RACE, RACISM, & UTOPIA "FOR REAL"

EDUARDO BONILLA-SILVA (DUKE)

To avoid confusions, "NEGRO UTÓPICO," by Colombian Afro-Latina artist Lilliana Angulo, exploits and implodes the cultural position of blacks in the Americas. By massively exaggerating the stereotypical blackface image of blacks, Angulo shocks viewers forcing them to think (and, hopefully, rethink) how blackness is depicted in our culture. Angulo's work is reminiscent of David Levinthal's *Blackface*, the conceptual art of Glen Ligon, and Kara Walker's work particularly her harshly beautiful cut paper silhouettes about slavery.

INTRODUCTION: THE RACIALLY SUBORDINATE AT THE UTOPIAN TABLE

I know that what I am asking is impossible. But in our time, as in every time, the impossible is the least one can demand—and one is, after all, emboldened by the spectacle of human history in general and American negro history in particular, for it testified to nothing less than the perpetual achievement of the impossible.

James Baldwin

The "Real Utopias Project" (RUP) has been in existence for about twenty years.[1] As of 2010, RUP is responsible for the publication of several books (e.g., Cohen and Rogers 1995; Roemer 1996; Bowles and Gintis 1999; Fung and Olin Wright 2003; Ackerman, Alstott, and Van Parijs 2006; Gornick and Meyers 2009; Wright 2010) and for national and international conferences on the subject. Professor Erik O. Wright, the main architect behind RUP, has delivered himself "over 50 talks in 18 countries" on this project (2010: xiii). Therefore, it is safe to estimate that thousands of people have heard or read about the ideas associated with RUP. Nevertheless, it seems that until 2011 no one associated with RUP thought seriously about the importance of including race scholars and activists in the utopian table. This is unfortunate as I believe—and will argue in this paper—that utopia will not be "for real" unless we take race[2] seriously, include the "race utopian" tradition as a fundamental part of the efforts to emancipate humanity from the yolk of domination, and forthrightly deal in the thinking, processing, and envisioning of utopia with the how to eliminate race as a category of social division as well as racism as a structure and culture (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2010; Goldberg 1993). For political and "structural reasons" (the specifics of the matrix of domination in modern societies, see footnote 2), emancipation projects in modernity cannot be fully realized unless race is included in a foundational way in the process (Mills 2003 particularly Chapter 6). Modernity was not just simply the socio-political development of a new mode of production, but also a "racial project" (Omi and Winant 1986) that embodied a "racial contract" (Mills 1997).[3] As scholar-activists envisioning utopia, we must realize that we cannot dismantle the contemporary house of

1

inequality unless the race-class-gender foundation upon which it was built are uprooted. Albeit as a progressive I am in solidarity with anyone trying to change the capitalist aspects of contemporary societies, thinking about utopia *exclusivel*y from a class perspective, as RUP has mostly done so far, is bound to produce at best political projects with limited potential for restructuring the social order of modernity. Worse yet, even if class-derived utopian policies were to be enacted in the near future (for example, the idea of guaranteed basic income), they would be seriously handicapped because some members of the polities in the world-system (white heterosexual men in the First World), like in Orwell's *Animal Farm*, would be "more equal than others" (Weitz 2003).

How then, given RUP's lack of engagement with race, did I get a ticket to ride on the utopian train? I speculate that the fact that I am a Wisconsin graduate and had Professor Erik Olin Wright in my dissertation committee had something to do with the invitation. More significantly, I used to be a "*Marxista cuadrado*" (vulgar Marxist) and did a dissertation on the political economy of squatting in Puerto Rico. Thus my invitation for this engagement is due to a personal network to Professor Wright, am a Marxist or sorts,[4] and because in the twenty years since leaving Wisconsin I have attained a certain "standing" in American sociology as a race scholar (this standing is not always a good thing as many members of the sociological elite conceive me as a "race man" thus as a person whose work is not "objective"). Although I am glad to be sitting at the utopian table, I respectfully[5] point out that the inclusion of race scholars in RUP is twenty years late. *We should have been part of this project from the very beginning*.[6] Some of the concerns we would have raised are similar to the concerns white feminist scholars[7] have raised about RUP—and I suspect, based on the available information about RUP's history, they too were invited late. An inclusive strategy from the inception would have helped anchor

RUP in a more solid footing and perhaps helped connect the *thinking* about utopia to grassroots organizations *doing practical political work* on various fronts—a vital concern for a utopian project that wishes to be "(for) real."

Before I move on, and to avoid confusion and consternation, I must state for the record that I am not singling out RUP, Marxists scholars, or Professor Wright (see endnote 5) for scorn. I have profound sympathies with RUP, am a Marxist (but see endnote 4), and regard Professor Wright as a mentor and fellow comrade in the struggle for a democratic socialist America. My argument about how race affects RUP is actually much deeper and wider and is truly non-personalistic. The lack of serious engagement with race and race matters is not peculiar to colleagues associated with RUP , but typical of how most whites deal with scholars of color and their scholarship and reflects the larger contemporary racial context in the nation and its manifestation in academia (Mills 1993; Bonilla-Silva 2001). In Post-Civil Rights America "regular whites" (sociologists included) label anyone who argues that racism is still central factor determining the life chances of Americans as "not serious" and as people playing the infamous "race card" to gain advantages.[8]

Because of these racial facts, most progressive race analysts in sociology experience a "separate but equal" life in their departments as they are either ignored, minimized, or kept at a safe distance—most are not part of the sociological cliques that rule the discipline.[9] Yet the "separate but equal" life we experience in academia these days is not the product of Jim Crow-like behavior, but of subtle, seemingly non-racial practices by our white colleagues characteristic of the "new racism" period (Bonilla-Silva 2001; 2011). I have written about these matters in Sociology and presented in various forums (Bonilla-Silva 2011a, 2011b), however, this important story about the life of race scholars in the contemporary academic minefield is not

central to the task at hand in this essay (but see section 4).

Now onto what I intend to do in this essay. *First*, I provide a robust yet friendly critique of the "real utopias"[10] project as currently conceived. *Second*, I argue that people of color developed some of the oldest emancipation traditions in modernity (in this essay I focus on the black radical tradition), traditions that should be central to the construction of utopia, racial or not. *Third*, I argue for *mental emancipation* (a la Bob Marley) by people of color from the emotional, intellectual, and spiritual tentacles of white supremacy as a prerequisite for any utopian process seriously concerned with tackling the racial problematic of America and the world. *Fourth*, I highlight the necessity of individual and collective *freedom practices* to move towards utopia. Albeit my view on these practices is broad (see Bonilla-Silva 2003 and 2006), I describe some specific practices for academia. *Lastly*, after briefly criticizing some of the emancipatory ideals that have emerged to address racial inequality (namely, the human rights approach, the citizenship paradigm, cosmopolitanism, and post-racialism), I advance with lots of trepidation the *contours* of racial utopia.

I. SOME COMMENTS ON RUP FROM THE (RADICAL) COLORLINES

The black man must be liberated, but he must also be liberated from the liberator.
Aimé Césaire

To be concise, I present my comments on RUP in outlined fashion.

1) RUP is too academic, "pragmatic," and formalistic. Wright describes his views as "hard-nosed proposals for pragmatically improving our institutions" and adds that instead "of indulging in utopians dreams we must accommodate ourselves to practical realities" (2010: 6). His specific goal is to work out "core organizing principles of alternatives to existing institutions." After Obama, God saves us from pragmatic thinkers (see chapter 9 in Bonilla-Silva 2010)! Kumar (2010) labels what Wright does as "utopian social theory" and claims these type of analysts are

"convinced that the time for fictitious accounts of the good society are past, that now is time for serious, 'scientific' schemes of social reformation" (556). In contrast to RUP, I argue that today more than ever what we need is "oppositional utopianism…to keep alive the vision of a world without 'others', without an oppressed" (Sargent 2006: 16).

RUP's dryness reflects in part the identity of RUP thinkers (mostly academics), but also the fact that its architects framed the project as a response to the demise of the socialism (see point 8 below). In contrast to RUP's pessimistic starting point, social movements of monumental significance—perhaps of even world-systemic significance (Arrighi 1989)—have transpired in the last twenty years such as the World Forum, the movement against the WTO, the Zapatistas, the peaceful revolutions in Eastern European countries, the recent Arab Spring, and the OWS which was partially inspired by the "Los Indignados" movement in Spain.

2) RUP has no poetry, emotion, or music! Utopian projects must capture the "heart (emotions) and mind (consciousness)" of the people (See Kelley 2002 pp.9-12). RUP's current version of utopia is soulless, the opposite of what social movements need to get off the ground (Oberschall 1972; McCarthy and Zaid 1977; Tarrow 1998). By mere coincidence, I began drafting notes for this paper when the nation witnessed the Occupy Wall Street movement—a dramatic, poetic, and very creative anti-capitalist social movement. Marx spoke about revolutions needing images and "spirits" as well as "heroism, sacrifice, terror, civil war, and battles of the people" in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (Marx 1977: 301). He also stated that the proletarian revolution "cannot draw its poetry from the past, but only from the future" and that "in order to arrive at its own content, [the revolution]…must let the dead bury their dead" (302). In short, a movement that does not capture the *imagination* of the people can never succeed. Period! This is why all revolutions and uprisings include elements of joy and carnival (Jordan and Whitney

5

2001).

By naming the project "real utopias," RUP conceded too much terrain to neoliberalism. "Neo-liberalism," according to Monsaváis, "promotes the bad reputation of utopias (even the term 'Utopia' itself [is identified] in the best of cases, with *science fiction*) (1997: 135). Albeit many historical utopias are all but dead, "the reasons for their existence remain," hence, we must insist in defending "the freedom to dream" (Monsaváis 1997: 138)). We must rearticulate the utopian words of the 1968 rebellion in France, "Be realistic: Demand the impossible" (Barry 1998). If we lose the utopian in utopia, utopia is likely to be either a Right wing farce or a pragmatic arrangement to "civilize" capitalism. Utopians must continue imagining a better world if they hope to stand a chance of making their dreams become "real."[11]

3) RUP has little to no connection to social struggles or social movements. This is perhaps the central weakness of RUP. As Robin Kelley (2003) argues in *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*, "the most powerful, visionary dreams of a new society don't come from little think tanks of smart people or out of the atomized, individualistic world of consumer capitalism where raging against the status quo is simply the hip thing to do." For Kelley, and I share fully his view,

> Revolutionary dreams erupt out of political engagement; collective social movements are incubators of new knowledge…The most radical ideas often grow out of concrete intellectual engagements with the problems of aggrieved populations confronting systems of oppression (8-9).

The same point has been made by Frances Fox Piven (2009) in her essay, "How do we get from here to there?" In her view, "the interior life of the movement…will itself become the vehicle for transformation" (302). Thus, for example, we have had plenty of "pragmatic" yet utopian ideas from the organizational, artistic, propagandistic, and political expressions of OWS.

Accordingly, rather than mentoring, educating, or serving as the vanguard for the people, what we need to do is to work *with* the people and participate in the struggle for human liberation.

4) RUP proposals are mostly conceived with Western nations as the site for utopia,[12] thus, they are not only "non-universizable" but, if implemented, likely to maintain "global exploitation" (Hassim 2009: 94-95). They are also conceived with strong nation-states in mind and since states in most of the world are not so (Rotberg 2003: 100-101), many of the institutions and policies imagined by RUP folks are not feasible for Third World countries.

