The Browning of America and the Evasion of Social Justice

an evasion of social justice: instead, it advances the cause of social justice, and it does so in a cosmopolitan direction. This occurs in two ways. First, the browning of America is strongly suggestive of a broad integrationist ideal (an ideal that too easily falls into utopian romance, as will be discussed in chapter 4) that connects to the normative insights of liberal color consciousness. If the advocates of the browning of America can resist the temptations of being co-opted by political movements and organizations that favor naïve or even malicious versions of color blindness, then they can utilize the browning of America as a backdrop to highlight the virtues of all the normative insights of liberal color consciousness. Such advocates can support traditional color-conscious civil rights public policy, but with the idea of a color-blind public sphere foregrounded in their rhetoric. Likewise, they can go beyond the cautious rhetoric captured by the moral insight of liberal color consciousness and push the people to think about the civic fruits of color blindness across social and private contexts as well. They can insert a clamor that disturbs the hush about the necessary private and social implications of the moral insight of liberal color consciousness. This is a clamor that does not coerce, God forbid, amalgamation; it is a clamor that points out that the racist opponents of integration were right about at least one thing—integration, and the liberal color consciousness upon which it depends, is an enabling condition of burgeoning interracial partnerships, friendships, and intimacies.

Second, the browning of America promotes the transformation of traditional nationalistic conceptions of social justice that dominate in American law, political science, and philosophy. For example, the demographic pressures of the browning of America should lead to the expansion of civil rights for immigrants so that they meet the needs of communities and individuals that do not neatly fit into the civil rights mold of the black-white binary. The potential here is enormous, as it touches on a multitude of aspects of American life: drivers' licenses for undocumented immigrants, bilingual rights, the right to vote for immigrant parents in local school district elections and access to education, immigration policies for transnational and dual-citizenship families, and so on. Civil rights must be transformed in light of transnational and global justice, and the browning of America is an agent of this change.

Chapter 3

The Black-White Binary as Racial Anxiety and Demand for Justice

Introduction

The future of race in the United States, or elsewhere, will not be determined solely through the American instinct to return to black-white politics—as if the question of the conservation or elimination of race and racial justice is in the hands of whites and blacks who need to hash out their issues for the sake of all of us. That somehow American racial problems are primarily black and white problems is the conceit of too many Americans.

This conceit is rooted in an image of an America defined by Protestantism, the English language, and its ties to Europe and populated by fading yet romantic "Indians," a few Mexicans, and "Orientals" but dominated by whites and blacks. In this fantasy, the racial problems that we have are determined by the painful yet interesting history between whites and blacks. From here, liberals and conservatives part company, but the central vision holds—both sides affirm that black-white division is the United States' core racial problem, and that solving black-white conflict is the master key to all of its racial problems.

The result of this assumption has been that the concerns, problems, and questions, specific to blacks and whites and the relationship between them, have historically dominated discourse over race in the United States. The domination of this focus, often called the black-white binary, has colored the U.S. reaction toward, and policies about, Native Americans, Asians, Latinos, and its colonial subjects, such as Puerto Ricans and Filipinos.[1] The color line, which W. E. B. Du Bois

famously claimed marked the twentieth century and spanned the globe, was imagined in the cast of the black-white binary.

In the following sections I clarify various conceptions of the black-white binary and consider their relative merits and failings. I then turn to the host of objections against this binary. I support the primary complaint against the binary, that it does not engender accurate descriptions of the United States' racial past or present, and it skews discussions of the future of race and racial justice toward the perspectives and interests of blacks and whites. Some readers may think that the problems with the black-white binary are so obvious and great that the subject is not worth a chapter-length study. I urge such readers to momentarily suspend their incredulity about the black-white binary so that they can consider the demands for justice that motivate its proponents. I argue that the black-white binary should not simply be dismissed, for incautious dismissals of it end up casting off the demands of justice that frequently motivate statements that seemingly support the binary. Nonetheless, there are troubling aspects of the black-white binary that go beyond the usual objections, leading, finally, to its total rejection. The black-white binary is rooted in a peculiar conception of black-white American nationalism and xenophobia that is ultimately hostile to American multiculturalism. Such a view is fundamentally illiberal, and the people of the United States should not capitulate to its desire that the false image of America as black and white not be upset.

The Black-White Binary

The historical relationship between white and black racial identity in the United States is the *root* of all of the other versions of the binary:

> **B-W Binary$_1$** The black-white binary refers to the historical relationship between white and black racial identity in the United States.

The relationship is not static, as it is historical and changes through time, and it is site specific, as it takes particular forms in the United States that differ from other such relationships at other sites, say, New Zealand or the United Kingdom.[2] Further, "racial identity" in the aforementioned formulation refers broadly to what Omi and Winant call racial formation, and thus it includes the historical political, economic, and social relationships between blacks and whites; likewise,

it may refer to the phenomenological structure of white and black identity, in the sense of Fanon's account of the "lived experience of the black" and his famous compartments.[3] This root version of the binary refers, then, to an isolated dyad and does not presume to place the position of other racial or ethnic identities in between the black and white poles.

There are two problems, one conceptual and the other moral, even with this root definition. First, as soon as other groups are included and thought of in these terms, what results is a great pinwheel of racial hierarchy and valuation that makes it difficult to think about the relationships between the nonwhite racial categories. Is the wheel static or does it spin? What does this image say about hierarchies between the nonwhite categories? Second, making "white" the pin of the wheel interferes with nuanced ethical thought about racism, in particular, the possibility of anti-white racism.

But the story does not end with the root version, because the black-white relationship has had a singular influence on shaping widespread understandings of the history of the United States, its cultural productions, and social life. The historical events that define that relationship—slavery, the Civil War, Emancipation, Reconstruction, lynching, Jim Crow segregation, the civil rights movement, and desegregation—have had such a tremendous influence on the events around and after them, as well as all the peoples involved, that the root version of the binary became, in the decades that followed the U.S. Civil War, an absolute reference point for talking about race in the United States and the world.

This process started in the years leading up to the Civil War. For example, Frederick Douglass, in his landmark 4th of July address, called for Emancipation and favorably compared it to the "liberalizing" influence of English colonialism in China:

> The far off and almost fabulous Pacific rolls in grandeur at our feet. The Celestial Empire, the mystery of ages, is being solved. The fiat of the Almighty, "*Let there be Light*," has not yet spent its force. No abuse, no outrage whether in taste, sport or avarice, can now hide itself from the all-pervading light. The iron shoe, and crippled foot of China must be seen, in contrast with nature. *Africa must rise and put on her yet unwoven garment. "Ethiopia shall stretch out her hand unto God."*[4]

There were other similar extensions of the black-white relationship in the writings of Alexander Crummell and Anna Julia Cooper,

but the best example of this extension comes from W. E. B. Du Bois. Within his 1897 "The Conservation of the Races," he proclaimed that Africans in North America and the Caribbean represented the "advanced guard" of all blacks, that this avant-garde would provide the leadership for the entire black world, and that the resolution of anti-black racial oppression in the United States would ipso facto provide the answer to uplift all black people. In Du Bois's hands, the black-white binary dissolved the particularity of black identity and struggles at various sites. Following the Spanish American War, in his essay "The Present Outlook for the Dark Races of Mankind" (1900), he extended the reach of black avant-gardism to include all nonwhite peoples under the sway of U.S. power:

> . . . the colored population of our land is, through the new imperial policy, about to be doubled by our own ownership of Porto Rico [*sic*], and Hawaii, our protectorate of Cuba, and conquest of the Philippines. This is for us and for the nation the greatest event since the Civil War and demands attention and action on our part. What is to be our attitude toward these new lands and toward the masses of dark men and women who inhabit them? Manifestly it must be an attitude of deepest sympathy and strongest alliance. We must stand ready to guard and guide them with our vote and our earnings. Negro and Filipino, Indian and Porto Rican, Cuban and Hawaiian, all must stand united under the stars and stripes for an America that knows no color line in the freedom of its opportunities. We must remember that the twentieth century will find nearly twenty millions of brown and black people under the protection of the American flag, a third of the nation, and that on the success and efficiency of the nine millions of our own number depends the ultimately destiny of Filipinos, Porto Ricans, Indians and Hawaiians, and that on us too depends in a large degree the attitude of Europe toward the teeming millions of Asia and Africa.[5]

It is important, though, to remember that the emergence of the black-white binary in African American social and political thought was in reaction to the support of colonialism and imperialism by white intellectuals and politicians at the turn of the century. Such elites, such as Teddy Roosevelt, saw the relation of the United States to the nonwhite world and the global south in terms of the American color line.[6]

This is in part why, as contradictory as it seems, when the black-white binary is employed, those who are using it think they are being inclusive. It serves as a sort of master key to all things racial. It can be used to get at the essence of our history, our problems, and any potential solution. In naïve hands, the binary is used to make the absurd claim that it *describes* the totality of racial diversity, or at least the diversity that matters. This is the second and simplest version of the black-white binary as an *empirical* claim:

> **B-W Binary$_2$** Racial patterns can be empirically described solely using black and white terms.

