-of-Christ" or "Refusers-of-Christ." The concessions of non-European lands to the Spanish and Portuguese by the pope was effected by various papal bulls that defined these lands as terra nullius ("the lands of no one") since they did not belong to a Christian prince (Wynter 2003:291–292). But the Spanish sovereigns soon became impatient with the papacy's claim to temporal as well as spiritual sovereignty and summoned several councils to establish new grounds for Spain's sovereignty outside the limits established by the papacy. This process backed by Sepulveda eventually led to a shift from the "Enemies-of-Christ" system of classification to one based on nature, embedded in the more modern concept of race, which established natural "racial" differences between the superior Europeans and theinferior non-Europeans, who were ordered along the lines of the degree of rational perfection/imperfection. This "by nature" difference would later be codified in a substance called I.Q. (Wynter 2003:297).

THE MODERN WORLD-SYSTEM AND THE
UNITED STATES IN THE RACIAL ORDER

The Modern World-System framework has not been widely used in the scholarly literature on the sociological study of race and ethnicity within the United States. A recent exception is from Morehouse University sociologist Cynthia Lucas Hewitt in a 2002 issue of *Review,* the journal of the Fernand Braudel Center.

Hewitt (2002) argues that racial stratification within national labor markets is an aspect of the worldwide division of labor the ruling strata used to grant and restrict access to the means of production. Specifically Hewitt argues,

> Capital ownership and control is 1) cumulative at a geometric rate since the inception of the system in the sixteenth century, leading to centralization, and 2) this centralization is organized through *ascriptive solidarity,* that rests, ultimately, upon familial relations of marriage and inheritance.

According to Hewitt, the key to this ascriptive solidarity is the European patriarchal family and it is expressed most clearly in the concept of private property, which is then clearly expressed in white racial solidarity and endogeneity (Hewitt 2002:138).

Hewitt holds that the likelihood of employment correlates closely to his or her social closeness to owners or controllers of productive capital. Social closeness is defined racially and enforced and reflected in marriage patterns. In contrast to those who point to the defining role of class in determining race relations, Hewitt argues that "class is largely an artifact of racialized solidarity processes of expropriation and exclusion integral to the formation of modern nation-state structures" (Hewitt 2002:140). In this way Hewitt identifies what she feels to be a crucial measure of long-term intergenerational control of productive assets, which she argues is the distinguishing feature of capitalist accumulation.

Hewitt argues that one may very well view an oppressed minority as a group within the lower class, but cautions that the theory of class focuses on a process of class differentiation based on individual or family choices and opportunities within a more or less open structure. This assumes sharing within any set of national borders as mandated by the imagined nation. But the reality for racist societies or nations is that racism assumes the exclusion of some groups from the national identity.

Hewitt contends that the concept of "race" as we know it was the handiwork of the Germanic Anglo-Saxon people of England who benefited from the colonization of America and who were the pioneers of manufacturing for the market with imposed conditions of unequal exchange. She adds that the term "race" was originally used among Europeans to designate a descent group linked by consanguinity (blood relationship). The importance of the concept of "race" at that time was to distinguish between a "migrating tribe" and a conquering group who formed a ruling class, connected by blood over various local and autochronous [indigenous] peoples (Hewitt 2002:142). The term "race," she argues was not known to the Greeks and Romans. It developed in the 16th century to designate such groups as the Normans as a group who were distinct from the Celts, and the Franks as distinct from the Slavs. Hewitt attributes to Cheikh Anta Diop the thesis that this social fissure begins with historic contact patterns between culturally distinguishable groups and ends with amalgamation, thus bringing cultural conflict and tension to an end. Relations of domination, however, are said to continue between classes, which, however, are distinguished by culture (Hewitt 2002:142).

Race in this theory emerges as an ideological justification for the processes of predatory raiding, settlement, and migration, which form the basis of class society in the capitalist division of labor. This is the framework, Hewitt argues, for the European raids of the Americas, the Indian Ocean, and Africa. The social orders formed by the European empires of the period 1500 to 1800 were organized along the lines of this blood-line stratification order. This social order also included religious distinction as the main cultural division. But in the Spanish and Portuguese empires there was much racial intermarriage such that phenotypically many 16th-century Portuguese were "Negroid" according to Du Bois (1992:47). Furthermore Hewitt cites the recent finding that Black Zimbabweans who self-identify as Hebrew are similar in phenotype to white Jews in Israel. For Hewitt this signifies that racial features are a continuum with differing central tendencies over space and time.