Cohen and Rogers, friends of Wright and of RUP, add yet another important wrinkle. They believe Wright's concern with rationality and procedural rules may leave domination intact because "under conditions of substantive inequality of power, a requirement of presenting reasons is unlikely to limit or neutralize power," hence, "proposals for deliberative democracy that are inattentive to background relations of power will waste the time of those who can least afford the loss: those now subordinate in power" (Cohen and Rogers 1995:248). Attempting to control from the outset the "rules of the game" is part of the Western tradition: universality means play *my* game by *my* rules or "no soup (no sit at the utopian table) for you" (Todorov 1994). The alternative to this Western bias is to open expand the conversation on utopia and include in a meaningful way non-Western voices (Benhahbib 2002).

5) RUP's utopia is fundamentally imagined as addressing class inequality hence social cleavages such as gender, race, and sexual orientation are viewed as secondary contradictions. Wright illustrates this point when he writes: "this conception [is not] simply about class inequalities; it also condemns inequalities based on gender, race, physical disabilities, and any other morally irrelevant attribute which interferes with a person's access to the necessary material and social means to live a flourishing life (2010: 16). This stand is precisely the problem: by relegating

7

other sources of social stratification to the level of "status attributes" (Wright 2010:16), RUP

continues the long, outdated Marxist tradition of not taking seriously these other sources of

domination[13] in the modern world-system (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Mills 2003; Wallerstein and

Balibar 1991). Sympathetic critics have already alerted RUP that by not including these other

structural inequalities in a forthright manner, their utopia would likely end up reproducing them

 (Hassim 2009: 99).

6) I believe that *radical* social transformations are always accompanied by revolutions (not one

but many hence the plural) and, for what is worth, this was Marx's view. In the *18ᵗʰ Brumaire of*

Luis Bonaparte he wrote:

Bourgeois revolutions, like those of the eighteenth century, storm more swiftly from
success to success, their dramatic effects outdo each other, men and things seem set in
sparkling diamonds, ecstasy is the order of the day – but they are short-lived, soon they
have reached their zenith, and a long Katzenjammer takes hold of society before it learns
to assimilate the results of its storm-and-stress period soberly. On the other hand,
proletarian revolutions, like those of the nineteenth century, constantly criticize
themselves, constantly interrupt themselves in their own course, return to the apparently
accomplished, in order to begin anew; they deride with cruel thoroughness the half-
measures, weaknesses, and paltriness of their first attempts, seem to throw down their
opponents only so the latter may draw new strength from the earth and rise before them
again more gigantic than ever, recoil constantly from the indefinite colossalness of their
own goals – until a situation is created which makes all turning back impossible, and the
conditions themselves call out:

   Hic Rhodus, hic salta!

RUP's approach on how to get to the Promised Land is exemplified by Wright's (2010)

discussion on "socialist social empowerment" and "symbiotic transitions" and his diagrams of

"ruptures" (what we use to call "revolutions")—the latter suggest he believes the likely path for

"transitions" is through long, evolutionary processes. This said, there is a healthy room for

debate on how to achieve radical social change. The old dilemma of "reform or revolution"

(Luxemburg 1900) is still with us and I am not claiming to have the truth by the handle. Some of

the reforms proposed by RUP might be of the "non-reformist reform" variety (Poulantzas 1978) and could produce what Wright classifies as "interstitial transformations."

7) RUP's focus on civic associations and civil society as sites with emancipatory potential because they are a domain of social power "rooted in the capacity of people to form associations to advance their collective goals" (Wright 2010: 145) downplay the fact that "the people" are divided in many ways and that those divisions are not merely "status" differences but based on different positions in the class, gender, and racial structures. Wright seems to also ignore that power in modernity, as Foucault argued (1980), is dispersed and may actually work best in non-state sites. Wright is aware of the potential limitations of his view (see 146-148), but believes that a "socialism of social empowerment will inevitably successfully meet (all sort of challenges)" (147). Of course, since we have the experiences of Cuba, The Soviet Union, Grenada, and Nicaragua among others, we need not speculate here. The socialism of so-called social empowerment will not successfully address racial or gender inequalities unless these matters are part and parcel of the process of building socialist, non-patriarchal, and non-racist societies (Weitz 2003; Sawyer 2005; Rooper and Smith 1986; Lacaster 1991).

8) The pessimism of RUP (Wright would call it "realism") stems from the fact that Wright's point of departure was the collapse of the Soviet Union, hence, his vision of utopia is blurred by the seeming victory of "free markets" in the late 1980s. This accounts for statements such as the following: "it now seems to most critics of capitalism that markets cannot be dispensed with, and thus alternatives to 'actually existing capitalism' need to be compatible with well-functioning market institutions" (Ibid: 92). This is a matter of debate and I do not believe the issue has been settled (Bruyn 2005). My point here is Wright's assumption that markets must be part of the future utopia. In the last section of the book (2010), it is clear that Wright knows one cannot

9

predict with great clarity the future. Thus, the more reason to be humble and open and not assume we will always have a market-based system. Here the work of world-system analysts like Immanuel Wallerstein, Giavanni Arrighi, and the original world-system authors, W. E.B. DuBois (Du Bois 2008[1903]; 1992[1935]) and Oliver C. Cox (1959), is instructive as the long historical view suggests that systemic "transitions" can take hundreds of years. Hence, assuming that a defeat today means "the end of history" is very problematic.

A good example that illustrates many of the limitations of Wright's views is his translation of Van Parijs's (2006) proposal for a "basic income." The idea is that "every legal resident in a country [should receive] a monthly living stipend sufficient to live above the 'poverty line'" (2010: 4). Wright and most members of RUP believe this proposal would give workers "power within the class relations of capitalist society" (2006: 95). But they seem to ignore the following things. First, by defining basic income as something given to "legal members of a country," they assume the current system of nation-states as well as its concomitant legal order that distinguishes between citizens and non-citizens (on this point, see Pateman 2009: 117). Given the current anti-Latino immigration sentiment in the USA, talking about "legal residents" is dangerous and unnecessarily timid. Second, this proposal is based on a "universalistic" view and, therefore, does not provide for remedying deep existing racial or gender income and wealth differences (on this, see the creative work of john powell and his notion of "targeted universalism"(powell 2009). In terms of race, giving each member of the polity the *same* amount of money avoids a discussion about the sedimentation of racial inequality (Oliver and Shapiro 1997) and the need for reparations. Third, colleagues working on the notion of "stakeholder society" (Akerman and Alstott 2006), unlike those on the "basic income," have a record of articulating their ideas to larger groups and have taken a strong stance on the

contemporary discussion of inequality (see the multiple articles these authors have posted in *The Huffington Post* (2011a; 2011b). My point here is that if one wants "basic income" or "stakeholding" proposals to be "for real," one must focus on organizing, mobilizing, and educating large segments of society. Fourth, besides the economic sedimentation of inequality and its impact, we must be cognizant that, as Pateman points out, "in itself, a basic income would not, for instance, provide an adequate stock of affordable housing, sufficient good quality education, adequate health-care, an end to racism, or violence-free neighborhoods" (117). Hence, this proposal by itself is reformist and could be incorporated so long as it guarantees racial and gender inequities in the First World and between the First and Third World to remain in place.

Overall, I believe RUP is not utopic enough (utopia is not a bad thing in itself), is not "political" enough, and has no serious engagement or understanding of racial matters in America or the world. In the next section I make the case for why knowing about the "black radical tradition" can help make RUP "for real."

II. ON THE BLACK RADICAL TRADITION: UTOPIA BEFORE (WHITE) UTOPIA

Arguably the racially subaltern can be regarded as the first utopians, the first "freedom fighters" in modernity. Although some analysts believe that "freedom stands unchallenged as the supreme value of the Western World" (Patterson 1991: ix), this is a misplaced and erratic view of history, if not an Eurocentric one, given that before the white workers of the West developed as a class in the latter part of the 18th and the early part of the 19th century, the racially subordinated had already gelled as a "social collectivity" (Jenkins 2004), developed a political consciousness, and organized acts of resistance, rebellion, and even revolutions (I leave to feminist scholars the narration of gender in the struggle for freedom in modernity, but point out

the obvious: in terms of black women, the historical evidence shows they were as concerned, if not more, as black men in the struggle for freedom (Beckles 1989; Glymph 2008)). In terms of their "freedom dreams," as Du Bois stated in his magisterial *Black Reconstruction* (1935: 47),

> [F]ew men ever worshipped Freedom with half such unquestioning faith as did the American Negro for two centuries. To him, so far as he thought and dreamed, slavery was indeed the sum of all villainies, the cause of all sorrow, the root of all prejudice; Emancipation was the key to a promised land of sweater beauty than ever stretched before the eyes of a wearied Israelites.

Although this may come as a shock to white analysts who seldom read historical accounts done by "the people without history" (Wolf 1982) the racially subaltern had advanced a utopian tradition *before* the European "workers of the world"[14] did. That utopian tradition is still part and parcel of the dreams and aspirations of people of color all over the world and that tradition was—and still is—a tradition of freedom (Kelley 2003; Robinson 2000) based on "freedom politics" (Jeffries 2009). The fact that enslaved Africans fought for freedom, resisted their enslaved condition, and developed what Cedric Robinson has labeled the "black radical tradition" (2000 [1983]) is no surprise as the "human cargoes" brought to the New World had "African cultures, critical mixes and admixtures of language and thought, of cosmology and metaphysics, of habit, beliefs, and morality. [All these things were]…the actual terms of their humanity" (Robinson 2000: 121-122). They became "troublesome property" (Stampp 1956) from the moment they were captured. In the slave ships they plotted, sabotaged, threw themselves overboard, and rebelled (Raediker 2007; Smallwood 2008). Rebellion and the culture and consciousness it produced were *directly* connected to the brutal conditions they experienced as human cargoes in the slave ships—not only "tight packing" and being regarded as "black cattle" which led to a mortality rate of 1 in 7 (Richardson 2004: p. 73), but also rape and rampant abuse. The brutally oppressive conditions continued upon arrival to the New World, hence,

enslaved Africans continued resisting. When possible, they rebelled openly (Baralt 1981) and, not surprisingly, enslaved Africans produced the first revolution against the "agroindustrial plantation regime"[15] (Mintz 2010) in history: the Haitian revolution (C.L.R. James 1989; Robinson 2010; Scott 2004).

Before I continue my discussion, I must make an important historical and political point. Albeit my discussion here is mostly based on the Afro-American experience, I could have easily made the same argument based on the 500-year history of Amerindian resistance to European colonialism. This is why I have referred in this essay to the "racially subaltern," rather than simply to black people, as the first freedom fighters. We must recall that (1) Amerindian wars of resistance (most notably, the Pueblo Indian rise in 1680, the indigenous uprising in Perú in 1780 which created the mythology around Tupac Amaru, and the so-called "caste war" of Yucatán of 1847 which continued in the region until 1903!) were more numerous than those launched by blacks,[16] (2) their revolts continued for much longer (until the 19th century), and (3) their efforts evinced in some cases what Robins (2005) labels as a "revitalization effort"—attempts to remove the people and culture of the colonizers (see also Thomson 2002, particularly Chapter 5). Furthermore, although some believe that slavery was the worst experience in modernity, the Indian loss in terms of human casualties and resources was (and I should use the present tense as their loss continues) *more devastating* than that endured by Africans. More Amerindians lost their lives in the conquest of America than Africans in the slave trade—90 million compared to 14 million and, unlike in the case of Africans, many Amerindian communities were completely wiped out—and they also lost control over almost all their land. Therefore, the collective resistance (Cornell 1988) and radical traditions of Amerindians are as powerful as the black radical tradition against Western imperialism if not more. This explains in part why Amerindians

13

seem, more so than blacks, to care little about Western traditions about "modernity" and have a very peculiar level of assimilation[17] (Deloria 1988). Accordingly, the reason I focus on blacks is due to my personal interests and expertise as a black man from Puerto Rico[18] and not due to believing the black radical tradition reigns supreme.

