

Truth and Reconciliation in America

By Ira Glasser

*All men are created equal . . .
endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . .
among [which] are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.*

-Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

America's Original Sin

The idea of natural rights that became contagious in colonial America during the late 18th century was radical because it was the first time in history that a nation was founded on the principle that rights were not given by governments, nor could they legitimately or morally be taken away by governments. To say that rights were "unalienable" meant precisely that every human being was endowed with certain rights at birth; that is why no government could legitimately or morally usurp them. Indeed, the very purpose of government was to protect the rights with which people were born. "To secure these rights," the Declaration announced, "governments are instituted among men [sic]." No government had ever before been created for this purpose.

No exceptions were contained in the broad and sweeping language of the Declaration. The implications were radical: if every human being was born with fundamental rights that no government could legitimately take away, if indeed the very purpose of government was to secure those rights, then every human being must be entitled by law to have his– or her– rights respected and protected.

How then could women be denied the right to vote– unless they were less than human? How could American Indians be treated so brutally and denied the right of citizenship– unless they were less than human? And how could slavery be accepted– unless Africans and their descendants were less than human? The denial of rights in early America thus required the denial of a person's humanity, of an entire group's humanity. Dehumanization became part of the founding ideology of post-colonial America, an ironic consequence of its sweeping belief in natural, or God-given, law as the origin of human rights.

Many early Americans were not blind to these contradictions, particularly with respect to slavery, and more than a few wrote and spoke passionately about it on the eve of the American Revolution and afterward.

The early Americans were so sensitive to the horror and degradation of slavery that they were quick to see it lurking in every illegitimate reach of government power. The Stamp Act was seen as a step toward slavery. Denial of the right to trial by jury was seen as a step toward slavery. The unlimited power to search was seen as paving the way toward slavery. In this context, the presence of a completely enslaved African population in America inescapably created a cancerous contradiction in the body politic. How could political leaders in the colonies seek liberty for themselves while they tolerated or even imposed the complete denial of liberty to others? If slavery was the ultimate evil, to be resisted even at its earliest stages, how could it be permitted in its extreme form? As one American pamphleteer put it, "What is a trifling three-penny tax on tea compared to the inestimable blessings of liberty to a captive?" In 1765, the Reverend John Camm put it pointedly. What does "all men are born free," mean? he asked. Does it mean "that Negroes are not ... born slaves, or that the said slaves are not men?" In 1770, Samuel Cooke pled "the cause of our African slaves," and in 1773, Benjamin Rush begged "advocates of American liberty" to rouse themselves to oppose slavery. "The plant of liberty is of so tender a nature that it cannot thrive long in the neighborhood of slavery," he wrote.

As the conflict with England deepened and liberty became a rallying cry against unjust exercises of power, the contradiction of slavery became harder to ignore. The "slavery we suffer," Samuel Hopkins wrote in 1776, "is lighter than a feather"

compared to the “heavy doom” of the African slaves. A colonial printer who was loyal to Great Britain attacked the hypocrisy. How could the rebels ground their rebellion in their professed love for liberty, he asked, and yet “themselves own two thousand Negro slaves?” There was no good answer to this question.

The contradiction may have become impossible to ignore, but it was not resolved. In the end, it was tolerated.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that “the abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire,” but he owned slaves himself and took no serious steps to outlaw the slave trade even when he was president. Patrick Henry, the fiery Anti-Federalist who refused to accept the original Constitution without a bill of rights, wrote that he looked forward to a time “when an opportunity will be offered to abolish this lamentable evil.” But that time would have to wait because, Henry said, “the general inconvenience of living here without them” made freeing the slaves impractical.

And so the great 18th-century apostles of American liberty came to tolerate the greatest possible denial of liberty in their midst. The contradictions were left unresolved, and the inhuman denials of liberty based on skin color became imbedded in American culture. The Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, was written in linguistic denial: the word “race” appeared nowhere in the original documents; neither did the word “slavery.” Like the Declaration, the Bill of Rights was written in broad language that appeared to exclude no one. But it was well understood that in fact there was a race exception to the Constitution, and it endured for most of the two centuries that followed.

It is important to understand that African slaves and their descendants were denied not only the fundamental rights of free speech, freedom of religion, trial by jury and other rights protected by the Bill of Rights. Nor was their condition merely one of peonage or economic servitude. No, the bondage in which Blacks found themselves in the American South was, beyond denial, deeply dehumanizing. For in America, where it was universally believed that all human beings are born with rights that no government could legitimately take away, American slavery could be legitimized only by regarding the slaves as subhuman. In fact, dominant White culture systematically denied the humanity of Blacks. Under the “slave codes” that controlled every aspect of their lives, slaves had no access to the rule of law. They could not go to court, make contracts, nor own any property— not even highly personal

items. A slave could not strike a White person, even in self-defense. Rape was common, and the rape of an enslaved woman by someone other than her owner was considered trespassing upon a White man's property, rather than a criminal assault upon a human being.

No notion of fairness or due process of law diluted the harshness of these codes, which were mercilessly enforced by slave tribunals whose procedures made the old English Star Chamber seem a model of fairness. And the tribunals were not the only means of enforcement: terrorist night patrols; public ceremonies of humiliation and torture, such as whipping, branding, and even boiling in oil; imprisonment without trial under conditions even more painful than slavery itself; and death by hanging— all were pervasive fea-

tures of life in the American South. Hundreds of desperate rebellions took place, undoubtedly many more than history has recorded, but few participants survived. Against all this, the Bill of Rights offered no shelter. Politics and racism became reified in the American culture and, from the beginning, overcame law and right.

Like a cancer, the fiction that skin color is a proxy for talent, character, intelligence, and humanity spread throughout the body politic . . .

Even worse, the fiction that skin color matters, that it is a legitimate distinction among people, that it signifies a lesser degree of humanity, was created and maintained. Over the years, that fiction became embedded in our social and political structures. It established and nourished sharp limits on opportunity and therefore on achievement.

Differential levels of achievement in employment, education, and politics— themselves the product of discrimination and subjugation— became, ironically, so associated with skin color that they began to furnish additional justifications for discrimination. Like a cancer, the fiction that skin color is a proxy for talent, character, intelligence, and humanity spread throughout the body politic, seeped below the surface of our professed ideals and corroded them from within.

From the beginning, not everyone was swept along, just as some had spoken strongly and passionately against slavery at the time of the Revolution. Throughout the first half of the 19th century, those who advocated the abolition of slavery, though unsuccessful, kept the beacon of liberty shining throughout the long night. And they did so on moral grounds.