The films of Michael Moore provide a telling example of this version of the binary at work and its dominance in the rhetoric of the American Left. Within his internationally recognized critical documentaries racial injustice is consistently depicted through black-white terms; from *Roger & Me* to *Fahrenheit 9/11*, racial injustice takes on the personage of white anti-black racism. In *Fahrenheit 9/11*, when Moore, for example, wanted to discuss the inequitable burden of military service that falls on the shoulders of young men from the poor through the lower middle classes, he mechanically focused on black men, despite the fact that this problem is shared in great numbers by Latino, Asian American, and immigrant youth.[7]

The second version of the binary is indefensible as a methodology for describing the social world, because it would obviously fail to capture the full spectrum of ethnic and racial diversity in American society. Another version, however, is evident in projects that *methodologically* focus on African Americans, white Americans, and their relationship to each other:

> **B-W Binary$_3$** The black-white binary is a methodological focus on blacks, whites, or on their interrelationship, to the exclusion of other ethnic or racial groups.

What is so irksome to the critics of the binary about this version is that researchers and theorists will generalize to the rest of society from this narrow focus. This complaint is everywhere and goes back to the first mention of the browning of America. It usually is stated in this form: American ethnic and racial life can no longer be simply described in black and white terms.[8] There is something objectionable about social science and theory that excludes consideration of any

groups outside of white and black Americans yet purports to study American ethnic and racial patterns.

Such a problem, however, lies within systems of social analysis and research, primarily the constitution of colleges and universities, and not with the individual researcher. The limitation of individual research to particular groups is the by-product of specialization and can be virtuous, as long as the researcher does not make great generalizations. Yet researchers who claim methodological limitations as the reason for narrowly tailored foci frequently indulge in great generalizations about larger American racial patterns, in particular, about the singular value of the black-white relationship. They do so, in part, because they accept stronger versions of the black-white binary. For example, in their important empirical work on biracial identity, Kerry Ann Rockquemore and David L. Brunsma add these claims to their methodological justifications for focusing solely on black-white biracial children:

> [B]lacks and whites continue to be the two groups with the greatest social distance, the most spatial separation, and the strongest taboos against interracial marriage. . . . In addition, focusing on black/white biracials enables us to *engage profound and enduring questions about racial categorization*. Specifically, probing into racial identity among black/white biracials leads to question about *the meaning of race*, the efficacy of racial categorizations, and how and why Americans have persistently used the "one-drop rule" to determine who is black in America.[9]

According to Rockquemore and Brunsma, due to the singularity of the black-white relationship, it is a master key of sorts that can unlock the answer to the meaning of race—as if *the* meaning of race was located in the black-white relationship and the constitution of the black and white categories.[10] Although they admit that empirical studies of other racial combinations would be valuable, for them the study of black-white biracial identity reveals the "meaning of race," which should be *reflected* but which does not have its *origin* in the other multiracial identities.

Rockquemore and Brunsma have gone beyond the third version of the black-white binary and have asserted a version of the black-white binary that is explicitly political:

> **B-W Binary$_4$** Racial patterns can be described in black and white terms, because "black" and "white" pick out prescriptive patterns of racial organization.

This version accords with the view of the majority of the proponents of the black-white binary. They do not claim that the binary provides a demographic description but that it describes *prescriptive* patterns of racial hierarchical organization. These patterns, which derive from America's history of race, organize the complexities of ethnic and racial experiences into the American "bipolar schema," and in this schema racial groups are politically either included as whites or excluded as blacks.[11]

This view is behind and provides the force for social and political thought from 1865, the start of Reconstruction, to 1964, the year the Civil Rights Act was passed, which made the achievement of civil rights for African Americans the crux of the realization of an authentic American democracy. Thus in 1957, Richard Wright wrote, "The history of the Negro in America is the history of America written in vivid and bloody terms," and "The Negro is America's metaphor."[12] And James Baldwin, in 1962, wrote that the Negro is "*the* key figure in his country, and the American future is precisely as bright or as dark as his."[13] Wright's and Baldwin's comments had a historical specificity and were justified given the world-historical moment in which they were writing, but even their vision of black and white America swept away other relevant facets of American racial divisions, such as Native American legal struggles to guard and recover tribal sovereignty during those decades. All the same, Baldwin was correct about African Americans and the future of the nation in 1962. Much, if not all, depended on black Americans achieving their civil rights. The problem is that too many still see African Americans as *the* American metaphor and the key to the future of the country—this is the substance of the fourth version of the black-white binary.

This view is certainly defended by Andrew Hacker and is represented by the expansive title of his book *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*.[14] Likewise, the view is perfectly captured in the pithy remark of Mary Frances Berry, historian and former chair of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, that the United States is made up of "three nations, one Black, one White, and one in which people strive to be something other than Black to avoid the sting of White Supremacy."[15] In addition to sociology, history, and political science, this version of the binary has even found support with some political theorists. For example, in Thomas McCarthy's otherwise careful discussion of deliberative democracy and reparations, this version of the binary is a centerpiece of his argument for national deliberations about racial justice:

> The black/white polarity has fixed the geography of the color-coded world to which successive waves of immigrants have

> had to adapt. . . . This is not at all to deny that Americans of diverse origins have their own histories to relate and their own politics of memory to pursue. It is merely to point out that the history of slavery and its aftermath have formed a *template* for those histories, they have been shaped by it, and that their fates have been inextricably entangled in the racialized politics that is its legacy.[16]

Examples of this form of the binary abound, but its most recent and most visible public expression was in the discussions of race and class in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Suddenly, to the nation's horror, that storm brought race and class back to the American consciousness and reminded the nation that despite the rhetoric of national unity broadcast throughout the nation in the days that followed September 11, 2001, race and the effects of racism were real, present, and cast in familiar black-white terms.

Hurricane Katrina forced the nation to confront the presence and legacy of anti-black racism. Its most dramatic, destructive event was the deluge of New Orleans, and the majority of its victims were black and elderly, and mostly poor.[17] Discussions about historical patterns of anti-black racism and the systematic neglect of African American urban communities quickly spread across the nation through major English language news sources, leaving long behind the context of New Orleans and demonstrating that the nation was not finished with the black-white binary.

The United States was not finished with the binary exactly because it never effectively addressed the full effects of the legacy of anti-black oppression.[18] Admitting this does not vindicate the binary's claims at describing prescriptive patterns; instead, it reveals that assertions of the binary so often clumsily stand in for demands of justice undelivered. The ensuing discussions that ricocheted across the nation should have addressed the nation as multiracial, but they did not; they were completely framed by the binary, and so much so that the racial divisions over the government's response to the storm were cast in black-white terms, as if the attitudes of blacks and whites comprehensively sorted any possible reaction based on race or ethnicity.[19] Instead of focusing on the particularity of anti-black racism and the disparities that poor, urban African Americans face, problems that all Americans have inherited an obligation to address, the significance of the event took over the whole meaning of race in America, and it became a discussion for and about black and white people.

One reason public deliberations, or news media polemics, return to the black-white binary is because black-white conflict is assumed to be this nation's primary and most intractable racial problem, even in the face of national turmoil over immigration. This assumption appears in two forms—the first is sociological, while the other is historical, and both imply that black-white conflicts and disparity have an ethical priority. The *sociological* form of this assumption provides the most defensible version of the binary and can be conceptualized in the following way:

> **B-W Binary$_5$** Disparity between blacks and whites is the United States' greatest social injustice and most pressing social problem.

According to this version of the binary, the injustices that African Americans had to endure, such as slavery and subsequent decades of Jim Crow oppression and benign neglect, are the United States' greatest infractions of justice, and those injustices have given the nation its deepest political, economic, and social disparities. These disparities cut across a wide range of life in the United States, including political representation, wealth, employment, housing, education, health, medical care, and other social indices; they are persistent and have not been adequately addressed by the nation.[20]

The second form of the assumption that black and white conflict is this nation's primary racial problem takes the following form as a *historical* claim:

> **B-W Binary$_6$** Black and white conflict is the United States' primary historical racial problem.

This version of the binary is closely related to the fourth and fifth versions, but it is conceptually distinct; moreover, the interplay between these functions of the binary demonstrates how it works in the minds of its proponents as the master key to race in America. First, black-white conflict is privileged because it simply has a historical priority.[21] Second, black-white conflict has a higher significance and needs to be addressed as such because, as in the words of Mary Frances Berry, "Racism against African Americans remains the prototype for racism in America."[22] Claims of this sort have the status of dogma, and versions of it are plainly apparent in the examples I have used thus far, the sociological research of Rockquemore and Brunsma,

the political analysis of Andrew Hacker, and the moral and political philosophy of Thomas McCarthy.[23] The point of this dogma is that as "immigrants," who are by definition outsiders to the American racial system, assimilate to U.S. culture, they mimic whites by adopting anti-black racism. This is a position articulated by Berry, Hacker, and McCarthy. Here is Berry's account:

> If we are to become a truly multiracial democracy, [Clinton's race initiative] must influence greater change in White behavior based on perceptions of African-Americans. When their behavior changes, maybe others who mimic their attitudes and actions also will be affected.[24]

Notice the naked nativism of Berry's statement. She claimed, in effect, that blacks and whites are at the center of American racial dynamics. Asian and Latinos are cast as mimics, and Native Americans, as is typical, are completely ignored.

The implication is that because so-called yellow, brown, and off-white folks mimic white folks—apparently red folks are now white or do not matter—the black-white conflict assumes a historical and political priority. According to Berry:

> As we absorb the world's tired, poor and hungry, we must first bring closure to our internal wounds. Americans must learn to measure themselves, not by their distance from Blackness and proximity to Whiteness, but by their acceptance of remedies of racism.[25]

In other words, the solution to the problem of white privilege and anti-black racism is the master key to all racial problems.

