

Racism in Modern America

Posted September 28, 2009

Commentary and Edited by Chris *the Abducted Alien*

Essay by F.V. Walton

COMMENTARY: The subject of racism is a continual controversial issue within everyday society. Racial equality is such a new concept within our lives that many raw emotions still cloud many people's judgment. Longstanding hatred and hurt feelings eat away at the good intentions and bold efforts that the majority of Americans are today trying to promote. Far too many people speak of equality and hope, yet secretly rationalize hate, based on little more than conditioning and stereotypes.

Maybe we should all take time to look at these issues and into our hearts to see if together we can learn to be a better species living on this planet together...the alternative may be no life at all if we continue on this path.

While surfing through the websites for articles and citations on "Racism in Modern America," I ran across this article by [F.V. Walton](#). No date published was given, but it read like post 9/11. I took the time to review and edit this article because it is everything I wanted to write. I have taken this excellent essay, edited, added and cited various references and resources to the essay. I felt everyone should experience and educate themselves to the many variations of RACISM. And this is one good place to start...

I truly believe that anyone who denies any information in this article is in Republican Congressman Joe Wilson's camp with all left-wing pundits who have been hiding in plain sight for decades...but no longer. There is a clear dividing line in America today...the left vs. the right. Those who want a better life for themselves and their families are on the right, the progressives that are disgusted by the bigotry, racism, and hatred of others. And the Republican Conservatives, the left-wing pundits who want the "mongrel hordes," gone. Why? Because they are different than what they, the Christian white male in America and the sheep that follow has perceived should be normal (moral) in this country and the world for centuries...

Some of these people fall into the "Paradigm Effect. (Defined in this article)

Sane rational thinking people have a right to FEAR these people. They have pandered to others that are mentally disturbed to do their bidding for decades. I wrote about this in my book "Abducted Alien, published June 2009." These types of people want continually want to rid America of the "mongrel hordes."

They believe only what they have been educated and conditioned to think through their theology, education and passed down by their parents. They will not consider any other thought. In other words...they are brainwashed into hate of others and only their way of life.

This is our Modern Day Revolution and Armageddon rolled into one...

The End of Days in 2012 that everyone is hearing and talking about; I believe for me will be the beginning of a new age on this planet... I say good riddance to the past when it comes to bigotry, racism and hate of others because of their life choices or heritage...

This article is twelve (12) pages long, almost a mini book...**DOWNLOAD PDF** to your computer and read at your leisure.

Racism is a danger which has plagued America throughout its existence as a nation, over 230 years. In years following the heyday of the Civil Rights movement of the 60's this danger has both increased and receded. Many pundits have offered their opinions, explanations and accusations.

But where has this really left us?

Few persons since Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. have offered a clear path toward a resounding resolution to this issue which can be readily embraced by all concerned. Would Dr. Martin Luther King have supported Affirmative Action? Some say that his call to judge by the "content of one's character" indicates that he would not, but scholars who've researched his comments on the issue indicate that he would. Are those who oppose the continuance of [Affirmative Action](#) the modern equivalent of the 60's racist, as has been contended by noted activist Julian Bond - or do organizations such as the [NAACP](#), where Bond is chairman, signify the face of modern racism with its clearly race based (Where 'CP' equals "colored people") point of view?

Or are none of these people "racist" at all, but merely attempting to solve the same problem using different means?

Many questions need to be answered ... this work is my attempt to answer them as best I can from my own humble perspective and experiences.

What is a Racist?

There can be many answers to this question, and many different *types* of racists.

Type #1 The Haters

The prototypical racist is one who expresses fear, loathing and hatred for persons who are of a particular race or ethnic background. These are most often the people who come to mind when the term "racist" is applied. Persons during the "golden era" of the Civil Rights movement were embodied by the [KKK](#), corrupt law enforcement such as Sheriff Bull Connor whose force to quell *peaceful* protests, or Alabama Governor George Wallace who authorized such use of force and once proclaimed "Segregation Forever".

But is this truly an accurate picture of the perspective of these people? Are they simply hateful and nothing more?

The modern equivalent to the [KKK](#) of old continues to exist and to expose their point of view. Former grand wizard David Duke has created the "National Association for the Advancement of White People" or [NAAWP](#). But by supplanting the KKK there has also come a new breed.

The Racist Skinhead.