Readers should be familiar with the history of resistance to slavery particularly in plantations in the USA. Since the ill-conceiver work of Elkins, Ulrich, and the so-called Marxist historian Eugene Genovese (see Chapter 3 in Walker 1991). , the consensus is that slaves rebelled in *all* forms and ways against slavery. Succinctly, "[t]he reason for slave resistance was slavery" (Katz 1990: 19). The planter class relied on a variety of coercive strategies to control slaves—whipping slaves, having overseers enforce discipline, amputations, jail, rape, separation of husbands and wives, the patrol system, and many others. But wherever there is domination (particularly when domination is brutal), there is resistance and the record shows that enslaved Africans rebelled in all sort of ways. Some ran away,[19] but most, given the demographic and geographic conditions they experienced, relied on other forms of resistance[20] which included "[breaking and misplacing] tools, the burning of crops, the work slowdowns, the assistance and protection of afforded to 'runaways,' stealing, flight, the forming of shirt-lived maroon communities, even self-mutilation and suicide" (Robinson 2000: 124). Such resistance threatened plantations and the entire slave system and slave owners were keenly aware of it. For example, Antiguan slave owner Robert Robertson recognized the implications of this type resistance for planters: "however they disguise it, they hate their Masters, and wish them destroyed" (Gaspar 1985: 190). Nevertheless, despite the demographic, geographic, and politico-military obstacles enslaved Africans faced, open insurrections against the slave system transpired. In the USA the names Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vessey, and Nat Turner are part of

our history, yet hundreds of names of black rebels in the Americas should be added to the list (Baralt 1981, Nistal-Moret 1984) and the foremost name of them all should be Toussaint Loverture, leader of the successful Haitian revolution (C.L.R. James 1938).

Nevertheless, all-out rebellions against any system are hard to organize under any circumstances, but particularly under the conditions that slavery imposed. Consequently a more typical form of open resistance to slavery, and a fundamental one for understanding the black radical tradition, was marronage. This tactic historically had two forms, *petit marronage*, escaping for a short time to express discontent with treatment and force changes, and *grand marronage*, which offered "deserters an opportunity to create for themselves a way of life that was structurally and socially of a much higher order than that which they had been subjected as enslaved persons" (Thompson 2006: 57). These maroons formed thousands of free communities (Thompson 2006: 78) all over the New World alternatively called *mocambos*, *palenques*, *cumbes*, and *quilombos* (Navarrete 2003: 9). Students of maroon communities disagree on many things (i.e., level of solidarity they attained, type and efficacy of their political organization, kind of relations they established with to Indians, level of survival of African traditions, etc.), but all concur on one central point: these communities were laboratories for freedom and provided a vision and a set of practices of what a world without slavery could look like. In Thompson's view, marronage gave enslaved Africans a window into a new world:

> As an enslaved person he was relegate to a subhuman being: as a Maroon he claimed equality with all human beings…the Maroon showed that he was not prepared to accept the enslaver's definition of him, but would define himself as he saw fit (2006: 110).

And maroon societies expert, Richard Price, believes these communities were central for the black liberation project:

Throughout Afro-America, such communities stood out as an heroic challenge to white authority, and as living proof of the existence of a slave consciousness that refused to be limited by the whites' conception and manipulation of it (1973: 2).

The literature on maroon societies is vast and my point here has been made well by many historians and anthropologists: these communities were central to the development of black consciousness, customs, and notions of (black) freedom. They were central in forging the black radical tradition: "the continuing development of a collective consciousness informed by the historical struggles for liberation and motivated by the shared sense of obligation to preserve the collective being, the ontological reality" (Robinson 2000: 171). And we must be clear that these communities, and the practices they developed, preceded any of the collective experiences that white workers developed in the 18th and 19th centuries in the freedom front.[21] Therefore, if for no other reason, the historical black radical tradition should be central to any utopian movement in modernity.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that the cultural practices of this tradition were also forged among those who remained enslaved and dreamt of freedom. They too created their own spaces, their own "freedom practices" (see below), and their own forms of religiosity connected to their African heritage.[22] In the words of Brian Meeks, blacks in the Americas are a "people forged in the furnace of slavery, disconnected from the confining traditions of their old world past, strategically located as gatekeepers between East and West, and postmodern long before the term was invented and vulgarized' (Meeks 2000:155-56) they are "a people driven by resistance to slavery, confinement, hierarchy and all features of the brutal, sordid past' (156). Blacks then are essential actors in modernity and it will be crucial to connect the class-based utopian effort of RUP to their traditions as well as to those of Native Americans if we hope for a utopian project that will break the chains of oppression for all and not for some (for a similar take, see Mintz 2011).

III. MENTAL EMANCIPATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR UTOPIA

Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery, none but ourselves can free our minds!

Bob Marley

Absolute clarity about the nature of oppression[23] is not a prerequisite for class, race, and gender stratification to shape actors' consciousness since people who share similar conditions and experiences express in various ways an awareness of "us" versus "them."[24] In an E.P. Thompsian sense, social groups are not "structures," "categories," or "things"[25] but *historical phenomen*a which "in fact [happen] (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships" (1966: 9). Race, like class and gender, is a relational and never-finished categorical process; is an evolving project in which people indeed "make their own history" based on their cultural resources[26] yet "not on conditions of their own choosing." And as I argued in the previous section, blacks gelled as a historical social collectivity in the Atlantic (Gilroy 1992) before the "(white) workers of the world" did and, due to the inhumane system of domination they faced, they also developed group consciousness and a rebellious tradition earlier than many other groups in modernity. (But, again, I point out the same applies to Amerindians and that their traditions and consciousness precedes that of blacks.)

Nevertheless, people cannot "fight the power" (that is, struggle for utopia) unless they are mentally free from the ideological bondage created by class, gender, or racial domination. This important freedom to hate, to conspire, and to think about alternatives; to have the "spirit of revolt and revenge [fill their hearts]" (Du Bois 1903: 218), was easier to develop in the openly brutal systems of racial domination of yesteryears and the genocidal policies endured by Indians (Meeks 2000). Accordingly, because domination in modern industrial societies, whether racial-, gender-, or class-based, tends to be *hegemonic*[27] and carried out with a "velvet glove" (Jackman

1994), breaking through the ideological maze of "(manufactured) consent" (Herman and Chomsky 1988; Parenti 1992) is imperative if we want "the people" (Dos Santos 2006) to be the central architects of the new society. In this section I venture some comments on the importance of "mental emancipation" by the racially subaltern in the struggle for freedom.

Resistance in Hegemonic Times

The black, Indian, Latino, and Asian "radical traditions" [28] in the USA, all based on resistance to racial domination (some refs on Asian and Latino resistance), have been *blunted* in the last thirty years. In my work I have discussed in detail the transition from the Jim Crow order to the "New Racism" racial regime and highlighted the emergence of new subtle, "now you see it, now you don't" mechanisms and behaviors as the main strategies for maintaining racial domination in the post-Civil Rights era (Bonilla-Silva 2001; Smith 1995; Brooks 1990). One element of the "New Racism" regime is the creation of "opportunities" for mobility for elite members[29] of minority communities (this was the product of struggle and not a gift from whites to people of color). Their mobility, albeit restricted, has contributed to what I have described as the "blunted racial consciousness" among racial minorities (Bonilla-Silva 2003). As "racial exploitation" (Mills 1997) has lost a significant amount of its open brutality and minority masses can see the success of some of its members, the heightened racial consciousness of the past has decreased and provided a space for the growth of post-racialism, colorblindness, and even for conservatism among the minority masses.

However, I do not want to belittle this point. Race, like class,[30] is a never-finished process based on oppressive relations thus at no point in time the racially subordinated are without "consciousness." To be black, Latino, Native America, or Asian in America is always an issue and one always feels treated by whites as a problem (Du Bois 2008[1903]); people of color

always know and feel that race *matters* and are aware that their lives are deeply affected by race (Apollon 2011). Hence, the concern I raise here is about increasing the political level of "race consciousness" and having more political clarity and should not be confused with believing people or color are no longer conscious about the significance of race and racism (Sears et al. 2000). My point in this section is that to achieve "mental emancipation" today people of color need to retool their political praxis. The minority masses, much like workers and women (Jackman 1994), have experienced a serious demobilization for thirty years (Piven et al. 2009) and have been "incorporated" (co-opted?) into electoral politics. This demobilization by people of color has been costly because as Marx suggested in *The German Ideology* "not criticism but revolution is the driving force of history" (172). In short, consciousness is political mobilization and political mobilization is consciousness. Without political praxis nothing happens and the consciousness of people becomes dull and diffused. Blacks, for example, are affected directly and indirectly by the frames of color-blind racism and, as I have pointed out in my work, "[t]his ideological infiltration…into blacks' political consciousness hinders the development of an all-out oppositional ideology or 'utopia' to fight contemporary white supremacy" (2010: 172).

Minority communities no longer have as many vital political organizations or are as deeply engaged in social movements as they were in the past (Marable 1983, 1991; Alexander 2010), hence, young members of these communities seem content, confused, and not as clear about the value of active resistance as previous generations (Ginwright et al. 2006). Members of minority communities must rescue their own traditions of resistance as a prelude to the necessary struggles they must wage in this confusing period where nothing is what it seems; where we have a black President and that does not imply "racial progress" or is leading to an improvement on the collective standing of people of color in the nation (Bonilla-Silva 2010; Bonilla-Silva and

19

Seamster 2011). Yet, to achieve mental emancipation from America's "racist culture" (Goldberg 1993) and from the "New Racism" that undergirds it will be harder than ever before. The contemporary racial ideology of colorblindness has produced a "racial grammar" that structures in many ways how we see and frame race matters. Since so-called "integration," we have inhaled the pollution of white supremacy in seemingly innocent ways: watching (white) movies and (white) TV shows which reinforce racially deleterious messages. Racial domination has thus become normalized and works as "this is the way things are" (for details see Bonilla-Silva 2011).

I have outlined some of the things we might consider doing in the concluding chapter of my *Racism Without Racists* such as organizing a new civil rights movement, nurturing antiracist whites, crafting counter-arguments to all the frames of color-blind racism, turning our analytical and political lenses to the goal of exposing white bullshit on issues such as segregation and the like, and returning to militancy. Furthermore, I advocated for even more radical individual and collective strategies in the *Postpcript* to the second edition of the book (2006) which can be found online in the website of Rowmand and Littlefield. In the following section, however, I want to target the discussion to specific things we ought to do in the academic trenches in sociology (Giroux 2007; Apple 1995). I do so because this is where we labor, but also because academic spaces have become less elitist as a quarter of the population attends college these days, hence, it is an important terrain for social struggles. More significantly, since this utopian effort emanates from academia, we must come clean with how race works in our own house if we want to urge others to join us in the effort to build a new society.