William Lloyd Garrison, the nation's most uncompromising White abolitionist, denounced slavery for more than 30 years from the pages of his newsletter and in fiery speeches, often in the most apocalyptic terms. Once, he publicly burned a copy of the United States Constitution, calling it

“a covenant with death and an agreement with Hell.” Garrison was sued, fined, imprisoned and abandoned by more moderate abolitionists. But he would neither relent nor apologize. “Slavery will not be overthrown,” he insisted, “without excitement, a most tremendous excitement.”

In 1857, at the peak of Garrison's activities, an event occurred that seemed to vindicate Garrison's view of the Constitution. The Supreme Court decided the Dred Scott case, striking down as unconstitutional a federal law that had prohibited slavery outside the South. If the Supreme Court was right, the Constitution prohibited Congress from abolishing slavery not only where it already existed, but also where it did not yet exist.

Worse than the decision itself, however, was its justifying language. Blacks, wrote Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, were “subordinate and inferior beings” who “had no rights which the white man was bound to respect.” If that was what the Constitution meant, could Garrison's characterization of it be considered extreme?

Frederick Douglass, the most famous Black abolitionist of the time, saw the Dred Scott decision in more political terms:

The Supreme Court is not the only power in this world. We, the abolitionists and colored people, should meet this decision, uncalled for and monstrous as it appears, in a cheerful spirit. The very attempt to blot out forever the hopes of an enslaved people may be one necessary link in the chain of events preparatory to the complete overthrow of the whole slave system.

Four years later, the Civil War erupted, perhaps exceeding “the tremendous excitement” Garrison had imagined and certainly constituting a formidable link in the chain of events Douglass had prophesied.

Six months after the Civil War ended, on December 6, 1865, the 13th Amendment became part of the Constitution. Chief Justice Roger Taney was no longer alive to see it, but William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass were. The 13th Amendment, all but unimaginable less than a decade earlier, seemed finally to have resolved the contradictions the original Constitution had ignored. But its promises were not redeemed.

Almost immediately, the former slave states, seeking to maintain their subjugation of African-Americans, passed a series of laws that came to be known as the “black codes.” These codes literally resurrected many of the elements of the old slave codes. Blacks were not allowed to testify in court, for example, except in cases involving other Blacks. Blacks were also prohibited by law from holding certain jobs or occupations. In one state, they were prohibited

from becoming shopkeepers or mechanics; in another, they couldn't start any business without first getting a license, which could be arbitrarily denied and often was. Thus excluded from the right to pursue economic opportunities, many Blacks came to depend for their living on jobs performed under conditions little different from slavery. Laws making it a crime to be unemployed were passed, and Blacks could be arrested and jailed for quitting a job; the acceptance of peonage became a condition of “liberty.”

The right to meet or otherwise assemble peacefully was denied; residence in certain areas was prohibited. South Carolina barred Blacks from entering and living in the state entirely unless they posted a \$1,000 bond. All this was enforced by internal passport systems. Blacks were legally excluded from juries, from public office, and from voting. Racial intermarriage was a crime for which offenders could be sentenced to life imprisonment. The death penalty was provided for Black men accused of raping White women; no similar punishment was imposed on Whites who raped Blacks. Law enforced social deference to Whites: Blacks were prohibited from insulting Whites, or even from looking at them in the “wrong” way. Some codes also required separation of the races in public transportation and in schools. Most codes authorized whipping and the public pillory as punishment for violations of any of the codes, not to mention the more informal and often more brutal private punishments that terrorized the lives of Black people.

All this was put in place within a year of the adoption of the 13th Amendment. During the three decades that followed, Black Americans' hopes and aspirations were snuffed out, and White domination was restored. Slavery had been abolished, but subjugation remained, supported by laws designed to deny the most fundamental rights to Black citizens and to maintain White supremacy. It would take another century before the struggles of Black people began even minimally to redeem the promise of the post-Civil War Reconstruction, much less the original 18th century vision of universal liberty and equal rights.

During all those years, racial discrimination became deeply entrenched, not only in our laws, but also in our political and social institutions, personal habits, instincts, and culture. Racial violence against Blacks was common and irreparable, and Black people, especially and tragically young Black people, learned to limit their aspirations and suppress their dreams. Most Whites accepted this, and nearly all Whites benefited from it. And until 1954, the United States Supreme Court—the institution James Madison had thought would be “an impenetrable bulwark” for liberty—mostly legitimized it.

During the middle of the 20th century— nearly 100 years after slavery had formally been abolished— a Civil Rights Movement arose that finally succeeded in striking down the crudest legal barriers to equal rights. But it could not strike down the complex social effects of centuries of slavery and legalized, persistent racial discrimination. It could not strike down the institutionalized, economic disadvantages that still fell disproportionately upon Black people. And it could not strike down what W.E.B. Du Bois once called “centuries of instinct, habit, and thought.”

Where We Are Now

During 1997, the nation celebrated the 50th anniversary of Jackie Robinson breaking the color line in major league baseball. Until that day— April 15, 1947— players with dark skin had not— for that reason alone— been allowed to play professional baseball except in segregated leagues.

It was not because they were inferior players. Everyone, including White major-league players who had played with Black players off-season on exhibition tours, knew that there were many superior players in what used to be called the “Negro Leagues.” But skin color alone, despite merit, talent, or productivity, had until that day in 1947 been maintained as a barrier. Good players, even great players, had been subjugated merely on the basis of a superficial and irrelevant physical attribute— skin color.

Robinson’s feat, a spectacular athletic accomplishment under unimaginable pressure, was the first great public civil rights event of the post-World War II era. I was nine years old at the time, and living in Brooklyn, New York, far from any Black families. I did not know yet about Jim Crow laws. But, I learned through participation in that event about oppression based on skin color in a way no book or classroom could have taught me. And by watching Jackie Robinson and the players who followed him, I learned when I was very young, and in a way deeply meaningful to me at the time, that skin color had nothing to do with talent, ability, hard work, strength of character or any other trait that mattered. Skin color, it seemed to me then, was like eye color or hair color. It told you nothing about a man’s character or his ability to hit a baseball.

From there, it was not a hard jump to understanding that skin color also told you nothing about a person’s ability

Seven years after Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in baseball, the U.S. Supreme Court declared school segregation unconstitutional . . .

to play the violin or do mathematics, or about the desirability of a person moving next door or marrying into your family. I was not naive enough, even at that young age, to believe that skin color did not in fact act as a barrier, but it became impossible for me to consider such barriers legitimate or moral.