Disaffected White Youths, dressed in Dr. Martens boots, close cropped or shaved heads, with a tendency toward violence and mayhem. Lesser known racist organizations such as "Christian Identify" groups such as the Church of the [Aryan Nations](#) (aka The Church of Jesus Christ Christian) continue to exist and grow in the modern age. Just as god and the bible was used to justify and maintain slavery, segregation and the internment of Japanese-Americans in previous years, these organizations argue

"...that Adam, man of Genesis, is the placing of the White Race upon this earth. Not all races descend from Adam. Adam is the father of the White Race only.... Genesis 5:1"

In modern times the Hater/Racist has gone paramilitary, gaining ties with the Militia movement via groups such as the *National Alliance*. People who plan and conspire to eventually overthrow the U.S. Government which they feel has violated and voided the Constitution, and start a race war which will cleanse the American Nation of the "mongrel hordes", just as is foretold in the bible/bluebook of modern militant racism, "[The Turner Diaries](#)." The book is a fictionalized novel documenting the final war between Aryans and other races for control of America. A novel which describes the destruction of a Federal Building by use of ammonium-nitrate bomb (the same technique was used by Timothy McVeigh and others to destroy the *Murray Federal Building in Oklahoma City* - [The Turner Diaries](#) was reportedly McVeigh's favorite book) and also the murder of an outspoken Jewish radio talk show host by a secretive military "cell" group known as [The Order](#). (A sub-group of members of the Aryan Nations were arrested and convicted of the murder of Jewish radio talk show host Alan Berg in 1984, the group called itself "The Order" as well...based on their "Turner Diaries" inspiration)

Non-white groups of "haters" also exists. Many people point to the Louis Farrakhan and the [Nation of Islam](#) as an example of black separatism, and violently anti-white and anti-Semitic rhetoric. Many others disagree with this view, pointing out that even though the Nation of Islam does expose very strong and often harsh criticisms, it has never been involved in the repeated acts of violence even remotely similar to the KKK or Skinheads.

Strangely, or maybe not so strangely, most of these organizations do not consider themselves to be "hateful", but argue that there are only doing what they have to, out of "love". Love for their particular way of life, their culture and their continued survival.

Love for themselves....all others be *damned*?

Sounds like hatred to me.

Contrary to the claims of people like [Dinesh D'Souza](#) who wrote the book, "The End of Racism," violence by these groups have gradually increased over the last few years according to the data available from the FBI, the [Simon Wiesenthal Center](#), and the [Southern Poverty Law Center](#) (an organization responsible for virtually bankrupting the Klan) which maintains an annual [Intelligence Report for 2009](#) on the activities of [Racial Hate Groups](#). Also check out [Truthdig report](#) on, "[Closet Racism in the Age of Obama](#)." Their danger should not be dismissed as irrelevant or meaningless in modern times - but neither should anyone be paralyzed with fear of them. Many of these groups remain small even with active and virulent recruitment efforts. Pointing a finger at these people as being in the "wrong", is easy and frankly ignores the depth and gravity of the racial issues that divide within this nation.

Type #2 [Covert Racist](#)

Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act, the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, it has become a crime to act out on the types of racist ideas that are exposed by a [Type #1-Hater Racist](#). Just as many of violently racist organizations have gone underground, there are many other individuals who share their views.

Being an open Racist was no longer considered *en vogue* until eight years ago...

Demonstrations or marches by and for racist causes were often picketed, banned and shutdown before they could occur. Casually exposing the flaws and failures of a particular racial group, or the greatness and wonders of another racial group was no longer a common occurrence.

Most people feel that this is a good thing, and take it as a sign that Racism in America is diminishing.

That point of view is somewhat debatable, however. It has come back with a vengeance within the past eight years. This time the Racist are in the minority in this country.

Take Republican Rep. Joe Wilson for example...

