Working Paper No. 84, 2015

Racialization
Paradigmatic Frames from British Colonization to Today, and Beyond

Vilna Bashi Treitler

Working Paper Series

desiguALdades.net
Research Network on Interdependent
Inequalities in Latin America

Racialization
Paradigmatic Frames from British Colonization to Today, and Beyond

Vilna Bashi Treitler

Abstract

This paper offers a template for understanding and analyzing racialization as a paradigm. Further, the template is applied to the North American case – an important one because it has endured and spread across the globe despite the enormous weight of scientific evidence against it. The fallacy of race (and in particular the North American origin Anglo variant) endures for two reasons. First, social agents seeking to gain or maintain power and control over paradigm-relevant resources benefit from reinvesting in pseudoscientific racial paradigms. Second, new science proving the fallacy of race is ignored because ignoring new paradigmatic science is in fact the way normal science operates. Thus, a paradigmatic analysis of race may help to explain why current social science approaches to the demise of racial thought may be ineffective.

Biographical Notes

Vilna Bashi Treitler is a Professor at the City University of New York in the Sociology Program of the Graduate Center and Chair of the Department of Black and Latino Studies at Baruch College. This paper was first drafted when Dr. Bashi Treitler was a Visiting Fellow from 15/05/2013 - 31/12/2013 at desiguALdades.net, the International Research Network on Interdependent Inequalities in Latin America at the Freie Universität Berlin.

Contents

1. Introduction

This paper offers a template for analyzing the structure of a racial paradigm. The template can be used in comparative historical analyses of racial paradigms, i.e., as a teaching tool, but also as a means for researching paradigmatic parts of racial thought. Analyses such as these aid in identifying the structure and function of racial paradigms, and allows researchers to investigate the processes that maintain and shore up antiquated racial thinking. After presenting the template for a racial paradigm, this paper then applies that template to an analysis of the Anglo (British origin) racial paradigm that was born in Europe but took root and matured in North America, later to be exported to and/or adopted by the brutal Nazi and Apartheid racial regimes. The paper ends with a brief discussion on the durability of paradigms and difficulties in vanquishing them, even if – as is this case – the science behind the paradigm has been refuted and denied more than a century ago.

Race is a system of human classification sorting humans into distinct "races" according to a constellation of physical, cognitive, and cultural traits believed to be hereditary, distinctive, and largely inescapable. Belief in the ability to scientifically categorize humans follows another belief: positivism, the idea that knowledge comes from scientific methods empirically applied to human behavior. Neither the validity of positivism's ability to be used on humans as social animals, nor the scientific nature of racial distinctions can be proven to be factual, no matter how doggedly someone prefers behave as if it is so.

Race is a set of superstitions and folk beliefs to which humans have applied scientific methods and then distributed around the world. Further, we like to think of race as natural and therefore "real", simply because these are believed to be set at the time of one's birth and unchanging. (In fact, one's race can change rather easily.[1]) Unfortunately, there are social and natural scientists who still debate the verity of race and express belief in races and devote their careers to search for the evidence of the existence of race (Cremo and Thompson 1999).[2] Further, racial thought prevails in large part because racial science shores it up. Racial science shores up the distinctions that comprise racial categories and the legal and public policies that dictate racial order. (For

---

1 Note, for example, that migrants must adapt to new racial assignment all the time – Rodriguez and Cordero-Guzman explain this case for Puerto Ricans (1992) as I do for English-speaking Eastern Caribbean origin (Bashi 2007). Too, persons readily appealed to the South African apartheid regime to have their race changed when the government declared to be different from their close family members, or changed their race as they aged (Bowker and Star 2000).

2 Michael Cremo and Richard Thompson, in *The Hidden History of the Human Race* (Cremo and Thompson 1999) show that falsehoods in anthropology and archeology continue to push the idea that (racial) divisions among humans exist and persist until today.

example, the German Nazi regime employed and heavily relied upon North American racial science that informed them of exactly how some humans are unalterably inferior or superior to others, and thus it was explicitly incorporated into Nazi ideology and the structure of Nazi rule. Also, the creators of the apartheid rule of law in South Africa modeled their brutally unequal racial system on the punitive system of North American "Jim Crow" segregation.)

I argue that it is scientifically useful to understand racialization paradigmatically, which will allow us to examine the particulars of racial structures (the components that are the building blocks of racial logic), study how they come to be widely accepted, and understand why and how they are maintained. Racial paradigms, like other paradigms, endure because they are infused with ideology that gains widespread support from a crucial core constituency, well after the latest science proved it to be false or to lack scientific basis. Two types of mechanisms help racial paradigms persist. First, agents reinforce the structure (or architecture) of the racial paradigm. Specifically and briefly (with further elaboration to come), agents adapt old and form new racial categories, (re)arranging them into hierarchies of varying human value, proferring greatest value to racial dominants who invest continually in the paradigm. Second, agents then reproduce and reinforce the political and cultural mechanisms that consolidate power and control over paradigm-relevant resources.[3]

An analysis of racialization as it results from a paradigmatic focus is useful because it can help the scientific and other communities interested in making space for new knowledge understand the working parts of this long-ago discredited paradigm in order to overturn it. The lag in accepting new science that overturns and replaces the racialization paradigm is far from benign. Rather, this lag in accepting anti-racist

---

3 Some social scientists believe that by continuing to write about and research racial issues we merely perpetuate the collective myth, thereby giving strength to the fallacious arguments of the latter group. While the weight of scientific research from the last 100 years and more shows race to be socially constructed, but not at all based in biology, genetics, or any other natural science, At Vincent Sarich, professor emeritus of anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley, and Frank Miele, senior editor of *Skeptic* magazine, remain stubbornly invested in the science of race. They disagree with each of the ten points (made by the Public Broadcasting System in their film series "Race, The Power of an Illusion" and also found on a page at the series' companion site (PBS 2003) entitled "Ten Things Everyone Should Know About Race": (1) Race is a modern idea; (2) Race has no genetic basis; (2) Human subspecies don't exist; (4) Skin color really is only skin deep; (5) Most [genetic] variation is within not between "races"; (6) Slavery predates race; (7) Race and freedom evolved together; (8) Race justified social inequalities as natural; (9) Racism isn't biological but racism is still real; (10) Colorblindness will not end racism. Sarich and Miele's disagreement is remarkable, particularly when it is clear that the first eight points are matters of scientific fact. In their book, *Race: The Reality of Human Differences* (Sarich and Miele 2005, xi), they write, "we present the evidence we believe refutes the first eight points and explain why we reject points nine and ten, not only for economic but ethical reasons as well". Sarich and Miele oppose the social constructionist position on race altogether, believing it is being used to justify "public policies based on racial privileges", and suggest further that race is indeed "a valid biological concept".

knowledge is all the more costly and insidious precisely because it shores up white supremacy on a global scale.