It was the Anglo-American settler colony project that gave the more dogmatic, ideological cast to the concept of "race" via its use of enslaved Africans as laborers in the emerging capitalist division of labor. Quijano and Wallerstein (1992) distinguished between the Spanish and Portuguese who settled among and intermarried with the indigenous people of their colonies and the Dutch and the British in the north who established a New Europe and thus settler colonies, and who used slave labor to produce commodities for the world market. For Hewitt it was this process of commodification of labor that was key to the process of rational calculation regarding quantity and value which led to the necessity to separate the enslaved Africans from their socially given identities and organized social lives. Since enslaved Africans were so central to the emerging stratification system in those colonies, the project of racialization was central to the construction, coherence, and stability of these new societies.

During the early colonial period Hewitt argues, whites, Native Americans, and Africans worked together in coerced labor arrangements. But pressure from the decimation of the Native American population, the need to encourage greater migratory flows from Europe, and the pressure of slave trading interests led to the erection of rigid distinctions between the groups. Hewitt relies on Lerone Bennett's account of "The Path Not Taken" (Bennett 1993) to explain the development of a total system of domination of subordinate strata using mechanisms of separation and subordination, including the prohibition of intermarriage between whites and Africans, first imposed around 1660 (Hewitt 2002:143).

Bennett argues that this system of total domination penetrated every corner of colonial life, using every institution, leaving absolutely nothing to chance. All legal and moral bonds or obligations between Black and non-Black were brutally and dramatically severed in assemblies, the courts, the churches, and the press. A massive propaganda campaign on one hand, supplemented by the use of private vigilante groups on the other, were instruments of this campaign to promote hate and terror to create and maintain this breach (Bennett 1993:71).

> . . . To mold the minds of whites, to teach them the new ideas, and to let them know who was to be loved and who was to be despised, the planter-merchant aristocracy used every instrument of persuasion and control. In every colony, from New York to South Carolina, the same mechanisms of separation and subordination were elaborated and imposed. From New York to South Carolina, the same penalties were used to keep blacks and whites apart, the same rewards were developed to make poor whites support a system which penalized them, the same statutes were elaborated to crush and diabolify blacks. (Bennett 1993:71)

The language of these statutes ("abominable mixture," "barbarous," "savage") was clearly designed to instill a sense of invidious distinction between Blacks and non-Blacks. It was often a legal requirement that parsons and politicians include the language of these statutes at presentations in public meetings and church services (Bennett 1993:71).

But for Bennett this was obviously only half of the story since rules governing the behavior of whites were of equal importance. The right of the master to free his slaves was curbed, and eventually eliminated. Masters could not teach their slaves nor permit them to gather in large assemblies. Furthermore, " . . . masters used Draconian measures to stop mingling and mating of blacks and whites . . . white women were whipped, banished, and enslaved to keep them from marrying black men." The increasing number of mulattos through intermarriage and from illicit relationships caused alarm among Puritan advocates of racial purity (Bennett 1993:75).

> Steadily and inescapably, a new rhythm was imposed on them, and by the middle of the eighteenth century a solid white front was developing . . . Concerted action by blacks and whites [so common among the multi-racial servant class during the early colonial period] virtually ceased. . . . It was in this crucible that the white identify in America was forged. (Bennett 1993: 77–78)

And in opposition to this process of shaping white identity was the formation of Black identity, "colored indelibly by the fact that blacks were deliberately pushed out of the circle of community" (Bennett 1993:79).

The institution of private property and inheritance insured the continuity of the intergenerational transfer of wealth via familial inheritance. Hewitt contends that the fundamental unit of class membership is the family and not the individual. This is not a simple matter of individual choice, but of a socially constructed solidarity network that frames individual choices, and which constrain interracial marriage between Blacks and whites rather severely. But for Hewitt the issue here is not inter-human relations of love and marriage, psychological response, or prejudice, but the channeling of human behaviors by a racially defined political economy of private property and its effects on the accumulation of land and labor for competition that determined, promoted, and rewarded what she feels is a particular process of solidarity she calls racism. She clarifies that for her there is only one racism, and that is the racism of the pan-European world.