Looking into the background of Rep. Joe Wilson, R-South Carolina, after his heckling of President Obama last night, I came across [this](#):

*Joe also has been a member of the Columbia World Affairs Council, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Sinclair Lodge 154, Jamil Temple, Woodmen of the World, **Sons of Confederate Veterans**,*

This is an organization that, [as the SPLC has detailed assiduously](#), has been taken over in the past decade by radical neo-Confederates who favor secession and defend slavery as a benign institution. Leading the takeover is a radical racist named Kirk Lyons, who's been an important legal figure on the far right for some years. – [David Neiwert](#)

U.S. Rep. Joe Wilson's outburst to President Barack Obama during a speech to Congress last week was an act "based on racism" and rooted in fears of a black president. – Former President Jimmy Carter

Overt racialism, particularly Aryan and white-power racism, has been discredited and is generally frowned upon as not acceptable within polite and civil discourse. This does not mean that those who have these particular beliefs have necessarily *changed* their opinions, (although some of them *have*) it is also quite likely that they have decided to take the prudent course and limit their potential liability by not discussing their views with "outsiders" who do not share them. When and if they act on their biases, over the decades a method has been developed to establishing "plausible denial" for their actions.

[Egregious Discrimination Cases](#)....search [GOOGLE.com](#) for more.

Speaking generally, an example of the type of actions that could occur might be when someone (from the "wrong" group) is applying for a job is never given an interview or is told that the "position is filled"; when - in fact - it is not. The following are specific real life examples...

First Alabama Bank of Mobile Alabama

In conducting a compliance review of this Federal contractor, OFCCP's compliance officers discovered that there were disproportionately few minorities that had been hired for entry level clerical positions. Of 588 applicants, 143 were minorities. Of these, only 11 were hired, although minority applicants were as qualified as non minorities. A review of the interview notes of the bank's personnel officer included statements pertaining to race, the color of one's eyes, hair and other physical attributes. For example: One candidate who was selected was described as "attractive white female, blond hair, blue eyes, teller-type appearance." A black candidate not selected was labeled, "very large lips and hips, overweight, dark skin, black girl, her hair is longer than most, and appearance is not good enough to meet the public."

San Diego Marriot and Marina

During a tour of the facility, [OFCCP](#) compliance officers noted that there were no Black women in any visible jobs on the worksite, such as restaurant servers, banquet waiters, room service attendants, hostesses and guest attendants. From reviewing the contractor's workforce analysis and applications, OFCCP staffs found that while Black women applied for these jobs, and were in some instances better qualified than the nonminority selected, they were not selected and the contractor could not offer a nondiscriminatory reason for the non-selections. As a result of the compliance review, 34 Black women received job offers, back pay with interest minus interim earnings and other benefits totaling \$627,000.

Another example might be someone applying for loan being denied with only the vaguest of reasons given.

Yet another example might be someone attempting to rent a home is rejected or told that the space is no longer available, when this is not true.

How is the person that they have acted against to know the reason for their action?

Was it bigotry or just bad luck? Or was it discrimination or some other intangible subjective factor?

A racist or bigot in a position to take the above types of actions...a person in a position of responsibility or relative "power"...can have a devastating impact on people lives. Actions such as these, if taken for racial or bigoted reasons are illegal - however, if taken for *other* reasons which are considered "bona-fide"...are in fact, fully and completely legal. Determining the difference between the two possibilities is sometimes nearly impossible for the person that they have acted against.

Few of these people are caught in the act of discriminating or employing bias, unless they happen to "confess" their actions via documentation, or to someone who they incorrectly believe may be sympathetic and supportive of their actions. The EEOC and OFCCP have attempted to determine this kind of bias in effect by using [Audits](#) and [Civil Rights Testers](#)...as opposed to quota or even goal based systems.

The long term result of this behavior has been an air of increasing fear, suspicion and outright paranoia among those people who may have, or may not have been the victims of the actions of a covert racist - even while the actions of unqualified overt racists have certainly diminished since the Civil Rights Era. Accusations are made, fingers are pointed. Sometimes incorrectly, which in turn brings bitterness and resentment by people who have *not* acted out of racism or bigotry, but are accused of it all the same?

As success is achieved and progress is made, further progress becomes more and more difficult and challenging.

Furthermore, this situation is worsened by the actions of the Type #3-Racist.

There are often many situations where race is a factor but the person considering those particular factors is not a "hater", either overtly or covertly. Various situations where people are unfamiliar with each other require them to make "snap" decisions.

When meeting someone for the first time in a dark alley, practically any person will have a tendency to assess any others in a fairly quick, slap-dash fashion. They will, in the effort of self-protection, attempt to answer several internal question, while having very little factual data.

- Does he (or she) *look* dangerous?
- Is he (or she) watching me?
- Is he (or she) moving to a position to attack or confront?