IV. FREEDOM PRACTICES IN "POST-RACIAL" SOCIOLOGICAL AMERICA[31]

Behaving as a free person and letting others, particularly one's "enemies," know that one is not to be taken lightly is fundamental for social change. Without blacks in South Africa in the

1980s or blacks in the USA in the 1960s losing fear of state repression and violence and engaging in individual and collective actions challenging their respective racial regimes, their struggles for utopia would not have been possible. But when people reach the point of no return and simply say "no more," "another world is possible" (Becker 2007). For this to happen, however, people of color need to get back to their resistance mode; they need to challenge all the practices, institutions, behaviors, and beliefs that reproduce white supremacy. Challenging the apparatus of white supremacy then begins by confronting the seemingly small ways in which racial power is reproduced in the everyday life. Racial power, like all power, is exercised and it operates in normative life. People of color must challenge the "racial grammar" that normalizes whiteness (see discussion above and Bonilla-Silva 2011) and the racial micro-aggressions[32] that maintain racial order in various settings and organizations and kills them softly in everyday interactions (Solorzano et al. 2000; Sue et al. 2006). Although collective action through "social movements" is ultimately the only way people can advance any emancipation project (Piven 2009; 2010), people need to achieve "cognitive liberation"[33] for movements to surface (McAdam 1982). Activists such as Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglas, Ché Guevara, and Malcolm X have provided us with examples of the critical moments in their lives where they fight back and were transformed into revolutionaries. For Frederick Douglas (1994[1845]) this meant physically fighting his master, but for Sojourner Truth (1997[1850]), frustrated by her master's failure to deliver on his promise to grant her freedom, this meant strategically planning her escape.

My approach is similar to Frantz Fanon's advice for treating the colonial "dependency complex." For Fanon, the therapy needed was "combined action on the *individual* and on the *group*" (My emphasis. 1967: 100). He advocated making the colonized "*conscious* of (their) unconscious and abandon (their) attempts at hallucinatory whitening" (100). The objective then

21

was not for the patient to "'keep his place'; on the contrary, [the objective was] to put him in a position to *choose* action (or passivity) with respect to the real source of the conflict—that is, toward the social structures" (100). Accordingly, the medicine I advocate for modern-day colonial patients is to *choose* action at the individual and collective levels against the social structures and practices that maintain racial oppression. We need to address not just "the man" and the horrid Jim Crow-like violence and social control we endure (e.g., Trayvon Martin and the Jena Six), but above all, cease our relative silence[34] about how race structures our *daily* lives and let the world know how some of "our best friends" participate in enforcing racial domination—some consciously but most by following the normal "racial etiquette" (Doyle 1937) of contemporary America.

The making of racial utopia hence begins in seemingly idealistic fashion. This may be perceived as "romantic," but movements need more than "objective conditions" to happen (Davies 1962; 1969). For collective resistance to emerge, *subjective* transformations among a significant number of the oppressed must take place first. [35] As Marx advised us in the Introduction to *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'* "to be radical" one must grasp "the root of the matter" which "for man (sic)…is man himself" (1961: 230).[36] In what follows I first sketch the main racial practices responsible for the maintenance of white rule in Sociology departments (and academia in general) and follow that with some specific "freedom practices" (for definition, see footnote 31) we should carry out individually and collectively.

White Racial Practices in Sociology Departments

Sociologists behave as if structural inequality based on race, gender, and class magically ends at the door of our profession and the departments where we labor. But work on occupations shows that jobs are gendered, racialized, and affected by class (Reskin and Padavic 1994;

Tomaskovic 1993). For brevity sakes, I outline below some of the main racial practices that maintain white rule in academia and the things we must do to stop the bleeding (for a longer list, see Bonilla-Silva 2011 as well as Hordge-Freeman, Mayorga, and Bonilla-Silva 2011).

1) White Kinship/Solidarity: Race, as all social categories, is a "social construction" but those constructions create realities that produce consequences. Whites, who form a social group outside academia (Lewis 2004), mesh together in sociology departments in a "web of group affiliations" (Simmel 1964) and form a kin-like group. [37] They help one another, become friends, walk their dogs together, teach one another the ins and outs of life in academia, collaborate in projects, etc. This, I contend, is one of the fundamental reasons behind the differential records whites and nonwhites attain as graduate students and faculty in sociology. The white family may have disagreements and even be dysfunctional, but they are still a family! Obviously, sociologists of color form a kinship group, too. But due to their size, diversity, and limited power in departments and the discipline, the protection kinship can provide to them is limited. Furthermore, since in the crazy racial game of America the ones viewed as raced subjects are people of color, their kinship and racial solidarity relegates them to the periphery of life in departments; they are "viewed as 'particularistic,' beyond the mainstream of the broader campus-based community, and automatically marginalized" (Bonner and Evans 2004: 5).

2) Exclusion and Emotional Exclusion from *Informal* Networks of Power: Sociologists of color were not part of HWCUs (historically white colleges and universities) until the late 1960s and since have been included as "tokens" in most departments (Ladner 1973). Sociologists of color are formally part of departments, but like in the polity at large, are not "emotionally embedded" (Aranda 2007). As graduate students, for instance, they are seldom incorporated in projects, asked to work with professors, encouraged to re-work their papers in seminars, told

23

how smart they are, excluded from study groups, and not invited to social events (Hughues 2004: 60). A black graduate student described a meeting with fellow black graduate students where "[w]hat spoke the loudest was that we don't feel connected or part of this program" while another stated that "the academic socialization process leaves so many of us feeling less like 'valued colleagues' and more like 'casualties of war'" (Anderson-Thompkins et al. 2004: 233). Thus, sociologists of color are formally citizens of Sociology departments across the nation, but are not "members of the club" (Otis-Graham 1996). This informal exclusion in departments continues outside departments. Albeit working together need not lead to "friendship," friendships and personal engagements beyond work (e.g., invitations to birthdays, holidays, etc.) among whites occur. This would not be an issue if it were not for the fact that these social bonds help produce outcomes in the Sociology club. This exclusion and the reinforcement of the white kinship leads to what King and Watts fear: "[i]f left to their own, White [particularly males] will replicate themselves" (2004: 116)

3) Labeling: In a classic case of the kettle calling the pot black, whites label sociologists of color as "difficult" in departments. Almost every sociologist of color I know has heard from a white colleague something like "You make me uncomfortable…" or "You are always talking about race and, come on, we have a Black President, so what else you people want?" (Anderson-Thompkins et. al. 2004). Sociologists of color hear comments like these as graduate students and as faculty. Whites, who rule this business and the environments where we labor (Cowan 2002), project onto us by labeling us, who are very few with limited power in departments, "controversial," "difficult," "one-sided," "political," or as one colleague recently said about me and my work, "ideological." I need not elaborate on the damage labeling does to the people being labeled as the literature on this matter is extensive (e.g., Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, & Davies,

2004; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978)

4) Micro-aggressions: Faculty of color endure a variety of seemingly small attacks such as white colleagues stating they do "me-search" rather than "research," shouting to them in their offices or in the hallways, calling them names, and ripping off signs from their offices (Milkman et al. 2012). All the things I listed have happened to me in my career and, based on my knowledge of the life of minority scholars through my extensive networks, I am not (unfortunately) alone. All in all, people of color in academia are, as Professor Will Smith et al. (2007) has argued, in a permanent state of fight or flight (Christian 2012).

5) White Searches, White Letters, and White Admissions: White rule is advanced in academia these days through routine actions and behavior that reproduce the white ecology. Open searches (almost) always curiously end up with the recruiting a white candidate.[38] Letters of support for minority scholars by white colleagues usually include caveats that convey to their white readers that the candidate is good, but has some "issues" (which candidate has no issues?). And recruitment of students for the program includes always getting a few minority candidates, but not as part of the central focus of the process, that is, students of color are included because departments need one or two of them to avoid been labeled racist, a practice that reproduces "tokenism."

6) Social Standing: Most sociologists of color labor in obscurity. White sociologists are more likely to receive respect, solidarity, support, grants, awards, and all the goodies one hopes to extract from academic labor. Even dead wood white sociologists—and there are many out there—as well as average white sociologists typically receive a better deal than sociologists of color. This is what Professor Tyrone A. Forman of Emory calls "the problem of white

mediocrity"—average white sociologists may become chairs or Deans, receive teaching awards in the "white rotation of accolades," and earn a very decent salary (Christian 2012).

7) Tenure Battles: Many assistant professors struggle to get tenure, but the struggles of minority faculty are uniquely and extraordinarily affected by racial considerations. Sociologists of color seldom receive "the benefit of the doubt" whereas whites are more likely to get it and, in some cases, in incredible ways. I have seen white sociologists promoted *two* ranks with one book. I have seen and suffered "*en carne propia*" white sociological judgment. I have seen how whites' work is more likely to be labeled "amazing" and "ground-breaking" while the work many of us do is labeled "political" or "particular." I have seen how when the crucifixion party is on, things that matter little for promotion (e.g., teaching, mentoring, departmental citizenship, etc.) are brought to the fore as central factors. (As a point of information, I have consulted with dozens of faculty of color on these matters and, since 2005, advice three to four colleagues *every* year on how to cope with these racial crucifixions.)

Overall, the work of sociologists of color is viewed with suspicion by their colleagues (Is Eduardo being objective? Did he control for X, Y, Z, and W? Who coded his data and what was his "inter-coder reliability index"?), thus, their scholarship is often regarded as "second-class."[39] [For white readers, how often do you read the work of scholars or color and how often your cite them. And, besides minority "stars" such as Lawrence Bobo, William Julius Wilson, and Patrica Hill-Collins, do you know the work of other sociologists of color?] And since sociologists of color are so often "lone rangers"[40] in departments (Hugues 2004: 60) and not part of the white cliques that rule, they do not accumulate as much "social capital" as their white colleagues. For example, they may not know about the specifics of the tenure process, know what they are supposed to do and not do in the first six crucial years in academia, or count on friends to help

them get through tenure or alert them in case they need to get out early—and on all these

matters, they need not general advice, but specific to their racial location in the academy.

Scholars of color then must be absolutely clear that race matters in academia and, hence, know

that outcomes such as being denied tenure[41] are not truly "meritocractic" as their white

colleagues want them to believe.

Freedom Practices to Whites' Racial Practices in Academia:

The basic "freedom practice" strategy we must have in mind was stated by Fanon in his

The Wretched of the Earth (1963: 94):

> At the individual level, violence is a cleansing force…It frees the native from his
> inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and
> restores his self-respect.

This does not mean people of color (or, in this case, sociologists of color) have to necessarily

resort to violence against those who oppress them (although they must always reserve the right to

do so as Malcolm X reminded us). Applying Fanon to neocolonial situations, in my view, means

that the colonized must not continue ceding moral and political terrain[42] by failing to object to

every single act of racial injustice. Finding one's bearings as an individual in the matters I have

discussed is a must for one to gain "self-respect." People of color in academia must name whites'

racial practices (e.g., "white searches," "white admissions," "white kinship/solidarity"), object to

them publicly, and call upon antiracist white colleagues to come forward and join us in the

struggle against white rule. More significantly, we must challenge frontally the racial order of

things in academia because it has deleterious effects for our careers, our collective future, and

our health (Williams 1990; Feagin 2005).

We must resist or we will perish, particularly in this peculiar post-racial moment we are

living were things are not what they seem (Bonilla-Silva and Seamster 2011)—a moment that is

rapidly bringing a "racial retreat" (Steinberg 1995) potentially as significant as the one we experienced after Reconstruction. As individuals, we must be clear and conscious about how race matters in whatever job we work (professors, lawyers, electricians, or carpenters[43]) and develop strategies to resist as well as to cope with racial domination. But the isolation we face in academia makes individual resistance hard, somewhat dangerous, and often costly. Most of us battle in departments where we are one or two out of twenty or more mostly white professors (Hordge-Freeman, Mayorga, and Bonilla-Silva 2011). Accordingly, although most resistance begins small and often at the individual level, the ultimate goal is working toward larger, collective forms of resistance. In the academic settings we labor this means joining forces with colleagues in other departments and making our demands as a collectivity. For example, at Duke, we have a Black faculty Caucus and in its short life (about three years) the group has already attained some important victories. Recently, after years of the Duke Administration promising hiring senior black Administrators, a simple threat of holding a press conference seem to have led the Provost to name a member of the group as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. At Wisconsin, I participated in a coalition of minority groups called the *Minority Coalition* and through militant action we were able to force the University to concede a number of our demands such as a Multicultural Center, Ethnic Studies requirements, and the like (Yamane 2001).