The Exclusions of the Black-White Binary

The black-white binary provides an inaccurate and irresponsible representation of the status of ethnoracial groups and the history of race in the United States. In this subsection, I argue the aforementioned two points, focusing on the more substantive fourth through sixth versions of the black-white binary. Objections to the root form of the binary have been provided, and the second form of the binary, as an empirical claim, can be quickly dismissed because it prima facie provides an inaccurate description of race in America. The third form of the

binary, as methodological focus, is due to the structure of the academy and the demands of individual research, both of which are beyond the scope of this work to critique. Furthermore, the third form of the black-white binary is most interesting when it is motivated by other forms of the binary, which are undermined by my later arguments.

Objections to the Prescriptive Claim (B-W Binary$_4$)

The fourth form of the black-white binary commits several faulty conflations. First, it conflates Native Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, immigrants from Asia or Latin America, and others who do not fit into the "black" or "white" categories into an amorphous and enormous middle group whose racial function, meaning, and role are totally defined by the principal black-white nodes. To put it simply, in the United States, the categories "Latino," "Asian American," and "Native American" must have the normative status of either "white" or "black." According to the likes of Berry and Hacker, those groups began with the normative status of "black" and, like the Irish, seek to attain the normative status of "white." That conflation, in turn, depends on a series of other conflations; in particular, it assumes that nonwhite, nonblack groups have, with each other as well as African Americans, identical accounts of (1) racial formation and (2) racial experience.

The conflation across such disparate and large groups of the first two items also is prima facie wrong. Each of these so-called "intermediate" groups has complex compositions that cut across race, ethnicity, and nationality. These groups have their own account of history and social processes, which has resulted in their individual formation—each category has a unique story behind its ontological status.[26]

Taking seriously the claim that the binary names prescriptive patterns of racial organization involves discounting the particularity of each nonwhite, nonblack group during deliberations about the broad dynamics of race. In that space, in public forums such as national conversations about race, according to the partisans of the black-white binary, there are only black and white folks.

The inaccuracy and irresponsibility of that strategy are what Gary Okihiro objected to when he analyzed the question "Is yellow black or white?"[27] To deracinate "yellow," according to Okihiro, is to fundamentally miss the particularity of Asian American history and experience. The discrimination that Chinese, Filipinos, Indians, Persians, and Arabs suffered was due to their perceived "Asian-ness"

and foreignness. The American concept of black does not capture the dynamics of the "Asian" and "Asian American" categories.

The difference between these groups is ensconced in Judge Harlan's famous dissent in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which was discussed in the second chapter. After arguing that the constitution is properly color blind, he argues further for the rights of African Americans by highlighting their nativity in comparison to the strange foreignness of the Chinese:

> There is a race so different from our own that we do not permit those belonging to it to become citizens of the United States. Persons belonging to it are, with few exceptions, absolutely excluded from our country. I allude to the Chinese race. But by the statute in question, a Chinaman can ride in the same passenger coach with white citizens of the United States, while citizens of the black race in Louisiana, many of whom, perhaps, risked their lives for the preservation of the Union, who are entitled, by law, to participate in the political control of the State and nation, who are not excluded, by law or by reason of their race, from public stations of any kind, and who have all the legal rights that belong to white citizens, are yet declared to be criminals, liable to imprisonment, if they ride in a public coach occupied by citizens of the white race.[28]

The black-white binary completely misses this history and the import of the particularity of Asian American racial formation and experience, because it is only aware of how the Asian American experience matches up to its conception of blackness—everything else is jettisoned. Thus it cannot account for the vital particulars of the Asian American experience, such as the judgment of absolute foreignness.

This reveals that the black-white binary also conflates (3) experiences of group-specific racism. The result is that American conceptions of racism have not taken seriously xenophobia and nativism, or rather nationalist claims of natality and priority, in the American experience of racism—forms of racism that affect Latinos, immigrants from Latin America, Asia, and Africa, and Asian Americans. Worse, as I discuss later, the binary functions to distance xenophobia and nativism from racism, thus protecting the xenophobic nationalists from the charge of racism.

This conflation, consequently, has ill effects for African Americans. It has contributed to the common assumption that there is nothing unique about anti-black racism. The idea here is that expressions

and the legacy anti-Asian or anti-Latino racism are quantitatively and qualitatively equivalent to anti-black racism. David Hollinger has named this the "one-hate rule," and it is a deeply misguided and inaccurate assumption that has undervalued the extent, depth, and effect of anti-black racism.[29] The one-hate rule has resulted in unfair, and quite malicious, comparisons of African Americans to so-called "model minorities."[30] Further, it has muddled the purpose of originally backward-looking civil rights programs conceived to rectify past racist harms against African Americans.[31]

The errors and consequences that result from the conflations of the fourth form of the binary are grounds enough for its dismissal. However, it has other consequences that deserve exposure, because they show the full force of its irresponsible nature, which ultimately will have profoundly troubling effects on liberal discussions of race and social justice. Linda Martín Alcoff pinpoints this problem in her critique of the black-white binary. According to Alcoff, "The black/white paradigm has disempowered various racial and ethnic groups from being able to define their own identity," with the result that "Asian Americans and Latino/as have historically been ignored or marginalized in the public discourse in the United States on race and racism." These marginalizations have eliminated "specificities with the large 'black' or nonwhite group" and have "undercut the possibility of developing appropriate and effective legal and political solutions for the variable forms that racial oppression can take."[32]

The black-white binary, as Alcoff has argued, is a bald attempt by black and white America to speak for the totality of the racial experience in the United States.[33] Its impulse to be avant-garde regarding concerns over race and social justice undermines its own conceit that it is inclusive. It leaves out claims for consideration that are radically different than traditional African American claims for civil rights and integration into the basic structure society. This reveals a fourth conflation committed by the fourth version of the black-white binary: it assumes that (4) African American solutions for racial oppression are fit for all other groups. However, traditional black-white civil rights claims are silent about, and perhaps even hostile to, claims for multicultural rights typically made by indigenous groups, groups whose primary language is something other than English, and immigrant groups.

To underline this final point, the critiques of the binary offered by legal scholars, such as Juan Perea and Richard Delgado, underscore the dangers that Alcoff's critique exposes.[34] Delgado in particular distinguishes three ways that the binary negatively affects Latinos

and Asian Americans. First, it has framed the legal conception of equal protection in terms of the struggle for equal black citizenship. That frame aids in discrimination against nonwhite immigrants and undermines the equal protection of Latino/a and Asian American citizens. Second, the binary plays into contractarian justifications for the national self-determination of citizenship and thus cements past race-based (and racist) definitions of citizenship. Third, the binary places Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans "out of sight" and thus out of the discourse of racial justice. The consequence of the normative force of the binary is that African Americans, according to Delgado, are trained to pursue, and are recognized as the primary legitimate recipients of, benefits and protections that flow from anti-discrimination laws.

The black-white binary, as a "template" or master key, demarcates who is a proper subject of our thoughts about race, racism, and civil rights. Consequently, some individuals and groups, and their respective interests, are left out of public deliberations of race and social justice, and are typified as, quite literally, foreign issues. Legal scholar Juan Perea put it this way:

> If Latinos/as and Asian Americans are presumed to be White by both White and Black writers . . . then our claims to justice will not be heard or acknowledged. Our claims can be ignored by Whites, since we are not Black and therefore are not subject to real racism. And our claims can be ignored by Blacks, since we are presumed to be, not Black, but becoming White, and therefore not subject to real racism. Latinos/as do not fit the boxes supplied by the paradigm.[35]

In the wake of the reaction of the United States to the terrorist strikes against the World Trade Center towers, the black-white binary's role as principle of exclusion in the service of American nationalism took on an ugly clarity.[36] It assuaged American worries about racism as it targeted Arabs, Middle Easterners, and Muslims in the war against Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, the war against Iraq, and the everlasting war on terror.[37] Whatever the role of racism in the rounding up, questioning, detention, and expulsion of Arabs, Muslims, and people from the Middle East, the United States was comforted by the "United We Stand" rhetoric, and a rainbow coalition of Americans helped author and justify the United States' reactions to terrorism. Thus practices such as the racial profiling of Arabs, Muslims, and those who look like them, to our eyes, met with 60 percent approval

ratings, while before the war 80 percent of Americans disapproved of racial profiling, a sentiment that George Bush and even John Ashcroft supported before the war.

It is of great consequence that this exclusion is a result of a particular black-white normative vision of the American nation as being properly and primarily black and white. The implication is that the black-white binary is a nativist idea that aids the continued exclusion of Latinos, Asian Americans, and other nonwhite immigrant groups, such as Arabs and Muslims, from full citizenship and equal protection.[38]

Objections to the Sociological Claim (B-W Binary$_5$)

As I mentioned earlier the fifth form of the black-white binary is defensible. It would not be reasonable to dispute its claim that racist oppression and discrimination against African Americans is a fundamental fact of U.S. history, and that its legacy is profound and persistent. This claim can be held and defended, however, without recourse to the black-white binary.

The fifth form of the binary has two parts: one is the recognition of the role of anti-black racism in the United States, and the other is a claim that anti-black racism has a sociological priority. What would the claim of sociological priority be based on? A quantitative claim that black suffering outweighs the suffering of other groups, or that blacks qualify for the Rawlsian category of the "least well off" would be very hard to establish and is an overextended sociological claim that is not needed to establish the fact that large portions of the African American community suffer from distributive injustice and other forms of oppression. Typically, claims of priority are based on the fourth (the binary names prescriptive patterns) and sixth (the binary as a historical claim) forms of the black-white binary, but they are, for the reasons discussed in the previous and next section, unsupportable. There is no reason to hold onto the fifth form's central claim, that disparity between blacks and whites is the United States' "most pressing" social problem.