America is world famous for its level of crime and violence, especially within its cities. Extraordinary tragedies of death are common fixtures on our news and media. Although in all fairness when considering a population of over 200 Million - an annual murder rate of 1/10,000th of that (approx 20,000 per year) is not quite as frightening. Far more people die of traffic accidents and suicide in America than violent murder by a margin of over 2 to 1, but *Fear* sells. It drives the news media. It sells newspapers; it keeps news programs on the air and provides the grit for the right-wing entertainment mill as well. One of the facts often and repeatedly reported in the news media is the percentage of minority, particularly young black men, who are arrested for violent crimes. Considering the frequency at which this is reported, it would be rather difficult *not* to take this into account when running through the questions..."Does he look dangerous"? - By consciously or sub-consciously appending..."Does he look dangerous - like one of those violent young black criminals?"

Essentially, it is common for most people to act as amateur statisticians, mentally calculating the odds and percentages for various outcomes when they encounter a person they have very little information about. It is entirely "Rational". A decision or judgment which is circumstantially based on very limited facts and information. Not only does this occur in dark alleys, but in banks when loans are applied for, and in job interviews. This is why most people endeavor to present their "Best Face" when in these situations, even though doing so actually legitimizes this type of "Rational" Discrimination by catering to it.

Like most real life situations, these kinds of events of discrimination can be seen from multiple dimensions. There is more than just a "one-way" street. Let's take the alley scenario and presume that our first hypothetical person decides when spotting another person, to exit the alley based on the presumed risk to them purely based on the "Look" of the other person.

What then is the second person likely to presume?

If it is reasonable and "rational" for the first person to act on limited visual information, would it also not be reasonable for the second person (similar to the victim of "Covert Racism") to make some presumptions based on the first persons action, even if those presumptions may be completely wrong?

"Discrimination" in its most basic form means to make a decision; to make a *choice*. Making a choice - discriminating, in and of itself is not wrong - however what may be wrong may be the method employed in making the choice. Has it been fair? Has it been reasonable or has it been premature? Has the first person in this scenario acted in a discriminatory and/or bigoted manner for presuming that the second one is a danger, simply because of the way they look? Would the second person be a bigot for presuming that the first person has behaved in a bigoted way by acting in accord with their own self-preservation?

The answers depend on the circumstances. Certainly addition elements can be brought to light on this scenario which would get more or less credence to the presumption of either person. In either case, we are still dealing with two persons who in all good faith are not *Haters*, or *Covert Racists*. They are simply people who have rationally "played the odds", and decided to err on the side of caution in both cases.

This kind of discrimination is the kind that has been reportedly perpetrated by Taxi Cab Drivers in many cities across the nation, such as Washington DC and New York. Cab Drivers are in fact, robbed at a fairly high frequency, often at gunpoint. Many of them have opted to use *discretion* when accepting fares which "appear" to be more dangerous than others. This has often meant that they have avoided taking on young black men as fares. Their choices in this are often bolstered by information reported by the media, from

places like the [Bureau of Justice Statistics](#), which indicate that the lifetime likelihood of a black male going to prison is nearly 8 times higher than for whites (16.5% compared to 2.5% respectively).

Even *black* Cab Drivers have been shown to behave in essentially the same manner, avoiding "undesirables". (And of course, there is the very famous Jesse Jackson comment about turning around and seeing that he was being followed by someone *white*, and feeling relieved) The argument has thus been made that this isn't really - "racism" as black people are prone too it as well, but that ignores the fact that "race" is still an integral component - even if the persons involved are of the same race.

The problem of "Rational Discrimination" is clearly pervasive, but does that make it right?

Even if you are to take one of the most egregious statistics available, that nearly 1/3 of black males between the ages of 18-24 have been under the supervision of the justice system, and look at it another way, that same information indicates that nearly 2/3 of young black men have *not* so much as received a parking ticket. Nearly 2/3 have never been accused of a crime or been in a court of law, but the point of fact is that - contrary to popular belief - you can't visually tell the third that has some type of criminal record (which could in fact mean everything from probation for a traffic ticket up to an including murder) from the other two thirds that *DO NOT*.

What has happened, even in the Cab Driver scenario is that more often innocent people are being unlawfully denied services and treatment to which they are entitled, simply because of the preconception and ultimately prejudice of other people. People who *don't* hate them. People who, if you were to confront them, would be quite taken aback, if not indignant at the accusation of "racism" on their part. Many of those so accused - then presume that the "true" racist is the person making the accusation rather than themselves - and so the cycle continues. One finger pointed, and then leads to another finger pointed *back*, and so on, and so forth...

