RACE in AMERICA

Restructuring Inequality

INTERGROUP RACE RELATIONS

The Third of Seven Reports on the Race in America Conference

June 3–6, 2010

CENTER ON RACE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Editors: Larry E. Davis and Ralph Bangs

RACE IN AMERICA: RESTRUCTURING INEQUALITY

INTERGROUP RACE RELATIONS REPORT

CENTER ON RACE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Despite significant progress in America's stride toward racial equality, there remains much to be done. Some problems are worse today than they were during the turbulent times of the 1960s. Indeed, racial disparities across a number of areas are blatant—family formation, employment levels, community violence, incarceration rates, educational attainment, and health and mental health outcomes.

As part of an attempt to redress these race-related problems, the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work and Center on Race and Social Problems organized the conference Race in America: Restructuring Inequality, which was held at the University of Pittsburgh June 3–6, 2010. The goal of the conference was to promote greater racial equality for all Americans. As our entire society has struggled to recover from a major economic crisis, we believed it was an ideal time to restructure existing systems rather than merely rebuilding them as they once were. Our present crisis afforded us the opportunity to start anew to produce a society that promotes greater equality of life outcomes for all of its citizens.

The conference had two parts: 20 daytime sessions for registered attendees and three free public evening events. The daytime conference sessions had seven foci: economics, education, criminal justice, race relations, health, mental health, and families/youth/elderly. Each session consisted of a 45-minute presentation by two national experts followed by one hour of questions and comments by the audience. The evening events consisted of an opening lecture by Julian Bond, a lecture on economics by Julianne Malveaux, and a panel discussion on postracial America hosted by Alex Castellanos of CNN.

This report summarizes information provided in the intergroup race relations sessions at the conference. The value of this report is that it provides access to the extensive and detailed information disseminated at the conference. This information will be particularly helpful to community and policy leaders interested in gaining a better understanding of race relations and finding effective strategies for improving these conditions.

Disclaimer:

This post-conference Race in America report includes detailed summaries of the presentations and subsequent discussions that took place. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work or Center on Race and Social Problems.

Table of Contents

Race: Changing Composition, Changing Definition

Presenter: Howard Hogan, Associate Director for Demographic Programs, U.S. Census Bureau

Moderator: Pat Chew, Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh

America's categorization of race is more of a definition of how America chooses to see individuals and less the result of how people categorize themselves. Our concept of race in the United States has evolved over the country's history. In America's first census in 1790, the country viewed itself racially as comprising only three groups: Whites, slaves, and others. American Indians were not identified as a distinct group for this census. As immigration increased, our racial composition changed rapidly, and it was for this reason that in 1850 and 1860, the United States felt that it was necessary to gather information on the birthplaces of individuals. The term "Black" was first used as a census race category in the census of 1850, and the term "Negro" did not appear as a census race category until 1930.

Most of our current racial categories stem from the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB). During the 1970s, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights felt that it was necessary to develop more precise definitions of race and a policy for the collection of racial and ethnic data. The racial and ethnic categories developed by OMB in 1977 were American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, White, and Hispanic/Latino. OMB revised and further defined these categories in 1997.

In the 2000 census, the United States saw a huge increase in its minority population. As these minority groups continue to grow in size and as individuals continue to reject the group affiliations assigned to them by the census and OMB, the United States will have to devise innovative ways of creating racial categories that individuals are more willing to accept.

The Past

- *1790 Census:* America thought of itself racially as three groups: Whites, slaves, and American Indians.

- *1850 Census:* This census included separate questionnaires for free persons and slaves. Free individuals were asked to identify as "B" for Black, "M" for Mulatto, or nothing for White. Also, America's first mass immigration was at its peak from 1940 to 1950 when large numbers of Irish, Germans, British and French immigrated to the United States. The U.S. Census began gathering information on the birthplaces of individuals.

- *1860 Census:* The concept of race changed to reflect the influx of immigrants coming into the country. Attempts were made to identify American Indians, and Chinese as a category appeared only for residents of California.

- *1870 Census:* Japanese and Chinese (beyond California) made their first appearances as census race categories. By this time, respondents included children of the 1840s and 1850s immigration, and America began to tailor census questions that would gather information on the birthplaces of parents of second-generation immigrants.

- *1890 Census:* Individuals were instructed to select among the following categories of "Race or Color." This was the first attempt to collect census data about American Indians.

  1. White
  2. Black
  3. Mulatto
  4. Quadroon
  5. Octoroon
  6. Chinese
  7. Japanese
  8. Indian

  Many census respondents did not understand the distinction between race categories, such as the distinction between "Mulatto," "Quadroon," and "Octoroon." However, Mulatto, Quadroon, and Octoroon were not eliminated as categories until after the 1920 census.

- *1930 Census:* The term "Negro" made its first appearance as a race category in the census. Mexican and Hindu also made their first appearance. "Mexican" as a selection for race appeared only in this census and was eliminated after protests from the Mexican embassy that Mexicans are White and not a separate racial category.

- *1960 Census:* First-time appearance of:

  1. Hawaiian
  2. Part-Hawaiian
  3. Eskimo or Aleut

The Present

In 1997, OMB issued revised categories for data on race and ethnicity. They included five categories related to race and one (Hispanic or Latino) related to ethnicity and were defined as follows:

1. American Indian or Alaska Native: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment. This is the only category that has a legal definition, and tribal affiliation or community attachment is required.

2. Asian: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

3. Black or African American: A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

4. Hispanic or Latino: A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race. Data on Hispanic ethnicity was first collected in the 1970 U.S. Census.

5. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, and Samoa or other Pacific islands.

6. White: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

- *1990 Census:* First appearance of "Indian (Amer.)". This was an attempt to clarify that this category was intended for those who identified as American Indian. The word "American" next to race choices confused many. For example, there were many people from the southern part of the United States that chose "South American" in the Hispanic origin question on previous censuses. To avoid this confusion, "American" was placed in brackets next to race choices.