Accordingly, I outline below a few collective "freedom practices" we should include in our repertoire:

1) Organize campus-wide groups to discuss issues, protect our integrity, share stories, and devise plans of action/resistance. We cannot depend on departmental-level organizations because our numbers prevent us from having a meaningful impact.

2) Develop fraternal relations with like-minded organizations such as women groups, LGBT organizations, etc. Many of the racial practices I outlined above have gender and sexual orientation equivalents which make these groups likely to understand and appreciate our concerns and efforts.

3) Have organizations with some standing (e.g., ally departments or programs such as Women Studies, recognized groups on campus such as LGBT, etc.) *out* practices or specific people we believe need to be outed. Making the practices I outlined a public matter renders them visible, constructs them as a "social problem," and limits the likelihood of "localizing" the person or practice in question as "an isolated incident." [44]

4) We need to recognize the importance of being political once again. In this so-called post-racial era, we have stopped militant political praxis on race and are paying for it dearly. Administrators wish we behave in a "civilized" manner so that they can establish Committees to investigate concerns or claims. However, the historical record shows that we do better when we are militant than when we follow the rules, that is, when we walk out of meetings, do rallies, and get busy, we are more likely to get things from University administrators (Button 1989).

Although none of the things I outlined in this section are radical, the ultimate goal is nothing short of revolutionary. As I articulated in a speech I gave at The University of Wisconsin twenty-five years after the enactment of the "Madison Plan,"[45]

> …because of the peculiar role of universities as institutions of knowledge-production, as places willing to experiment, and as potential repositories of what is good in society, they can—and should—struggle to forge spaces where "racial democracy" and "racial justice" flourish. HWCUs (historically white colleges and universities) like UW can enact "non-reformist racial reforms" with the goal of eliminating their white foundation and structure and fostering their transformation into truly inclusive and democratic institutions of higher learning. The work will be hard, but HWCUs can reimagine and re-invent themselves into pockets of anti-racism and true universalism in the United States (Bonilla-Silva 2008).

V. WHAT IS TO BE DONE "FOR REAL" TO FORGE UTOPIAS (RACIAL AND OTHERWISE)

I tell you, people of America, the dark world is on the move! It wants and will have Freedom, Autonomy and Equality. It will not be diverted in these fundamental rights by dialectical splitting of political hairs ... Whites may, if they will, arm themselves for suicide. But the vast majority of the world's peoples will march on over them to freedom!

W E. B. Du Bois

My writing on "utopia" is not based on the construct produced by the West (Manuel and Manuel 1979),[46] but anchored on the intellectual, spiritual (in the Leninist sense of the word), and political traditions of resistance of people of color in the Americas. Accordingly, I have been in this essay very critical of RUP's lack of engagement with the political articulations of people of color, in particular, and with social movements, in general (not just on race matters, but on all sort of progressive agendas). In this concluding section, I do three things: (1) suggest why some paths to "racial utopia" will not get us there, (2) advance some component parts of a utopian project, and (3) make explicit why the struggle for *racial* utopia is also the struggle for utopia in general.

Failed Paths to Racial Nirvana

The Citizenship Paradigm and the Human Rights Tradition

I have written on the limitations of these traditions to address racial inequality and will not say much here (Bonilla-Silva and Mayorga 2009. See also the great essay by Nandy 2005). In essence, these traditions, anchored on the bourgeois individual logic, assume that "struggles" for redemption must be waged in a "civilized" way. Hence, they do not deal with the unequal footing between Empire (Negri and Hardt 2001) and the rest of the world and will never be able to serve as the ultimate foundation for resistance to racial-imperial domination. By missing group-based differences and assuming a juridical status position (citizen or rights of the citizen)

will ultimately achieve real equality among people and groups in the (unequal) world, these traditions end up as just others versions of liberalism.

Give me a Cosmo! On Cosmopolitanism

For at least ten years, but harking back to an old sociological tradition,[47] social analysts in Europe (Habermas 1996 and Gilroy 2000) and the USA (William Julius Wilson (1997), Kwame Anthony Appiah (2007) and, most recently and more vocally, Elijah Anderson in his *The Cosmopolitan Canopy* (2011)) have argued that cosmopolitanism is the cultural modality needed to get us "beyond race." By cosmopolitanism these analysts mean people having "a greater variety of interactions and more communication with people from diverse backgrounds" (Kerbo 2008: 239). The problem with this view is that modernity and domination co-exist, thus, having *formal* interactions with the Other in bars, restaurants, clubs, and the like does not challenge or alter in any meaningful way the racial structure of America or any other polity.

Colorblindness and Post-racialism

For about forty-years in the USA whites have claimed the nation is color-blind and, therefore, attribute any racial problem or existing racial inequality to minority folks own doing. I have written extensively on the ideological foundation of this thinking and argued it is the perfect cover for the "New Racism" era of racial domination. But this mythology which began in the 1970s (Caditz 1977) has been reinforced by the election of the first black President, Barak Obama. Although his election was not the result of a social movement demanding a new deal for people of color, the moment produced high hopes and muddled the racial waters (Bonilla-Silva and Seamster 2011). Whites believe "we live in the best of all possible worlds" even though racial inequality is as bad today as ever before (Daniels 2008; Sampson and Sharkey 2008;

31

Massey 2007; Western 2006). (Interested parties can read me extended discussion on the Obama phenomenon on Chapter 10 in the third edition of my *Racism Without Racists*.)

What all these alternatives have in common is a belief that racism can be overcome with good intentions. In contrast, progressive race scholars and activists alike insist that to get *beyond* race we must work *through* race, that is, that we must work to dismantle the racial structure of the country in question—the practices, cultural beliefs, and institutions responsible for the reproduction of racial inequality—if we wish to get to racial Nirvana. Postulating that we all have human rights or can be equal through attaining citizenship standing in a polity, behaving in cosmopolitan fashion, or arguing that we are beyond race are not going to get us to racial utopia. The road to *real* racial utopia will be paved with the blood, sweat, and tears of people of color and their allies. The prophetic words of Fredrick Douglass are as true today as when he uttered them more than a hundred years ago: "Power does not concede without a demand. It never did and it never will."

Contours of Racial Utopia

I do not wish to provide a blueprint of things to come as I believe that the specifics of racial utopia will be manufactured by the movement for racial emancipation (see Chapter 20 Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008). Hence I highlight instead some basic elements of the process needed to get to racial utopia as well as a few unresolved issues that will require serious debate.

First, the "usual suspects" (the victims of racial domination) and their white progressive allies will be the ones leading the charge for racial redemption. This argument has been historically controversial as whites whether liberal, progressive, or Marxist have all, from various angles, suggested a universalistic type of engagement to advance social change.

Second, in the USA and in most other racialized social orders, the racially subaltern have demanded reparations. Whether the Maoris in New Zealand, the aboriginal people in Australia, the Native peoples and blacks all over the Americas, or blacks and Native Americans in the United States, reparations seem crucial to help remedy inequalities, mobilize people, and sharpen our focus. This is, by the way, the opposite of what some "weighty" analysts have claimed. Before his death, this was the argument of Charles Tilly (2008). Tilly argued *against* reparations and even against the simple acknowledgment of historical injustices suggesting that this requires giving credit and assigning blame, which draws "us" and "them" boundaries—exactly one of the central points needed for social movements to emerge and ultimate produce social change.

Third, to advance a "racial utopia," one would have to do much more than just compensate racial minorities for historical and contemporary discrimination. One would have to dismantle the "racial structure" of society as well as its co-constituent culture. This means that the practices responsible for social, economic, political, and cultural domination must be extirpated from society and that we must work towards the development of a new non-racist culture (Nash 2003).

Fourth, utopia, racial or otherwise, needs to be conceived as a global effort. Although the movement may have specific sites of action, the thinking and the agenda must be global. Citizens of the United States, for instance, must conceive the components of their utopian agenda as an agenda for humanity. Racism is world-systemic and, therefore, we need to think of practices to unroot it globally.

Now I raise some unresolved issues. *First*, will race remain in paradise or will we all become global citizens with benign ethnicity to show? If the racial structure of any society disappears and social interaction becomes truly fluid and random, the social force behind race

would disappear, too. However, after 500 years of race-making, the social category has produced cultures, traditions, and even aesthetics that will not dissipate quickly. Hence, I believe the "cultural stuff" attached to race will remain in place in a benign way for a long time (Wade 1997), but I doubt it will remain forever. Race is socially "real" and has produced effects in culture, family affiliations, and in other areas. But if race ends its life as a category of inequality, its effects will eventually dwindle and its positive attributes (e.g. music, food, religiosity, and philosophy of blacks and Native peoples, etc.) will become part of the patrimony of humanity. This is my view, but an equally compelling case can be made for communities of color maintaining their difference (see Walzer 2004: 14-17).

Second, will racial utopia be nation-state based or anchored on larger sociopolitical entities (or on smaller ones as many anarchists have advocated)? As in the case of the social category race, if the "imagined community" (Anderson 1983) upon which modern states were built were to disappear, the nation-state might disappear, too. Yet, these nation-states have become resilient entities and are not easily dismantled (Ricupero 2008). Besides the issue remains: how would any sociopolitical formation be genuinely multiethnic and democratic (Peleg 2007)? Are sociopolitical formations (states, UN, or even smaller units such as cities) shaped so deeply by race (and class and gender) that we need to imagine new forms and units of communal association?

Third, will racial utopia be possible without addressing other inequalities or by addressing other inequalities will we lose focus on the salience of race? Once again, this is not an easy matter. Albeit the consensus among progressive activists is for the need to work on

intersectional ways, activists in struggles know how hard it is to do so and how easy it is for the older class-based agendas to take over race struggles (Wise 2010).

Fourth, if we reach racial utopia, will that be the "end of history"? The historical record shows that *homo sapiens* has been quite capable of inventing and recreating forms of inequality and social categories to do so (Lenski 1984). Therefore, in my view, the struggle to end race and racism will not be the end of history, but it will get us to a better place. But, once again, this is a somewhat unresolved matter as some may query about why struggle when one may never end inequality altogether. To this my reply is simple: one faces the monster at hand and let others deal with the new monsters that surface.

From Real Utopia to Utopia "For Real"

I end my essay with a seemingly contradictory claim: *racial* utopia will not be for real unless utopia has as a goal smashing the social (and perhaps global) matrix of domination, that is, until it sees its ultimate goal the abolition of *all* forms of domination. For "curious George-type" readers who wonder, "If you believe this, why talk about *racial* utopia at all?," the answer lies in the history of racial domination and the need to be realistic about what happens when one does not press hard to advance a racial agenda. The record amply shows that if one begins with universalism, the universal will reflect the dominant interests of the groups leading a social movement. As Fanon (1967: 186) pondered aloud,

> What? I have barely opened eyes that had been blind-folded, and someone already wants to drown me in the universal?

Although I wholeheartedly believe in coalition politics and have participated in several in my life, I also believe that exclusively race-, gender-, and sexual orientation-based groups should maintain their own organizations and independence (Young 2000). If racial minorities, women,

or gays and lesbians do not demand remedy to their specific issues, radical social movements are not likely to include their concerns in the agenda.