2. Template of Elements of a Racial Paradigm

For over 500 years, each new generation has been force fed the ideology and practice of continually sorting humans into races, shown that some humans are denigrated and others lauded, in ways that have consequences for lives lived and life chances. What could a comparative analysis of racial structures reveal about the way race is lived and relived on each continent? What are the characteristics that we should look for, world over, to identify it as a racial structure?

Table 1: Elements of a Racial Paradigm

Racial Architecture	**Racial Politiculture**
Categories + *Hierarchy*	*Commonsense* + *Sanction*

Source: Own elaboration.

I argue that two main elements that mark racial structures worldwide. The first is the architecture of race – sometimes I call these racial structures – made up of categories and hierarchies. I distinguish these from identities; these are after the fact internalized identities created by corrupting the denigrated racial labeling originally assigned to a group, and coming after and out of racialization. Categorization refers to the racialization process itself, whereby categories are straightforwardly developed and assigned according to a combination of phenotype and stereotype. (Because races are assigned by onlookers, they differ from identities, which are asserted and embraced.[4] For example, one may identify as mixed race, but in the United States the rule of

4 Sociologists have a tradition of conflating race, ethnicity, and identity in qualitative research, and failing to acknowledge how race impinges on outcomes presumed to be "ethnic." For example, when scientists asked respondents "What do you call yourself?" and treat the response as if it alone held inherent significance, absent of the social context of racism and ethnic ranking, and without acknowledgement that people hold racial and ethnic identities simultaneously (see Bashi 1998).

hypodescent – or "one drop rule" – would have others assign the "black" category instead; see Davis 2001.)

The social context in which racial categories are interpreted is comprised of the politics and culture (or politiculture) that enables us to understand these categories. The politiculture is the second identifiable element of racial structures, and is itself made up of racial commonsense and racial sanctions. The commonsense is the body knowledge of racial assignment, categories, explains the logic of the hierarchy, the meaning of racial dominion over others, the meaning of inferiority. Racial commonsense sets the body of expectations for behavior of all the people in the hierarchy knowing what category someone is in. We aim to definitively make a racial assignment; it is then that we can use the racial commonsense to guide the interaction between the assignor-interrogator and persons racially assigned or interrogated until assignment might be determined (Kilomba 2008).

Once racial assignment is made, the expectations for behaviors are established (and expected to be known by all parties); conversely, sanctions are established for transgressions in behavioral expectations. When loved ones say to you "Don't bring home any [fill in the blank]" (i.e., meaning an undesirable ethnoracial type), you are being threatened with racial sanction. When you are warned not to walk in certain spaces in certain ways, in certain garb, at certain times of day, you are being told of racial sanctions that can accompany "wrong" racial behavior. Racial sanction is also found among the threats presumed to come in response to those nonwhites accused of "acting white". But these can be extended to larger sanctioning processes, like unequal rates of racial detaining, arrest, deportation, sentencing, and in the historical systems of South African apartheid; German Nazism; or Jim Crow, Black Codes, or Slave Codes of the USA, each of these is a form of racial sanction.

Even if we did not sanction people according to our expectations of their racial behavior, racism would still exist. This is because racial categories are meaningful only in hierarchical relation to one another, and we therefore rank humans as soon as we put them in a racial category. Said another way, racial assignment does violence to the idea of human equality because the purpose of racial categorization is to differentially value humans such that some are marked as superior and others are inferior.

Racial paradigms are always contested – even under racial dictatorship the harshest form of racial rule there was in the United States, the struggle against the paradigm was waged, and that struggle continues even under the system of racial hegemony that largely replaced racial dictatorship in the post-Civil Rights Movement era (Omi

and Winant 2014). The contest between anti-racist and racist elements often results in changes to racial rule, and compromises elements of the racial paradigm. Thus, there is no single paradigm - paradigms shift and change, and vary over history and geography. Indeed, in any one time, there may be global and local racial paradigms impinging on a single racial context. Think, for example, of an immigrant familiar with one paradigm in her country of origin, being judged differently in the post-migration destination where a different racial paradigm applies, while having had to contend with a border crossing system that ranked her national origin in a global hierarchy of racial states (Rodriguez and Cordero-Guzman 1992; Bashi 2004, 2007; Grosfoguel 1999).

Up to this point in the paper I presented the reader with a template for understanding racial paradigms. It may be usefully applied to analyzing how racial commonsense and sanctions are applied to hierarchically arranged racial categories and together comprise a particular historically- or geographically-specific racial paradigm. In the coming section I apply this template toward understanding the development of the racial paradigm that took over North America and employed in racial regimes across the globe.

3. A Historical Analysis of White Supremacist Racialization

Race was an English social experiment in domination that was tried in several settings but was not perfected until English racemakers reached North American shores and had (what they in the end named "black") African bodies upon which to experiment. By the late mid-1700s the British had managed to create a system of racial categories (that at least included "white," "Negro," and "Indian" but sometimes were interchangeable with the colors white, black, and red); a hierarchy (based on the premise of systematic white male supremacy that was now divorced from property ownership but did not require redistribution of property to those made newly white); and a racial politiculture that designated systems for distributing knowledge about the new racial rules, and a means for punishing those persons who refused to live by the rules of racial delineation (including the imposition of anti-miscegenation rules that somehow allowed for nonconsensual sexual relations with women of color and punishments for consensual relations with white women who dared to cross the newly drawn color lines). When "white" is fully formed as the category at the hierarchy's topmost position, race is systematic, paradigmatic, and unmistakably of this white supremacist variant that was codified in North America.

While the template presented in the preceding section may be used to study any racial regime in time and space, in this paper I employ it to examine and analyze the case

of a particular evolving racial paradigm that began with British colonization but was established fully only after migrating to North America. (The Spanish and Portuguese racial paradigms differed from the white supremacist Anglo variant that took root in colonial North America, particularly in their treatment of admixture, and whether an individual could transfer out of the assignment one was given at birth to a different racial category.) As a case this Anglo-North American variant has important qualities that give it great sociohistorical significance, particularly in the way it traveled and remained durable over centuries, adapting to the socioeconomic needs of different sites and times. It was first formulated in Europe (under Irish colonization), a second model was rooted in the English conquest of North American native peoples, and a third variant took hold in African slaveholding North America. Once fully formed, this white supremacist paradigm was explicitly appropriated as heavy-handed racial rule elsewhere in the globe, specifically (as noted), in Nazi-controlled Germany and under South Africa's apartheid regime.