- *2000 Census:* The interracial population increased to 2.9 percent in the country by 1990, and the multiracial movement intensified. In response, people were able to choose more than one race on census forms. The census questionnaire also included the option of "Some Other Race."

- *2010 Census:* Detailed group examples were re-introduced for Hispanic, Asian, and Pacific Islander response categories (e.g., Hispanic: Colombian, Dominican, etc.). The census is still struggling to find ways to properly identify and categorize race in a way that people understand and fully accept. Children who are identified as multiracial may define themselves as only one race as they reach adulthood.

The Future of Race and Ethnicity Categories in America

Over the next 20 years, the population of the elderly will increase, and in 2026, the first baby boomers will turn 80 years of age. In the future, the Hispanic population will continue to grow,

but it will still look very similar to the current Hispanic population. More and more children will be born to parents of different races and ethnicities as we continue to have a mobile, more integrated population. These are just a few of the many social changes that will affect the U.S. population. As a result, categories for race and ethnicity will continue to be problematic as groups outgrow and reject the classifications given to them by the U.S. Census Bureau and OMB. One example of this is the Afro-Caribbean population, many of whom do not identify themselves as African American.

The concept of race and identification of racial origin continue to serve a role in the United States with regard to monitoring and enforcing civil rights legislation for employment, educational opportunities, and housing. It was for this reason the U.S. Supreme Court, in the 1980s, declared Judaism to be a race for purposes of antidiscrimination. Data on race also are used to study changes in the social, economic, and demographic characteristics and changes in our population. But there is no reason to assume that it will get easier for OMB and the U.S. Census Bureau to make the kind of distinctions they need to be able to collect this information.

To address this problem, the U.S. Census Bureau is conducting experiments with alternative questions to assess how the format of a question affects the ways individuals respond to it. In-depth interviews and focus groups are now being conducted with different race and ethnic groups to formulate more effective ways of categorizing race. The trend is toward assessing how individuals perceive themselves with regard to race and ethnicity and how they believe they are perceived by those around them.

Reference

Humes, K. and Hogan, H. (2009). Measurement of race and ethnicity in a changing, multicultural America. *Race and Social Problems*. 1(3): 111–131.

Leveraging America's Increasing Diversity

Presenter: Patricia Gurin, Nancy Cantor Distinguished University Professor Emerita of
         Psychology and Women's Studies, University of Michigan

Moderator: Pat Chew, Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh

The coexistence of people from different backgrounds, races, and ethnicities alone is not enough to increase positive interactions among them. Because of the difficulty in getting people to talk about race, programs that facilitate candid discussions about diversity issues could be useful in increasing opportunities for positive interaction among different racial and ethnic groups.

Diversity in any characteristic of space, institution, or organization should be mediated in order for society to receive the most benefit. Inequality and disparity have increased along racial lines in recent years in spite of the tremendous growth of racial and ethnic diversity in America. As diversity in the United States continues to grow, more social mechanisms will need to be in place at all levels to properly deal with problems of discrimination and inequity.

Research shows the value in creating more opportunities for positive intergroup relations in society. College-level courses in intergroup dialogue are one way to create opportunities for promoting effective interactions between students of different backgrounds. Students who experience positive interactions in intergroup relations during college harbor less prejudice (conscious and unconscious), have a more positive demeanor toward diversity, and exemplify greater openness to multiple perspectives in their adult lives.

The Problem

People from different backgrounds, races, and ethnicities who coexist do not necessarily increase the probability of actual positive interactions among them. It takes more than being in the same space to make diversity beneficial. Forms and institutions of inequality are interconnected, and you have to address the interconnections of inequality in order to create major change. Talking about race across races is incredibly difficult.

Causes

Diversity in any kind of characteristic of a space, institution, or organization somehow needs to be mediated in order for it to have any meaning. Among the challenges America faces are:

The Demographic Challenge

America is becoming a more diverse place, and social mechanisms need to be in place to deal with it properly.

The Democracy Challenge

There is an enormous problem with inequality and disparity—across racial and ethnic lines—that continually has gotten worse during the past 10–20 years.

The "Rise of the Rest"

It is more important than ever for students to learn how to dialogue with people from other backgrounds, because they will be graduating into a world where the United States is not the only economic leader.

Solutions

Universities can help to improve race relations. First, simply having racial and ethnic diversity on college campuses is associated with:

- Reduced prejudice (both unconscious and conscious)
- Cognitive development on various measures
- More positive attitudes toward diversity
- Greater adherence to democratic values
- Stronger electoral behavior
- Leadership skills
- Openness to multiple perspectives
- More integrated lifestyles as adults

Structural diversity (the racial and ethnic composition of a space) on college campuses can primarily increase the probability of interaction across differences. However, these interactions often result in negative reactions, such as:

For Whites	**For Racial/Ethnic Minorities**
- Concerns about being prejudiced (also, concerns about being viewed as being prejudiced)	- Concerns about being the target of prejudice
- Anxiety	- Compensatory strategies
- Depleted executive (frontal lobe) functioning	- Negative emotions
- Increased cardiovascular reactivity	- Feeling inauthentic in interactions with those outside of their race or ethnicity
- Nervous behaviors	

The Program on Intergroup Relations

Intergroup Dialogue is a program at the University of Michigan and other universities. This program brings together students on a voluntary basis (students apply to be part of the program) and asks them to dialogue on diversity topics, deal with the contentious issues that may arise as a result of that dialogue, and over time begin to understand each other and form coalitions with one another. The educational goals of Intergroup Dialogue are to increase intergroup understanding, establish positive intergroup relations through empathy and motivation to bridge differences, and create intergroup action and collaboration. The program consists of credit-bearing courses in intergroup dialogue.