No, none of this is "racism" per se. This is *fear and laziness* on the part of both of these people in this scenario. Neither has taken the time or applied the personal *courage* required to find the truth. Unfortunately, *Racism* is exactly what the results of their actions wind up being, even if unintentionally.

What is Race?

Many have argued that there are 5 or 7 distinct "races" in the world. Usually these "races" correspond with the various continents and land masses on the earth, with each race designating a particular continent as their "Homeland".

However, this idea has given way in recent times to a different idea. One that what it is we consider "race" has far more social and cultural significance than it does genetic. Reports of work with the [Human Genome Project](#) have shown that there are as many genetic differences *between* people within the same racial classification, as can be found between nearly any two people of *different* racial classifications.

This idea is further supported by the common idea to consider Hispanics as a "Race", when Hispanic people can be just as blue-eyed, blond and light-skinned as any Anglo or dark as any African or Native American.

Ultimately there is only one "Race" in the world...The Human Race.

What we commonly call "Race", is in fact a matter of social convenience, not a matter of predetermined genetics. Therefore Racism itself has been argued by some to be an artificial construct, rather than a universal one, and that it therefore can be "cured" or completely removed from our daily lives.

I find this particular argument dubious. Although we may not have always used the term "race" the way we do now, we have certainly always recognized that individuals are different, as well as individuals are similar. Those that are similar are often more comfortable with each other and might congregate together, which also means they have separated themselves from other individuals who are different, creating factions.

Factions have always been with us, and always will. The long term issue, to my mind, shouldn't be trying to eliminate factionalism, for that is a fruitless task, but to devise ways in which different individuals, and different factions, can maintain a healthy respectful relationship *in spite* of their differences and similarities.

So is race something we *are* or is it things we *do*?

To some extent, it is both and neither - to a large extent, both race and racism are matters of what we individually *believe*.

People are free to believe whatever they might wish, but they are also responsible for the actions they take based on those beliefs.

Are Stereotypes ever justified?

Ste-reo-type n. 1. Something conforming to a fixed or general pattern; esp.: a standardized mental picture that is held in common and that represents an oversimplified opinion or affective attitude. 2. A metal printing plate made from a mold of set type.

All forms of racism are usually taking actions based on a Stereotype. Some have argued that the solution to racism is to therefore, remove all Stereotypes.

They argue that Hollywood and the media perpetuates negative stereotypes about certain peoples, particularly those that are black. The assumption being that Hollywood has a responsibility to present minority characters in the best possible light.

But I think this issue creates an even greater danger...the idea that the scarcity of black characters in Hollywood (or the media and entertainment industry in general) tends to push forward the idea that every black character presented should be "representative" of the best and most positive aspects of those particular people - this is just as much a distortion of reality as the stereotype itself.

It simply isn't realistic on several levels. It isn't how movies get made...they get made based on having a high likelihood of generating money. Characters appear in films based on the quality of the character. Actors get parts (usually) based on the quality of their acting.

The idea that simply because social preconceptions and stereotypes exist...you can't address them or reflect the reality of them in film or TV is (common, but I think) preposterous.

If the characters are good, the actors are good and everybody involved is working under good faith (which isn't always the case)...chances are enough diverse black characters will become available that the fact that they all aren't saints will become irrelevant.

Essentially, I believe that the "stereotype" problem would continue anyway, but instead of being false, unflattering stereotypes they would become false, *flattering* ones.

Also many movie characters are based, at their core, on real people and real events. Or at the very least *realistic* people, whom the film producers judge are believable because they reflect back a reality that we are already experiencing in large measure. Often more compelling dramas are taking place on the News, than in the theater. Quite a few stereotypes arise from the simple reporting of the factual news, regardless of editorial bias.

Factual information from the Census Bureau concerning average incomes, crime statistics, levels of education by various people from various backgrounds...all, continue to foster *stereotypes*.

None of this addresses the root cause of stereotypes themselves (they are *short-cuts*), or their miss-use by individuals who assume they are true about other individuals when they are not (which is the real problem). Overall, trying to "remove" or "ignore" them is no improvement, some people will still miss-use them.