Seven years after Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in baseball, the U.S. Supreme Court declared school segregation unconstitutional and, 19 months after that, Rosa Parks sat down in a seat reserved for Whites in a bus in Montgomery, Alabama. A young, unknown Baptist minister named Martin Luther King, Jr. stood up to help her and organized a bus boycott that galvanized the nation’s moral attention. These events inaugurated the mid-20th century Civil Rights Movement. In those days, and the days that followed, the facts were clear and hardly in dispute: people were segregated and subjugated based on superficial attributes, primarily skin color, by custom everywhere and by laws in the South often through state sanctioned terrorism.

No one disputed these facts. The dispute was rather about legal and moral principles: was such segregation and subjugation right? Was it legal? Although the struggle over these principles surely and perhaps decisively took place in the streets as well as in the courts, the forum where transformational outcomes primarily occurred were legal forums: courts and legislatures.

The goals of the struggle were to strike down Jim Crow laws and pass in their place civil rights laws that would prohibit discrimination based on skin color in places of public accommodation, schools, employment and housing. In 1963, at the time of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, no such laws had been passed by Congress since Reconstruction. Yet by 1968— an astonishingly short time for so fundamental a change— this legal revolution was essentially won, at least formally. The legal infrastructure of segregation was destroyed, and a new legal infrastructure of antidiscrimination laws was in place.

No one should diminish the revolutionary consequences of that achievement. But at the time, few if any foresaw how limited that achievement would turn out to be. One current observer has noted that the effect of the Civil Rights Movement was to reduce discrimination and create equal opportunities only for those prepared to take advantage of it. What we know now is how deep the damage of slavery, discrimination, subjugation and dehumanization had pene-

trated, and how few were therefore ready to take advantage of the new formalities of legal equality. We also badly underestimated the intensity of resistance to the new equality and how enduring it would be.

Three decades later, we look out upon a landscape where legal equality is secure, but where serious and substantial color stratification remains— in education, employment, housing, health and imprisonment. These stratifications seem both deeply entrenched and relatively immune to the kind of litigation strategies that were so successful a generation ago. Moreover, no sense of moral urgency to do anything about these disproportions exists. Today, almost mad-deningly, public opinion surveys show that nearly everyone seems to subscribe to the legal principles of non-discrimination we fought so hard to establish three decades ago. These principles are no longer significantly in dispute. That is our victory.

At the same time, public opinion surveys show no strong belief among Whites in the need for continued remedies for inequalities based on skin color. It is not that disparities are denied. It is just that to many Americans those disparities no longer seem immoral or the consequence of majoritarian and state-sanctioned injustice.

The moral and legal principles of legal equality are nearly universally supported, but now the facts are in dispute: what is the cause of the persistent stratifications? Are such inequities due to discrimination— past or present— or to something else? Are African-Americans disproportionately trapped in poverty because they are victims of structural racism or because they have less capacity, less intelligence, less talent, and less character? Are they disproportionately on welfare because of structural unemployment that is itself related to discrimination or are they disproportionately lazy and unwilling to work? Are our schools failing Black children because of public neglect, underfunding and inequitable allocations of resources, or are these failures of Black children the result of their place at the bottom of the bell curve of talent and intelligence? Are Blacks disproportionately in prison because of what Troy Duster has called “a fantastically intricate web of interactions” (not to mention the disproportionate and nearly genocidal impact of the “war on drugs”) or because Blacks are as a group more genetically disposed to violent behavior?

These questions do not deserve to be taken seriously, but they are serious because they are being debated seriously in the forum of public opinion and among certain scholars. Public opinion polls show that large majorities of the American public, including large majorities of Whites, are

For many Americans, the racist explanations seem to ring true.

opposed to discrimination and want to remedy it where it exists. But many, perhaps most, of these same White Americans no longer strongly believe that there is much discrimination taking place now. What then, they ask, is the reason for the persistence of demonstrable, color-coded disparities?

This is where Charles Murray comes in. He has an explanation. Blacks as a race are statistically less able. The welfare “reformers” also have an explanation: Blacks are lazy or, if not innately lazy, have been robbed of their initiative by having been on the dole, a malady not apparently found among those born rich. And the drug warriors have a similar explanation: Blacks are disproportionately arrested for drug law violations because they disproportionately commit more drug law violations.

These explanations have little, if any, basis in fact. Charles

Murray’s “science” has been overwhelmingly skewered by scholars, and his racial theories have been shown to be closely related to the sordid histories of pseudo-science that Stephen Jay Gould has so well described in *The Mismeasure of Man*. The welfare “reformers” have been properly taken to task for ignoring the macro-economic problems in which persistent, structural unemployment occurs. Just as the dominant ideology of Victorian England blamed poverty on the lack of virtue among the poor, while ignoring the cataclysmic changes of the Industrial Revolution that changed the nature of joblessness and poverty, so today’s neo-Victorians have ignored the economic and technological changes that have widened the gap between rich and poor and permanently diminished the availability of manufacturing and low-skill jobs. They prefer instead to find laziness and the unwillingness of the poor to work as the cause for poverty. As for the drug warriors, their willingness to blame disproportionate criminality among Blacks as the reason for the exponential explosion of Black incarceration flies in the face of overwhelming facts, including the government’s own studies which a few years ago showed that only about 12 percent of drug users and dealers were Black, while nearly 40% of those arrested were Black.

Yet these rebuttals of racist explanations seem not to have penetrated the domain of public opinion. For many Americans, the racist explanations seem to ring true. Why should this be so? I would suggest several reasons:

1. We are operating in a different context economically. Although inflation is low and the stock market is booming, many Americans feel economically insecure. Wage disparities have widened dramatically since 1979. Where once

the wages of White males without a college education were only 30 percent less than those with a college education, by 1990 that disparity had widened to more than 70 percent. Where once one wage earner was sufficient to support an average family, today both spouses increasingly work because their combined wages are required. Many families are working longer hours and the everyday tasks of managing households and children have become frustrating and more difficult. Despite both parents working, many families cannot afford health care, cannot afford to educate their children, are burdened by the need to care for aging parents and are afraid for their own retirement years. For the first time since the end of World War II, a majority of Americans say that they think their children will be less well off than they are.

Optimism for the economic future has faded into insecurity for many American families. The spirit of generosity that characterized the '60s and was, in part, the result of widespread economic optimism has been replaced by a spirit of meanness and resentment born of fear and insecurity and whipped to a froth by pandering politicians who feed resentment and nourish fear as a certain path to electoral success. During the '80s this sort of pandering nearly became an art form, and many Whites came to believe that they were the victims of an excess of civil rights of Blacks and unfair advantages given to underserving minorities.