Central to this process according to Hewitt is the process by which status group ownership of capital affects individual outcomes. Hiring in this conception is often based on networks of contacts which include family and co-workers, friends, and neighbors whose residency and relations are structured by a highly segregated organization of community life. While aware of the tendency toward the concentration of capital on a world-scale, Hewitt focuses on the empirical finding that small businesses have continued to be a mainstay of employment in the United States. It is among these 22 million small businesses (defined as those employing fewer than 500 employees) who are most likely to make hiring decisions on the basis of ascriptive characteristics such as family, friends, and co-ethnics. But even among larger corporations, she argues, there tends to exist a homogeneity of whiteness, citing, for example, Dye's estimate that only 3 percent of all top corporate executives are drawn from the lower 78 percent of the population by wealth and status (Hewitt 2002:148).

In the world-scale status order, Hewitt locates people of African descent at the bottom, and Native Americans just above Blacks in the racial hierarchy. Hewitt attributes this order to the role of the enslavement of Africans in the formation of the capitalist world-economy and the need of Europeans to achieve stratification order on Native American lands and the resultant depressed (underclass status) of Native Americans throughout the hemisphere. Though Native Americans rank clearly on the bottom of Latin American society, their status has not reached the level of opprobrium achieved by Blacks, which is so low that there is a general refusal to acknowledge Black heritage (Hewitt 2002:151).

For Hewitt the existence of racism insures a high degree of endogenous marriage patterns within racial groups, especially among elite groups. Capital acquired by a group defined as a marriage pool early in the process of capitalist development tends to remain concentrated in that group. Only the intervention of the state has been able to distribute aggregations of wealth beyond family control. Curtailment of the impoverishment of racial polarization is only likely to be achieved via the incorporation of lower ranking groups into the marriage circles of the more elite groups; the redistribution of wealth among families; or the separation of control over capital from family ownership by ending the system of private property and inheritance as we know it (Hewitt 2002:162).

Hewitt calls for us to focus in on the significance of racism within a capitalist system as fundamentally a system of exclusion of groups of people from accumulation based upon the sanctity of private property. Thus the focus of the study of inequality and impoverishment should be the institution of private property and the family (Hewitt 2002:163).

This powerful indictment of the exclusion of African Americans via endogenous forms of family formation stands in counterpoint to the alleged "crisis of the Black family" in the rhetoric of the conservative counter-revolution against the egalitarian and inclusive trend set in motion by the civil rights, feminist, and other movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

FAMILY VALUES AND THE RACE CARD
IN THE UNITED STATES

The discourse on the underclass and family values so prominent since the 1980s emerged out of the 1960s debate about poverty and race, but the conservative turn in the debate cannot be understood outside the impact of the Black insurgency on the social psychology of rebellion throughout the entire society. The conservative backlash, however, did not simply line up against the enemy of the moment. By its very nature it sought to reassert the foundation of the social order by reasserting the relations of honor that put the most dishonored section of the population back in their places. It is not difficult to discern that the ideological discourse of the conservative backlash was part of a broad counterinsurgency designed to turn the nation away from a commitment to the general welfare, to a focus on the survival of the fittest, defined as those who had earned their social positions because of their adherence to the work ethic, their cultural and family values, etc. It is key that we pay close attention to the evolution of relations of force in this historical moment. My point is that the rise of the most dishonored sections of our population in itself leads inexorably to the elaboration of a variety of counter-hegemonic discourses that constitute a fatal threat to centrist liberalism and the geoculture of the modern world-system. We cannot understand the conservative backlash of the post–1965 period without understanding the meaning of the postwar period for the world and the United States.

Wallerstein holds that the 19th century saw the emergence of two kinds of antisystemic movements: the social movements of the working classes against the bourgeoisie, and the national movement of the underdog peoples (or minorities) against dominant groups. Both kinds of movements took some kind of organizational form almost everywhere in the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century (Wallerstein 1991:68). The period from 1945 to 1968 was, according to Wallerstein, a period of remarkable achievement for these movements, which came to power in a large number of countries all around the world. By 1968, however, these movements were no longer in the mobilizing phase, and the youth who came to the fore at this time found those movements wanting, in part because of

the social psychology of demobilization, and in part because of the historical trajectory of these movements, which were able to take power in a large number of states but who were not able to complete the second part of the two-stage strategy, which was to change the world. These movements did make some changes, but nowhere near the depth of change that they had envisioned. This of course was a component of demobilization as people scaled back their militance because they now confronted a state that argued that it was the state of the oppressed groups.