The assumption that all stereotypes should be avoided is, I think...an extremely Politically Correct argument - but I personally, don't tend to be very "PC". I say what I believe, not what's "popular" or necessarily "acceptable". For my own personal purposes and the purpose of this article - *truth* is crucial; even unpleasant truths.

The "PC" argument almost appears as if to say, that simply because a rifle can be used to kill a human as well as hunt for food...that no rifles should be used, as opposed to holding the *user* responsible for the quality of his or her usage of what is essentially - a tool.

I think ultimately, the questions involving the quality of human life hinges more on our judgment and responsibility in properly using the tools we have before us...not on a restrictive path that assumes we are all incompetent, untrustworthy, and irresponsible and should have those tools taken away.

Setting such a low standard, increases the chances that we may live-down to its level, rather than live up to our personal responsibilities.

What keeps us apart? (Sources of the Fear)

All forms of bigotry, prejudice and stereotypes are essentially based on concepts, opinions, knowledge and memory. Specifically it is the way in which our brains process this information that causes much of our problems.

Memory Associations

There are several methods which can be used to memorize ideas and concepts. Typically people use repetition (cramming) to force an idea from their short-term memory into their long-term memory. But there are other methods which occur naturally. One of the most effective is by *association*, linking something that is unfamiliar conceptually to something that is familiar. (For example: Visualizing a shopping cart on your front porch may help you remember to get groceries on the way home...)

Stereotypes are essentially an association between two items, one which is known and one which is unknown. Because associations are a natural part of the way our minds and memories function there is no real way to avoid the formation of stereotypes, per se, and in and of themselves stereotypes are neither good nor bad, they just are.

The Paradigm Effect

The situation turns problematic when multiple and overlapping associations occur. Generally, people are more likely to form conceptual associations which are similar to associations which they already have. Familiar ideas are easier to accept and believe. They are re-affirming and supportive of a point of view. These ideas seem to almost **leap** out at us. Conversely, concepts which are contrary to our already held ideas, concepts and associations become increasingly more and more difficult to fathom as time goes on. In some cases they can become physiologically "invisible" to a person. People literally can't comprehend or see them in their mind's eye.

Collections of association and concepts which enhance and support a particular point of view are called *Paradigms*. The tendency for associations and concepts which are contrary to a person's current point of view to be ignored and discounted is called the *Paradigm Effect*. The impact of this effect has been documented throughout history. Scientist who simply and honestly looked at the facts like Galileo and Copernicus were ostracized, intimidated, and threatened for presenting new concepts and ideas...they were outside the accepted Paradigm which was held by the "mainstream" of society (and church) of the day.

When people conceptualize about other people of various heritage and/or cultures ("Races" if you will) they quite naturally use associations and create stereotypes, which in turn become part of complex Paradigms. It is my view that Prejudice and bigotry are the result of the Paradigm Effect *on* Stereotypes...when facts and the truth concerning individual people are ignored in favor of the previously conceived group which they have been associated with.

The Paradigm Shift

The answer to racism therefore, is for individuals to form "open ended" Paradigms, which support what is called a Paradigm Shift, which is what occurs when a person (or persons) come to the realization that their current Paradigm is inadequate and/or inaccurate and they revise it by (finally) accepting and incorporating new information which had been previous ignored, or gone unrecognized.

Everyone forms associations in their mind; it's unavoidable since that is partially how our minds function. Everyone builds Paradigms from these associations.

Everyone...

But, we must not allow ourselves to simply rest on our own individual Paradigms; we must constantly seek to challenge them, especially when the Paradigms themselves are taken out of context. A Paradigm (or a simple stereotype) which applies to a particular group, may or may not necessarily have any validity when applied to any particular individual within that group.

If *that* is one of the first conceptual Paradigms that a person forms and learns, then that person is essentially "inoculated" from bigotry and prejudice. But if it is not, then overriding their current Paradigm with this idea becomes increasingly difficult as time goes on and they become more and more entrenched in their particular point of view.

There is no way to guarantee which Paradigms any individual will form. But if we have a clearer picture of the problem, we can devise methodologies to help us reach the goal.

Unfortunately, there is no magic bullet to erasing racism, bigotry or prejudice. It will always be with us to some degree because it is a "natural" by-product of how we "nurture" knowledge.

It will always, to some extent, keep us apart.

What can bring us together?