As noted, the first iteration of this Anglo-centric racial paradigm was born as the English colonized Ireland. The English invaded Ireland in 1169 and by 1200 controlled it (except for a few scattered clans who could not be conquered). The English despised the Irish for their nomadic and pastoral culture (which relied upon animal herds and collective land use); by contrast, the English had long depended on acknowledged land boundaries and farming with very ordered social relations that had become increasingly hierarchical in class terms – the propertied lorded over the property-less.

Until 1534, the English were Catholics just as the Irish were. The Church of England broke away from Catholic faith when Henry VIII sought and did not receive annulment of his marriage. It was not long after this separation that the English justified their oppression of the Irish by the denigration of the religion to which they used to belong. That the Irish enjoyed Catholic forms of Christianity and organized themselves in communal economic relations were a shock to the English who professed a Protestantism that sanctions the divine right to individual wealth and equates poverty with devilishness and damnation.

> From the standpoint of English cultural values, Irish utilization of the land was a monstrous waste; the rich soil that their animals trampled could be put to better use cultivating grains, vegetables, and other goods to be marketed abroad and in expanding urban centers. Moreover, the younger sons of English gentlemen who had no hopes of inheriting paternal lands could earn their fortunes from great estates that would be established in Ireland with the aid of Irish labor. Yet all attempts to force Irishmen to settle on the land were rebuffed. When the

English met their intransigence by confiscating and destroying their cattle, the Irish fled into the forests and let it be known that they preferred starvation to life as forced laborers on English farms (Smedley 2007: 59).

Of course, not all English agreed with this plan – social relations are always contested. Since Irish conquest was achieved by settlement, repatriated Englishmen and -women encountered new ways of living, and many found those ways attractive. Some chose to assimilate to Irish culture; and in the nascent racial commonsense these cultural converts were considered degenerates. Racial sanctions are then developed as well. New laws against such mixing were enacted; and the 1367 Statutes of Kilkenny made it punishable for English persons to trade with the Irish, intermarry with them, wear Irish dress or hairstyles, speak the Irish language, and they even "outlawed Irish games, poetry, and music, apparently under the assumption that these cultural features were too seductive for young Englishmen to resist. These prohibitions and others stayed in effect until the seventeenth century" (Smedley 2007: 55-56).

The English experience with Irish persons on Irish lands, in hindsight, was a precursor to the atrocities they inflicted on those who lived and loved in North America, Africa, The Caribbean, and in the South Asian peninsula (the other English colonial projects). But from the perspective of the times, the Irish experiment was all new. The English tried as they might to force the Irish to change their lifestyles and submit to enslavement on plantations in agricultural operations that were more capitalist than communal, but they failed. The English responded to Irish resistance with a campaign of murder and propaganda about

> the unsuitability of the Irish for civilization. […] They cited Spanish practices of exterminating Indians not only as a justification for policies of killing Irish men, women and children but also as an appropriate solution for dealing with those who refused to be enslaved. In the English collective consciousness, 'the savage' was thus a kind of composite of these streams of negative ideas and images that flourished during a period of great social disorder, change, and unrest. The savage came to embody all of those repulsive characteristics that were contrary to English beliefs, habits, laws, and values. The imagery induced hatred for all things Irish, which persists among many English people right up to the present (Smedley 2007: 63-64).

The English planned a plantation system to be run with permanently forced labor from their supposedly savage inferiors, the Irish. They believed the Irish to be "heathen" despite their being Christians – according to the English, the Irish communal and

pastoral lifestyle was proof enough that Catholics were insufficiently pious to be anything but heathens, and worse, they were sure "that the only way to bring them under some form of civilized control was to enslave them. Indeed, Irish people formed the bulk of the servile peoples who were eventually transferred to the New World English plantations during the seventeenth century" (Smedley 2007: 63). In Ireland, as Edward Burke wrote in 1792, "Roman Catholics were obliged to submit to [Protestant, VBT] plebeians like themselves, and many of them tradesmen, servants, and otherwise inferior to some of them […] exercising upon them, daily and hourly, an insulting and vexatious 'superiority'"(Allen 1998: paragraph 28). At the hands of the English, the Irish experienced forced colonization to "settle the Irish problem once and for all" that meant regular killings of women and children, enslavement, being driven off their land; and destruction of their cattle, "their primary form of wealth" (Smedley 2007:60). "Extermination became a policy. Massacres were carried out. Prisoners of war were transported to servitude in the new English colonies in the West Indies" (Smedley 2007:61, quoting Liggio 1976:28). To the ire of the English, their project for Irish enslavement/plantation/colonization ultimately failed to hold. The ideology of colonial racism endured for the Irish (Hickman 1995); further, the English moved on with other far-reaching attempts to subjugate others for profit, and their belief that they had a God-given right to do so – even if that included the murder of men, women, and children – would carry on.

When the English migrated to North America in their second colonization project, they brought with them their contemptible views of the Irish as inferiors. The belief in human inferiority cemented previously was transposed on the local "Indian" populations in North America where a new round of merchant capitalism fueled new attempts at enslavement, the replacement of communal customs of survival with plantation production, and a reinvigorated logic of hierarchy of persons. In the initial phases of paradigm shift, only the racial categories had changed when the label "Indian" was added to the "ethnic" or "minority" groups that make up the nascent nation.

The Europeans that colonized North America were Northern Europeans who had unsophisticated understandings of the other human beings with whom they shared the planet. By contrast, Southern Europeans had encountered and intermingled with diverse populations and were therefore more sophisticated about the range of human variety in the Old World. When Northern Europeans began to encounter human physical and cultural differences, they were wholly underprepared (Smedley 2007). This is one reason why the English, Dutch, and German variants of North American racialization enterprises differ so greatly from those of the Spanish and Portuguese (Smedley 2007).

Even as they began to come up against human differentiation, Northern European societies were themselves transforming. The feudal organization of social and economic life waned, wage labor gained prevalence, and money began to dominate exchange. Opportunities for acquiring wealth through merchant capitalism increased, a philosophy of possessive individualism and a market mentality gained prominence, and these occurred in England well before the rest of Western Europe (Smedley 2007). These socioeconomic changes displaced people from the land and created a class of jobless poor who degenerated to begging in the streets; they became a class that was punished for their poverty and forced to work in systems of indentured servitude (Smedley 2007; Allen 1994). Conversely, property ownership eventually became so valued as to be equated with the fundamentals of religious Protestantism. These ideas about poverty, property, and servitude helped to formulate Northern Europeans' racial thinking and the forms of oppression they imposed on those they (later) decided were racially beneath them.[5]

Initial contacts with native Americans were not full of racial prejudices, however. Englishmen and cousins John Hawkins and Francis Drake, although involved in plunder and kidnapping in African villages and the trading of African and Native American slaves, showed no obvious racial prejudice in these dealings with native populations. Other English explorers (like Walter Raleigh, ca. 1552-1618) plundered from the Indians, Africans, and Spanish alike, i.e., they did not single out native peoples for especially heinous treatment. At the time the English neither made reference to race when justifying their equal opportunity pillaging, nor did they consider either of these ethnicities to be racially charged in the extreme.