Lastly, I end this essay by restating my deep concern with RUP's agenda—to elucidate the specifics of utopia relatively independent of social movements and claiming to be advancing a "real," pragmatic vision for transforming the world. Those of us who labor in academia have a responsibility and a role to play in the transformation of society, but we are not, and should never aspire to be, Comtean "sociological priests" giving the people formulas of what the new world should look like. On this point, Marx stated that workers, and his argument applies to all social categories, "have no ready-made utopias" as "[t]hey have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant" (Marx 1977: 545). He also admonished that workers would "smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen's gentlemen with the pen and inkhorn, and at the didactic patronage of well-wishing bourgeois-doctrinaires" (Ibid: 545). Our job, then, is to work *with* and *for* the oppressed, *join* social movements as well as help bring them come to the fore, and help craft "revolutionary theory" and radical knowledge to assist the revolutionary movement (Lenin 1961[1902]). Consequently, scholar activists must be humble and develop the capacity to listen and learn from the various political and organizational efforts of the oppressed. Believing otherwise helps keep us aloof, removed from real struggles, and make our efforts become, dare I say, utopian "pie in the sky."

References:

Ackerman, B., A. Alstott and P. van Parijs. 2006. *Redesigning Distribution: Basic Income and Stakeholder Grants as Cornerstones of a more Egalitarian Capitalism*. Real Utopias Project Series V, Verso, London.

Ackerman, B., and A. Alstott. 1999. *The Stakeholder Society.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ackerman, B., and A. Alstott. 2001a. "Class Warfare?" *Huffington Post*, September 27

Ackerman, B., and A. Alstott. 2001b. "Democratizing Wall Street?" *Huffington Post*, October 12th.

Alexander, Michelle. 2010. *The New Jim Crow: mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

Anderson, Elijah 2011. *Cosmopolitan Canopy: race and civility in everyday life*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Anderson-Thompkins, S., Gasman, M., Gerstl-Pepin, C., Hathaway, K., & Rasheed, L. 2003. ''Casualties of war'': Suggestions for helping African American graduate students to succeed in the academy. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students in higher education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Apollon, Dom. 2011. "Don't Call Them 'Post-Racial' Millenials Say Race Matters to Them." *Colorlines*, June 7. Retrieved May 24, 2012 (http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/06/youth_and_race_focus_group_main.html)

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. W. W. Norton and Company.

Apple, Michael. 1995. *Education and Power*. New York: Routledge.

Aranda, Elizabeth. 2007. "Struggles of Incorporation Among the Puerto Rican Middle Class," *The Sociological Quarterly* 48(2): 199-228.

Arrighi, G., Hopkins, T.K. and Wallerstein, I. 1989. *Antisystemic Movements*. London: Verso.

Balibar, Etienne and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein. 1991. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso.

Baralt, Guillermo. 1981. *Esclavos Rebeldes*. Rio Piedras: Ediciones Huracan.

Barry, Skip. 1998. "Be Realistic—Demand the Impossible," *Dollars & Sense* 217: 8.

Becker, Marc. 2007. "World Social Forum," *Peace & Change* 32(2).

Beckles, Hilary. 1989. *Natural Rebels: A Social History of Enslaved Black Women*. London: Rutgers University Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking racism: toward a structural interpretation," *American Sociological Review* 62: 465-80

___. 2001. "Anything but racism: how social scientists limit the significance of racism," *Race and Society* 4: 117-31.

___. 2004. "From bi-racial to tri-racial: towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(6): 931-50.

___. 2009. "Are the Americas 'sick with racism' or is it a problem at the poles? A reply to Christina A. Sue," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(6): 1071-82.

___. 2010. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and Mayorga, Sarah. 2009. "Si me permiten hablar: limitations of the human rights tradition to address racial inequality," *Societies Without Borders* 4: 366-82.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and Louise Seamster. 2011. "Introduction: Examining, Debating, and Ranting About the Obama Phenomenon." In *Rethinking Obama: Political Power and Social Theory,* ed. Julian Go. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Bonner, F.A. II and Evans, M. 2004. "Can you hear me? Voices and experiences of African American students in higher education," In D. Cleveland (Ed.) *Broken silence: Conversations about race by African American faculty and students on the journey to the professorate* (pp. 3-18) New York: Peter Lang.

Bowles, Samuel, Herbert Gintis, and Erik Olin Wright. 1999. *Recasting Egalitarianism: New Rules for Communities, States and Markets*. London: Verso.

Brooks, Roy L. 1990. *Rethinking the American Race Problem*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford: University of California Press.

Bruyn, Severyn T. 2005. *A Civic Republic: Beyond Capitalsim and Nationalism.* Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press Inc.

Button, James W. 1989. *Blacks and Social Change: Impact of the Civil Rights Movement in Southern Communities*. Princeton University.

Caditz, Judith. 1976. *White Liberals in Transition: Current Dilemmas of Ethnic Integration*. New York: Spectrum Publications, Inc.

Caraway, Nancie. 1991. *Segregated Sisterhood: Racism and the Politics of American Feminism*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.

Christian, Mark. 2012. *Integrated But Unequal: Black Faculty in Predominantly White Space*. African World Press.

Cohen, Joshua and Joel Rogers. 1995. *Associations and Democracy*. London: Verso.

Cox, Oliver. 1959. *Foundations of Capitalism*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Cornell, Stephen. 1988. *The Return of the Native: American Indian Political Resurgence.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Cowan, Eugenia D. 2002. "Hanging In: The Journey to Good Enough." In Lila Jacobs, José Cintrón, and Cecil E. Canton (eds.), *The Politics of Survival in Academia*, pp. 33-55.

Daniels, Lee A. 2008. *Last chance.* New York, NY: Public Affairs.

Davies, James C. 1962. "Towards a Theory of Revolution," *American Sociological Review* 27: 5-18.

Davies, J. 1969. "The J-curve of rising and declining satisfactions as cause of some great revolutions and a contained rebellion," pp. 671-709 in High Davis Graham and Ted Gurr (eds.) Violence in America. New York: Signet.

_____. 1962. "Toward a theory of revolution," *American Sociological Review* 27: 5-19.

Deloria, Vine. 1988. *Custer Died for Your Sins*. New York: Macmillan.

Dos Santos. 2006. *The Rise of the Global Left. The World Social Forum and Beyond*. London: Zed Books.

Douglas, Frederick. 1995[1845]. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*. Dover Publications.

Doyle, Bertram W. 1937. *The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South: A Study in Social Control*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 2008[1903]. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Rockville, MD: Arc Manor.

_____. 1992[1935]. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. New York: First Free Press.

Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. 2004. "Seeing black: Race, crime, and visual processing," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87: 876–963.

Fanon, Frantz. 2004 [1963]. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

____. 1967. *Black Skin White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., &Williams, C. J. 1995. "Variability in automatic activation as an unobstrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline?," *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 69(6), 1013–1027.

Feagin, Joe R. and Karyn D. McKinney. 2005. "The Many Costs of Racism." Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fung, Archon and Erik Olin Wright. 2003. Deepening Democracy: Institutuional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. London: Verso.

Gaspar, David Barry. 1985. Bondmen and Rebels: A Study of Master-Slave Relations in Antigua. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Gilbert, Oliver. 1997[1850]. *Narrative of Sojourner Truth*. Dover Publications.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

____. 2000. *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Ginwright, S., P. Noguera, and J. Cammarota. 2006. *Beyond Resistance! Youth Activism and Community Change: new democratic possibilities for practice and policy for America's youth*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, Henry. 2007. *The University in Chains: confronting the Miitary-Industrial-Academic Complex.* Paradigm Publishers

Glymph, Thavolia. 2008. *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldberg, David Theo. 1993. *Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Gornick, Janet and Marcia Meyers. 2009. *Gender Equality: Transforming Family Divisions of Labor*. London: Verso.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. 1995. "Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes," *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4–27.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Hassim, Shireen. (2009). Rethinking gender politics in a liberal age: Institutions, constituencies and equality in comparative perspective. Geneva*: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Retrieved April 13, 2010, from* http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/(httpAuxPages)/307981CD212531B6C125 7607004F9CFF/$file/ShireenHassim.pdf

Herman, Edward S. and Noam Chomsky. 1988. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hugues, Robin, 2004. "The Dwindling Pool of Qualified Professors of Color: Suburban Legends." In *A Long Way to Go: Conversation about Race by African American Faculty and Graduate Students*, Darrel Cleveland (ed.), pp. 81-93 (New York: Peter Lang).

Jackman, Mary. 1994. The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

James, C.L.R. 1989. *The Black Jacobins*. New York: Vintage Books.

Jenkins, Richard. 2004. *Social Identities*. London: Routledge.

Jeffries, Hasan Kwame. 2009. *Bloody Lowndes: Civil Rights and Black Power in Alabama's Black Belt*. New York: New York University.

Jordan, John and Jennifer Whitney. 2001. "Resistance is the Secret of Joy" *New Internationalist* 338.

Joyner, Brian. African Reflections on the American Landscape. 2003. National Park Service. June 2003. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/crdi/publications/African%20Reflections.htm>. An in-depth study of Africanism in the United States and the contributions of Africans to America.

Katz, David. 1990. *Breaking the Chains*. Atheneum.

Kelley, Robin. 2002. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Kerbo, Harold R. 2008. *Social Stratification and Inequality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

King, Kimberly Lenease and Ivan E. Watts. 2004. "Assertiveness or the Drive to Succeed?:

Predominantly White University." Pp. 110-119 in *A long Way to Go: Conversations About Race by African American Faculty and Graduate Students,* edited by Darrell Cleveland. New York: Peter Lang.

Kumar, Krishan. 2010. "The Ends of Utopia." New Literary History 41 (3): 549.

Ladner, Joyce (ed.). 1973. *The Death of White Sociology*. New York: Random House.

Lancaster 1991. "Skin Color, Race, and Racism in Nicaragua," Ethnology 30(4):339-353 (October, 1991). Reprint: Race and Ethnicity: Comparative and Theoretical Approaches. John Stone and Rutledge Dennis, eds. Basil Blackwell (Readers in Sociology Series), 2003.

Lenin, Vladimir. 1961[1902]. "What is to be Done?: Burning Questions of Our Movement?" Pp. 119-271 in *Lenin's Collected Works, Volume 1*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Lenski, Gerhard E. 1984. Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lewis, Amanda E. 2004. "What Group?: Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era of Colorblindness." *Sociological Theory* 22(4): 623-646.

Manuel, Frank E. and Fritzie P. Manuel. 1979. *Utopia Thought in the Western World*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Luxemburg, Rosa. 1900. Social Reform or Revolution. S. Wanasinghe.

Marable, Manning. 1983. *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems in Race, Political Economy, and Society*. Cambridge: South end Press.

____. 1991. *Race, reform, and Rebellion: the second Reconstruction and beyond in Black (2nd ed.)*. University Press of Mississippi.

Marx. 1970 [1843]. *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right.'* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

____. 1977 [1913]. The Eigteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Company.

Massey, Douglas S. 2007. *Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory" *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6).

Meeks, Brian. 2000. *Narratives of Resistance: Jamaica, Trinidad, the Caribbean*. University of the West Indies.

Mills, Charles W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

____. 2003. *From Class to Race: Essay in White Marxism and Black Radicalism*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Milkman, K. L., Modupe, A., and Chugh, D. (In Press). "Temporal Distance and Discrimination: An Audit Study in Academia," *Psychological Science*.

Mintz, Sidney W. 1989. *Caribbean Transformations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

____. 2010. *Three Ancient Colonies: Caribbean Themes and Variations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Monsaváis , Carlos.1997. *Mexican Postcards*. New York: Verso.

Nandy, Ashis. 2005. "Imperialism as a Theory of the Future," in Bernd Hamm and Russell Smandych (eds.), *Cultural Imperialism: Essay on the Political Economy of Cultural Domination* (Toronto: Broadview Press), pp. 52-59)

Nash, Catherine. 2003. "Cultural geography: anti-racist geographies," *Progress in Human Geography* 27(5): 637-648.