There has been a tendency among intellectuals in the United States to exclude the United States from this scenario. But if we put aside the ideological battles within the Left we can conceive of the communists in much of the semiperipheral zones of the world-economy, national liberation movements in the periphery, and social democrats in the core as members of the family of antisystemic movements which does include the U.S. Democratic Party from the advent of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal.

While the U.S. New Deal was implemented in a manner that maintained the hierarchical racial order, I believe it was a fundamental component of the social democratic compromise. Indeed Beverly Silver and Eric Slater (1999:204) contend that it was the United States who sponsored global reform in the postwar period and the nature of this reform was greatly influenced by the New Deal experience. In response to the wave of labor militancy in the core during the 1930s and 1940s, reformists advocated an accord (or social contract) in which government and business accepted the permanence of unionism and workers accepted the right of business to manage production and make changes in the organization of production to facilitate productivity. Gains in productivity would then be the basis of higher wages, which would allow workers a much higher level of consumption. This constituted a dramatic increase in access to the American Dream.

Silver and Slater argue that the co-optation of the "responsible" elements of the labor movement was supplemented by the fierce repression of the radical and communist Left who were purged from the labor movement. We know that this process began in 1947 with the Taft Hartley Act's "loyalty oaths" and culminated in 1949 with the exclusion of communists and communist sympathizers from the CIO executive board, and the purging of 11 unions with a membership exceeding one million from the ranks of the CIO (Silver and Slater 1999:206).

In 1949 the Chinese Communist Party took power in the world's most populous country. While Japan had long signaled the rise of the dark world, China would take on this role in a far different political space, one much more appropriate to the subordinate position of the people of the dark world. But this event shook the capitalist world to its foundations. Decolonization and development became the strategy of the United States to control the pace of change in the third world and to create conditions to maintain indirect (or neo-colonial) control over the people of the third world. This appeal was directed to the nationalist elite who had not aligned themselves with the social revolution.

In the United States, the rebellion in 1968 was directed against the administration of Lyndon Baines Johnson, who presided over the greatest extension of the welfare state and of civil rights for Blacks in the history of the country (Wallerstein 1990:39). But the context in which this expansion took place is important. There was the civil rights movement, which captured the soul of the United States. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech marks symbolically the high point of the American Century. This expansion of the New Deal into a more inclusive social contract had many limitations, but it established a precedent that would allow for increasing pressure for more, and it stemmed from a social base that surely articulated an egalitarian ideology, which it cast as the "true expression of the American

creed." The pressure for more was certainly on the move as the Black urban masses responding to de facto discrimination outside the Jim Crow areas expanded the Black Freedom Struggle to challenge the deeper roots of social and racial inequality in the nation. While Malcolm X argued that he did not see an American Dream but an American nightmare, on the contrary it might be more accurately observed that he co-opted the American Dream and replaced it with a dream for all humanity.

While King did not fear to appropriate the American dream as the legitimate right of Black people, he did not hesitate to chastise America for failing to deliver on her promise. Within a year or so after the 1963 March on Washington, legislation had been passed that broke the back of Jim Crow and de jure segregation. The civil rights revolution had overcome the reactionary caste system of the Old South.

But what of those outside the South, where a segregated and marginalized urban proletariat lived in squalid conditions despite their access to formal citizenship rights? The sentiments of this segment of the Black population have been more accurately expressed by Malcolm X, who argued that Black people should have no illusions about being included in the American Dream. Rather, the reality of Black people in America was an American nightmare. He said, "Just because kittens are born in an oven, you don't call them biscuits. You can't sit at the table and throw us a few crumbs from the table and call us Americans. You could not go to the criminal and ask for civil rights, you had to take the criminal to the World Court and sue for denial of our human rights." Malcolm X was clearly involved in a process of rearticulating the American Dream, or even of transcending the American Dream.