Early contacts with the Native Americans were marked by altruism – the Europeans were welcomed, fed each day, and were generally aided by the natives; settlers were taught survival skills and encouraged to trade. It was only later, "when some of the English colonists began to help themselves to food in the fields and in storage areas, to cross into Indian lands that were not open to them, and to generally ignore Indian rights and customs, [that] the latter began to withdraw support. Many even decided to flee from the strange ingrates who made such arrogant demands of them" (Smedley 2007: 77). The European settlers' gratitude devolved into wariness for they distrusted the motivations of those who helped them survive, and it is then that racialized thinking becomes applied to native groups. When Europeans are newcomers in need of Indian

---

5   "Their ideologies about individualism and accumulating property guided their assault on foreign lands and their treatment of the indigenous peoples of the New World. These ideologies also helped to determine the kind of slavery that evolved in North America. Possessive individualism and the near sacredness of property and property rights in seventeenth-century English culture facilitated the transformation of Africans into slave property and their concomitant demotion to nonhuman forms of being" (Smedley 2007: 52).

services, Indians are seen as ignorant and primitive; when their land and goods are desired in a context of conquest, the Indian becomes the "savage" of the New World for whom no defense from aggression, subjugation, and enslavement should be allowed. The natives' communal behavior is condemned in ways similar to the Irish before them, but even those Indians who assimilate and convert to Protestant ways of life are not spared.

Here again, as happened in Ireland, some Europeans joined communities of colonized peoples; it is even suspected that some of the early European settlements in North America that seemed to disappear with no trace actually may have been absorbed by Indian societies; it was clear that many English who were captured by Indians preferred the lifestyle of their new culture (Smedley 2007: 77, 89). But neither in this instance would the English in power understand nor remain indifferent to these cultural converts; the racial commonsense of the day was constructed to disallow such acceptance. Their explanation for white attraction to Indian life had to be because they all cavort with Satan. Neither the evidence of Indian assistance to the English settlements, nor Indian conversion to English lifestyles, nor the repeated protests of captured whites who refused to stay with the English once offered "rescue" showed the English that the Indian could be worthy of the rights to land nor to freedom to use that land according to their own choice of lifestyle. Indeed, Indian communal regimes, the diversity of Indian nations, predilections to nudity and polygamy, and a general refusal to convert to Protestantism and "civilized" ways, were all considered proof that they were savage, as savage as were the "wild Irish" before them. It is well known that racial sanction in this period went to genocidal extremes.

The English subjugation of Africans in North America is the third iteration in the creation of the U.S. racial paradigm. Since my purpose is to derive the origins and trace the development of the U.S. racial paradigm, here I focus only on summarizing the changes involving incorporation of African bodies into North America and its shifting racial paradigm (setting aside the British colonial enterprises that subjugated African and Indian-subcontinent peoples in other parts of the globe). First, a new racial category evolved, as Africans were slowly, over time, and in contested ways, forced to descend into racial enslavement; (The "African" as a concept is also invented, for the masses of people shipped as chattel from the West coast of the continent did not think themselves united in any particular ways, except in the ways of subjugation; see Gomez 2004.) In the earliest years of the creation of blackness, Africans' physical differences were not given as the reason for their descent into lifelong enslavement. The reasons for African inferiority were the same as for "Indian" and for the Irish: savagery, and non-Puritanism, and by this time, "many colonists of the seventeenth century believe, or vindicated their

actions with the belief, that enslavement was a major step toward saving the souls of the Africans" (Parent 2003: 109).

In 1640, the first Virginia law demarking difference between black and white rights prohibited blacks from bearing arms; and soon, lifetime enslavement became the fate of the black man, woman, and child. Discriminatory treatment was allotted to those men and women whose love caused them to cross the color line into sexual affairs; a 1691 law in Virginia ordered a fine (and five years bondage if it remained unpaid) for a white woman who birthed a biracial child and interracial marriage was prohibited altogether. Since neither black women nor the black men to whom they may be attached have right of self-defense, punishments for white men who sexually violated black women made no sense. Blacks who had been able to resist slavery because they had adopted Christianity, or because they could claim free white paternity, over time lost their rights to freedom. "Lawmakers [and readers of the law] were beginning to see blacks as a people apart" (Parent 2003: 116). Africans were not enslaved because they were black; they were made black because they were made slaves. Thus, it is only after that descent was completed that they were designated "black", the new nadir of the racial hierarchy.

In the evolving racial hierarchy that had already begun to travel the globe, the Irish is deemed a savage, a beast with a wild animal nature (i.e., the "wild Irish"), whose nation need not be recognized. The evolution continues, and Irish racialization gives way to racialization of the "Indian" (the name bequeathed them by a geographically disoriented Columbus), who are deemed to deserve natural but not civil rights any white man need recognize. As happened with the Irish, the North American Indian is deemed heathen, the unenlightened person of an unrecognized religion who lacks morals and principles. These racializing ideas and ideals are later applied to the "negro" - but racialization is now complete: as negroes are enslaved they are stripped of their humanity, which merits no rights at all, and recognizes no nation of birth, but only recognizes that which is "black", inhuman chattel.

The social theorist Max Weber wrote that Protestantism is the key to the success of the English enterprise in North America and central to the way they viewed the world, for it was a marrying of modern capitalism ("the rational organization of formally free labour") and Protestantism (the idea that one might be driven to accumulate wealth, but at the same time have little interest in the "worldly pleasures it can purchase") which brought about a great self-discipline among the colonizers (Giddens 1976: 3-4). Anthropologist Audrey Smedley thinks little of this idea, and instead argues that the New World invaders actually chose capitalism over religiosity and piousness. English

Protestant religiosity became a source of protection and comfort when used to identify friend (Protestants) and foe (others – including other Christians) in Europe but was hardly a driving force of their action. When Protestantism was evoked in intergroup relations, it was used mainly to make excuses for brutalizing of others.[6] In fact, the racial thinking of the day took Protestant religiosity (and the delineation between heathen and savage) and added to it the Spanish belief in the heritability of social status.[7] (Note that the term "ethnicity" is in its origins synonymous with "heathen.") Together, religion and blood created a heritable racial character, and the lore about the tainted races were plastered on any enemy in order to downgrade them from fully valued human status.