Fortunately, recognizing the severity of anti-black racism and its centrality to United States does not require the assertion that black-white disparity and conflict have a sociological priority over other racial and ethnic divisions and disparities. Indeed, without the assertion of priority, the recognition of the role of anti-black racism in the United States is not properly an instance of the black-white binary. Therefore, if the claims of priority do not hold and are abandoned,

when researchers and theorists focus on black life, they cannot be considered supporting or utilizing the black-white binary.

There are many reasons to concentrate on the role of anti-black racism in the United States; indeed, it is important so that the specificity of anti-black racism and its effects is not lost. Thus Patricia Hill Collins, in *Black Sexual Politics*, objects to demands that researchers and theorists adopt "more abstract theories of race and racism" instead of focusing on the "black/white relations paradigm."[39] She argues, correctly, that turning away from the specificities of the black experience would harm the study of African American life and contribute to those forms of racism that seek to "cover over the harm done to victims and to mute their protest."

While Collins is correct to defend the need for specificity in studies of ethnoracial groups, her otherwise elucidating defense of the specificities of black studies is tainted by an assertion of another sort of priority. According to Collins, the demand that black scholars abandon the black-white binary

> . . . redefines Black intellectual production that focuses on social issues that are of concern to Black people as being myopic and reflecting special interests. One important dimension of the new racism is to cover over the harm done to victims and to mute their protest. Telling African Americans to take a number and wait their turn in a long line of special interest groups vying for recognition in an oppression contest rewrites the specificity of American race relations in an especially pernicious way.[40]

Although I agree with her defense of specificity in black studies, I am disturbed by her invocation of the image of African Americans being told to "take a number" and wait in a "long line of special interest groups." Insofar that Collins rejects the depiction of racial politics in the United States as an arena of competing special-interest groups, or the idea that the demands of justice from Native Americans, Latinos, African Americans, and Asian Americans can be reduced to special-interest demands, she is correct. The demands for social justice by communities of color in the United States are not mere policy "interests" but are reasonable demands of procedural, distributive, and reparative justice that the United States, if it is to be a liberal democratic society, must deliberate about and address. However, Collins employs the image of the "long line" in the context of her dismissal of counter-black-white binary critiques. So who exactly is in this long

line? Does she mean groups such as the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the special-interest group representing the beef industry? No, in the context of her argument, the "long line" is composed of other ethnoracial groups. Collins is supporting a version of the sixth form of the binary, which asserts the unsupportable idea that the black-white binary has a historical priority.[41]

Objections to the Historical Claim (B-W Binary$_6$)

The sixth form of the binary is justified for some because of the historical precedence of the African American experience, as well as the relative severity of the conflict between African Americans and whites. For others, such as Mary Frances Berry, Andrew Hacker, and Toni Morrison, the sixth form has additional justification because, as Toni Morrison put it, assimilation and integration into the United States happen upon the "backs of blacks." My objection to the fourth form of the binary (that it names prescriptive patterns of racial organization) undermines the latter claim, and without it the first claim is not as significant. Mainstream African American demands for justice deserve satisfaction, and those claims do not need the black-white binary as justification. Worse, the black-white binary in the contemporary multiethnic United States, with the complexities of its history in which the conflations of the black-white binary are invalid, undermines the realization of social justice for all because it, as Alcoff argued, "seriously undermines the possibility of achieving coalitions."[42] Therefore, public deliberations that commence by professions of the black-white binary are anti-political and either imperil or end public communication on race and social justice.

Additionally, the basic historical claim of the sixth form of the binary is suspicious when Native American claims are considered. Native Americans possess their own history as a group defined as a national other and enemy of the United States. The history of Native Americans, since 1492, has been interwoven with that of the descendents of Africans brought to the Americas by European powers, but their history is distinct in terms of geography, language, culture, international political treaties, and the formation of sovereign nations within North and South America and the Caribbean. The claims of the black-white binary are so totalizing that it would erase the importance of this history by assimilating Native Americans in the black-white system. This is the reason Native Americans scholars, such as Vine Deloria and David Wilkins, need to remind Americans that Native

Americans are members of "sovereign nations" and are not minorities; or, in the words of Will Kymlicka, indigenous Americans are "national minorities" rather than a "polyethnic" group.[43] The black-white binary does violence to that distinction by erasing Native Americans' claims of precedence and envisioning a state of national racial harmony that is at odds with Native American sovereignty.

In concluding this section, I return to the events around Hurricane Katrina, because just as it served as an example of why there remains some commitment to the black-white binary, it also serves to demonstrate its failures and dangers. As the aftermath of the hurricane developed, the image of African American urban poverty dominated the news and discourse. It dominated so much that the nation struggled to figure out how to talk about the loss of other groups. The discussions of the hurricane and race did not stray from stories about poor African Americans and worked to exclude the news that the Bush administration had used the disaster as an opportunity to apprehend and deport undocumented Latin American immigrants who ended up in shelters. This move was, of course, paired with widespread exploitation of Latino labor by contractors who sought to take advantage of federal and state monies for the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast region. Additionally, the binary blocked from public attention the news of the losses of Honduran Americans in New Orleans and Vietnamese American communities of the Gulf Coast.[44] The race story was simply the black story, and the result was that the nation thought of race in its old black-white terms. Immigration policy and the plight of immigrants were not on the table. These dynamics were crystallized when Mayor Ray Nagin shared with America his worry that during the rebuilding of New Orleans, Mexicans would overrun the city that, in his words, he hoped would again be "chocolate."[45] Nagin was conforming to an American script informed by the black-white binary and he, like Mary Frances Berry, did not bother to distinguish between citizens, resident aliens, and undocumented aliens in his complaint about Mexicans: "they" were simply here after us; "they" were all Mexicans and were not really New Orleanians, not really *Americans*.

A Limited Defense of the Black-White Binary

The black-white binary has few explicit defenders; few, if any, assert that race in the United States can be completely understood through black-white terms and experiences. The binary, nonetheless, does have

implicit proponents: those who attempt to explain and understand the experience of race in the United States primarily through black-white terms and experiences.[46] The title of Hacker's book, *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*, seemingly says it all, and in politics its echoes could be detected in Senator John Edwards's moving, yet simplistic, references to "two Americas" during the 2004 presidential campaigns.

It is inaccurate to say of Hacker, Hill, or Morrison that they are being merely "lazy," or that the implication of the binary in their works was unintentional, for they do cast blacks and whites as the principal actors and agents in U.S. racial drama. Certainly these and other proponents of the binary do not assert that the binary is strictly descriptively accurate, yet they do think that it names prescriptive patterns of racial and ethnic social organization and hierarchy in the Unites States. Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and multiracial persons are understood according to their relative (socioeconomic, cultural, or political) similarity to either whiteness or blackness. Likewise, progress, under this model, is understood as the process of assimilation into white Protestant American life.

To those not familiar with U.S. history, the binary may look terribly naïve or inadequate, but the reasons for its adoption by analysts of American life are rooted in the racial history of this nation. The earliest English language discourses on race in the United States were concerned with the obvious conflicts between Europeans, enslaved Africans, and Native Americans and were put in terms of "questions" and "problems" about "Negroes" and "Indians."[47] Over time, and despite national and major occurrences and wars with Native American nations, but due to the belief that Native Americans would experience extinction, blacks came to dominate all discussions of the "race question."

The "race question," then, was not about the white "question" or "problem" but about white concerns about "Negroes" and "Indians," and eventually it pertained exclusively to the "Negro question." Hence, there was never any conceptual parity between the so-called races in the "white-black-red" paradigm or the evolving "black-white" binary. The "black-white" binary was, and still is, primarily about white problems with black people. At best, and only occasionally, is the binary about the problems that black and white people have about each other; the binary is really a mask for a singularity: the problem of being "black" in the United States. The binary, therefore, names an experience that is constitutive of the history and experience of race in the United States; it refers to the anchoring roles given to both blackness and

whiteness in American racial and ethnic concepts and identities. The black-white binary, then, and for all its faults, has assumed the role of conceptual baseline in national discussions of race.[48]

Any discussion of race that ignored the fundamental nature of the obsession over blackness in American life would be dishonest and, given the American history of anti-black racism, irresponsible. Thus the status of the binary as a conceptual baseline of race in the United States should be acknowledged so that the obsessions to which it refers can be confronted. This can be accomplished, moreover, without giving in to the totalizing pressures of the binary. For example, the nation can address the conflicts between delivering social justice for historically disadvantaged national groups and the duties of liberal immigration policy without accepting xenophobia directed against Latinos, Asian Americans, Arab Americans, and immigrants from non-European and non-English-speaking nations. Likewise, the nation can attend to the particular structure and harms of anti-black racism without discounting xenophobia. These are not unreasonable prescriptions, as post-civil rights era African American politics has already been invested in multiracial coalitional politics.[49]

Visions of multiculturalism and racial justice that do not address the reasonable content of the binary, such as popular and culturally embedded antipathy toward blacks or popular folk theories of black inferiority, simply aid in the conservation of anti-black racism. The conservation of anti-black racism is one of the core anxieties about the browning of America and those movements, such as multiracialism, that celebrate national "browning." This anxiety and fear is one of *displacement*: African American moral and political claims will be displaced by claims from Latinos, Asian Americans, multiracial groups, and immigrants who do not require extensive rectification and are, thus, less expensive and easier to satisfy; and their claims would be more politically popular than black claims because, well, they are thought to be closer and more appealing to whites.