2. The Civil Rights Movement has encountered a generational disconnect. The legitimacy of resentment against civil rights remedies has taken especially strong root among the young. Speaking today on college campuses, one is forced to realize that college freshmen were not yet born when Ronald Reagan first became president in 1980. The experiences that shaped many of our lives and formed our perceptions of reality are not shared by them. When one speaks to the young about the Edmund Pettis bridge, the road to Selma or the 1963 March on Washington, one might as well be talking about the Ottoman Empire. This generation has come of age during a time when the sharp edges of racism have been blunted, when symbols of black achievement in politics, business, education, journalism and entertainment are highly visible and when their political leaders almost universally encouraged them to believe that there was no longer any need for effective governmental remedies to skin color stratifications. The events that moved us do not move them.

3. Ironically, the sharp edges of racism have been blunted by the successes of the Civil Rights Movement. The public could see and understand voting discrimination when it came in the form of Bull Connor and his cattle prods on the 6 o'clock television news. The moral urgency of vot-

ing discrimination was made clear to most Americans by a succession of searing events: fire hoses in Birmingham; the death by bombing of four little girls attending church on a Sunday morning; Viola Liuzzo shot dead from a passing car; Medgar Evers assassinated in his driveway; and James Chaney, Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman found shot dead and buried in a ditch by Mississippi police officers— all killed in reaction to efforts to help Black citizens register to vote.

But, despite the violence, those efforts succeeded. Today, Blacks freely register and vote, and Black elected officials are visible, even in the deep South in a way that was nearly unimaginable only 30 years ago. Voting discrimination still exists, but now it lurks behind an impenetrable shroud of statistics and arguments over complicated, inkblot shaped voting districts— arguments too abstract and remote to engage the public's sense of moral urgency or outrage.

4. We have not been good enough— certainly not as good as our opponents— at learning to market our facts and ideas for public audiences, particularly audiences who say they share our values but who do not share our views because they did not share our experiences. Our skills were developed a generation ago for the specialized audience of judges and the specialized language of courtrooms and legal analysis. We have a deficit of language and imagination in marketing our case to the public.

Moreover, we often make the wrong arguments. We argue legal principles when legal principles are no longer substantially in dispute. We do not sufficiently argue the facts at a time when crucial facts are seriously in dispute, and when different factual perceptions are driving political outcomes.

5. Above all, we seem to lack a strong moral vision.

Certainly, we do not often articulate such a vision. In the '60s, our vision dominated public discourse. Today the vacuum of our own visionary deficit has been filled by those who have cynically used our language— the language of fairness, nondiscrimination and color blindness— against us.

We are also often anachronistic. We think in terms and use the terms of our youth. Consider, for example, how we talk about race. We know what we mean by that term when we talk to each other. But the task is to talk to others who do not share our views. What does the term "race" mean to them? Often it means more than we intend when we use the term. And sometimes it unwittingly reinforces precisely what we wish most to avoid. I propose that we begin to talk about discrimination based on skin color instead of discrimination based on race. I propose that we begin to call attention to social and economic stratifica-

tions and disproportionate distributions of opportunities and benefits based on skin color, not race. Why?

Skin color implies a superficial physical attribute, nothing more. Race implies much more. Race implies fundamental, defining characteristics biologically linked to skin color or other superficial physical attributes. Race implies that skin-color is linked to fundamental qualities like character, talent, intelligence and honesty when we know it is not. The concept of race in that sense is a scientific and biological fraud. The concept of race is the concept of our enemies, a social and political construct designed to justify the oppression of dark-skinned people. Getting rid of that construct has been our central goal. The very use of the term "race" unwittingly reinforces the teachings of Charles Murray. It is a fiction, and we should abandon it.

This should become the centerpiece of our articulated moral vision. Alex Boraine has said that in order to have reconciliation in South Africa, we need to tell the truth, to find ways to change false perceptions. The myths are there, he said, and they must be destroyed.

In America, the key myth that needs to be destroyed is the myth that skin-color is a proxy, a marker for innate, genetically-based fundamental characteristics like intelligence, morality, capacity for hard work, criminal behavior, etc. If leadership in America requires a vision, my vision is the one being projected today in South Africa: the vision of a nonracial society— a society where skin color matters as little as eye color or hair color.

It is an ambitious vision, in South Africa as it would be in America, but we have never lacked ambition and there is no reason to stop now. By a nonracial society I do not mean to eradicate physical or cultural differences. Indeed, the eradication of such differences would require nearly genocidal suppression, not perhaps through actual genocide but through the slow death of assimilation. Even at its most benign, assimilation of differences implies hierarchy and subjugation, while true integration, as John A. Powell has pointed out, celebrates differences and finds a way to accept them on equal terms.

In America, the key myth that needs to be destroyed is the myth that skin-color is a proxy, a marker for innate, genetically-based fundamental characteristics like intelligence, morality, capacity for hard work, criminal behavior, etc.

But some differences are more meaningful than others. I believe we must project the vision that skin color, like hair color and eye color, is a superficial physical attribute signifying little. Skin color is not linked to more fundamental innate traits, and it is unfair, unjust, immoral and un-American to impose and maintain hierarchies and stratifications based on skin color.

The vision I propose is not without danger, however. Indeed, articulated mechanically, it can be strategically treacherous. Even as we articulate this vision, therefore, we must make it crystal clear that achieving the vision requires remedies for current hierarchies that take skin color into account. This is so because we do not write on a blank slate. We inherit a long history, reflected today, of imposed hierarchies based on skin color. A mechanical conversion to color blindness today would necessarily contribute to maintaining those hierarchies. That is why our opponents have adopted the language of color blindness. In fact, color blindness today is a barrier to achieving color blindness tomorrow because it ignores the reality of socially constructed color-based stratifications.

Our moral vision is of a society where benefits and opportunities are not linked to skin color. But our strategic imperative is to find a way to get from here to there, and in the world we have inherited we cannot do that without taking skin color into account. That is our dilemma.

Our task is daunting, but we should not, must not, lose the belief that we will prevail. Stamina is everything. Since the 1950s, skin color disadvantages have been unimaginably reduced, yet they remain startlingly substantial and highly resistant to further change.

Why should we be surprised? Skin color subjugation is America's original sin, written into the blood and bones of the body politic for hundreds of years. Why should we have thought that redemption could come in only 40 years of struggle and through the passage of a few laws and the rendering of a few court decisions, however fundamental and transformational they were? Redemption is not that easy or swift, but I believe we are up to it. As Frederick Douglass said after the Dred Scott decision in 1857, we must stay cheerful. And struggle wisely.