Continually contested at the national and local levels, the bottom category changes and reshapes – here the racial pariah being those who are "red" and there being those "black," and so on Smedley 2007; Davis 2001; Almaguer 2008). In 1908 the Louisiana Supreme Court first declared that, "there are no negroes who are not persons of color; but there are persons of color who are not negroes" (Dominguez 1986: 30). But then in 1910 changed its ruling to nearly equate the terms (persons of color and negroes) in order to fully ban the intermixing of blood (through miscegenation), [8] one of many steps made to solidify the racial binary in the U.S. between whites and others. This act not only had great historical significance, but indicates the permanence of the dominance of racial thinking in American life. After all,

> people of non-Caucasian, non-Negro ancestry had been labeled *persons of color* through out the nineteenth century. But to continue to call them persons of color in the twentieth century would mean that [all such persons, formerly non-negroes included] would assume all legal disabilities intended only for those with African ancestry. The relabeling of Indians and Filipinos was part of the movement to clarify the intentions of anti-miscegenation statutes (Dominguez 1986: 33-34, emphasis hers).

---

6 "The possibility of adventure and profit attracted men and women away from familiar forms of social control, away from family, kinspeople, employers, patrons, friends, and clients, into interactions with alien merchants, adventurers, pirates, sailors, and other strangers. The frequent anonymity of these new interactions underscored the need for a familiar identity to which others could relate. With growing competition and protonationalistic conflicts among the various nations of Europe, the English, like other Europeans, often found it critical to establish political and/or commercial alliances predicated on religious affiliation. Thus, whether one was Catholic, Protestant, or some variant thereof was often the key not only to the identity of others but also to how they were to be treated" (Smedley 2007: 66).

7 The Spanish developed mechanisms for issuing "certificates of Limpieza de Sangre" and "elaborate tests for finding social genealogical connections" to prove one's purity, as in free of Jewish or Moorish heritage (Smedley 2007: 69). Thus did blood become the site where – in North American thinking – racial character resides.

8 "Miscegenation" has roots in the Latin words *miscére*, meaning mix and *genus*, meaning race.

Other laws follow – whereby white men deny their "mixed race" progeny the right to inherit. Thus, the net was cast to include all such "darker races" as inferiors to whites. By the time they were done, they had perfected race well enough that it was systematically imposed to denigrate all such "persons of color".

Difference is not immediately hierarchical – so racialized thinking is required to make hierarchy of difference. In three different historical settings (Ireland, and then North American encounters with native persons, and then again with Africans they capture and use as goods for trade) English colonizers chose markers that identified them as culturally different in order to place themselves in the superior position in the very first racial paradigm. They succeeded in uplifting themselves socioeconomically and defining as inferior their opponents in the colonial and enslavement enterprises. This model of differentiation and denigration/superiorization has been repeated over and over again on US soil (see Bashi Treitler 2013), and of course it may be found elsewhere around the globe.

Elements of this white supremacist paradigm were adapted to two of the most infamous racial regimes in recent history. The Nazi regime relied heavily upon the racial science developed by American eugenicists, not mainly to acquire scientific information but to garner support and quell opposition to their race policies, particularly because "Statements by non-German scientists were more credible than were those of German scientists, who were often regarded as mere puppets of the new regime" (Kühl 2002: 88). Adolf Hitler had written to thank Madison Grant (conservationist and eugenicist) for writing The Passing of the Great Race, stating that "the book was his Bible" (Kühl 2002: 85).

> Hitler's personal correspondence with American eugenicists reveals both the influence that American eugenicists had on the highest figures of the Nazi regime and the crucial important that National Socialists placed on garnering support for their policies among foreign scientists. The Nazi government consistently relied upon the support of scientists to propagate their race policies both at home and abroad (Kühl 2002: 86).

In turn, Nazis honored US scientists who produced such research, conferring upon several German honorary doctoral degrees. Similarly, the US and South Africa relied upon the colonial models developed by Britain, France and Germany to shape their own racial segregation policies (Nightingale 2012: 334). In fact, "the trans-oceanic trade in social Darwinist and eugenical ideas – most notably American eugenecists' strong support for research on 'racial hygiene' in early Nazi Germany – was an important

source of inspiration to all three [i.e., US, German, and South African racial] systems" (Nightingale 2012: 334).

While the North American racial paradigm was not the first racial paradigm to be explicitly hierarchical,[9] it is the first to make an unalterable Anglo whiteness supreme. Thus, this racial paradigm differs from others – like the Spanish variant – in expressly punishing intermixing in ways that both damn (in racial sanction) those who engage in it and (in hierarchical denigration) the offspring produced from such unions. It creates a divide between racial superiority and inferiority that lasts into subsequent generations. For this reason, it is particularly well suited to applications of strict segregation and even eugenic or genocidal action in its most nefarious forms.

4. Summary and Discussion: Merits of the Paradigmatic Analysis of Racialization

Social constructionism is an approach to scientific inquiry that believes social phenomena "arise in specific times and places, in response to identifiable circumstances and needs, and they are passed on through processes that are readily observed" (Steinberg 2001: 263). A social constructionist analysis was employed here, first, to analyze the creation and dissemination of the North American racial paradigm, and to demonstrate how the paradigmatic analysis of a racialization analysis can aid one in seeing how racial paradigms evolved and are readily translated into different parts of the globe and different historical moments. Using a paradigmatic analysis, we can see how categories are constructed and made hierarchical, and the rules for racial assignment, the commonsense understandings of racial assignment and proper behavior of racialized peoples, along with the sanctions for improper racial comportment are developed and deployed in different times and places.

Racial hierarchy is at war with those who fight for equality. No one is born with racial commonsense, so there must be indoctrination processes for each new generation, and for those who continue to question even after indoctrination is presumed to have occurred. And the politiculture requires a power structure to run its machinery (in both its propaganda and its punishment forms); and power is always contested. Thus racial paradigms do face constant challenges. And further, because the scientific foundation of racial categorization is completely fallacious, the pseudoscience on which racialization is based must be continually reified.

---

9   Some credit the German Johann Blumenbach creating the first racial hierarchy. For example, see Gould 1994.

Professors in the natural and social sciences who teach and do research on the social construction of race, the etymology of racial thought, and the injustice of racial inequality work to reeducate about the fallacies of race, and write scholarship continually disproving the legitimacy of the practice of categorization. Surely, dismantling racial commonsense is a necessary pathway toward struggling against the dominance of the reigning racial paradigm, but it is insufficient, for two reasons.