The persistence of the black-white binary may be due to the widespread assumption that black, whites, and Native Americans are specially "native" to the United States, in contrast to the perpetual foreignness of Asians and Latinos, whether they are citizens or not.[50] Yet the black-white binary also persists, because as a conceptual baseline, it points to unmet moral and political claims concerning anti-black racism. The binary reminds the nation that many of its citizens are still participating in personal anti-black racism or fail in their moral duties to treat and regard African Americans as equal human beings and citizens. It also reminds the nation that anti-black institutional

and social racism is still prevalent, and that the legacy of anti-black racism and exclusion has yet to be satisfactorily rectified.[51] Apart from a conceptual baseline, the black-white binary, then, also is a moral baseline by which to measure this nation's progress toward racial justice. The binary is one of this nation's moral gauges by which it measures its attempt to achieve racial justice. Ignoring this baseline, again, would be dishonest, as it would mean actively ignoring and forgetting formative aspects of U.S. history. Further, it would also mean actively abandoning and openly mocking our public morality and claims of justice.

Nicolás C. Vaca's account of the conflicts between African Americans and Latinos, in his *The Presumed Alliance*, is a painful example of such dishonesty and irresponsibility.[52] Vaca assumes a legal model of responsibility and simply claims that Latinos "are not responsible for the plight of African Americans." His claims depend on a liability or a moral conception of responsibility, which informs dominant conceptions of legal responsibility. Hence, he claims that since Latinos did not create or support the systems, such as slavery or Jim Crow segregation, that oppressed blacks, they are not responsible for their plight and must approach them in the political arena with a "clear conscience." With that thin argument he washes his hands of any responsibility to African Americans, and he blithely evades the open question of whether Latinos have a political responsibility for the nation's past racial harms.

Political responsibility, however, cannot so easily be washed away; it is a responsibility based on group or, in this case, national, membership, and it is assumed along with all of the other duties and responsibilities that come with citizenship.[53] Thus claiming that, for example, Asian Americans did not start the 2003 Iraq War does not mean that Asian Americans as members of the United States do not bear any responsibility for the actions of the U.S. government as it prosecutes that war and the occupation of Iraq. Whether any individual has a "clear conscience" in regard to any group is beside the point; what Vaca evades is the co-equal political responsibility between Latinos and African Americans, and all of the people of the United States, to fulfill its responsibilities to its people and the peoples of the globe. Further, Vaca's own reasoning contradicts his claims. Although he must recognize that all whites are not, strictly speaking, liable for the oppression of African Americans, Vaca seems to recognize that whites may not have clear consciences; therefore, he implicitly recognizes some form of collective or political responsibility. If such political responsibility holds true for whites who were not

directly involved in black oppression, *ceteris paribus*, then the same must hold true for Latinos and other groups as well.

Given the ubiquity of claims such as Vaca's and the high likelihood that the demands of African Americans for rectification of race-based distributive injustice and reparations for past racist harms will continue to be neglected or denied, fears about displacement are warranted. Thus behind the reluctance to move beyond the black-white binary are legitimate anxieties about the future of racial justice. The browning of America is changing the classic African American baseline for racial justice without those legitimate demands ever having been satisfied. An echo of this threat was heard in Mayor Nagin's unfortunate complaint about the threat of a substantial and "foreign" Mexican presence in New Orleans. Just ignoring or dismissing this anxiety, or urging African Americans to just swallow the bitter fact that they are no longer the United States' dominant nonwhite group, which is Vaca's solution, will not be effective; instead, the long-existing claims of the black-white baseline for racial justice should be squarely addressed and solutions offered.

Another fear of the browning of America connected to the stubbornness with which the binary is adhered to is the fear of *replacement*. African Americans have stood as the icon of the quest of racial justice in America. The leadership of the Left clings to that black-white iconography, however, in the mind of the public, and in the rhetoric of the Republican National Committee (RNC), African Americans have been replaced with the image of the Mexican, Latin American, or Asian immigrant. This replacement was on full view at the Republican Nationbal Convention of 2004 and in the RNC's brilliant decision to highlight Asian American and Latino faces and voices (in particular, three speakers addressed the mostly non-Latino crowd in Spanish).[54] That event was singular, as it was a national and an international spectacle of the committee's vision of American multicultural diversity, and at its core was the image of the assimilated model minority next to images of accomplished and exceptional African Americans, such as Powell and Rice. An interesting result of this spectacle of replacement was that conservative Christian African American groups rallied with the anti-homosexual rights agenda of the RNC and the Bush administration, while concurrently reiterating demands based on the civil rights model.[55] In effect, they were hoping to parlay their status as civil rights "moral gauges" to counter the appropriation of the language of civil rights by the same-sex marriage movement, in exchange for Republican support for their policy agendas.[56]

There is nothing redeemable within this fear of replacement except its connections to the fear of displacement. Neither blacks nor whites are justified in a presumption of dominance over America, whether demographic or in the realm of images or meaning. Xenophobia need not be indulged in order to satisfy African Americans' demands. To indulge in xenophobia would be to accept, fundamentally, the logic of the racial state, and doing that would be to absolutely betray the value of equal personhood and other core ideas of political liberalism.

There was, therefore, much to celebrate in African American civil rights organizations declaring solidarity with Latino activists during the "Day without an Immigrant" protests that occurred during March and April 2006. Bruce S. Gordon, the president of the NAACP, declared solidarity with the marchers and stated essentially that discrimination and distributive injustice rather than immigration of Latinos was the barrier to black progress.[57] Gordon's declaration of solidarity, along with the statement of other African American public figures, stands as a strong counterstance to the embarrassing words of Mayor Ray Nagin. Although the press and few black figures did remark on the conflicts between African Americans and Latinos, an impressive show of solidarity was displayed by African American religious and civil rights figures. Most stunning were the words of Rev. Hurmon Hamilton and Rev. Ray Hammond, of the Black Ministerial Alliance and the Ten Point Coalition, offered at Boston's pro-immigration rally:

> We are a nation of immigrants with an eternal debt of justice to pay with regard to immigration. It is a tortuous logic for the dominant power class in this country to forget that we were established as a nation when people immigrated here from Europe, and displaced the Native Americans, destroying their jobs, homes, food supply, and culture. Those new Americans used and profited from forced immigration, as millions of African slaves were brought here to build our cities, plant and harvest our crops, and become the backbone of our modern-day economic power.
>
> So the descendants of those who immigrated to this land and shattered resources and hope for others, and who benefited from forced immigration of Africans for over 100 years, should have only one response when asked what to do about our immigrant sisters and brothers, and it should be in the form of a question: "How do we pay the debt of justice we owe?" We acknowledge that immigration will always be

> a challenge, as long as our neighbors to the south of us, and families throughout our world, have a substandard of living in a global economy of wealth and opportunity. As Americans we have a responsibility to use our wealth not only to fatten the calves that we eat, but to ensure that our neighbors in this hemisphere and beyond eat in their homes at their family tables as well as we do here in America.[58]

Their prophetic words (in Cornel West's sense) demonstrated many of the dynamics I analyzed earlier; they called on the United States to remember its racial history and debt of justice to African and Native Americans, while refusing the temptation of xenophobia and calling on the United States to take seriously its responsibilities in light of the demands of global justice.

From the Binary to Deliberation

Calling for the termination of the black-white binary is too easy. There are historical political and moral demands behind this binary that should be understood, positively transformed, and then incorporated. Otherwise those methodologies and perspectives that are offered as substitutions, whether color blind, multiracial, or *mestizaje*, risk, at best, abandoning racial justice, or, at worst, further entrenching anti-black and anti-indigenous racism and social disparities.

The nature of the black-white binary goes far beyond its place as a flawed method for describing patterns of racial organization and oppression. Couched inside the binary is a political and ethical demand that people of the United States contend with the conflicts between white and black Americans as well as the particularity of anti-black racism, and rectify the harms of racism and racial oppression inflicted on African Americans. At best, the binary is a demand for justice.

At worst, the binary marks a peculiarly American liberal form of racial anxiety over the displacement and replacement of African Americans from the focal point of discussions of racial justice, as well as the displacement of the black-white baseline for all racial matters in America. In this form the binary is a complaint and a call for recognition of a black-white America as the authentic, real, and, ironically, native America. As such, it is a mirror image of the fear of the browning of America as the loss of white dominance exhibited by various forms of white nationalism. These anxieties are nostalgic

visions that should not be catered to because of the exclusive and covertly racial nationalism they seek to perpetuate and the social and cultural homogeneity they seek to enthrone.

Although the image of a black-white authentic America should not be surrendered to, the demand for justice behind the black-white binary is a facet of the politics of recognition. The politics of recognition is a response within democratic liberal societies to recognize, at various degrees and institutional involvement, important and central social identities within societies.[59] This aspect of the binary strongly connects to its redeemable aspects as a moral and political reaction. Beside the call for the official recognition of African Americans as a group, with specific rights, by the state, the employment of the binary by African Americans is a demand that the state and its people remember as well as recognize the constitutive role of African Americans in the formation of American political concepts, religious life, and social and cultural institutions, in addition to the racist harms it had to endure.[60]

Insofar as the request for recognition is in the service of white or black-white racial nationalism, it is dangerous and should be considered with deep suspicion; recognition can develop into enthronement or institutionalization of group identities at odds with reasonable conceptions of liberty and deliberative democracy.[61] Further, consistent with Seyla Benhabib's criticisms of the politics of recognition, the reasonable demands of the black-white binary have more to do with the politics of equal dignity and distributive justice than with recognition.[62] It is precisely the nationalist and conservative concepts of political life within the binary that are and should be rejected, yet the liberal concepts of equal dignity and citizenship also within the binary, lead to its partial redemption as a political idea and provide for its role in public deliberations of race and racism.