A study across nine colleges and universities is being conducted to discover the program's effects on intergroup relations among students. The research has found that these are the conditions under which intergroup dialogue is effective:

- Two groups of students, equal numbers in each group
- Sustained personal contact
- An official class that provides legitimation of authorities
- A common goal: to capitalize on differences, while at the same time recognizing similarities, to get to some kind of action

The program also has identified two types of processes in intergroup dialogue:

- Dialogic (about relationships characterized by dialogue)
    - Active listening
    - Asking questions, follow-up, and inquiry
    - Sharing of perspectives
- Critical
    - Identifying one's assumptions
    - Critical analysis of inequalities
    - Individual and collective reflection on the activity that has taken place and what was learned

The instructional methods of the program are:

- Content—reading, assignments, papers
- Structured interaction—equal numbers/statuses and active learning exercises to illustrate concepts
- Facilitative guidance

The program promotes effective interaction through:

- Guided and sustained facilitation that lasts for an entire semester
- Helping students to deal with anxiety and concerns about prejudice and to view the interaction in "promotive rather than preventative" ways, i.e., opportunities for learning rather than avoiding appearing prejudiced
- Teaching listening exercises to students
- Addressing the different needs of advantaged and disadvantaged group members – for personalized relationships based on commonalities v. explorations of power and privilege and how to affect social change

Finally, members of high-powered and more advantaged groups come into Intergroup Dialogue wanting to find commonalities. Members of low-power groups come into Intergroup Dialogue wanting to discuss inequalities and affect social change. The program balances desires for personal connection with the importance of understanding groups, cultures, and inequalities.

References

Allport, G.W. (1955). *Becoming: Basic considerations for a psychology of personality*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Walsh, K.C. (2004). *Talking about race: Community dialogues and the politics of difference (Studies in communication, media, and public opinion)*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Wilkinson, R.G. and Pickett, K. (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London, England; New York, N.Y.: Allen Lane.

Zakaria, F. (2008). *The post-American world*. New York, N.Y.: W.W. Norton & Co.

Obama and the Durable Racialization of American Politics

Presenter: Lawrence D. Bobo, W.E.B. Du Bois Professor of the Social Sciences, Harvard
        University

Moderator: Lu-in Wang, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Law, University
        of Pittsburgh

There are some in American society who are unable to assess issues of racial discord because
they accept the concept that the United States has become a postracial nation. There are others
who consider postracialism to be a politically neutralizing falsehood that veils how the racial
divide is constructed and maintained in American society. The prevalence of racial dissonance
has waned over time in comparison to the racial conflicts America faced in the past. However, in
order for this recuperation to continue, American society has to be forthright about current race
relations conditions and open to developing new ways to improve relations in the future.

The United States has adopted a new contemporary form of racism, because the blatant Jim
Crow discrimination of years past is not as socially acceptable. The characteristics of this
contemporary form, called laissez-faire racism, are the widespread and consequential harboring
of negative stereotypes and the collective racial resentment of African Americans. Laissez-faire
racism is very prevalent in today's society despite the belief by many that the United States has
transitioned into postracialism, spearheaded by Barack Obama's presidential election. However,
the majority of White voters chose not to vote for Barack Obama for president. An
overwhelming majority of minority voters chose to vote for him.

There are several reasons why America has not reached the point where the color line between
Blacks and Whites has become blurred beyond recognition. First, only 14.6 percent of U.S.
marriages in 2008 were between spouses of a different race or ethnicity, and only 11 percent of
these mixed marriages were White-Black. Second, only 7 million (2 percent) of the U.S.
population in 2000 marked more than one race on the census. One-quarter of these were Black.
Third, Black-White wealth gaps have grown, even among educated Blacks.

In order to relieve some of the racial discord in society, progressive dialogue on the current
realities of race relations in the United States is needed, as well as structural and cultural change.

The Problem

Many Americans believe, partly as a result of Obama's election, that America is postracial,
"Blackness" is being "erased," and America is a happy tale of assimilation. Reality is just the
opposite.

Causes

The success of Barack Obama's presidential campaign is one that reflects the durable
racialization of American politics. Obama's election should not be seen as the milestone that

ended racism in American society even though his political success is regarded as the one major event that fuels the postracial narrative in American society. Although Obama's election is a great achievement, it is an accomplishment as confined and constrained by race as it is an accomplishment that transcends race. Obama's political success hinges on his continued deft management of the racial divide in the United States. This racial divide includes:

- Gallup polls reveal that 30 percent of Whites believe they are more intelligent than Blacks, and 50 percent believe they are more hardworking
- Eighty percent of Whites believe Blacks should overcome prejudice without special favors from the government
- The national presidential election exit poll results show that Obama received:
  - 43 percent of the White vote
  - 95 percent of the Black vote
  - 67 percent of the Latino and Asian vote
- Despite the belief that Obama's election pushed America into a postracial society, Obama received the most death threats ever of any president elect, and racist political cartoons appeared in several major newspapers and publications across the country.

The new configuration of racial attitudes by Whites in America is one that accepts a laissez-faire approach to racism and steadily repudiates Jim Crow racial ideology. In laissez-faire racism, negative stereotypes about African Americans remain widespread and consequential.

Collective Racial Resentment

In laissez-faire racism there is also collective racial resentment. This relates to a core narrative about the nature of Black-White inequality in which the individual choices and cultural shortcomings of Blacks are the primary sources for any disadvantages facing the Black community. This belief frowns upon any political initiative to undo systematic racial inequality or improve the social circumstances of African Americans. The belief in collective racial resentment is that Blacks should overcome prejudice without any special favors and without any commitment by the rest of society or government to undo inequality.

Although many Blacks concur with the sentiments of collective racial resentment, a majority still believes that discrimination exists on many levels. There also is an emotional tonality among Whites in relation to collective racial resentment. This is not represented in Blacks who may harbor the same beliefs.