Paradigms endure, first, because the progress of knowledge does not allow for new information to overturn the old. As Kuhn explains it,

> Normal science, the activity in which most scientists inevitably spend almost all their time, is predicated on the assumption that the scientific community knows what the world is like. Much of the success of the enterprise [of science] derives from the [scientific] community's willingness to defend that assumption, if necessary at considerable cost. Normal science, for example, often suppresses fundamental novelties because they are necessarily subversive of its basic commitments (Kuhn 1970: 5).

Those scientists who live in a world where they believe race rightly exists are living with wholly different assumptions than those who do science under the assumption that race is a fallacy. Indeed, the two sides use frames wholly incommensurate with one another, meaning that scientists in each tradition "disagree as to what the facts are, and even as to the real problems to be addressed" (Marcum 2005: 82, quoting philosopher Shapere).

Racial paradigms endure, too, because they involve so many parts that are all being reinforced; and there are a number of fronts on which we must fight. It is not enough to fight the categories and prove them false; nor is it enough to fight police brutality or other forms of state violence; nor can we rest when we teach parents to accept their offsprings' cross-racial or -ethnic partnering; nor can we rest without driving- or shopping-while-black; for race has to be fought on many sides simultaneously. If we consider, for example, only the so-called War on Drugs – a sample of relevant fronts to be fought include unequal sentencing for drug-related crimes (sanction), the spread of falsehoods that blacks use drugs more than whites (commonsense), the idea that blacks are inherently prone to drug crime and that entire communities of black people are suspect by virtue of their inferiority (hierarchy), or even that there is such a thing as a racial "black" or "white" (category) (Jarecki 2013).

The obvious conclusion is that racial paradigms are inordinately difficult to vanquish. Humans have lived with the scourge of (the Anglo variant of) white supremacist thought

since its birth in the 15th century, and more than a century's worth of science proving its falsity has not dislodged it from its high-ranking perch among our myriad options for social organization. But perhaps thinking in terms of a philosophy of paradigms can allow us to see why these falsehoods live on, and what might be the best plan for dismantling the paradigmatic frame on which they hang, such that we may replace it with a more humanist way of life.

5.   Bibliography

Allen, Theodore W. (1994): *The Invention of the White Race: Volume One, Racial Oppression and Social Control*, London: Verso.

(1998): "Summary of the Argument of The Invention of the White Race (Part Two)", in: *Cultural Logic*, 1, 2, at: http://clogic.eserver.org/1-2/allen.html (last access 23/7/2015).

Almaguer, Tomás (2008): *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bashi, Vilna (1998): "Racial Categories Matter because Racial Hierarchies Matter: A Commentary", in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21, 8, 959-968.

(2004): "Globalized Anti-blackness: Transnationalizing Western Immigration Law, Policy, and Practice." in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27, 4, 584-606.

(2007): *Survival of the Knitted: Immigrant Social Networks in a Stratified World*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

(2013): *The Ethnic Project: Transforming Racial Fiction into Ethnic Factions*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bowker, Geoffrey C. and Susan Leigh Star (2000): "The Case of Race Classification and Reclassification under Apartheid", in: *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 195-225.

Cremo, Michael and Thompson, Richard (1999): *The Hidden History of the Human Race,* Los Angeles: Bhaktivedanta.

Davis, F. James (2001): *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition,* Tenth Anniversary Edition, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Dominguez, Virginia (1986): *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Gomez, Michael A.   (2004): *Reversing Sail: A History of the African Diaspora,* Series: New Approaches to African History, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giddens, Anthony (1976): "Introduction", in: Max Weber (1958): *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by Talcott Parsons, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Gould, Stephen J. (1994): "The Geometer of Race", in: *Discover Magazine*, 15,11, 65-69.

Grosfoguel, Ramón (1999): "Introduction: 'Cultural Racism' and Colonial Caribbean Migrants in Core Zones of the Capitalist World Economy", in: *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 22, 4, 409-434.

Hickman, Mary J. (1995): *Religion, Class and Identity: The State, the Catholic Church and the Education of the Irish in Britain*, Aldershot: Avebury.

Jarecki, Eugene (2013): *The House I Live In*, documentary film, directed by Jarecki, released by Virgil Films and Entertainment.

Kilomba, Grada (2008): *Plantation Memories: Episodes of Everyday Racism,* Berlin: Unrast.

Kühl, Stefan (2002): *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism,* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970 [1962]): *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Liggio, Leonard P. (1976): "English Origins of Early American Racism." *Radical History Review* 3, 1, 1-36.

Marcum, James A. (2005): *Thomas Kuhn's Revolution: An Historical Philosophy of Science*, New York: Continuum International Publishing.

Nightingale, Carl H. (2012): *Segregation: A Global History of Divided Cities,* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant (2014 [1994, 1989]): *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*, Third edition, New York: Routledge.

Parent, Anthony S. (2003): *Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740,* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Public Broadcasting Service - PBS (2003): "RACE – The Power of an Illusion", at: http://www.pbs.org/race/000_General/000_00-Home.htm (last access: 22.01.2015).

Rodriguez, Clara E. and Hector Cordero-Guzman (1992): "Placing race in context", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15, 4, 523-542.

Sarich, Vincent and Miele, Frank (2005): *Race: The Reality of Human Differences*, Boulder: Westview Press.

Smedley, Audrey (2007): *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview,* Boulder: Westview Press.

Steinberg, Stephen (2001 [1989, 1981]): *Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity and Class in America*, 3d edition, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Working Papers published since February 2011:

1. Therborn, Göran 2011: "Inequalities and Latin America: From the Enlightenment to the 21st Century".

2. Reis, Elisa 2011: "Contemporary Challenges to Equality".

3. Korzeniewicz, Roberto Patricio 2011: "Inequality: On Some of the Implications of a World-Historical Perspective".

4. Braig, Marianne; Costa, Sérgio und Göbel, Barbara 2013: "Soziale Ungleichheiten und globale Interdependenzen in Lateinamerika: eine Zwischenbilanz".

5. Aguerre, Lucía Alicia 2011: "Desigualdades, racismo cultural y diferencia colonial".

6. Acuña Ortega, Víctor Hugo 2011: "Destino Manifiesto, filibusterismo y representaciones de desigualdad étnico-racial en las relaciones entre Estados Unidos y Centroamérica".

7. Tancredi, Elda 2011: "Asimetrías de conocimiento científico en proyectos ambientales globales. La fractura Norte-Sur en la Evaluación de Ecosistemas del Milenio".

8. Lorenz, Stella 2011: "Das Eigene und das Fremde: Zirkulationen und Verflechtungen zwischen eugenischen Vorstellungen in Brasilien und Deutschland zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts".

9. Costa, Sérgio 2011: "Researching Entangled Inequalities in Latin America: The Role of Historical, Social, and Transregional Interdependencies".