Chronology of Major Events

in the History of Brazil, South Africa and the United States

BRAZIL

- 1444** Portugal begins slave trade with Africa.
- 1494** Treaty of Tordesillas between Spain and Portugal grants Portugal the right to colonize lands east of a line 335 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands (this will include as-yet unknown Brazil).
- 1500** Cabral lands on the Northeastern coast of Brazil and claims land for Portugal.
- 1530** First Portuguese settlers arrive in Brazil.
- 1532** City of São Vicente founded.
- 1538** Direct importation of African slaves into Brazil begins.
- 1542** Duarte Coelho establishes first sugar mill in Pernambuco and receives permission from the Crown to import African slaves for plantation labor.
- 1548** Salvador Bahia established as viceregal capital of Brazil.
- 1555** Indians help French establish Rio de Janeiro.
- 1560s** Series of smallpox epidemics decimate Indian population of Brazil.
- 1567** Portuguese expel French from Rio de Janeiro.
- 1570** Crown prohibits Indian slavery; the law is not enforced in Brazil.
- 1575** Expedition from Rio de Janeiro crushes nearby Tamoios Indian settlements, killing 2,000 and enslaving 4,000.
- 1603** *Quilombo* (community of escaped slaves) Republic of Palmares founded near present-day Alagoas.
- 1609** *Paulista* armies begin raiding Jesuit missions in Paraguay for Indian servants.
- 1621** Smallpox epidemic ravages Amazonian Indians.
- 1621** Crown prohibits training of mulattos, Blacks and Indians as goldsmiths.
- 1630** Dutch East India Company seizes Pernambuco and other Northeastern captaincies; era of religious tolerance begins in northeast Brazil.
- 1645** Dutch expelled from Recife.
- 1648-49** Multiracial Brazilian forces defeat Dutch in Battle of Guararapes and begin to drive Dutch from northeastern Brazil.
- 1648** Portuguese recapture Angola from Dutch; Atlantic slave trade between Angola and Brazil reopens.
- 1654** Dutch withdraw from Pernambuco.
- 1692-94** *Paulista* army lays siege to and destroys Palmares *Quilombo*.
- 1692** Gold discoveries in present-day Minas Gerais region spark Brazilian gold rush; center of Brazilian slave economy begins to move to the south.
- 1708-09** War of the Emboabas: *Paulistas* fight Portuguese immigrants and northeastern Brazilians in Minas Gerais gold fields.
- 1710** Captaincies of Minas Gerais and São Paulo established.
- 1720** Royal control declared over captaincy of Minas Gerais.
- 1729** Diamonds are discovered at Sero do Frio Comerca.
- 1732** Crown abolishes color distinctions in Brazilian Army; Brazilians ignore the law.
- 1734** Free Blacks and mulattos expelled from Minas Diamond District for alleged smuggling.
- 1734** Crown prohibits Brazilians sending women to Portugal to discourage interracial unions in Brazil.
- 1750-1800** Cotton replaces sugar in plantation economy of northeast Brazil.

- 1755** Marquis de Pombal issues order encouraging marriage between Portuguese and Indians, proclaiming descendants of such marriages eligible for positions of honor and dignity.
- 1757** Pombal removes Indians from control of religious orders, establishes Directorate of Indians to integrate Indians into Brazilian colonial society.
- 1759** Pombal expels Jesuits from Brazil and seizes their property for the Crown.
- 1763** Viceregal capital moved from Bahia to Rio de Janeiro.
- 1769** Marquis de Lavradio begins coffee plantation in São Paulo.
- 1773** Crown orders that color should not disqualify persons from holding office in Brazil; law is ignored.
- 1775** Royal law encourages marriage between Whites and caboclos (children of White and Indian parents) but excludes Blacks and mulattos.
- 1798** Afro-Brazilian gold miners instigate Sastre Rebellion in Bahia.
- 1807** First Muslim Mâle slave revolt occurs in Bahia.
- 1808** Portuguese crown arrives in Rio de Janeiro.
- 1814** Famelic slave revolt occurs in Bahia.
- 1822** Empire of Brazil under Dom Pedro declares independence from Portugal.
- 1831** Anglo-Brazilian treaty bans importation of slaves into Brazil; it is not immediately enforced.
- 1831** Dom Pedro abdicates; Creole administration of Brazil begins.
- 1835** Muslim slaves and freedmen lead second Muslim Mâle revolt in Bahia.
- 1837** Sabinada revolt of women, children, and older slaves in Bahia is crushed, ending period of slave revolts in northeast Brazil.
- 1849** Quieroz anti-slave trade law is passed; Brazil begins enforcing Anglo-Brazilian treaty of 1831.
- 1849-50** British warships seize and destroy Brazilian slave ships in South Atlantic; slave imports into Brazil end by mid-decade.
- 1865-70** Paraguayan War: Brazilian government decrees that government-owned slaves who join the army will be emancipated; Blacks are conscripted into army and suffer overwhelming majority of casualties.
- 1869** Reform Club of the Liberal Party calls for a free-womb law.
- 1871** Rio Branco Law declares children born to slave mothers free and allows slaves the right to purchase their freedom.
- 1881** Non-Catholics, freedmen and naturalized citizens are granted the right to vote, subject to property requirements.
- 1884** Amazonas and Ceará states abolish slavery; abolitionist underground railroad begins.
- 1884** All slaves over age 60 declared free.
- 1886** General strikes force city of Santos to abolish slavery.
- 1887** City of São Paulo abolishes slavery within its borders, compensating owners with funds raised by abolitionists.
- 1888** Brazilian Parliament declares immediate, uncompensated abolition of slavery.
- 1889** Monarchy is overthrown; Brazil is declared a republic.
- 1924** *O Clarim da Alvorada*, Black newspaper, is founded in São Paulo.
- 1931** *Frente Negra Brasileiro* (Brazilian Black Front) is founded.
- 1937** President Vargas shuts down Frente Negra Brasileiro offices and those of other political parties in Brazil.
- 1944** *Teatro Experimental do Negro* (Black Experimental Theater) founded in Rio de Janeiro to promote Afro-Brazilian cultural advancement.
- 1946** Anti-discrimination prohibition is included in new Constitution but is weakly enforced.
- 1949** *União dos Homens de Côr* (Colored Peoples' Union) is formed in Rio de Janeiro to raise funds to overcome Black poverty in rural and urban areas.
- 1950** *Premiero Congresso do Negro Brasileiro* (First Brazilian Black Congress) is founded in Rio de Janeiro to give structure to Black politics in Brazil.
- 1951** Lei No. 1.390, the Afonso Arinos Law, makes discrimination based on race or color in public establishments, education and employment a criminal offense.
- 1978** *Movimento Negro Unificado* (Unified Black Movement) is founded.