Collective racial resentment is highly correlated with which political party people associate. This association has grown stronger in recent years, and it correlates with how people actually vote.

The anti-Black cultural project of "erasing Blackness" has not destabilized the core racial binary. Although many believe that miscegenation—the mixing of races through marriage, cohabitation, sexual relations, and procreation—an overwhelming majority of Whites, Blacks, Hispanics and Asians still marry within their racial group.

Miscegenation

Many Americans buy into the notion that miscegenation is causing the end of the Black and White races and that eventually the color line between Whites and Blacks will become blurred beyond recognition. The data show:

- African Americans are the least likely of all races to marry Whites
- Although the pace of interracial marriage increased more rapidly in the 1990s than it did in other periods, the social boundaries between Blacks and Whites remained highly rigid and resistant to change
- Although interracial marriages have increased greatly in recent years, they still only account for 15 percent of marriages in the U.S.
- Only 7 million Americans (2 percent) identified more than one race when given the option to do so on the 2000 Census. Of those 7 million, one-quarter identified having any mixture with African Americans
- Biracial African American-White individuals have historically identified themselves as Black and typically married other African Americans.

Ethnic Heterogeneity

The number of foreign-born in the United States who are classified as Black has increased to nearly 3 million, circa 2005. Despite this huge change, more than 89 percent of Blacks are classified as regular, non-Hispanic, American-born Blacks.

The configuration of the racial separation in the United States may be moving away from one that is Black-White and into a division that is more Black-Non-Black.

Race and Class

Race and class interact, as opposed to a situation in which class operates as the fundamental basis of racial division. The growth of a Black middle class does not mean or foreordain an end to racism. In terms of data:

- The median wealth gap between Whites and Blacks has increased from $20,000 to $95,000 since 1984.
- Without extraordinary effort through reparations, there is no way that the White-Black economic gap will ever close.

The fundamental purpose of the one-drop rule, which was part of Virginia's Racial Integrity Act of 1924, was to ensure Black children had no claim on the wealth of Whites. The act tried to protect the integrity of the White race by criminalizing miscegenation between Whites and non-Whites.

Take America Back versus Inertia of Diversity

Census trends show that by 2050, Whites will be less than 50 percent of the population. If current trends persist, today's multiracial hierarchy could be replaced by a dual or bimodal one consisting of non-Black and Black population categories, with a third residual category for the groups that do not, or do not yet, fit into the basic dualism (Gans, 1999).

The notion of the United States as a happy tale of assimilation among immigrants remains misleading at best:

- Asian Americans are perpetually seen as foreign regardless of how many generations their families have been in the United States. The rate of intermarriage is increasingly pan-ethnic, as opposed to intermarriage between Whites and Asians.
- The Latino community, particularly those of Mexican-American descent, is now in the midst of deep racialization.
    - Economic fortunes are at or below those of African Americans
    - African Americans are advantaged compared to undocumented Latinos because they have the benefit of American citizenship
    - In income ratios since the 1970s, Latino men and women have been steadily losing ground.

Solutions

1. Honest and progressive discourse: Only on the basis of truth can there be true reconciliation in race relations.
2. Policy priorities: Wealth accumulation strategies are needed for minority populations. These strategies should atone for excluding Blacks and Latinos from the Social Security Act, initial Aid to Families with Dependent Children and unemployment coverage, and the G.I. Bill and home mortgage opportunities.
3. There must be continuity in the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws, particularly in housing, to undo racial residential segregation.
4. There needs to be an end to the War on Drugs and a dismantling of racialized mass incarceration.
5. Meaningful strategies to help close the achievement gap have to be implemented.
6. We need positive cultural *and* structural change, rather than just structural change. Structural change alone will not be enough to change the hearts and minds of American society.

References

Bai, M. (2008). Is Obama the end of Black politics? *New York Times Magazine*, 8. Retrieved from Newspaper Source database.

Dickerson, D.J. (2005). *The end of Blackness: Returning the souls of Black folk to their rightful owners*. New York, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.

Dickerson, D.J. (2007). Colorblind: Barack Obama would be the great Black hope in the next presidential race—if he were actually Black [Web log comment]. Retrieved from www.salon.com/news/opinion/feature/2007/01/22/obama/index.html.

Gans, H.J. (1999). The possibility of a new racial hierarchy in the 21st-century United States, in M. Lamont, ed., *The cultural territories of race: Black and White boundaries*. Chicago, Ill.; London, England: University of Chicago Press and New York, N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hsu, H. (2009). The end of White America? *The Atlantic*. January/February. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/01/the-end-of-White-america/7208/.

Johnson, C. (2008). The end of the Black American narrative: A new century calls for new stories grounded in the present, leaving behind the painful history of slavery and its consequences. *American Scholar.* 77(3): 32–42.

Massey, D.S. (2009). Racial formation in theory and practice: The case of Mexicans in the United States. *Race and Social Problems*. 1(1): 12–26.

Remnick, D. (2008). The Joshua generation: Race and the campaign of Barack Obama. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from www.newyorker.com/reporting/2008/11/17/081117fa_fact_remnick#ixzz16Wm5WOcT.

Telles, E.E., and Ortiz, V. (2008). *Generations of exclusion: Mexican Americans, assimilation, and race*. New York, N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation.

Tierney, J. (2008). Where have all the bigots gone? *The New York Times.* Retrieved from tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/11/07/where-have-all-the-bigots-gone/.

Somewhere Over the Rainbow?: Postracial and Panracial Politics in the Age of Obama

Presenter: Taeku Lee, Professor of Political Science and Law, University of California at Berkeley

Moderator: Lu-in Wang, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh

Postracism has several forms in society, and each of these forms is a failed attempt at creating an empirical reality that colorblindness exists. Even though Obama's presidential election convinced many that America is now a postracial society, recent political commentary and movements have been increasingly "racialized." The Tea Party movement demonstrates how political movements in U.S. society have become increasingly racial. A majority of supporters of the Tea Party movement are White, and a majority of Tea Party supporters harbor negative sentiments toward Blacks, immigrant populations, and gay/lesbian rights.