10. Daudelin, Jean and Samy, Yiagadeesen 2011: "'Flipping' Kuznets: Evidence from Brazilian Municipal Level Data on the Linkage between Income and Inequality".

11. Boatcă, Manuela 2011: "Global Inequalities: Transnational Processes and Transregional Entanglements".

12. Rosati, Germán 2012: "Un acercamiento a la dinámica de los procesos de apropiación/expropiación. Diferenciación social y territorial en una estructura agraria periférica, Chaco (Argentina) 1988-2002".

13. Ströbele-Gregor, Juliana 2012: "Lithium in Bolivien: Das staatliche Lithium-Programm, Szenarien sozio-ökologischer Konflikte und Dimensionen sozialer Ungleichheit".

14. Ströbele-Gregor, Juliana 2012: "Litio en Bolivia. El plan gubernamental de producción e industrialización del litio, escenarios de conflictos sociales y ecológicos, y dimensiones de desigualdad social".

15. Gómez, Pablo Sebastián 2012: "Circuitos migratorios Sur-Sur y Sur-Norte en Paraguay. Desigualdades interdependientes y remesas".

16. Sabato, Hilda 2012: "Political Citizenship, Equality, and Inequalities in the Formation of the Spanish American Republics".

17. Manuel-Navarrete, David 2012: "Entanglements of Power and Spatial Inequalities in Tourism in the Mexican Caribbean".

18. Góngora-Mera, Manuel Eduardo 2012: "Transnational Articulations of Law and Race in Latin America: A Legal Genealogy of Inequality".

19. Chazarreta, Adriana Silvina 2012: "El abordaje de las desigualdades en un contexto de reconversión socio-productiva. El caso de la inserción internacional de la vitivinicultura de la Provincia de Mendoza, Argentina".

20. Guimarães, Roberto P. 2012: "Environment and Socioeconomic Inequalities in Latin America: Notes for a Research Agenda".

21. Ulloa, Astrid 2012: "Producción de conocimientos en torno al clima. Procesos históricos de exclusión/apropiación de saberes y territorios de mujeres y pueblos indígenas".

22. Canessa, Andrew 2012: "Conflict, Claim and Contradiction in the New Indigenous State of Bolivia".

23. Latorre, Sara 2012: "Territorialities of Power in the Ecuadorian Coast: The Politics of an Environmentally Dispossessed Group".

24. Cicalo, André 2012: "Brazil and its African Mirror: Discussing 'Black' Approximations in the South Atlantic".

25. Massot, Emilie 2012: "Autonomía cultural y hegemonía desarrollista en la Amazonía peruana. El caso de las comunidades mestizas-ribereñas del Alto-Momón".

26. Wintersteen, Kristin 2012: "Protein from the Sea: The Global Rise of Fishmeal and the Industrialization of Southeast Pacific Fisheries, 1918-1973".

27.   Martínez Franzoni, Juliana and Sánchez-Ancochea, Diego 2012: "The Double Challenge of Market and Social Incorporation: Progress and Bottlenecks in Latin America".

28.   Matta, Raúl 2012: "El patrimonio culinario peruano ante UNESCO. Algunas reflexiones de gastro-política".

29.   Armijo, Leslie Elliott 2012: "Equality and Multilateral Financial Cooperation in the Americas".

30.   Lepenies, Philipp 2012: "Happiness and Inequality: Insights into a Difficult Relationship – and Possible Political Implications".

31.   Sánchez, Valeria 2012: "La equidad-igualdad en las políticas sociales latinoamericanas. Las propuestas de Consejos Asesores Presidenciales chilenos (2006-2008)".

32.   Villa Lever, Lorenza 2012: "Flujos de saber en cincuenta años de Libros de Texto Gratuitos de Historia. Las representaciones sobre las desigualdades sociales en México".

33.   Jiménez, Juan Pablo y López Azcúnaga, Isabel 2012: "¿Disminución de la desigualdad en América Latina? El rol de la política fiscal".

34.   Gonzaga da Silva, Elaini C. 2012: "Legal Strategies for Reproduction of Environmental Inequalities in Waste Trade: The Brazil – Retreaded Tyres Case".

35.   Fritz, Barbara and Prates, Daniela 2013: "The New IMF Approach to Capital Account Management and its Blind Spots: Lessons from Brazil and South Korea".

36.   Rodrigues-Silveira, Rodrigo 2013: "The Subnational Method and Social Policy Provision: Socioeconomic Context, Political Institutions and Spatial Inequality".

37.   Bresser-Pereira, Luiz Carlos 2013: "State-Society Cycles and Political Pacts in a National-Dependent Society: Brazil".

38.   López Rivera, Diana Marcela 2013: "Flows of Water, Flows of Capital: Neoliberalization and Inequality in Medellín's Urban Waterscape".

39.   Briones, Claudia 2013: "Conocimientos sociales, conocimientos académicos. Asimetrías, colaboraciones autonomías".

40. Dussel Peters, Enrique 2013: "Recent China-LAC Trade Relations: Implications for Inequality?".

41. Backhouse, Maria; Baquero Melo, Jairo and Costa, Sérgio 2013: "Between Rights and Power Asymmetries: Contemporary Struggles for Land in Brazil and Colombia".

42. Geoffray, Marie Laure 2013: "Internet, Public Space and Contention in Cuba: Bridging Asymmetries of Access to Public Space through Transnational Dynamics of Contention".

43. Roth, Julia 2013: "Entangled Inequalities as Intersectionalities: Towards an Epistemic Sensibilization".

44. Sproll, Martina 2013: "Precarization, Genderization and Neotaylorist Work: How Global Value Chain Restructuring Affects Banking Sector Workers in Brazil".

45. Lillemets, Krista 2013: "Global Social Inequalities: Review Essay".

46. Tornhill, Sofie 2013: "Index Politics: Negotiating Competitiveness Agendas in Costa Rica and Nicaragua".

47. Caggiano, Sergio 2013: "Desigualdades divergentes. Organizaciones de la sociedad civil y sindicatos ante las migraciones laborales".

48. Figurelli, Fernanda 2013: "Movimientos populares agrarios. Asimetrías, disputas y entrelazamientos en la construcción de lo campesino".

49. D'Amico, Victoria 2013: "La desigualdad como definición de la cuestión social en las agendas trasnacionales sobre políticas sociales para América Latina. Una lectura desde las ciencias sociales".