- 1988 Brazilian Constitution makes acts of racial discrimination crimes punishable by imprisonment without bail.
- 1988 Centennial celebration of abolition takes place; Black political organizations bring discussions of racism to the forefront of politics.
- 1988 Literacy requirement for voting is repealed.
- 1988 *Fundação Palmares* (Palmares Foundation) established by the government to address concerns of Black activists.
- 1989 Lei No. 7.716 defines crimes that result from prejudice against race or color as felonies.

SOUTH AFRICA

- 1652 First Dutch settle at the Cape of Good Hope.
- 1657 Dutch East India Company frees a few servants, creating the nucleus for a burgher class.
- 1658 First substantial importation of slaves from Africa and East Indies begins.
- 1659-60 First Khoikhoi-Dutch War occurs.
- 1673-77 Second Khoikhoi-Dutch War occurs.
- 1688 Two hundred French Huguenot settlers arrive.
- 1717 Dutch East India Company decides against encouraging European immigration, increasing colony's dependence on slavery.
- 1779-81 First Frontier War with Xhosas near Fish River (Eastern Cape) occurs.
- 1793 Second Frontier War with Xhosas occurs.
- 1795 Burgher rebellions take place on the Eastern Cape frontier.
- 1795 First British occupy the Cape.
- 1799 Burgher rebellion is renewed on the eastern frontier.
- 1799 Third Frontier War against Xhosas occurs.
- 1803 Cape is restored temporarily to Dutch rule.
- 1806 British occupy the Cape for second time.
- 1807 British Atlantic slave trade is abolished.
- 1809 Colonial ordinance is issued regulating Khoi Khoi contract labor for Whites, bringing it under state control for the first time but strengthening masters' control over servants.
- 1812 Khoi Khoi servants bring complaints against masters' brutality to First Circuit Court for the first time.
- 1814 British acquire permanent sovereignty over the Cape.
- 1815 Frontier Dutch-speaking farmers (Boers) instigate Slagter's Nek rebellion against British colonial administration and servants' regulations.
- 1816 Shaka creates Zulu kingdom; period of African warfare and conquest known as *mfecane* begins throughout southeastern Africa.
- 1820 Some 5,000 British immigrants arrive at Algoa Bay (present-day Port Elizabeth).
- 1828 Ordinance No. 50 relieves Khoi Khoi of restrictions on their economic freedom.
- 1828 Shaka is assassinated by his brother Dingane.
- 1834 Slave emancipation begins at the Cape.
- 1834-35 British defeat Xhosas in Third Frontier War.
- 1836-38 "The Great Trek": small parties of Boer settlers migrate east into the African interior to escape British colonial administration.
- 1838 Dingane has trekker party of Piet Retief killed; other trekking Boers defeat the Zulu at the Battle of Blood River in retaliation.
- 1838 Boer Republic of Natal is founded.
- 1838 Slave emancipation is completed in the Cape Colony.
- 1843 British annex Natal; most Boers abandon colony for the interior.
- 1846-47 British defeat Xhosas in Fourth Frontier War.
- 1848 British government proclaims its sovereignty between the Orange and Vaal rivers (future Orange Free State).
- 1850-53 British defeat Xhosas in Fifth Frontier War.
- 1852 British recognize the independence of the Boers in the Transvaal.
- 1854 British grant independence to Boers in the Orange Free State.
- 1854 Cape Colony is granted representative government; nonracial franchise (subject to property qualifications) is established.
- 1857 Xhosa people kill cattle and destroy grain on the advice of anti-colonial Xhosa prophetess

- Nongqawuse; 40,000 Xhosas eventually die of starvation.
- 1858** Boers in the Transvaal found the South African Republic.
- 1858** Basotho under Moshoeshe defeat Orange Free State in battle over highveld farmland.
- 1860** Indian indentured laborers arrive in Natal to work on sugar plantations.
- 1865-67** Orange Free State reconquers lost territory from Basotho.
- 1867** Diamonds are discovered near the confluence of the Orange and Vaal rivers (present day Kimberley).
- 1872** Cape Colony is granted responsible, cabinet government.
- 1877** British annex the South African Republic.
- 1879** Zulu army defeats British at Insandhlwana; British conquer Zulu kingdom.
- 1879** British capture Chief Sekhukhune, conquer Pedi kingdom in the Transvaal.
- 1880** First Anglo-Boer War occurs.
- 1881** South African Republic regains independence.
- 1884** First important gold fields are discovered in Transvaal.
- 1886** Johannesburg is founded.
- 1893** Natal is granted responsible government.
- 1895** Jameson Raid: An abortive effort by pro-British interests to overthrow the South African Republic government occurs.
- 1898** South African Republic forces defeat of Venda Chief Mphephu in Northern Transvaal to complete the colonial conquest of Africans in South Africa.
- 1899** Second Anglo-Boer War (South African War) breaks out.
- 1902** Peace of Vereeniging ends South African War.
- 1905** South African Native Affairs Commission advocates territorial segregation of Whites and Africans.
- 1907** Cape Colony School Board Act restricts access of non-Whites to public education.
- 1907** Responsible government is granted to Transvaal and Orange Free State; Africans are expressly denied suffrage.
- 1908** Convention assembles to plan for union of the four South African colonies.
- 1910** Union of South Africa is established.
- 1911** Mine and Works Act of Union Parliament sanctions an industrial color bar; Africans largely are relegated to lower wage mine labor.
- 1912** South African Native National Congress, later the African National Congress (ANC), is founded in Bloemfontein.
- 1913** Native Lands Act provides for territorial segregation; only 13 percent of land is reserved for Africans.
- 1921** Communist Party of South Africa founded.
- 1921** Bulhoek Massacre: Police in Eastern Cape open fire on millennial Israelite community under the leadership of Enoch Mgijima; 200 are killed.
- 1922** The Rand Rebellion: Violent strikes by White workers on the Witwatersrand end by military force.
- 1924** Smuts's South African Party is defeated in Parliamentary elections; a Nationalist-Labour coalition government is established under Hertzog.
- 1926** Colour Bar Act secures a monopoly on skilled jobs for White mine workers.
- 1927** Native Administration Act gives Native Affairs Department full control over African administration and encourages "retribalization" of Africans under hereditary chiefs.
- 1930** White women are enfranchised.
- 1933** Hertzog and Smuts form coalition government.
- 1934** Afrikaner opponents of Hertzog's coalition policy found Purified Nationalist Party.
- 1936** Africans are removed from the common voters' roll in the Cape Province; disenfranchisement of African majority is complete.
- 1946** Military troops break African gold miners' strike.
- 1948** Nationalist victory is declared over the United Party in Parliamentary elections under the slogan of *apartheid* ("separateness" in Afrikaans).
- 1949** Mixed Marriages Act is prohibited.
- 1950** Population Registration Act and Group Areas Act strengthen pass regulations and territorial segregation measures; forced removals of Blacks from White areas begin.