Disparities in incarceration rates are high and have increased in recent years. Latinos are three times as likely and Blacks are five times as likely as Whites to face prison incarceration in the United States. In addition, Blacks and Latinos are more than four times more likely to be imprisoned at some point in their lives compared to Whites. A cultural switch to a panracial categorization of race is a crucial step toward creating a society that is inclusive of all races and nationalities. Collective action is necessary to move society to develop a panracial view. For collective action to work, individuals must choose to act as part of a group and must choose which group best represents their interests.

The Problem

Many Americans live under the false notion that the country has become a postracial society. The concept of postracial often means different things for different people, and many use the term without offering a definition. It need not include the elimination of race but might simply be a desire to transcend past the point of race's having any significance for the greater good. In effect, postracialism can be an ideological commitment to colorblindness without the empirical reality. Some attempts at postracialism take the form of:

- Coda: The belief in the end of the importance of race in society
- Trans: Reaching beyond, to the exceptional
- Abnegation: Renouncement or rejection of race in society
- Invisibility: Pretending race no longer exists. One example of this is the failed California Proposition 54: Racial Privacy Initiative, Section 32(a), which stated: "The state shall not classify any individual by race, ethnicity, color, or national origin in the operation of public education, public contracting, or public employment."

The focus of this presentation is to explore the concept of a panracial, rather than a postracial or biracial structure, to consider the relationship between research and practice, and to question who would be included in an inclusive group and what standards would be used for inclusion. These issues have implications for the potential of individuals to develop into a political coalition and to take collective action.

Causes

Obama's presidential win in 2008 convinced many that America is now a postracial society. However, there is much evidence that this is not true:

Voting Changes

In the 2008 election, voting increased by 14 percent among Asians, 27 percent among Latinos, and 15 percent among Blacks, while increasing only 2 percent for Whites. This represented a primary change in voting patterns in terms of race.

Subsequent Political Activity

U.S. racism has been described as having moved from Jim Crow to laissez-faire. There is evidence to suggest that both types of racism continue to exist across the country. Some of the public statements and images about President Obama, for example, went far beyond laissez-faire. Sample findings from a noted survey about whether or not there is a racial basis behind the Tea Party movement in the United States are illustrative of current attitudes:

- Approximately 45 percent of Whites either strongly or somewhat approve of the movement. Of those, only 35 percent believe Blacks to be hardworking, only 45 percent believe Blacks are intelligent, and only 41 percent think that Blacks are trustworthy.
- Seventy-two percent of strong Tea Party movement supporters disagree that there is an historical basis for the challenges that Blacks face in the United States.
- Eighty-three percent of strong Tea Party supporters disagree that Blacks have gotten less than they deserve over the past few years.

There is a sharp demarcation in racial attitudes between Tea Party supporters and nonsupporters. One of the most striking findings from this national survey is that so many respondents were willing to express support for negative stereotypes of African Americans in a time period that so many others are calling postracial.

Incarceration Rate Disparities

The incarceration rates for Blacks and Latinos continue to increase at a far greater pace than the rate for Whites. Based on current trends, about one in three Blacks will be incarcerated at some point in their lives, up from one in six in 2001. Not only are the disparities in actual rates of imprisonment compelling and demanding of attention, but so is the comparative number of young men in prison versus those in college. Furthermore, research by a Princeton University

professor found that Whites with curricula vitae (CVs) that included a felony conviction were more likely to be called for a second interview than Blacks with the identical CV, except with no felony conviction.

Immigration

Immigration has increased greatly since the enactment of the Hart-Cellar Act of 1965, which abolished the national origins quota system that had structured American immigration policy since the 1920s. In 1991, the immigrant population in the United States reached more than 1.8 million, its highest point in the country's history. Over the next few decades, the proportion of Whites in the United States is expected to decline to a minority as the proportion of Asians and Latinos increase and the proportion of African Americans remains fairly constant.

Miscegenation

The racial and ethnic categories of the U.S. Census Bureau continue to change as the population becomes more multicultural and more people take on a multiracial identity. For example:

- One in 15 marriages was interracial in 2000, a 65 percent increase from 1990.
- Nearly three out of 10 marriages involving an Asian or Latino is a mixed-race marriage.
- Nearly one in two interracial marriages in the United States involves a Latino/a.

Solutions

Research and Practice in Areas of Race

- Research on initiatives that are directly aimed at trying to improve social conditions
- Research that directs practice, such as driving the work of electoral campaigns, government agencies, and community-based organizations
- Avoiding research regardless of practice: Having the ability to refrain from engaging in research that has no connection to its intended audience
- Research directed by practice: Practice that is deemed important through a network of community friends and colleagues
- Mutually constitutive and communicative spheres of action

America Should Strive to Become a Panracial Society

Panracial is a racial categorization that is inclusive of all races and nationalities and could become the new goal for racial integration in the United States. Both historically and currently, discussions and analyses of race in America focus on a Black/White paradigm and all races in the United States are categorized by this paradigm. The recent census used terms like Black and non-Black. However:

- The United States has seen a greater influx of immigrants in recent years than it has in any other time in its history.

- U.S. immigrants in recent years have primarily been from Latin American and Asian countries.
- Americans commonly do not affiliate themselves with U.S. Census Bureau categories.

For these reasons, a panracial conception of U.S. society might be more relevant and might facilitate collective action to achieve equality.