The fact is that what we commonly call races are actually different social groups which share a common familial and cultural heritage. Each has their own unique perspective and is signified by *that* more than they are by any physical or visual traits which may be apparent.

This idea has given rise to a new concept of how to solve racism.

Assimilation

It is believed by some that, at least within America, the natural course of social and cultural evolution leads to the assimilation of disparate cultures into one single mainstream culture (or *faction*). That once this is accomplished, our "differences" will disappear and we will all finally "get along", because will all finally be "one" - with a common set of allegiances and goals. It is argued that the continued divisiveness within America is the result of those who *resist* assimilation by separating themselves into ethnic, cultural and social enclaves.

But is it really even feasible for everyone to join the same "faction"?

Is the idea viable that in order to reduce partisan strife, we should all become members of the same political party? Which party would that be? Would the largest one win by default? What tools would be used to entice the *stragglers* to join the new all inclusive party?

It would, similarly, be like requiring everyone to join the same religion.

Wouldn't this create many more problems than it solves? A single party system would be prone to monopoly abuse. It would act to preserve itself by stifling opposing viewpoints and different ideas from those that were officially sanctioned by it. The same would be true of a monopolistic cultural structure. Individual freedom would be greatly endangered by such an event.

To some extent assimilation *does* work for immigrants and immigrant cultures. The choice of coming to America voluntarily tends to mean that a person wishes to participate in what America has to offer. That usually entails it's culture, it's economy and it's protections of personal freedom. It is quite common for immigrants, and their native born children to minimize elements of their native culture and adopt elements of American culture readily. Conversely, portions of their culture are often co-opted into the mainstream of America forming a link between the two cultures.

In and of itself there is nothing wrong with this. However, there are several cultural strains within America which are *not* founded on immigrants and immigration.

America's Native Cultures vs. it's Immigrant (Assimilated) Cultures

The first is the culture of Native American's, which clearly predates modern American culture by many centuries. America was once the home of many proud Indian Nations, each with its own unique culture, traditions, language, religion and point of view. The modern day Native American civilization and culture is still merely a shadow of itself, and is still greatly divided on how and how much of the ancient traditions can maintain their relevance in the modern world.

The second is the culture of Latinos and Hispanics, which is a hybrid of Native American and Latin cultures originating largely in Spain. Modern day Latino's and Hispanics are the ancestral decedents of the *mestizo*, who were part Indian (Native American) and part Spanish. The impact of assimilation on the indigenous culture of these peoples clearly shows that much of their Native American heritage has been abandoned in favor of the language, religion and traditions of what had been Spanish *Conquistadors*.

The culture of these indigenous peoples has been practically *assimilated* out of existence.

The third indigenous American cultures is that of Blacks. Contrary to the opinion of some, it's basic genesis isn't from Africa, it's America. Some of its elements come from Africa, but very few largely because of the process of "identity stripping" that took place as African Slaves were brought to America. Some have argued that "Black Culture" doesn't exist, but there are many examples to indicate this is incorrect.

1. They were not allowed to speak their natives tongues, nor were they properly taught English - hence they created a hybrid language using English words with African syntax ("Juba") - this was used as a means to communicate freely among blacks by disguising what was said apparent "gibberish" so as to avoid punishment from overseers - over generations this changed becoming the *Jive* speak of the early 20th century jazz juke-joint during Jim Crow, to modern speech of modern Hip-Hop, commonly referred to as Black Vernacular Speech or *Ebonics*.
2. Their names were taken from them and new "Americanized" ones provided (Just as many indigenous Indians had their names "Spanish-sized"), if any. They created new names and families which crossed what had been tribal and geographic lines in Africa.
3. New customs were adopted to deal with many families broken by random sale or trade of a member. Their native method of worship was denied and they were not originally allowed participate in American churches - eventually this gave rise to an independent church system. Black Baptist. (AME) African Methodist Episcopal and Nation of Islam as well as others.
4. Slaves were often given what was considered *refuse* for food. Hog-jowls, Pigs Feet, and Chitterlings (pig intestines), together with vegetables like Collar Greens, Black Eyed Pees. From that sprang new forms of cuisine, commonly referred to as "Soul Food".

5. Music in Africa was primarily a means of communication rather than entertainment. From the Black Churches sprang a unique form of music (Gospel, Spirituals) which expressed the level of pain, frustration and hope in the kinds of dramatic outbursts that blacks were not allowed to voice in public.