Some in the generation that emerged as the radical leadership of the Black Freedom Struggle in the 1960s recalled the anti-colonial movement formed within the Council of African Affairs led by Paul Robeson, Alphaeus Hunton, Shirley Graham, E. Franklin Frazier, and W.E.B. Du Bois and allied with Walter White's NAACP. This movement argued powerfully for the essential linkage between the liberation movements in Africa and Asia and the struggles of the African American people for civil and democratic rights. The repression of Robeson and Du Bois served to disconnect this linkage and was an object lesson to the civil rights mainstream to stay within the parameters of the cold war consensus.

But the rising tide of decolonization in the post–World War II period was to reinforce the radical elements within the African American population who linked civil rights with liberation movements and radical states such as China, Cuba, Algeria, and Ghana. Malcolm X, Ella Baker, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Huey P. Newton, Angela Davis, Amiri Baraka, Kwame Ture, and others were eloquent advocates of global solidarity with those whom Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. referred to as "the barefoot people of the earth." These groups sought both to complete the Great American Revolution and to transform the American Century into something more akin to a "People's Century." The triumph of the Right in the 1980s was part of a global reversal of these trends, and perhaps predictably took the form of a restoration of the age-old ideological refrain lodging the causes of poverty within the vices and weaknesses of the poor.

We argue the macrosociological framework for this evolution above. That the conclusion to the issues that the country faced was not foreordained can be glimpsed in the career of Daniel Patrick Moynihan and his famous report, *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action.* Both careers spanned the height of the global liberalism that promised to expand the benefits of the New Deal to all, and the precipitous drop from those heights, and the corresponding sharp turn to the right of the nation's political center.

With the passage of both the Civil Rights Bill and the Voting Rights Bill by 1965, the expectation was that Black people would rapidly assimilate into white society on the basis of

equality. The Moynihan Report was a cautionary note arguing that such assimilation could not be expected because of the crumbling of the family structure among the Negro lower class. The family is said to have been the basic unit of American life, and to have been central in promoting the rapid progress of those immigrant groups that have been most successful in American life. But the demand for equality of results central to the Negro Revolution would be frustrated because of the sad plight of the lower-class Negro family. In attributing this state of affairs to 300 years of almost unimaginable treatment, Moynihan held that the historical record justifies compensatory policies that would achieve equality of results as demanded by Bayard Rustin. If we do not achieve equality of results, Moynihan argues, there will be no social peace (Moynihan 1967:2–3).

It should not be lost that Moynihan located the Negro Revolution within the same landscape as India's struggle against British colonialism, the decolonization of Africa, and the increasing tensions between the white world and people of color the world over. So it is within this broader geopolitical arena that Moynihan worries about the political culture of lower class Negroes, specifically the Black Muslim doctrine, based on total alienation from the white world. For Moynihan who has one eye on violent rebellions in Black inner cities and the other on Vietnam, this implies the possibility that Blacks may be attracted to Chinese communism. He argues that the course of world events will be profoundly affected by the success or failure of the Negro Revolution in seeking peaceful assimilation of the races within the United States (Moynihan 1967:1).

The continued oppression of the Negro (particularly the male) is said to have worked against the emergence of a strong father figure. He thought that "segregation, and the submissiveness it exacts, is surely more destructive to the male than to the female personality. Keeping the Negro 'in his place' can be translated as keeping the Negro male in his place: the female was not a threat to anyone" (Moynihan 1967:16). The Negro community has been forced into a matriarchal structure, which, because it is so out of line with the rest of American society, seriously retards the progress of the group as a whole.

He tells us that ours is a society that presumes male leadership in private and public affairs, and a subculture in which this is not the pattern is placed at a distinct disadvantage. This matriarchal society is what Moynihan deems "the tangle of pathology." In contrast to the Negro family, the white family, despite many variants, remains a powerful agency, not only for transmitting property from one generation to the next, but also for transmitting contacts with the world of education and work.

> [T]hree centuries of injustice have brought about deep-seated structural distortions in the life of the Negro American. At this point, the present tangle of pathology is capable of perpetuating itself without assistance from the white world. The cycle can be broken only if these distortions are set right . . . a national effort must be directed towards the question of family structure. (Moynihan 1967:47)

We should recall that *The Negro Family* was written during the most dramatic expansion in the economy in history. This expansion was the context of the social democratic strategy in the core states. Between 1967 and 1973, the economy began to stagnate and the ensuing profit squeeze was compounded by a geopolitical crisis in Vietnam and a crisis of governability because of the unruliness of the inner-city poor and their radical allies.