What, however, will be the standard or benchmark goal? The traditional standard has been Anglo conformity. Could African Americans be a benchmark? In the case of stereotypes of Asian Americans as hardworking, ambitious, valuing education, and so on, these qualities seem to be held up specifically to show African Americans as a negative benchmark. But, when we look at how African Americans come together at times for political action, such as during the Civil Rights Movement, for the 2008 presidential election, and to offer support for Democrats, they can be seen as a positive benchmark for political coalition.

Coalition Politics

Group solidarity is needed for political strength and collective action. There are four identifiable factors in the link between identity and politics:

1. Classification. How are people classified by others, such as the U.S. Census Bureau? Their sense of identity is influenced by the category names assigned to them and by the changes in these labels over time.
2. Category Identification. Do people actually identify with the categories given?
3. Consciousness. Do members of the group share a group consciousness with others similarly identified? This group identity—view of linked destiny—is stronger among African Americans than among Asian Americans.
4. Collective Action. Do members of the group believe that political coalition and political behavior is a way to mobilize and conduct collective action? Do individuals choose to act in pursuit of group-based interests?

A final question is, Which group do individuals choose to work with for their group-based interests and ambitions? These groups could be based on ethnicity, political party, religion, ideology, gender, or sexual orientation.

References

Bonczar, T.P. (2003). *Prevalence of imprisonment in the U.S. population, 1974–2001*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=836

Parker, C. (2010). *2010 multistate survey on race and politics*. University of Washington Institute for the Study of Ethnicity, Race, & Sexuality. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/uwiser/racepolitics.html

Where and Why Whites Still Do Blatant Racism: White Racist Actions and Framing in the Backstage and Frontstage

Presenter: Joe Feagin, Ella C. McFadden Professor in Sociology, Texas A&M University

Moderator: Kathleen Blee, Distinguished Professor of Sociology, Psychology, and History and Chair of the Department of Sociology, University of Pittsburgh

The systemic racism that was created by Whites in the beginning of U.S. society still is prevalent today in major contemporary forms. A central part of systemic racism is the White racial frame. This set of racial stereotypes, prejudices, emotions, narratives, images, and ideologies was created by Whites to maintain the continuity of White power and privilege in the United States. This set of pro-White, anti-Black, and anti-other concepts and perspectives dates back to the 1600s and can clearly be seen in our first intellectual, Thomas Jefferson's, famous book called *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Over the years, Whites have added to this blatant racism some more subtle forms of racism, and both can be found in diverse public, frontstage settings and in all-White backstage (more private) settings and situations.

People of color encounter a significant number of subtle or blatant racist events on an annual basis. The present-day framing of Whites' racial thinking and action often takes place in a joking format so Whites can more easily deflect accountability and ownership of this racist framing to others if necessary. Probably billions of racist commentaries and performances by Whites take place annually across the United States.

Most Americans, especially Whites, need to learn much more about our history of systemic racism and White privilege in the United States. Americans of all backgrounds, especially Whites, need to learn how to respond when they face racist commentaries, racist discussions, and other racist events. In addition, in the backstage all-White settings Whites should call out everyday racism aggressively and, in countering racist events, guide the perpetrators toward a more positive liberty and justice framing.

The Problem

Foundational and systemic racism created by Whites early in U.S. history has persisted to the current time. This racism has involved 246 years of slavery and 90 years of Jim Crow, which is about 85 percent of modern North American history.

White racial framing is the set of racial stereotypes, prejudices, emotions, narratives, images, and ideologies developed to rationalize and explain institutionalized oppression targeting people of color over the centuries. It rationalizes the racial hierarchy and extensive White power and privilege that structures of oppression have created. The White racial frame was first fully developed by Whites in the 1600s and was well established by Thomas Jefferson in *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Today, most Whites still adhere to many of the racist concepts accented by Jefferson, including negative views of Blacks and other people of color, as well as pro-White superiority perspectives.

Today, Whites still buy into and perpetuate blatant racism in many aspects of everyday life. Much present-day racism is presented in a joking format. Racist comments and interactive commentaries often are played out in a backstage setting where only Whites are present. Young Whites, in backstage and frontstage settings, often maintain and exhibit much of the blatant racism adhered to by their parents and grandparents. For example, since the 1600s, the Black criminology stereotype has often been at the heart of anti-Black sentiment among Whites. This negative view has been essential to the dramatic expansion by White elites of the U.S. prison system, which now imprisons far more Blacks for doing things (like using illegal drugs) that Whites engage in with far fewer instances of incarceration. The White racial frame often is viscerally held, for it is tied to White emotions and ideals and to the personal identity of Whites.

In a field study by Joe Feagin and his colleague, Leslie H. Picca, about 626 White college students at 28 colleges and universities across the country reported in diaries that they saw or experienced more than 9,000 accounts of racial events over a brief (about 8–12 weeks) period. The events reported reflected blatant racism of the sort that Jefferson espoused and documented in the early 1780s. Racist jokes and stereotypes were common themes. Only about 1 percent of the young educated Whites actually reported in their diaries any Whites protesting racist commentaries and actions by Whites. There is frequently an aggressive pro-White arrogance in Whites' expression of the anti-Black sentiments so central to the dominant White racial framing. White roles in racist commentaries and racist performances often take these forms:

- White protagonist: Person that leads off with racist comments and actions (common)
- White cheerleader: Person that laughs and eggs on White racist comments and actions by protagonists (very common)
- White passive bystander: A person who does nothing to counter White racist comments and actions (very common)
- White dissenter: A person who protests other Whites' racist comments and actions (rare)

Another study involving interviews about racial attitudes of White professionals, including executives, lawyers, and doctors, yielded similar results, as did a study of local community business leaders. Racist attitudes among these groups have far-reaching implications for Black employment opportunities. In another inquiry, detailed questioning of educated White students revealed far less acceptance of racial intermarriage than those students reported initially on a more superficial survey. Yet another Internet survey investigated perceptions of White men about Black women. Of the 160 respondents, 80 percent reported negative, stereotypically racist views. The narratives about Black women and men that so many Whites have learned and adopted continue to perpetuate Whites' negative views of Blacks. We definitely do not live in a postracial America.