Navarrete, María Cristina. 2003. *Cimarrones y palenques en el siglo XVII*. Cali, Colombia: Universidad del Valle.

Nistal-Moret, Benjamin. 1984. *Esclavos profugos y cimarrones: Puerto Rico, 1770-1870*. Rio Piedras: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Oberschall, Anthony. 1972. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Oliver, Melvin and Thomas Shapiro. 2006. Black Wealth, White Wealth: a new perspective on racial inequality. New York: Routledge.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s. New York: Routledge.

Otis Graham, Lawrence. 1996. *A Member of the Club: Reflections on life in a racially polarized world.* New York: Harper Collins.

Parenti, Michael. 1992. Make-believe Media: the politics of entertainment. Wadsworth Publishing.

Pateman, Carol and Charle Mills. 2007. *Contract and Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Patterson, Orlando. 1991. Freedom Vol.1: Freedom in the making of Western Culture. New York: Basic Books.

Piven, Francis Fox. 2009. "How do we get from here to there"

Piven, F.F., L.C. Minnite, M. Groarke, and A.S. Cohen. 2009. Keeping Down the Black Vote: Race and the Demobilization of American Voters. New York: New Press.

Poulantzas, State, Power, Socialism (hereafter SPS), New Left Books, (1978),

powell, john a. 2009. "Post-Racialism or Targeted Universalism?" *Denver University Law Review* 86: 785-806

Price, Richard. 1973, "Introduction, Marrosna nd their Communities, pp. 1-30, in *Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Rediker, Marcus. 2007. The Slave Ship: A Human History. New York: Viking.

Reskin, B. F., & Padavic, I. 1994. *Women and men at work.* Thousand Oaks, CA : Pine Forge Press.

Richardson, David. 2004. Black Experience and the Empire. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ricupero, Rubens. 2008. "The resilience of the Nation State to globalization" *Estudos Avancados* 22(62): 129-144.

Robins, Nicholas A. 2005. *Native Insurgencies and the Genocidal Impulse in the Americas*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Robinson, Cedric J. 2000 [1983]. Black Marxism: the making of the black radical tradition. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Roemer, John. 1996. Equal Shares: Making Market Socialism Work. London: Verso.

Rooper, A. and Smith, H. 1986. "From nationalism to autonomy: the ethnic question in the Nicaraguan revolution," *Race and Class*, 27 (4), 1-20.

Rotberg, Robert I. 2003. "Nation-State Failure: A Recurring Phenomenon?" November 6th CIA Discussion Paper.

Sampson, Robert J. and Patrick Sharkey. 2008. "Neighborhood Selection and the Social Reproduction of Concentrated Racial Inequalities" *Demography* 45(1):1-29.

Sawyer, Mark Q. 2006. *Racial Politics in post-revolutionary Cuba*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, James C. 2004. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sears, D. O., J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo. 2000. *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sergeant, Lyman Tower. "In Defense of Utopia," *Diogenes 53(1):11-17.*

Simmel, George. 1964. *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smallwood, Stephanie E. 2008. *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora*. Harvard University Press.

Smith, Robert. 1995. *Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era, Now You See It, Now You Don"t*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Smith, W.A., Allen, W.R., and Danley, L.L. 2007. "'Assume the Position…You Fit the Description': Psychosocial Experiences and Radical Battle Fatigue Among African American Male College Students," *American Behavioral Scientist* 51(4).

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. 2000. "Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students," *The Journal of Negro Education* 69: 60–73.

Stampp, Kenneth M. 1956. The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-bellum South. New York: Vintage Books.

Steinberg, Stephen. 1995. *Turning Back: The Retreat From Racial Justice in American Thought and Policy*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C. Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Esquilin, M. E., et al. 2006. *Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for counseling*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Tarrow, Sidney G. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. 1978. "Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotyping," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 36, 778–793.

Thomson, Sinclair. 2002. *We Alone Will Rule: Native Andean Politics in the Age of Insurgency*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Thompson, Alvin O. 2006. *Flight to Freedom: African Runaways and maroons in the Americas*. University of West Indies Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2008. *Credit and Blame*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Todorov, Tzevetan. 1994. *Human Diversity: Nationalism, Racism, and Exoticism in French Thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Tomaskovic, Donald. 1993. *Gender and Racial Inequality at Work: The Sources and Consequences of Job Segregation*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 1993.

Walker, Clarence E. 1991. *Deromanticizing Black History: Critical Essays Reappraisals*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Walzer, Micahel. 2004. *Politiocs and Passion: Toward a More Egalitarian Liberalism*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Weitz, Eric. 2003. A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Western, Bruce. 2006*. Punishment and inequality in America. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.*

Williams, D.R. 1990. "Social Structure and the Health Status of Black Males," *Challenge: A Journal of Research on Black Men* 1:25-46.

Wilson, William Julius. 1997. *The Truly Disadvantaged: the inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wise, Tim. August 17, 2010. With Friends Like These, Who Needs Glenn Beck? Racism and White Privilege on the Liberal-Left

Wolf, Eric R.1982. *Europe and The People Without History*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Wright, Erik Olin. 2010. Envisioning Real Utopias

Yamane, David. 2001. Student Movements for Multiculturalism. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Young, Iris. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. London: Oxford University Press.

Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

[1] Professor Erik Olin Wright, the main force behind RUP, has stated he was always interested in utopia, but that he returned in earnest to this theme in the early 1990s in the following context:
The Berlin Wall had fallen, the Soviet Union disintegrated. Neoliberalism and market fundamentalism dominated government policies in capitalist democracies. With the demise and discrediting of the centrally planned economies, many people believed that capitalism and liberal democracy were the only possible future for humanity. The "end of history" was announced (Wright 2010).

[2] In this paper I will highlight the significance of taking race and racism seriously in our thinking about utopia. However, as intersectional scholars such as Kimberle Crenshaw (1991), Iris Young (2000), Patricia Hill-Collins (1990), and Evelyn Nakano-Glenn (2002) have argued, race, class, gender, and sexual orientation comprise the complex "matrix of domination" (Hall 1981) in all modern societies and, thus, institutional and social power is expressive of all these social cleavages. Others have already pointed out some of the weaknesses of RUP on the gender front (Orloff 2009; Pateman 2005) and we await for RUP to invite scholars and activists from the LGBT community to help us imagine a more humane and thoroughly inclusive future.

[3] The important group of analysts working on the footsteps of Anibal Quijano's work on the "coloniality of power" and "gobal coloniality" may provide us the theoretical, political, and epistemological bridge to get us out of the 19th century thinking that weighs like a nightmare on the brains of all 21ts century social scientists (Wallerstein 1991). See, for example, the anthology edited by Ramón Grosfoguel and Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007).

[4] If by Marxist one means following Marx's writings in a biblical way, then I am not a Marxist. But if one believes that Marxism is about using "class analysis" and "class politics" to advance the struggle for collective human emancipation then I am a Marxist. It is my belief that Marxism must be modified (reconstructed?) to include race, gender, and sexual orientation not as ideological practices used by the bourgeoisie to divide the "workers of the world," but as central categories of group action and consciousness. If modernity is a complex bundle of articulated systems of domination, the theoretical-political task at hand is to untangle this complex web in order to develop a praxis that allows us to get to the Promised Land. In term of the race-class nexus, the book by fellow Caribbean scholar, Charles W. Mills, *From Class to Race: Essays in White Marxism and Black Radicalism* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003).

[5] I respect Professor Erik O. Wright enormously. He recruited me to come to Wisconsin in 1984 and was an important member of my dissertation Committee. Thus, my comments here are about the project, the process, and the ideas and in no way, shape, or form, reflect ill feelings toward Professor Wright. He is, and will always be, a generous and gentle academic soul. I disagree with him on many fronts—as I am sure he does with me—but I value his scholarship, genuine curiosity, as well as his immense generosity. Anyone who knows Professor Wright appreciates his acumen and scholarship, but also his decency.

[6] Scholars such as Kimberly Chrenshaw, Patricia Hill-Collins, Angela Davis, Evelyn Nakano-Glenn, Howard Winant, Michael Omi, the late Manning Marable, Troy Duster, Lawrence Bobo, Walter Allen, Melvin Oliver, William Darity, Jr., and many, many others could have helped this project immensely.

[7] This is yet another example of the race blinders of so many analysts. They assume that by inviting white feminists to a discussion or conference, they have covered the gender angle and the gender concerns of their audiences. By doing this, however, they keep women of color out of the conversation even though they have for at least a hundred years tried to make the claim that their plight is *distinct* from that of white women (Caraway 1991). The sisterhood has always been divided!

[8] Survey results show that both whites and non-whites (but blacks in particular) believe that discrimination is still happens. However, when the question is about whether racial inequality in America is due to discrimination and its cognates, whites believe this is not the case and blacks disagree vehemently. On this subject, Maria Krysan, one of

the authors of the second edition of *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations* (Schuman et al. 1997), stated in an on-line update the following:

Finally, there are a set of questions that have become less racially liberal over time. Specifically, questions that ask whether African Americans continue to experience racial discrimination and if the consequences of past discrimination and slavery continue to shape the experiences of today's African Americans. Essentially, the trend is for fewer whites to acknowledge that African Americans are adversely affected by past and persistent discrimination. This trend is of consequence, since support for policies targeted toward helping African Americans are closely related to whether or not an individual believes that African Americans continue to face these kinds of barriers.

[9] Some may, from time to time, be elected to the Council of the Association or even be elected President of the group or chair departments as I do at this very moment. But none of these things indicate they have power as power in the discipline is concentrated in the hands of the sociological power elite, the 100 or so sociologists mostly at elite institutions who rule the business. They control effectively the publications racket by controlling the major journals, have a leading role in how research funds are disperse and what research agendas are deemed worthwhile, and influence inordinately the entire discipline by having authority over the top 30 departments of sociology in the nation. Thus, the symbolic inclusion of a few hides in plain sight the objective and subjective exclusion of the many!

[10] At least five years before Professor Wright thought about "real utopias," Marcos Kaplan wrote in his book, *Estado Y Sociedad en America Latina* (Oaxaca y Ciudad de Mexico: Editorial Oasis, 1984), about a "realist utopia." He stated the following:

El modelo utópico muestra la historicidad, la contingencia y la precariedad de las estructura existentes. Desnuda y revela las ideologías justificatorias. Fundamenta una recusación de la racionalidad dominante. Favorece la formulación, el balance y la confrontación de alternativas. Perfila una apertura hacia lo posible. Permite saber mejor hacia dónde se quiere ir a partir de la situación actual. Da credibilidad a la posibilidad de cambios profundos y verdaderos. Incorporando a las consciencias y a las prácticas individuales y colectivas, genera una fermentación, corroe y disuelve las viejas formas caducas pero efectivas y obstaculizantes…*Niega el fatalismo con respecto al pasado, el presente pero también al futuro* (266-267. My emphasis).

Thus, the term existed before Wright's came up with this project, but had, in my view, a more radical bent.

[11] It is well-known how critical Marx was of utopias is texts such as *The Communist Manifesto*. But he acknowledged their critical ideas and how revolutionary their originators were. For an analyst that suggests Marx did not reject fully the utopians and develop a utopian tradition himself, see Roger Paden (2002). See also Harvey (2000)

[12] Despite the fact that Wright examines work by others in Brazil and other localities, his project is fundamentally envisioned as utopia for Western "democracies."