6. Following the Gospel and Negro Spirituals of 19th Century, came Jazz, Blues, Rock n' Roll, Soul, Motown, Funk and Hip hop of the 20th - all were the expressions (originally and predominantly) of blacks in response and reaction to the circumstances of their lives under Jim Crow, through the Civil Rights Movement, up to today and our current social climate.

Unlike immigrant cultures - there is no real evidence that Native American, Latino, or Black culture thrives in any way, shape or form on any other "homeland" than America, as the culture of Polish, Irish, Asian, Jamaican, or even more recently immigrated African's does.

It therefore follows that if these cultures were completely *assimilated* into the mainstream, they would cease to exist for all practical purposes. (*Elements* which are absorbed into the mainstream would exist, but largely as *echoes* of a culture that would no long function, change or grow)

Would this be a good thing or bad thing?

Personally, I don't see it as good on any level. Assimilation may be a natural process for immigrant cultures, but it isn't for indigenous ones, and America has several different indigenous cultures as I have pointed out.

Which one should be dominant? How will that dominance be achieved and enforced? Will those who fail to subscribe to the dominant mainstream culture be ostracized and harassed for their defiance and refusal to *conform*?

Does this kind of ostracism, harassment and intimidation typify the Jim Crow period of American History? Wasn't it endemic of the internment of Japanese American's during World War II? Wasn't it used to proclaim that the Native American's were uncivilized savages, deserving of nothing but death and enslavement? Didn't it justify and excuse the horrid treatment that the Irish received in America?

I don't believe this is the path we should embark upon. This is not a real solution to the problem of racism.

Respect for Freedom

The [U.S. Constitution](#) states "nor shall any state deprive any person of life, *liberty*, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

"**Liberty**" is defined in [Webster's dictionary](#) as

1: the quality or state of being free: a: the power to do as one pleases b: freedom from physical restraint c: freedom from arbitrary or despotic control d: the positive enjoyment of various social, political, or economic rights and privileges e: the power of choice.

"**Culture**" is defined as

5 a: the integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief, and behavior that depends upon man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generation's b: the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group.

So it follows that in order to preserve the right to "**Liberty**", you must preserve the freedom and *power of choice* by individuals to enjoy "social forms" which may involve their own unique independent *cultural (i.e.. social, racial, religious) group*.

With this in mind, I believe that the solution to the Hater and Covert Racist is vigorous (and *fair*) enforcement of Anti Hate, Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity Legislation. People are free to hate, if they

want to. However, when dealing with other people they are required to do so fairly and justly, not based on their hate.

I do not believe that Civil Rights need to turn into *Special* Rights for anyone in particular; I believe that people can be protected from abuse, without the protection itself become abusive, but that the danger and risk of this possibility should not be downplayed.

The solution to the "Unconscious" Racist is much more difficult, in my opinion and I think is where our efforts need to be focused primarily.

I believe that fundamentally, we are all Human...recognizing this concept is paramount to any solution. Also paramount is recognizing that we are all individuals, in some ways we are alike and in some ways we are different from each and every other individual.

1. We must commit ourselves to the idea that regardless of our differences *and* our similarities, we must *respect each other's freedom and right* to fair treatment - as is documented in the U.S. Constitution and the International Declaration of Human Rights.
2. This commitment should not be taken lightly, for it may often require us to bet against what commonsense and statistics tell us are the "odds", it may require us to take a personal risk in order to preserve fairness and the rights of others.
3. We have to be willing and able to *Shift* our own paradigms, to reflect the truth and reality accurately, not just the way we are comfortable.

To a large extent, none of the above is "natural". It doesn't just "happen" and it's not going to unless people put forth the effort needed. Fighting racism takes *personal courage*, and unless people draw forth the courage to fight the pre-conceptions, laziness, fear and hate both inside and out, things will not improve. People have to commit themselves to this struggle and keep that commitment.

Individually...One at a time...

I hold no illusion that *everyone* will make this commitment, we are after all, different individuals, but my hope is that with this and other knowledge as our tools we can do far better than we have. With these tools, at least we will be fighting the problem and not each other.

And we do have a very long way to go in this struggle. Together we can make the change for a better life!

Original essay by F.V. Walton 1998 and Edited by Chris the Abducted Alien