- 1951** Bantu Authorities Act establishes a new system of government for African reserves (“homelands”).
- 1952** Reservation of Separate Amenities Act: “petty apartheid” is established (similar to U.S. segregation laws for public transportation, restrooms, etc.).
- 1955** ANC adopts the Freedom Charter.
- 1956** Coloureds are removed from the common voters’ roll in the Cape Province.
- 1959** Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) is founded.
- 1960** Sharpeville Massacre: Police open fire on a protest over pass laws; 69 are killed.
- 1960** ANC and PAC are banned; parties advocate armed resistance against the apartheid regime from exile.
- 1961** South Africa severs its ties with the British Commonwealth and becomes a republic.
- 1964** Nelson Mandela and other ANC leaders are convicted of treason and imprisoned.
- 1966** Coloured District Six in Cape Town demolished; residents are removed to Cape Flats.
- 1976** Schoolchildren protesting compulsory Afrikaans education begin the Soweto Uprising.
- 1976** Transkei homeland is granted independence by Pretoria but is not internationally recognized.
- 1977** Bophuthatswana homeland is granted independence by Pretoria but is not internationally recognized.
- 1977** South African police in Port Elizabeth arrest and torture Black Consciousness activist Bantu Steven Biko, who dies in a Pretoria prison.
- 1979** Venda homeland is granted independence by Pretoria but is not internationally recognized.
- 1981** Ciskei homeland is granted independence by Pretoria but is not internationally recognized.
- 1983** Anti-apartheid groups form the United Democratic Front (UDF) and begin to agitate within South Africa for an end to apartheid.
- 1984** New Constitution creates Tricameral Legislature for Whites, Coloureds and Asians; Coloureds and Asians largely ignore legislative elections.
- 1986** Pass laws are repealed.
- 1986** President P.W. Botha declares state of emergency to quell Black resistance to apartheid; international sanctions are imposed on South Africa.
- 1989** F.W. de Klerk becomes president and begins process of reform.
- 1990** Nelson Mandela is released from jail; ANC and PAC ban is lifted; ANC suspends armed struggle.
- 1990** Separate Reservation of Amenities Act is repealed.
- 1991** Land, Group Areas, and Population Registration Acts are repealed.
- 1991** Government negotiations with ANC and other political parties begin in Council for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA).
- 1992** White voters overwhelmingly approve negotiated transition to democracy in referendum.
- 1993** South African Communist Party leader Chris Hani is assassinated.
- 1993** Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk receive Nobel Peace Prize.
- 1994** Bophuthatswana Army repels Afrikaner militia uprising, stages coup against President Lucas Mangope and demands reincorporation into South Africa.
- 1994** ANC wins first nonracial elections in South Africa; Nelson Mandela becomes president.
- 1996-98** Truth and Reconciliation Commission offers limited amnesty for crimes committed during apartheid era in exchange for truthful testimony.

UNITED STATES

- 1607** First permanent English settlement in North America is established at Jamestown, Virginia.
- 1619** First Black slaves arrive in Virginia.
- 1620** English establish New England settlement at Plymouth, Massachusetts.
- 1622** Indian attack on the Virginia settlement provokes massive retaliation.
- 1644** Second Indian uprising occurs in Virginia.
- 1667** Virginia legalizes slavery for converted Christian Blacks.
- 1675-76** Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia: White indentured servants form militia and threaten to overthrow colonial government.
- 1675-76** King Philip’s War ends Indian resistance in southern New England.

- 1691** Interracial marriage between Blacks and Whites banned in Virginia.
- 1711-12** Tuscarora Indian War occurs in North Carolina.
- 1715** Yemassee Indian War occurs in South Carolina.
- 1763** Pontiac's Rebellion breaks out in the Ohio Valley.
- 1763** British proclamation prohibits White settlement west of Appalachian Mountains to prevent further Indian uprisings.
- 1776** Declaration of Independence is signed.
- 1783** American independence is recognized internationally.
- 1783** Northern states begin emancipation of slaves.
- 1787** Northwest Ordinance prohibits slavery in territories north of the Ohio River.
- 1787** Constitutional Convention comes to Three-Fifths Compromise on slavery; Southern states allowed to count five slaves as three citizens for purposes of proportional representation in House of Representatives.
- 1790** First federal naturalization law reserves citizenship for Whites.
- 1793** Invention of cotton gin strengthens economic basis for Southern slavery.
- 1803** Louisiana Purchase brings Indian nations and lands of the Mississippi-Missouri basin under U.S. control.
- 1808** International slave trade is closed.
- 1811** Battle of Tippecanoe breaks resistance of Ohio Valley Indian tribes.
- 1813-14** Creek War leads to cession of most Creek lands in Alabama.
- 1820** Missouri Compromise establishes dividing line between slave and free territory at 36° 30'N latitude.
- 1830** Indian Removal Act: Most Eastern Indian tribes are encouraged to relocate west of the Mississippi River; Indian Territory is established in present-day Oklahoma.
- 1831** Nat Turner's slave rebellion occurs in Virginia.
- 1831** Abolitionist agitation begins in the North.
- 1838** Cherokee "Trail of Tears": Federal troops forcibly remove Cherokee Indians from Georgia and lead them on a march to Indian Territory.
- 1840s** U.S. Army fights series of costly Seminole Wars in Florida, suffering many casualties and defeats; Army ultimately defeats Seminoles and removes them to Indian Territory.
- 1846-48** Conquest of Texas, New Mexico, and California in Mexican War brings Indian and Mexican communities in these regions under U.S. control.
- 1850** Compromise of 1850 temporarily resolves controversy over extension of slavery into the Western territories.
- 1854** Kansas-Nebraska Act revives sectional controversy over slavery; conflicts between White settlers and Indian nations on Great Plains intensifies.
- 1854-56** "Bleeding Kansas": Widespread violence occurs between pro- and anti-slavery White settlers in the Kansas Territory.
- 1857** *Dred Scott* decision of U.S. Supreme Court nullifies Missouri Compromise and denies all Blacks the right to U.S. citizenship.
- 1859** John Brown, a White abolitionist, attempts to lead slave rebellion in Virginia.
- 1860** Election of Republican Abraham Lincoln as president on platform opposed to the territorial expansion of slavery.
- 1860-61** Southern states secede from Union.
- 1861** Civil War breaks out; escaped slaves and free Blacks enlist in Union Army to fight slavery.
- 1863** President Lincoln issues Emancipation Proclamation, freeing all U.S. slaves.
- 1865** Civil War ends.
- 1865** Ratification of Thirteenth Amendment prohibits slavery.
- 1865** Presidential Reconstruction begins; Southern state legislatures pass Black Codes.
- 1866** Congress passes Civil Rights Act over President Johnson's veto.
- 1867-68** Radical Reconstruction begins; Southern Blacks are enfranchised; military occupation of Southern states offers some protection of Black civil rights.
- 1868** Ratification of Fourteenth Amendment extends citizenship rights to freedmen.
- 1870** Ratification of Fifteenth Amendment protects voting rights of Blacks.