In line with the changes going on at that time, Moynihan's position would shift. He edited a volume entitled *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Science* in which he argued in his introduction, entitled "The Professors and the Poor," that the fashionable poverty ideology promoted by intellectuals within the poverty program was a disservice to the poor. He had nothing but contempt for these "white radicals" who gained positions of

authority within the Office of Economic Opportunity and who perpetrated the notion that the poor are in poverty because the power structure deprived them of opportunity. In support of this position he cites Walter Miller's contention that

> Opportunity is not something that people are either inside or outside of. Americans may achieve widely varying degrees of success or failure in a thousand different spheres and in a thousand different ways. Beaming to lower status people the message that one can attain "success goals" by breaching, demolishing or otherwise forcing the "walls" that bar them from "opportunity" conveys a tragically oversimplified and misleading impression of the conditions and circumstances of success, in addition to fostering an imagery with potentially destructive consequences. (Moynihan 1968:32)

Moynihan argues that the function of many of the community action program was to raise the level of perceived and validated discontent among poor persons with the social system about them, without actually improving the conditions of life of the poor in anything like a comparable degree. For Moynihan, to blame the system is not an analysis, but its opposite.

In 1967 Moynihan delivered an address to the national board of the Americans for Democratic Action entitled "The Politics of Stability." He attempted to understand the violence that the nation faced in the inner cities and in Vietnam as a consequence of liberal actions or caretaking.

> Liberals must see more clearly that their essential interest is in the stability of the social order; and given the present threats to that stability, they must seek out and make more effective alliances with political conservatives who share their interest and recognize that unyielding rigidity is just as great a threat to continuity of the social order as an anarchic desire for change.

> Liberals must divest themselves of the notion that the nation—and especially the cities of the nation—can be run from agencies in Washington. (Moynihan 1975:188)

> Liberals must somehow overcome the curious condescension that takes the form of defending and explaining away anything, however outrageous, which Negroes, individually or collectively, might do. (Moynihan 1975:191)

In tracing Moynihan's career, Darryl Michael Scott argues that in February 1964 as the Johnson administration planned the War on Poverty, Moynihan argued that welfare had made poverty more endurable instead of providing an escape from it. As the War on Poverty progressed, Moynihan argued that welfare was a great achievement, but it must not be allowed to become the economic system of a permanent subculture. Men need jobs, families need fathers, communities need independence (Scott 1997:155). The War on Poverty is said to have substituted the chimera of political empowerment (the citizen participation stipulations of the Office of Economic Opportunity, known as the Community Action Program) for the time-tested process of social mobility. Scott argues that he wanted the state to assist the poor in their quest for social mobility, not to forge them into a self-conscious and politically active group.

But the conflict between Moynihan's class-conscious liberals (who view the path of individual social mobility as the best road to social justice) and racial liberals would soon take a back seat to the conservative backlash, which emerged front and center after the 1965 Watts uprising. After Watts, the *Wall Street Journal* ran an article with the headline "Family Life Breakdown in Negro Slums Sows Seeds of Race Violence: Husbandless Homes Spawn Young Hoodlums, Impede Reforms, Sociologists Say." The *Wall Street Journal* relied on academic authorities who were decidedly outside the group of racial liberals who had been most active in social policy making and deliberation in Johnson's Great Society Programs. Thus the conservatives claimed the Moynihan Report as their own and elaborated a new genteel racism that asserted that unemployment is a result of the breakdown of the Black family, poor

education a result of cultural deprivation among Negroes, and slum conditions the lack of acculturation among Southern Negro migrants to the urban North.

Patricia Hill Collins (1991) held that such discussions about the Black family used a convergence of race and gender to explain the social class position of Blacks. Racial difference is used to explain class disadvantage, and gender deviance is used to account for racial difference. Social class is not viewed as a causal variable that actively shapes the life chances of Black people, their family life, or their attitudes and values. The image of the welfare mother, furthermore, provides ideological justifications of interlocking systems of gender, race, and class oppression.