50. Gras, Carla 2013: "Agronegocios en el Cono Sur. Actores sociales, desigualdades y entrelazamientos transregionales".

51. Lavinas, Lena 2013: "Latin America: Anti-Poverty Schemes Instead of Social Protection".

52. Guimarães, Antonio Sérgio A. 2013: "Black Identities in Brazil: Ideologies and Rhetoric".

53. Boanada Fuchs, Vanessa 2013: "Law and Development: Critiques from a Decolonial Perspective".

54. Araujo, Kathya 2013: "Interactive Inequalities and Equality in the Social Bond: A Sociological Study of Equality".

55. Reis, Elisa P. and Silva, Graziella Moraes Dias 2013: "Global Processes and National Dilemmas: The Uncertain Consequences of the Interplay of Old and New Repertoires of Social Identity and Inclusion".

56. Poth, Carla 2013: "La ciencia en el Estado. Un análisis del andamiaje regulatorio e institucional de las biotecnologías agrarias en Argentina".

57. Pedroza, Luicy 2013: "Extensiones del derecho de voto a inmigrantes en Latinoamérica: ¿contribuciones a una ciudadanía política igualitaria? Una agenda de investigación".

58. Leal, Claudia and Van Ausdal, Shawn 2013: "Landscapes of Freedom and Inequality: Environmental Histories of the Pacific and Caribbean Coasts of Colombia".

59. Martín, Eloísa 2013: "(Re)producción de desigualdades y (re)producción de conocimiento. La presencia latinoamericana en la publicación académica internacional en Ciencias Sociales".

60. Kerner, Ina 2013: "Differences of Inequality: Tracing the Socioeconomic, the Cultural and the Political in Latin American Postcolonial Theory".

61. Lepenies, Philipp 2013: "Das Ende der Armut. Zur Entstehung einer aktuellen politischen Vision".

62. Vessuri, Hebe; Sánchez-Rose, Isabelle; Hernández-Valencia, Ismael; Hernández, Lionel; Bravo, Lelys y Rodríguez, Iokiñe 2014: "Desigualdades de conocimiento y estrategias para reducir las asimetrías. El trabajo de campo compartido y la negociación transdisciplinaria".

63. Bocarejo, Diana 2014: "Languages of Stateness: Development, Governance and Inequality".

64. Correa-Cabrera, Guadalupe 2014: "Desigualdades y flujos globales en la frontera noreste de México. Los efectos de la migración, el comercio, la extracción y venta de energéticos y el crimen organizado transnacional".

65. Segura, Ramiro 2014: "El espacio urbano y la (re)producción de desigualdades sociales. Desacoples entre distribución del ingreso y patrones de urbanización en ciudades latinoamericanas".

66. Reis, Eustáquio J. 2014: "Historical Perspectives on Regional Income Inequality in Brazil, 1872-2000".

67. Boyer, Robert 2014: "Is More Equality Possible in Latin America? A Challenge in a World of Contrasted but Interdependent Inequality Regimes".

68. Córdoba, María Soledad 2014: "Ensamblando actores. Una mirada antropológica sobre el tejido de alianzas en el universo del agronegocio".

69. Hansing, Katrin and Orozco, Manuel 2014: "The Role and Impact of Remittances on Small Business Development during Cuba's Current Economic Reforms".

70. Martínez Franzoni, Juliana and Sánchez-Ancochea, Diego 2014: "Should Policy Aim at Having All People on the Same Boat? The Definition, Relevance and Challenges of Universalism in Latin America".

71. Góngora-Mera, Manuel; Herrera, Gioconda and Müller, Conrad 2014: "The Frontiers of Universal Citizenship: Transnational Social Spaces and the Legal Status of Migrants in Ecuador".

72. Pérez Sáinz, Juan Pablo 2014: "El tercer momento rousseauniano de América Latina. Posneoliberalismo y desigualdades sociales".

73. Jelin, Elizabeth 2014: "Desigualdades de clase, género y etnicidad/raza. Realidades históricas, aproximaciones analíticas".

74. Dietz, Kristina 2014: "Researching Inequalities from a Socio-ecological Perspective".

75. Zhouri, Andréa 2014: "Mapping Environmental Inequalities in Brazil: Mining, Environmental Conflicts and Impasses of Mediation".

76. Panther, Stephan 2014: "Institutions in a World System: Contours of a Research Program".

77. Villa Lever, Lorenza 2015: "Globalization, Class and Gender Inequalities in Mexican Higher Education".

78. Reygadas, Luis 2015: "The Symbolic Dimension of Inequalities".

79. Ströbele-Gregor, Juliana 2015: "Desigualdades estructurales en el aprovechamiento de un recurso estratégico. La economía global del litio y el caso de Bolivia".

80.   de Paula, Luiz Fernando; Fritz, Barbara and Prates, Daniela M. 2015: "Center and Periphery in International Monetary Relations: Implications for Macroeconomic Policies in Emerging Economies".

81.   Góngora-Mera, Manuel; Costa, Sérgio; Gonçalves, Guilherme Leite (eds.) 2015: "Derecho en América Latina: ¿Corrector o (re)productor de desigualdades?"

82.   Atria, Jorge 2015: "Elites, the Tax System and Inequality in Chile: Background and Perspectives".

83.   Schild, Verónica 2015: "Securing Citizens and Entrenching Inequalities: The Gendered, Neoliberalized Latin American State".

84.   Bashi Treitler, Vilna 2015: "Racialization: Paradigmatic Frames from British Colonization to Today, and Beyond".

desiguALdades.net

desiguALdades.net is an interdisciplinary, international, and multi-institutional research network on social inequalities in Latin America supported by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF, German Federal Ministry of Education and Research) in the frame of its funding line on area studies. The Lateinamerika-Institut (LAI, Institute for Latin American Studies) of the Freie Universität Berlin and the Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut of the Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (IAI, Ibero-American Institute of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, Berlin) are in overall charge of the research network.

The objective of *desiguALdades.net* is to work towards a shift in the research on social inequalities in Latin America in order to overcome all forms of "methodological nationalism". Intersections of different types of social inequalities and interdependencies between global and local constellations of social inequalities are at the focus of analysis. For achieving this shift, researchers from different regions and disciplines as well as experts either on social inequalities and/or on Latin America are working together. The network character of *desiguALdades.net* is explicitly set up to overcome persisting hierarchies in knowledge production in social sciences by developing more symmetrical forms of academic practices based on dialogue and mutual exchange between researchers from different regional and disciplinary contexts.

Further information on www.desiguALdades.net

Executive Institutions of desiguALdades.net

Freie Universität Berlin

Ibero-Amerikanisches
Institut
Preußischer Kulturbesitz

Contact

desiguALdades.net
Freie Universität Berlin
Boltzmannstr. 1
D-14195 Berlin, Germany

Tel: +49 30 838 53069
www.desiguALdades.net
e-mail: contacto@desiguALdades.net

SPONSORED BY THE

Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research