Basic lessons:

1. Postracialism does not exist in U.S. society; Whites invented the "lie" and terminology of postracialism.
2. U.S. racism is deep, foundational, systemic, and everywhere today, as it has been for centuries.

3. Contemporary racism involves the old racial hierarchy: Whites at the top with power and privilege and most others below and positioned by Whites on the hierarchy.
4. Many billions of racist commentaries and performances, routine actions in frontstage and backstage, occur in the United States annually.
5. Racism is legitimized and reproduced by a very old, extensive, and constant White racial framing, one that views White Americans as mostly superior and deservedly privileged and Americans of color as mostly inferior and racially "othered." This reality has existed since the 1600s.

Solutions

Areas of personal action. Whites and others should study and know their racial history. They should be able to teach themselves and others how to respond to racist events taking place around them.

Call out racist acts aggressively. Possible strategies include using of pointed humor, showing puzzlement to racist jokes and comments, and calling out the racist protagonist subtly or bluntly.

Reframe the racist content of commentaries to accent positive liberty and justice framing. Where people have conflicting frames in mind (e.g., justice/fairness frame versus the old White racist frame), try to counter the racist action by activating the justice/fairness frame. Counter-framing is required for change. We must regularly call out racist performances in the backstage and frontstage. We must teach and encourage more (especially White) people to see and understand everyday racism and how to dissent in all social settings in the backstage and frontstage.

Collective action. We need to create more national and multiracial organizations that call out individual/systemic racism and teach people how to challenge and eradicate everyday racism. We need to create Stereotyping 101 and Racism 101 courses in schools from kindergarten to graduate school. We need to create well-organized movements to aggressively pressure our major socialization organizations (e.g., the mainstream media) to honestly assess society's racial oppression and to press for major structural change. Only large-scale societal movements can bring major changes to this deep and foundational racism. Eternal organization is, indeed, the price of real liberty and justice. This will be an uphill struggle. But systemic racism is human-made and, thus, can be unmade—but only with large-scale collective efforts.

References

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York, N.Y.: The New Press.

Jefferson, T. (1781). *Notes on the state of Virginia*.

Picca, L.H. and Feagin, J.R. (2007). *Two-faced racism: Whites in the backstage and frontstage*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.

The Future of White Privilege in a Post-Race, Post-Civil Rights, Colorblind America

Presenter: Charles Gallagher, Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology, Social Work, and
            Criminal Justice, La Salle University

Moderator: Kathleen Blee, Distinguished Professor of Sociology, Psychology, and History and
            Chair of the Department of Sociology, University of Pittsburgh

Whites maintain the myth that America is a colorblind society in order to continue to reap the benefits of White privilege. White privilege consists of systemic social, cultural, and economic advantages that Whites (consciously or unconsciously) enjoy and assume are available to people of all backgrounds. Those who deny the existence of White privilege believe that inequality, prejudice, and discrimination have little or nothing to do with the current disparities that exist between the races. Rather, the lower social and economic status of races outside of the dominant group primarily is due to individual failings and character flaws that make them incapable of achieving success in society. Whites allow themselves to think society is colorblind and that race no longer has any bearing on the success of individuals. Whites subscribe to the notion of colorblindness to alleviate themselves of any responsibility for the current state of inequality and disparity among the races in America and to maintain the power that comes along with White privilege.

Barack Obama's presidential election often is referred to as the event that proves America is a colorblind nation. However, since Obama has taken office, the negative racial commentary and images that have followed prove not only that postracialism does not exist, but that racism is more prevalent in politics and in the media than ever before. In order to advance the discussion about the true social reality in American society, Whites have to be open to discuss the nature and depth of racial inequality and the myth that we are a colorblind nation.

The Problem

Much of White America now believes that the United States is, by and large, a colorblind society and that the shift to a colorblind perspective has been achieved by the eradication of White privilege. The election of a Black president led to bold headlines touting the end of racism in America. Many Whites do not see race as an obstacle to upward mobility and equal treatment, nor do they see it as a barrier to achievement. The primary danger of this view is the belief that the goals of the civil rights movement have been achieved, that there is no longer such a thing as race-based privilege, and that we no longer have a need to address issues of race in the United States. It promotes the belief that race is a benign cultural marker, more like ethnicity. A rich body of research firmly establishes the falsity of this colorblind perspective, yet it persists throughout White America. The fact that we are hampered by our inability to talk candidly about race continues to be a factor in the racial stratification of our society. We must honestly confront the myth of the colorblind narrative in order to expose it.

Causes

White Americans try to convince themselves that racism is not, and presumably has not been for some time, an obstacle to upward mobility, unequal treatment or a barrier to achievement. Further, the media, regarding the election of President Barack Obama, have opposed the idea that racism continues to infect our country. The media in America continue to paint the picture that racism is a false collective belief that is not grounded in fact.

Colorblindness

Colorblindness is the new racial narrative of Whites:

- Colorblindness means that color no longer plays a role in shaping an individual or a group's life chances.
- Within the framework of colorblind race relations, the act of pointing out racist actions is a form of racism in itself, because in the false reality of colorblind society, institutional racism no longer exists.
- Adherents of colorblindness readily admit there are individual manifestations of racism, but these singular acts of hate are carried out by fringe elements of the population and are individual outliers that are not representative of America's new consensus on race.
- Whites believe that the colorblind racial frame has crystallized into a truism, a common-sense understanding of how a significant part of the population understands society.
- Subscription to a colorblind worldview allows people to believe that there is no such thing as White privilege. If they believe society is colorblind, they cannot simultaneously believe being White affords people any social and/or economic privileges.