The War on Poverty, short-lived though it was, is often blamed for the conditions in today's inner cities. While it is true that the War on Poverty did not really end poverty, it had a striking impact. The number of poor fell from 18 percent in 1960 to only 9 percent in 1972 (Quadagno 1994:175). Child poverty rates declined from 27 percent in 1960 to 15 percent in 1974. The percentage of Blacks enrolled in college increased from 13 percent in 1965 to 22.6 percent by 1975. By 1989 the number of Blacks holding white-collar jobs had increased by 522 percent. But poor Blacks did not fare nearly so well. Between the early 1970s and the late 1980s, the percentage of two-parent Black families fell from 63.4 to 40.6 percent. The labor force participation rate of Black high school dropouts fell by 25 percent. Jobless rates for Black men rose from 4.7 to 13.6 percent, and the percentage of Black children born out of wedlock increased from 35.1 percent to 62.6 percent.

When Reagan took office in 1981, he proceeded to roll back the welfare state. Funds for job training declined from more than $6 million in 1980 to less than $2.5 million in 1984. In 1981, federal aid to cities was reduced to 1968 levels. Support for low income housing was reduced markedly from 183,000 starts in 1980 to 28,000 starts in 1985 (Quadagno 1994:178).

Some advocates of the family values crusade argued that the absence of a biological father in the home has replaced race and class as the major cause of socioeconomic inequality and psychological disadvantage in America. Traditional conservatives, such as George Will, held that what is called the "race crisis" is in reality a class problem arising from dysfunctional families and destructive behaviors. But the conservative contention that Blacks are lacking in family values does not square with studies that show that traditional family ideology is as strong as or stronger among some Blacks than among whites, and indeed to be quite strong among low-income Blacks as well (Staples 1994).

The defenders of historical capitalism have always blamed poverty on the poor rather than the system of structural inequality in which they live. The attack on the Black family is simply the focal point of the capitalist attack on any form of egalitarianism, an attempt to rationalize the structural inequality that is inherent to capitalism. Spiraling poverty would discredit the system save for finding an explanation that is ideologically acceptable to large numbers of its supporters. This is precisely the role that racism plays. But the rebellions of the inner city threatened to breach the social reforms used to contain the dangerous classes.

Since this was the era of the rising of the women, Black feminists have argued most forcefully for a strategy based on race, class, gender, and sexuality as interlocking forms of oppression. This contribution by Patricia Hill Collins, Angela Davis, and Rose Brewer adds a depth to the Black Liberation movement and its potential for unifying broader emancipatory forces that portends an uncompromising break with the U.S.-centric perspective that the ruling class labored so hard to install across the political spectrum from the Right to the social democratic Left during the postwar period. It was Malcolm X's insight that most effectively demolished the power of that consensus among African Americans when he argued that the Negro problem was not simply an American problem or a Black problem, that it was an issue

of the haves against the have-nots on a global scale—an issue not of civil rights but of human rights. An anti-racist movement must oppose pan-European racism on a global scale and fight to make this a contending element in our common sense to counter the U.S.-centric consensus. This strategy must be central to all our efforts, and compromise on this position is a dead end for progressive social change, pure and simple.

REFERENCES

Allen, Robert, "Reassessing the Internal Colonialism Theory," *The Black Scholar,* Vol. 35, No. 1, Spring 2005, pp. 2–11.

Bush, Melanie, *Breaking the Code of Good Intentions: Everyday Forms of Whiteness.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.

Collins, Patricia Hill, *Black Feminist Thought.* New York: Routledge, 1998.

Collins, Patricia Hill, "A Comparison of Two Works on Black Family Life." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* Vol. 14, No. 4, 1989, pp. 875–884.

Du Bois, W.E.B., *The World and Africa.* New York: International Publishers, 1992.

Du Bois, W.E.B., *The Souls of Black Folks.* Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, 1961.

Grant, Madison, *The Passing of the Great Race or the Racial Basis of European History.* New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1920.

Grosfoguel, Ramon, Introduction: "'Cultural Racism' and Colonial Caribbean Migrants in the Core Zones of the Capitalist World-Economy," *Review,* Vol. 22, No. 4, 1999, pp. 409–434.