Without calling for nativist exclusions, the binary asserts that the nation has an obligation to remember America's debts and obligations to the African American community—before the "browning of America" makes the black-white baseline of racial justice completely irrelevant.[63] Which parts and how that history is to be remembered, however, are contested.[64] To call on the people of the United States to remember controversial accounts and interpretations of the genocide and displacement of Native Americans, the continued exploitation and oppression of Native American nations, slavery, Jim Crow segregation, or, for that matter, the Alamo and the Mexican-American War is to assume unity, offend the value of reasonable pluralism and autonomy

of citizens, and invite prolonged frustration. All the same, there is a great need for a widespread awareness of the role of race in U.S. history, and its role in the formation of our national institutions and communities within the nation. Awareness can be cultivated through democratic deliberation, through national and local forums, yet can leave room for democratic disagreement.[65]

Importantly, public deliberations offer the public space for the reasonable claims and demands that may be extracted from the binary to be shared with and considered by the citizens and resident noncitizens of the United States. They would generate legitimacy for the state and signal to the population that the state takes seriously its moral and political obligations regarding race and social justice and is invested in nurturing civic pride in multiracial citizenship. Dialogues about the history and legacy of race in a changing United States will strengthen political life and help citizens form reasonable positions on the controversial concerns of the public, what Rawls called truly public political opinions.[66]

But deliberation is not enough. What else is needed, of course, so that the people of this nation remember the legacy of race and answer its obligations, is old-fashioned political agitation and activism.[67] When it comes to its national moral obligations, the memory of the United States is poor and lethargic. Public forums, however, provide communities afflicted by the historical legacies of racial oppression with opportunities to continue to argue and agitate for distributive justice and the rectification and reparations of past racial harms. Thus democratic deliberation, accompanied by multiracial coalitional political activism, has the potential to resist the alienation that results from the lack of official recognition.[68]

Finally, national discussions of race and racism should upset the nativist presuppositions and xenophobic tendencies of the black-white binary. The black-white binary should not be allowed to dominate national discussions of race, as it did the dialogues sponsored by the Clinton administration.[69] On this point Vaca, in *Presumed Alliance*, is correct, but he misunderstands the purpose of overturning the binary:

> In the area of ethnic relations the Latino population will continue to grow and have power to wield. *And let there be no doubt that this power will be wielded.* In the relations with African Americans a new dialogue must be opened, one with perspective and recognition of the Latino's new numerical stature.[70]

Vaca's invocation of Latino power as a tool or weapon to be wielded is the negative image of Samuel P. Huntington's white nationalist anxieties about Latino power; both images are deeply flawed, because they cast the political in zero-sum terms, as competition between friends and enemies, between so-called cultural or ethnic groups.[71] Neither man's political recommendations are fitting for a liberal pluralist society. In contrast to Vaca's view, I assert that the purpose of sweeping away the binary is not to make room for the power brought on by Latino's "new numerical stature." Rather, the binary must go so that new dialogues will not be hindered by nativist assumptions, and the nation can achieve new conceptions of national belonging, citizenship, civil rights, and political responsibility that meet the needs of its transnational population, as well as the demands of global justice.

46. For a legal history of this fear, see Leti Volpp's " 'Obnoxious to Their Very Nature': Asian Americans and Constitutional Citizenship," *Citizenship Studies* 5: 1 (2004): 57–71; for a general history of yellow peril, see Okihiro, *Margins and Mainstreams*.

47. G. W. F. Hegel, "Anthropology," in *The Idea of* Race, ed. Robert Bernasconi and Tommy Lott, 41 (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2000).

48. See supra note 45, 77. The threat in this instance is cultural, because as long as Mexican and Latin American immigrants could be used, managed, and then repatriated, this "brown tide" was judged as benign.

49. Pete Wilson, "The Minority-Majority Society," in *The Affirmative Action Debate*, ed. George Curry, 167–74 (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1996).

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid. Notice that Governor Wilson adopted the typically absolutist rhetoric on "discrimination." In his view, any use of racial discrimination (e.g., in the national census) would be "discrimination." If pressed, I think he would admit that all uses of racial categories were not all equally morally bad; rather, his main point is that in ethnically and racially diverse California the "fundamental American principle of equality" is best pursued through color-blind public policy.

53. The view of "brown" as monolithic has the further result of contributing to what historian David Hollinger called the "one-hate rule." That rule captures the assumption that all nonwhite groups have identical experiences of racism and suffer identical harms. See Hollinger's "One-Drop Rule and One-Hate Rule," in *Daedalus* 134: 1 (Winter 2005): 18–28. The one-hate rule is discussed in further detail in chapter 3. Likewise, both the problems of "masking" racism and engendering a racism based on gradations of skin color are discussed in further detail in chapter 5.

54. Kevin R. Johnson, "The End of 'Civil Rights' as We Know It?: Immigration and Civil Rights in the New Millennium," *UCLA Law Review* 49 (June 2002): 1481–1511.

55. See supra note 46.

56. Hugh Davis Graham, *Collision Course: The Strange Convergence of Affirmative Action and Immigration Policy in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

57. Frank H. Wu, *Yellow* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

58. The reparations movement also is affected by the browning of America. In the face of rapid demographic change, the relevancy of reparations claims in the mind of the public may be undermined. See the discussion of this issue in the following chapter on the black-white binary.

59. Peter Morrison and Ira S. Lowry, "A Riot of Color: The Demographic Setting," in *The Los Angeles Riots: Lessons for the Urban Future*, ed. Mark Baldassare, 19–46 (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994). For more on King/Drew Medical Center, see the *Los Angeles Times* 2004 series "The Troubles at King/Drew" by Tracy Weber, Charles Ornstein, Mitchell Landsberg, and Steve Hymon at http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-kingdrewpulitzer-sg,0,1507651.storygallery (accessed December 5, 2004).

60. Regina Freer, "Black-Korean Conflict," in *The Los Angeles Riots: Lessons for the Urban Future*, ed. Mark Baldassare, 175–204 (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994). See also In-Jin Yoon, *On My Own: Korean Businesses and Race Relations in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Jennifer Lee, *Civility in the City: Blacks, Jews, and Koreans in Urban America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); Kwang Chung Kim, ed. *Koreans in the Hood: Conflict with African Americans* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Patrick D. Joyce, *No Fire Next Time: Black-Korean Conflicts and the Future of America's Cities* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003).

61. Nicolás C. Vaca, *The Presumed Alliance: The Unspoken Conflict between Latinos and Blacks and What It Means for America* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004).

62. Abigai Goldman, "Young to Quit Wal-Mart Group after Racial Remarks," *Los Angeles Times*, August 18, 2006.

63. Michael Barbaro, "Wal-Mart Tries to Enlist Image Help," *New York Times*, May 12, 2006. Also see the Web site for the advocacy group, http://www.forwalmart.com/.

64. David Wilkins, *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997).

65. *John Doe v. Kamehameha Schools/Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate*, 416 Fd 1025 (9th Cir. 2005).

66. For such a position, see Vaca's *The Presumed Alliance*. Contrast his claim that Latinos are not responsible for addressing the political concerns of African Americans with Wu's *Yellow*.

67. I owe this point entirely to Melissa Nobles. James Baldwin, of course, called this evasion a pretension of innocence. The pretension of innocence, in terms of fresh starts and new beginnings, complements the other values (freedom, hard work, and opportunity) that are wrapped up in narratives of the pursuit of the American dream.

68. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 12. I return to this quote and this issue in chapter 3.

Chapter 3

1. Many books and articles complain of the black-white binary. For a good cross-section of the arguments, see Okihiro's *Margins and Mainstreams*; Wu's *Yellow*; Shirley Hune's "Rethinking Race: Paradigms and Policy Formation," *Amerasia Journal* 21: 1 and 2 (1995): 29–40; Juan Perea's "The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race," in *The Latino/a Condition*, ed. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, 359–68 (New York: New York University Press, 1998); Linda Martín Alcoff's, "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary," *Journal of Ethics* 7 (2003): 5–27; *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005). As an example of the presence of this complaint in the popular press, see Richard Rodriguez's *Brown* (New York: Viking, 2002).

2. Ronald Sundstrom, "Race as a Human Kind," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 28: 1 (2002): 93–117.

3. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge); Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967); Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963).

4. Frederick Douglass, "The Meaning of July Fourth for the Negro, July 5, 1852," in *Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, vol. 2, ed. Philip S. Foner, 192, emphasis added. The psalm Douglass refers to reads: "Princes shall come out of Egypt; Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God" (King James Edition).

5. W. E. B. Du Bois, "The Present Outlook for the Dark Races of Mankind," October 1900, in *Writings by W. E. B. Du Bois in Periodicals Edited by Others*, ed. Herbert Aptheker, vol. 1, 1891–1909, 73–79 (Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson, 1982).

6. Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

7. Michael Moore, *Fahrenheit 9/11* (New York: Miramax Films, 2004). For the statistics on military personnel in Iraq at the time of this writing, see John S. Friedman's "The Iraq Index," *The Nation* (December 19, 2005): 23–25.

8. Robert Lindsey, " 'Brown' Power Arrives," *New York Times*, December 30, 1979, p. DX6.

9. Kerry Ann Rockquemore and David L. Brunsma, *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002), ix, emphasis added.