Many scholars argue that the reason Whites deny the existence of institutional racism is because of the tangible benefits of buying into a colorblind belief system. One dominant line of thinking among researchers is that Whites fully understand that the system is rigged in their favor yet choose to do nothing about it because the status quo serves their interests. Recent trends in racial attitudes suggest most Whites have arrived at an attitudinal tipping point where false perceptions of equality have pushed aside structural explanations of racial disparities between groups.

Belief in a nondiscriminatory, merit-based system that is accessible to all promotes the notion that success, like failure, is a choice that can be made by each individual. Even some well-placed Black leaders in America today espouse this view of unfettered individual accountability.

Ignorance of Evidence About Racial Disparities

Many Whites are ignorant of the documented reality of socioeconomic disparity among different groups in our society. For example:

- The wealth gap between Blacks and Whites has grown over the last two decades. Evidence shows that the typical White family is five times richer than its average African American counterpart.

- Schools are more segregated now than they have been since the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. Research shows that, 55 years after this landmark decision, Blacks and Latinos are more segregated than they had been the previous four decades.
- Blacks and Hispanics continue to face discrimination in the housing and rental markets. Too many neighborhoods remain segregated and "geographic steering" keeps Blacks and Latinos living in selected communities.
- In 2000, almost half of all African American men who lacked both a high school degree and a job were incarcerated.
- In 2009 in New York City, Blacks and Latinos were nine times as likely as Whites to be stopped by the police although they were no more likely to be arrested.
- The jobless rate for Blacks is 16.5 percent, almost twice the rate for Whites.

Access to health care, college graduation rates, infant mortality rates, and rates of long-term unemployment are additional examples of racial disparity.

"Racial redistricting" is taking place where the boundaries of "Whiteness" are expanding to include groups who, until quite recently, would have been on the margins of "Whiteness." Within the context of contemporary race relations, those groups who do not conform to cultural and physical expectations of White middle-class norms will be stigmatized and cut off from the resources Whites have been able to monopolize for decades.

Messages from the Media

Watching television depictions of well-off, successful Black, Hispanic, and Asian Americans has the effect of convincing White Americans that racial minorities share their socioeconomic opportunities. Although stereotypes remain in the media, we now typically see images of a carefully manufactured racial utopia where people of different races interact comfortably in common spaces. Race is meaningless in these race-neutral environments and camaraderie crosses all color lines. Well-off, successful, light-skinned Asians and Blacks are positioned in jobs and housing specifically designed to communicate equal social and economic opportunity.

Blurring of the Concepts of Race and Ethnicity

A common belief among White Americans is that if White ethnic groups could overcome the obstacles they faced when they immigrated and could climb the social ladder in America, why can't non-Whites, especially Blacks, do the same? A recent survey showed that 70 percent of Whites agreed with the following statement: "Irish, Italian, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudices and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without special favors." In the same survey, 58 percent disagreed that "Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class." Even with recognition of the very real discriminations and hardships to which White ethnic groups were subject upon immigrating, it is inconceivable that these could become undistinguishable from three centuries of slavery, Jim Crow, legal segregation, and state-sanctioned benign neglect.

Demographic changes in the United States are altering our definitions of racial categories. In 1990, there were 22 million Latinos in the United States. By 2010, there were 47 million, making this the largest minority group in the country at 15 percent. Many of these individuals described themselves as "White only" in the latest U.S. census, and we now have the emerging racial categories of "Black" and "non-Black." Research shows that our lightest-skinned immigrants earned an average of 8–15 percent more than immigrants with darker skin. In fact, one skin shade lighter has the same effect on income as one additional year of education.

Solutions

Society needs to move to the next level of discourse where the social definition of reality for many Whites is one where we have meaningful discussion about the nature and depth of racial inequality and the myth that we are a colorblind nation. We need to address colorblindness as a form of ideology that maintains White privilege. We also need to recalibrate the baseline from which we study attitudes about race. Our traditional methodologies fail to tap the deeper attitudinal complexities of a colorblind worldview, and our traditional theories oversimplify how race and racism are understood.

Sponsors

Race in America: Restructuring Inequality was generously supported by the following organizations:

GOLD Sponsors

Richard King Mellon Foundation
The Heinz Endowments
The Pittsburgh Foundation

SILVER Sponsors

BNY Mellon
Staunton Farm Foundation
UPMC

BRONZE Sponsors

The Buhl Foundation
EQT Corporation
Falk Foundation
Ford Foundation, Institute of International Education, Inc.
Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield
Jewish Healthcare Foundation
PNC Financial Services Group, Inc.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH Sponsors

College of General Studies
Computing Services and Systems Development
Division of Student Affairs
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
Graduate School of Public Health
Learning Research and Development Center
Office of Institutional Advancement and the Pitt Alumni Association
Office of the Provost
School of Arts and Sciences
School of Dental Medicine
School of Education
School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences
School of Information Sciences
School of Law
School of Medicine
School of Nursing
School of Pharmacy

Swanson School of Engineering
University Center for International Studies
University Center for Social and Urban Research
University Honors College
University Library System
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford
University of Pittsburgh at Titusville

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY Sponsors

Boston College, Graduate School of Social Work
Bryn Mawr College, Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research
Case Western Reserve University, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences
Fordham University, Graduate School of Social Service
Howard University, School of Social Work
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, School of Social Work
University of Buffalo, School of Social Work
University of Georgia, School of Social Work
University of Houston, Graduate College of Social Work
University of Illinois at Chicago, Jane Addams College of Social Work
University of Kentucky, College of Social Work
University of Maryland, Baltimore, School of Social Work
University of Michigan, School of Social Work
University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work
University of Washington, School of Social Work
Washington University in St. Louis, George Warren Brown School of Social Work

ADDITIONAL Sponsors

The Anderson-DuBose Company
Three Rivers Community Foundation