[13] The work of Desmond and Emirbayer (2009) on "racial domination" is important. They claim that domination is institutional and interpersonal and embedded and operating in "corporations, universities, legal systems, political bodies, cultural life, and other social collectivities" (345). The only thing I wish these authors would have added in a clear and forceful way is that domination has a material foundation, that is, racial domination exists because white people benefit from it. See Mathew Desmond and Mustafa Emirbayer, "What is Racial Domination?" *Du Bois Review,* 6: 2 (2009): 335-345.

[14] I do not count Moore's *Utopia*, published, in the 16th century as the foundation for *radical* imaginings of the world. His utopia was extremely hierarchical (it even maintained slavery) and was not connected to any democratic movement of his period (1516).

[15] This modern institution was not feudal and paternalistic as, for example, Eugene Genovese argued (1965; 1974). The contemporary consensus is summed well by Mintz (2010: 31): "The plantations were governed by violence of every kind and at every level. The system's abuse and inhuman labor regime horrifically shortened and ended lives. When buying more slaves was cheaper than maintaining the lives of the slaves one had—and this was commonly remarked on—planters bought more slaves. There was nothing in the slightest picturesque about the plantations." (Joyner 2003)

[16] This is not to say that Africans in the Americas were wimps. The explanation for their lesser level of resistance has a socio-political explanation. They were out of their land, had to develop unity across ethnic lines, and unlike many Indian groups, lacked a land base from which to mounts attacks.

[17] Amerindians all over the world, perhaps because unlike Africans, they endured their brutal domination in their territories of origin, never accepted or included as much of European culture in their "syncretism." This, as well as their historical segregation in communities and reservations may account for why so few Native peoples seem to care much for European values and culture (Deloria 1988).

[18] I am the product of the black radical tradition in many ways. First, albeit my nuclear family is mulatto, my own consciousness was based on my parents' politics (nationalist and somewhat socialist) and my blackness—I related more and in a deeper way to the black side than to the white side of my family (Bonilla-Silva 2010). Second, I lived my formative years (from eleven to twenty one) in barrio Caimito, a barrio in the outskirts of San Juan, Puerto Rico, "established in the 18th century by free blacks and mulattoes at the margins of the labor market and of the market in general" (Picó 1988: 15. My translation). This community hardly saw slavery as most residents were free blacks and mulattoes working in small land plots as *agregados* (sharecroppers) and in small cattle ranchers. Barrio residents resisted proletarianization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. For instance, they resisted wage labor by doing the minimal work necessary to survive, resisted the workbook regime, and resisted taxation and all sort of state regulations. In many ways, folks in my barrio live today *still* at the margins of state control: many residents do not have papers, licenses, registration, and regard the police as an outside force. It was in this barrio that I developed my style and social instincts as I spend all the time I could outside my house with friends who were all barrio residents. Lastly, I have lived in *gringolandia* since 1984, a place that has provided me the political, scholarly, and lived experiences I needed to sharpen my inchoate racial consciousness.

[19] Most escaped for short periods of time to challenge a specific overseer or family disruptions caused by masters. Escaping permanently in many localities and situations was extremely difficult. See William Loren Katz, *Breaking the Chain*

[20] For a good discussion on alternative forms of resistance, see Ackerman and Kruegler (1994)

[21] Marx and many of the anarchists he chastised (Proudhon most notably) firmly believed in the importance of communal experiments including The Paris Commune. What workers did in the 19th century, blacks had already done in the 17th and 18th which is yet another reason for realizing the importance of this emancipatory tradition.

[22] See Michael Craton, *Testing the Chains: Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982); Leslie Howard Owens, *This Species of Property: Salve Life and Culture in the Old South* ((Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1976); and Stuart Schwartz, *Slaves, Peasants, and Rebels: Reconsidering Brazilian Slavery* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992).

[23] Marxists avoid the concept oppression as they believe the notion of exploitation is more "scientific." For the limitations of the notion of exploitation and a defense of the term oppression as the best one to capture multiple dimensions of injustice, see Ann C. Cudd, *Analyzing Oppression* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[24] In Gramsci's words as it pertains to class:

La división del trabajo ha creado la unidad psicológica de la clase obrera: ha creado en el mundo proletario ese cuerpo de sentimientos, de instintos, de pensamientos, de costumbres, de hábitos y afectos que se resumen en la expresión solidaridad de clase (1977: 39).

[25] Nicos Poulantzas, one of my structuralist heroes of yesteryears, said that classes are not "'an empirical thing'" (1982: 67). However, his solution to what he termed the "voluntarist" and "historicist" view on class was seeing class as the "*effect of the ensemble of structures*" (67), a stand that obscures the issue. Yet, one can still work with Poulantzas' ideas as he also stated that class can only be conceived as "class practices," practices which always exist in opposition (86). This allows one to see classes, and I extend the argument to race and gender, as concrete historical realities that exist in opposition (us versus them) and which are defined meaningfully by what they do. On how to rework Poulantzas' work, see Ernesto Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory* (NLB, 1977).

[26] My take is similar to the notion of "cultures of solidarity" coined by Fantasia (1988: 17) by which he meant, "a cultural expression that arises within the wider culture, yet which is emergent in its embodiment of oppositional practices and meanings" and this expression is always based on "mutuality" (25). Class (or race) for Fantasia is the "lived experience" of workers (or racial groups) and "consciousness" its cultural expression.

[27] I must make a point of clarification on hegemony here. For some analysts, hegemony is absolute and ready-made. This, however, was not Gramsci's notion. Hegemony is always contested, incomplete, and a never-finished project. See Raymond Williams (1973)

[28] I excluded from this discussion the Latino and Asian American experiences and traditions of resistance in the USA. For discussions of these traditions, see Karin Aguilar-San Juan, *The State of Asian America: Activism and Resistance in the 1990s* (Boston: South End Press, 1999)

[29] At the same time, the new era of "racial domination" has cemented the pace for most people of color as second-class citizens in America (Marable 1983; Marable 1991)

[30] In the words of E. P. Thomson, "Class happens when some men (sic), as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests" (1966: 9). Therefore, class consciousness is "the ways in which these experiences are handled in cultural terms" (10).

[31] I have urged analysts to move away from the concept of "discrimination" given its intrinsic connection to the prejudice problematic and its focus on overt behavior which does not allow analysts to capture normative, subtle, routine behaviors. Thus, I have urged analysts to replace this term with the notion of *racial practices* by which I mean behaviors, styles, cultural affectations, traditions, and organizational procedures that help maintain white rule. Freedom practices encompass all resistance practices of the racially subaltern in pursuit of their liberation, but in this section, I mostly focus on individual and (lesser) collective strategies in academia as my audience is folks in the academy and RUP is a child of academic freedom dreams (nothing wrong with them so long as they are connected to the freedom dream of people in struggles).

[32] Sue et al. (2007) describe micro-aggressions as, "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of other races."

[33] Although this term was coined by Doug McAdam, the best explanation of how individuals get to the state of cognitive liberation appears in Piven and Cloward's classic *Poor People's Movements*. First, a large number of individuals come to believe the system is not legitimate. Second, people who ordinarily are "fatalistic" begin to

make demands and to assert their "rights." Lastly, people believe they can alter their lot and behave in defiant ways (3-5).

[34] Joana Kadi (1996: 11), in her marvelous little book, *Thinking Class: Sketches from a Cultural Worker*, writes:

> All systems of oppression…function most effectively when victims don't talk. Silence isolates, keeps us focusing inward rather than outward, makes perpetrators work easier, confuses and overwhelms.

[35] There is no formula to "correctly" assess when a "crisis" has reached its boiling point. But as radicals, we know that we must always do: agitate, politicize, and engage.

[36] It is worthwhile to cite the entire quote.

The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism of the weapon, material force must be overthrown by material force; but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping the masses as soon as it demonstrates *ad hominem*, and it demonstrates *ad hominem* as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But, for man, the root is man himself. The evident proof of the radicalism of German theory, and hence of its practical energy, is that is proceeds from a resolute *positive* abolition of religion. The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that *man is the highest essence for man* – hence, with the *categoric imperative to overthrow all relations* in which man is a debased, enslaved, abandoned, despicable essence, relations which cannot be better described than by the cry of a Frenchman when it was planned to introduce a tax on dogs: Poor dogs! They want to treat you as human beings!

Accordingly, the test of civilization for radicals is working towards the abolition of all relations which debase us (Laclau 2007). In terms of race, the struggle for racial emancipation begins the day we say "no more."

[37] Our presence in these spaces may even help solidify the sense of commonality among whites because of the well-known psychological process of "contrast effects"—"the in-group is seen as more similar because of the perceived contrast with the out-group" (Fryberg 2010: 199).

[38] William Darity, Jr., has divided the departmental outcomes of these practices into three categories, namely, sundown departments (those that have never had black faculty), midnight departments (those that had one in the past), and window dressing (those that have one token member). See his "Notes from the Back of the Bus," in *The Future of Diversity: Academic Leaders Reflect on American Higher Education*, Daniel Little and Staya P. Mohanty (eds.), pp. 173-180 (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

[39] On this point, Professor Derrick Bell outlined the four cardinal "rules of racial standing" in *his Faces at the Bottom of the Well* (1992), namely, (1) minorities talking about race as a social fact are construed as doing a "special pleading", (2) minorities cannot be objective on race, (3) a minority person disagreeing with minority leaders or with most minority social analysts is granted "enhanced standing," and (4) when a minority challenges whites in an "outrageous" way (from the white vantage point of view), whites will desperately search for other minority people to refute the person of her views.

[40] Social psychologists have studied the impact of "solo status" and it is not pretty. People in solo status experience "heightened visibility, stereotypical role encapsulation, and contrast effects" (Fryberg 2010: 198. See her discussion 198-201).

[41] My point here is not that every minority person denied tenure reflects racism. My point is that promotion judgments reflect in many ways how race shapes the academy.

[42] I have discussed many times the limited racial consciousness of black youth, particularly of those we encounter in academia, with Professor Tyrone A. Forman (Emory). They seem not to know what time it is and we believe this is due to (1) the long period without a strong racial movement (now inching into fifty years) and (2) the slippery character of the racial practices of domination in America. Hence, albeit blacks have not bought one hundred percent into colorblindness, they have a partially blunted consciousness (Bonilla-Silva 2010).

[43] Deidre Royster demonstrates in, *Race and the Invisible Hand*: *How White Networks Exclude Black Men from Blue-collar Jobs* (2003), how race affects who gets typical working class jobs (e.g. plumbers, electricians, etc.). The invisible white hand of the market works in all jobs, so there is now a cottage industry of books on how race matters among architects, stock traders and investors, police officers, and many other professions.

[44] Across the nation, whenever race issues come to the surface, University Administrators work hard to dissipate the matter by claiming the incident in question was "an isolated incident."

[45] The "Madison Plan" was the product of the struggle for racial justice at UW in the late 1980s. It was a response from Donna Shalala, then Chancellor of the University, the "Holley Report," a report by a blue-ribbon commission on the state of racial affairs in the University. Albeit the Madison Plan watered-down *all* the proposals the minority-led student movement had issued, it showed that organizational work and relentless politicking produces outcomes.

[46] The problems with the utopian Western tradition have been succinctly addressed by Lasky (1976:10): 'The rigidity of almost all utopias, their authoritarianism and paternal perfectionism, are almost incomprehensible, seen against the whole record of the human imagination."

[47] Sociology has always had a bias towards the urban or modern and from early on sociologists postulated that as societies became more urban, educated, and modern all sort of shortcomings associated with rural, less educated, traditional societies would dissipate including "racism." An early important sociologist who challenge this view was ASA President, Everett Hughes, who in his 1963 Presidential Address, "Race Relations and the Sociological Imagination", suggested that modernity and racism were not mutually exclusive