10. Their vision of the singularity of the black-white relationship relies on the claim that blacks and whites have between them the "greatest social distance, the most spatial separation," and the "strongest taboos" against interracially intimate relationships. Their claims about social and spatial separation, we can assume, are based on research of urban racial segregation. Although their claim is right about urban life, it is too sweeping, for most segregation studies have not considered the segregation indices of Native Americans on reservations. See my "Racial Politics in Residential Segregation Studies," *Philosophy and Geography* 7: 1 (2004): 61–78. The black-white binary constantly undervalues the role of Native Americans in American racialism.

11. Linda Martín Alcoff, "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary," *Journal of Ethics* 7 (2003): 9. For a discussion of race as legal status, and especially the political and legal significance that whiteness has had in the United States, see Ian López's *White By Law* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).

12. Richard Wright, *White Man, Listen!* (New York: Doubleday, 1957).

13. James Baldwin, "Down at the Cross," in his *The Fire Next Time*, 13–106 (New York: Vintage, [1963], 1993), emphasis in original.

14. Hacker, *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. 3rd ed. (New York: Scribner, 2003), 22.

15. Mary Frances Berry, "Pie in the Sky? Clinton's Race Initiative Offers Promise and the Potential for Peril," *Emerge* (September 1997): 68. Cited in Wu's *Yellow* and Alcoff's "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary."

16. Thomas McCarthy, "Coming to Terms with Our Past, Part II: On the Morality and Politics of Reparations for Slavery," *Political Theory* 32: 6 (December 2004): 636, emphasis added. Robert Gooding-Williams brought it to my attention that there is a tension between McCarthy's use of the template metaphor, which implies copying, and his use of the verb "shape," which accords with the first, and least problematic, form of the binary.

17. Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals, "Deceased Victims Released 2-23-2006," February 23, 2006.

18. For a scholarly review of this legacy, see Neil J. Smelser, William Julius Wilson, and Faith Mitchell, eds., *America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences*, vols. 1 and 2. (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001).

19. "Newsweek Poll: Fifty-Seven Percent of Americans Have Lost Confidence in Government to Deal with Another Natural Disaster; 52% Do Not Trust President to Make Right Decisions in a Crisis," *Newsweek* (September 11, 2005). Spike Lee's recent documentary about New Orleans, *When the Levees Break* (HBO Films, 2006), repeats this mistake. For a wider perspective about the effects of the disaster, see Brenda Muñiz's "In the Eye of the Storm: How the Government and Private Response to Hurricane Katrina Failed Latinos" (National Council of La Raza, 2006). See also Keith Plockek's "Shortchanged: Houston-Based Immigrants Who Flock to New Orleans Can Get All the Jobs They Want," *Houston Press* 18: 6 (February 9, 2006). Plockek writes, "For the most part, the story of Hurricane Katrina has been told in black and white. The Lower Ninth Ward was devastated, we learned, and the Garden District untouched. White survivors 'found' food, while blacks 'looted' it. And 'George Bush doesn't care about black people.' But Katrina was about more than black and white; it was also about brown. Last month two Rice University sociologists, Katharine Donato and Shirin Hakimzadeh, released 'The Changing Face of the Gulf Coast,' a report charting how Latino immigrants have been settling in large numbers along the Gult Coast for the last 15 years. Before Katrina, the New Orleans area was home to some 140,000 Hundurans—making it the largest Honduran community in the United States—and to thousands of immigrants from other countries in Latin America. The evacuation of these immigrants went largely unreported; many of them were undocumented and hesitant to hop on a bus to Houston. But they did come, traveling along an underground railroad of sorts, shacking up with relatives and countrymen whenever they could."

20. Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993); Jonathan Kozol, *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America* (New York: Crown, 2005); Joe R. Feagin and Karyn D. McKinney, *The Many Costs of Racism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

21. A charitable interpretation of this idea is that dealing with black-white conflict is a precondition for justice in the United States. See Thomas McCarthy's "Coming to Terms with Our Past, Part II: On the Morality and Politics of Reparations for Slavery," *Political Theory* 32: 6 (December 2004): 750–72. I agree, but the obvious importance of dealing with black-white conflict does not give it lexical or political priority over other racial conflicts.

22. See supra note 15.

23. Rockquemore and Brunsma, *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*; Hacker, *Two Nations: Black & White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*; Thomas McCarthy, "Vergangenheitsbewältigung in the USA: On the Politics of the Memory of Slavery," *Political Theory* 30: 5 (October 2002): 623–48.

24. See supra note 15.

25. Ibid.

26. See M. Omi and H. Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*; Sally Haslanger, "Ontology and Social Construction," *Philosophical Topics* 23: 2 (1995): 95–125; Ronald Sundstrom, "Race as a Human Kind," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 28: 1 (2002): 93–117; see also Linda Martín Alcoff, "Toward a Phenomenology of Racial Embodiment," in *Race*, ed. Robert Bernasconi, 267–83 (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001), and *Visible Identities*.

27. Okihiro, *Margins and Mainstreams: Asian in American History and Culture*.

28. *Plessy v. Feguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896). For a discussion of Asians in America, see Ronald Takaki's *Strangers from a Different Shore* (Boston, MA: Back Bay Press, 1998). For a discussion of Harlan's double standards regarding color blindness, see Gabriel Chin's "The *Plessy* Myth: Justice Harlan and the Chinese Cases," *Iowa Law Review* 82 (1996): 151–82, and chapter 4 of Wu's *Yellow*. For an account of the history of Asian American citizenship, see Leti Volpp's " 'Obnoxious to Their Very Nature': Asian Americans and Constitutional Citizenship," *Citizenship Studies* 5: 1 (2004): 57–71.

29. See also the discussion of different forms of racism in David Theo Goldberg's *Racist Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993) and the discussion of the scalarity of the harms of racism in Blum's *"I'm Not a Racist, but . . ."*.

30. See the discussions of the model-minority phenomenon in Okihiro's *Margins and Mainstreams*, Wu's *Yellow*, and David Hollinger's "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States," *American Historical Review* 108: 5 (December 2003): 1363–90. The "model minority" phenomenon attributed to Asian Americans is a consequence of the language of traditional integration mixed with assumptions of American identity. African Americans are unfavorably compared to Asian Americans, who are considered model minorities for their success within economic life. The implication is that there are no barriers to integration, and the fault of the lack of African American integration is due to an intragroup deficiency. The other side of the coin is, of course, the stereotype of the "yellow peril." With this stereotype Asian Americans are unfavorably compared to African Americans, who are considered to possess "American-ness," something that Asian Americans cannot possess because of their Asian racial origins.

31. Hollinger, "Amalgamation and Hypodescent," 1363–90, and "One-Drop Rule and One-Hate Rule," *Daedalus* 134: 1 (Winter 2005): 18–28.

32. Linda Martín Alcoff, "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary," *Journal of Ethics* 7 (2003): 16–19. Alcoff's essay offers a seven-part critique of the black-white binary. Her arguments influenced and parallel my own.

33. Linda Martín Alcoff, "The Problem of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique* (Winter 1991–1992): 5–32.

34. Juan Perea, "The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race," 359–68); Richard Delgado, "The Black/White Binary: How Does It Work?" 369–465, both in *The Latino/a Condition*, ed. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

35. Perea, "The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race," 366.

36. The binary may have helped Americans see the abuse of Afghanis, Iraqis, and other Arabs and Muslims as a form of racism. In particular, the photographs of smiling faces of white American soldiers engaging in sadistic and sexual torture of the prisoners at Abu Ghraib brought back unwelcome memories of the lynching of blacks. While the binary helped us "see" the racism, this was a result of the American public's identification with the bodies of the white soldiers, and their troubling smiles, rather than with the tortured bodies of the Iraqis. The soldiers were our co-nationals. The Iraqis, while human, in the United States would be regarded as aliens.

37. Volpp, " 'Obnoxious to Their Very Nature,' 57–71, and "The Citizen and Terrorist," 1575–92.

38. Ibid.

39. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

40. Ibid., 12.

41. Ibid., 13–14.

42. See supra note 32.

43. For a discussion of the key differences and similarities between Native Americans and African Americans in relationship to their status as citizens, and the political recognition of their groups, see David Wilkins's *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997). For a strong position on the difference between the two movements see Vine Deloria's "The Red and the Black" in his *Custer Died for Your Sins*, 168–96 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969). For a discussion of the fundamental difference between group rights claimed by national minorities (such as indigenous groups) and polyethnic groups (ethnic, racial, or immigrant groups), see Will Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

44. Linda Hoang, "Asian American Community Calls on Government and Relief Agencies for More Effective Actions for Katrina Evacuees," press release from the National Alliance of Vietnamese American Service Agencies, October 3, 2005. A Spanish news agency, Agencia EFE, through the COMTEX news service, brought to the English-language press the story of the plight of

Latinos and specifically Hondurans in New Orleans. It released six reports following Hurricance Katrina that spanned from September 2 to November 15. For example, see "Hunduran Victims of Katrina Getting Aid from Home," *EFE World News Service* (September 2, 2005).

45. Peter Pae, "Immigrants Rush to New Orleans as Contractors Fight for Workers as Many Evacuees Stay Away, Latin American Workers Move In, Lured by Soaring Pay. They Could Change the Face of the City," *Los Angeles Times*, October 10, 2005.

46. For developed theoretical and legal criticisms of the binary, see Perea, "The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race," 359–68, and Martín Alcoff, "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary," 5–27.