Grosfoguel, Ramon and Ana Margarita Cervantes-Rodriguez, "Unthinking Twentieth-Century Eurocentric Mythologies: Universalist Knowledges, Decolonization, and Developmentalism," in Grosfoguel and Cervantes-Rodriguez (eds.), *The Modern/Colonial/Capitalist World-System in the Twentieth Century: Global Processes, Antisystemic Movements, and the Geopolitics of Knowledge.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002.

Harrison, Hubert Henry, *When Africa Awakes.* Baltimore, MD: Black Classics Press, 1997.

Hawkins, Clifton C., *"Race First versus Class First": An Intellectual History of Afro-American Radicalism, 1911–1928.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Davis, 2000.

Hewitt, Cynthia Lucas, "Racial Accumulation on a World-Scale: Racial Inequality and Employment," *Review,* Vol. 25, No. 2, 2002, pp. 137–171.

James, Winston, *Holding Aloft the Banner of Ethiopia: Caribbean Radicalism in Early Twentieth-Century America.* New York: Verso, 1998.

Kousser, J. Morgan, *Colorblind Injustice: Minority Voting Rights and the Undoing of the Second Reconstruction.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Makalani, Minkah, *For the Liberation of Black People Everywhere: The African Blood Brotherhood, Black Radicalism, and Pan-African Liberation in the New Negro Movement, 1917–1936.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2004.

Malcolm X, *The End of White World Supremacy: Four Speeches.* New York: Merlin House, 1971.

Marable, Manning, *Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945–1982.* Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press, 1985.

Mignolo, Walter, "The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference," *South Atlantic Quarterly,* Vol. 101, No. 1, Winter 2002, pp. 57–96.

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action,* in Lee Rainwater and W.L. Yancey (eds.), *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1967.

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, "The Professors and the Poor," in Moynihan (ed.) *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences.* New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Newton, Huey, *To Die for the People.* New York: Random House, 1972.

Perry, Jeffrey, *A Hubert Harrison Reader.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2001.

Quadagno, Jill, *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Quijano, Anibal, "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from South,* Vol. 1, No. 3, 2000, pp. 533–580.

Quijano, Aníbal and Immanuel Wallerstein, "Americanity as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World-System," *Social Science Journal,* Vol. 44, No. 4, 1992, pp. 549–557.

Santiago-Valles, Kelvin, "Racially Subordinate Labour Within Global Contexts: Robinson And Hopkins Re-Examined." *Race Class,* Vol. 47, 2005, pp. 54–70.

Santiago-Valles, Kelvin, "'Race,' Labor, 'Women's proper Place,' and the Birth of Nations: Some Notes on Historicizing the Coloniality of Power," *The New Centennial Review,* Vol. 3, No. 3, Fall 2003, pp. 47–69.

Scott, Daryl Michael, *Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche, 1880–1996.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Silver, Beverly and Eric Slater, "The Social Origins of World Hegemony," in Giovanni Arrighi and Beverly J. Silver (eds.), *Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999, pp. 131–206.

Singh, Nikhil Pal, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Staples, Robert (ed.), *The Black Family: Essays and Studies (5th Edition).* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1994.

Stoddard, Lothrop, *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy.* New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1921.

Von Eschen, Penny, *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937–1957.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Wallerstein, Immanuel and Terence K. Hopkins, *The Age of Transition: Trajectory of the World System, 1945–2025.* London: Zed Press, 1997.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, "The Racist Albatross: Social Science, Jorg Haider, and Widerstand." 2000a (Lecture at the Universität Wien, Mar. 9, 2000, in the series, "Von der Notwendigkeit des Überflüssigen-Sozialwissenschaften und Gesellschaft." An abridged version appeared in the *London Review of Books*, May 18, 2000. Also as "Racism: Our Albatorss" in Wallerstein, The Decline of American Power: The U.S. in a Chaotic World. New York: The New Press, 2003).

Wallerstein, Immanuel, "Cultures in Conflict? Who Are We? Who Are the Others?" Y.K. Pao Distinguished Chair Lecture, Center for Cultural Studies, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Sept. 20, 2000b.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, *Historical Capitalism and Capitalist Civilization.* New York: Verso, 1995.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Capitalist World-Economy.* Boston: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Wynter, Sylvia 2003, "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—an Argument," *The New Centennial Review,* Vol. 3, No. 3, Fall 2003, pp. 257–337.