47. Thomas F. Gossett, *Race* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1963] 1997).

48. Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark* (New York: Vintage, 1993). That the binary names salient features of race in America is indubitable, yet although it has assumed, or been given, the role of baseline, in part by American historians and the public, does not mean it deserves this position. In other words, the binary does not name an empirical truth about racial patterns in the United States.

49. Manning Marable, *Beyond Black and White: Transforming African American Politics* (New York: Verso, 1996); Cornel West, "The Paradox of the African American Rebellion," in his *Keeping Faith: Philosophy and Race in America*, 271–91 (New York: Routledge, 1993); Robert Gooding-Williams, "Race, Multiculturalism, and Democracy," in his *Look, a Negro!*, 87–108 (New York: Routledge, 2006); Tommie Shelby, *We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

50. According to the Pew Hispanic Center's report, *America's Immigration Quandary* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, March 30, 2006), 53 percent of whites and 56 percent of blacks agree with the statement, "Immigrants are a burden on the country," and 47 percent of whites and 51 percent of blacks agree with the statement, "Immigrants threaten traditional values." For more on the black-brown conflict, see Jeff Diamond's "African-American Attitudes towards United States Immigration Policy," *The International Migration Review* 32: 2 (Summer 1998): 451–71; Vaca's *The Presumed Alliance;* John Pomfret's "Jail Riots Illustrate Racial Divide in California: Rising Latino Presence Seen as Sparking Rivalry with Blacks That Sometimes Turns Violent," *Washington Post*, February 21, 2006, A01; Jack Kemp's "A Nation of Immigrants and of Laws," *The New York Sun*, April 4, 2006, 11.

51. Neil J. Smelser, William Julius Wilson, and Faith Mitchell, eds., *America Becoming*, vols. 1 and 2 (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001). Poor and urban African Americans suffer the majority of the worst effects of political, social, and economic disparities in the United States—a fact that was vividly on display in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

52. Vaca, *The Presumed Alliance*. See especially his "axioms" for altering the dialogue between Latinos and blacks in the "Visions of the Future" chapter: (1) Latinos Are the Largest Minority in the United States and African Americans Will Never Regain This Position; (2) Latinos Have a History of Oppression; (3) Latinos Are Not Responsible for the Plight of African Americans; (4) Because Latinos Are Not Responsible for the Plight of African Americans, They Come to the Table with a Clear Conscience; (5) Latinos Will Seek Different Benefits Than Blacks; (6) Latino Immigration Is a Fact of Life; (7) Immigrants Will Compete for Unskilled Jobs with African Americans (185–93).

53. Hannah Arendt, "Collective Responsibility," *Amor Mundi: Explorations in the Faith and Thought of Hannah Arendt* (Boston, MA: Martinus Nijoff, 1987), 43–50. For discussions and applications of Arendt's conception of collective responsibility as political responsibility, see McCarthy's "Coming to Terms with Our Past, Part II, 750–72; Iris Marion Young's "Responsibility and Global Labor Justice," *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 12: 4 (2004): 365–88; Brian A. Weiner's *The Sins of the Parents: The Politics of National Apologies in the United States* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2005).

54. For an analysis of the Latino vote in the 2004 presidential election, see David L. Leal, Matt A. Barreto, Jongho Lee, and Rodolfo O. del la Garza, "The Latino Vote in the 2004 Election," *Political Science & Politics* 38: 1 (January 2005): 41–49.

55. In particular, see Neela Banerjee, "Black Churches Struggle over Their Role in Politics," *New York Times*, March 6, 2005, 23.

56. Angela Dillard, *Guess Who's Coming to Dinner Now?: Multicultural Conservatism in America* (New York: New York University, 2001). See also supra note 55 for a discussion of the employment of African American religious figures as "moral gauges" in Republican strategies to derail the movement for same-sex civil unions and marriages. The black conservative Christian gambit will not pay off. They will help defeat same-sex marriages, but race-based public policies will remained doomed, and even the turmoil between those same conservative Christian African American groups and the Bush administration after Hurricane Katrina will not push the administration or the RNC to backpedal on decades of anti-race-based policy commitments. Additionally, and ironically, the identification of African Americans as being in the core of Bush's "United We Stand" America only serves to exacerbate the process of replacement.

57. Erin Texeira, "Blacks Concerned That Legalizing Undocumented Immigrants Hurts Workers," Associated Press State & Local Wire, April 6, 2006. See also Leslie Fulbright's "Polls, Leaders Say Many Blacks Support Illegal Immigrants, *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 13, 2006.

58. Rev. Hurmon Hamilton and Rev. Ray Hammond, "It's Our Fight, Too," *Boston Globe*, April 13, 2006, A11. The Rev. Hamilton, on behalf of the Black Ministerial Alliance and the Ten Point Coalition, delivered the full text of this editorial letter on April 10, 2006, at Boston's immigration rally.

59. Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Multiculturalism*, ed. Amy Gutmann, 25–73. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

60. Lucius T. Outlaw, *On Race and Philosophy* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

61. Appiah, "Identity, Authenticity, Survival: Multiculturalism Societies and Social Reproduction," in *Multiculturalism*, 149–63.

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

63. For examples of the expression of this urgency, see Thomas McCarthy's "Coming to Terms with Our Past, Part II, 750–72; Kim M. Williams's "Multiracialism and the Future of Civil Rights Future," *Daedalus* 134: 1 (Winter 2005): 53–60; Kenneth Prewitt's "Racial Classification in America," *Daedalus* 134: 1 (Winter 2005): 5–17; David Hollinger's "One-Drop Rule and One-Hate Rule," *Daedalus* 134: 1 (Winter 2005): 18–28.

64. David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002).

65. Robert Gooding-Williams, "Race, Multiculturalism and Democracy," in his *Look, a Negro!* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Howard McGary, "Achieving Democratic Equality: Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and Reparations," *The Journal of Ethics* 7 (2003): 93–113; Thomas McCarthy, "Vergangenheitsbewältigung in the USA: On the Politics of the Memory of Slavery," *Political Theory* 30: 5 (October 2002): 623–48, and "Coming to Terms with Our Past, Part II, 750–72.

66. John Rawls, "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited," *The Law of Peoples* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

67. Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990); Michael Walzer, *Politics and Passion: Toward a More Egalitarian Liberalism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 90–109.

68. Howard McGary, "Alienation and the African American Experience," *Race and Social Justice* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999): 7–26.

69. Alcoff, "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary," 5–27; Hollinger, "Amalgamation and Hypodescent," 1363–90; Frank Wu, *Yellow*.

70. See supra note 52: 193, emphasis added.

71. Samuel P. Huntington, "The Hispanic Challenge," *Foreign Policy* (March–April 2004): 30–45; and *Who Are We: The Challenges to America's National Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004).

Chapter 4

1. James Baldwin, "Freaks and the American Ideal of Manhood," in *James Baldwin: Collected Essays*, ed. Toni Morrison, 814–29 (New York, The Library of America, 1998). The essay first appeared in *Playboy* in January 1985 and was collected in Baldwin's *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction: 1948–1985* (New York: St. Martin's Press/Marek, 1985) as "Here Be Dragons," 677–90.

2. To see the continuation of classic rejections of interracial belonging, whether political or familial, see Carol Swain's and R. Nieli's edited volume *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). Maria P. P. Root gives a typical defense of the promise of interracial familial belonging in her *Love's Revolution* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2001).

3. Charles W. Mills, "Do Black Men Have a Moral Duty to Marry Black Women?," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 25 (1994): 131–53; Anita L. Allen, "Interracial Marriage: Folk Ethics in Contemporary Philosophy," in *Women of Color and Philosophy*, ed. Naomi Zack, 182–205 (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000). Allen and Mills argued that moral and political philosophers avoided moral questions around interracial marriage because they took such questions as settled by *Loving v. Virginia* and ignored the ethical concerns of people of color. The work of Angela Davis and David Theo Goldberg is an exception to this general evasion. Davis's *Woman, Race, & Class* (New York: Vintage, 1983) is a classic text arguing for the interconnections between social identities and specificities of African American women's experience. Goldberg's analysis of racism investigates the political meaning of racism, but it is not precisely concerned with identifying its semantic essence. See his *Racist Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993) and *Racial State* (Cambridgem MA: Blackwell, 2001).

4. François Bernier, "Nouvelle division de la terre," *Journal des Sçavans* (April 24, 1684): 148–55. Bernier's essay, "A New Division of the Earth," also is in *The Idea of Race*, ed. Robert Bernasconi and Tommy Lott, 1–4 (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2000).

5. There is an unceasing and obvious obsession with sex (later to be neutrally termed "reproduction") in the founding documents in the history of race. For a collection of those documents, see Bernasconi's and Lott's *The Idea of Race*. Likewise, see Anthony Marx's *Making Race and Nation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) for a discussion of the prohibition, use, and management of miscegenation by racial states, such as the United States, South Africa, and Brazil.

6. For discussions of sex in the history of race and its role in the formation of the racial state, see Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968); Thomas F. Gossett, *Race* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1997), George M. Frederickson, *White Supremacy* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1982); David A. Hollinger, "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States," *American Historical Review* 108: 5 (December 2003): 1363–90. For recent texts that draw a line between race making and state formation, see Anthony Marx, *Making Race and Nation*, and Pamela D. Bridgewater, *Breeding a Nation* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 2006).

For a specific discussion of interracial sexuality in history and law, see Randall Kennedy, *Interracial Intimacies: Sex, Marriage, Identity and Adoption* (New York: Pantheon, 2003); Werner Sollors, *Interracialism* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 2000).