- 1876** Sioux defeat of Gen. George Custer at the Battle of Little Bighorn intensifies drive to conquer and pacify Sioux nations in northern Great Plains.
- 1877** Radical Reconstruction ends; federal troops withdraw from Southern states.
- 1881** Tennessee passes first state law segregating the races in public transportation.
- 1882** Exclusion Act prohibits immigration of Chinese.
- 1887** Dawes Severalty Act provides for individual land allotment on Indian Reservations.
- 1889** Oklahoma is opened to White settlement.
- 1890** Mississippi becomes the first state to disenfranchise Blacks by constitutional convention.
- 1890** "Ghost Dance": religious resistance spreads through western Indian Reservations; Wounded Knee massacre of Sioux ends armed Indian resistance.
- 1896** *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of Supreme Court sanctions segregation of public accommodations.
- 1909** National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) is founded.
- 1917** Supreme Court outlaws residential segregation.
- 1917** Race riots occur in East St. Louis, Illinois.
- 1919** Chicago race riot occurs along with similar outbreaks in other cities.
- 1934** Indian Reorganization Act grants greater autonomy to tribes on reservations.
- 1942-44** Japanese-Americans are forced into U.S. Army internment camps during World War II.
- 1948** Democratic Party platform calls for civil rights for Blacks; Southern Democrats bolt party convention.
- 1954** Supreme Court bans segregation in public schools in *Brown v. Board of Education* of Topeka.
- 1955** Montgomery (Alabama) Bus Boycott begins.
- 1957** President Eisenhower sends National Guard to force integration of Little Rock, Arkansas, high school.
- 1960-64** Sit-ins and mass demonstrations protest legalized segregation in the South.
- 1963** Martin Luther King Jr.'s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) leads March on Washington.
- 1964** Civil Rights Act requiring equal access to public facilities is passed.
- 1965** Malcolm X is assassinated.
- 1965** Voting Rights Act providing strong protection for Black voting rights passes.
- 1965** Watts, California, riots occur.
- 1966** Huey Newton and Bobby Seale form Black Panther Party in Oakland, California.
- 1967** Supreme Court declares state laws banning interracial marriage unconstitutional in *Loving v. Virginia*.
- 1967** Riots occur in Newark, New Jersey, and Detroit, Michigan.
- 1967-68** "Black Power": Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) and Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) reject non-violence.
- 1968** Assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. in Memphis causes riots in New York, Washington, D.C., and across the United States.
- 1970** American Indian Movement (AIM) activists seize Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay.
- 1975** School busing riots occur in Boston.
- 1984** Rev. Jesse Jackson seeks Democratic Party nomination for President.
- 1986** U.S. civil rights groups protest the apartheid regime in South Africa; Congress imposes sanctions against South Africa over President Reagan's veto.
- 1992** Los Angeles riots result from the acquittal by an all-White jury of five White police officers for the 1991 beating of an African-American man, Rodney King.
- 1996** California voters pass Proposition 209, repealing affirmative action policies in state employment.
- 1998** Washington state voters repeal affirmative action.

Appendix

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Colin Bundy is Vice-Chancellor of the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa. Until 1998, he was Vice-Rector of the University of the Western Cape. Bundy is a historian who received degrees from Witwatersrand and the University of Oxford. He taught history at South Africa's universities for more than 10 years and was director of the Institute for Historical Research at the Western Cape. He is author of *The Rise and Fall of a South African Peasantry* (University of California Press, 1979) and co-author of *Hidden Struggles in Rural South Africa* (University of California Press, 1987).

Ira Glasser is the executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a post he has held since 1978. Previously, he served as executive director of the New York Civil Liberties Union. Prior to the ACLU, Glasser was a member of the science and mathematics faculties of Queens College and Sarah Lawrence College, and he served as an editor of *Current* magazine. Glasser is author of *Vision of Liberty: The Bill of Rights for All Americans* (New York: Arcade Publishing, 1991) and co-author of *Doing Good: The Limits of Benevolence* (New York: Pantheon, 1978).

Charles V. Hamilton is Wallace S. Sayre Professor Emeritus of Government at Columbia University. He taught political science and government for over 40 years at Tuskegee University, Roosevelt University, Rutgers University, Lincoln University, and Columbia. Hamilton is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the board of trustees of the Century Foundation. He served from 1979-1981 on the Study Commission on U.S. Policy Toward South Africa. Among other works he has written, Hamilton co-authored *Black Power* (New York: Random House, 1967) and *The Dual Agenda: Race and Social Welfare Policies of Civil Rights Organizations* (Columbia University Press, 1997).

Lynn Walker Huntley is director of the Comparative Human Relations Initiative, a project of the Southern Education Foundation. She previously served as director of the Ford Foundation's Rights and Social Justice Program. A graduate of Barnard College and Columbia University Law School, Huntley served as Deputy Assistant Attorney General and Section Chief in the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, staff counsel at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., and columnist for *Essence* Magazine. She is a member of the boards of directors of the Center for Women Policy Studies, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and the Interdenominational Theological Center.

Wilmot G. James is a professor and Dean of the Humanities Faculty of the University of Cape Town. He previously served as the executive director of the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (Idasa). James also has taught at the University of the Western Cape, Indiana University and Yale University. He is a member of the

boards of trustees of the Ford Foundation, Independent Newspapers (Cape), and David Philip Publishers (PTY) Ltd. James chaired the Task Team on International Migration for the South African government. He was a contributing author and co-editor of *Now That We Are Free: Coloured Communities in a Democratic South Africa* (Cape Town: Idasa, 1996) and *Angry Divide: Social and Economic History of the Western Cape* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1989).

Jeffrey Lever works with the Impumelelo Innovation Awards Programme in Cape Town, South Africa. He holds a doctoral degree in Sociology and has taught at various South African universities, including the University of Stellenbosch, the University of Cape Town, and most recently the University of the Western Cape. Lever has published articles on various aspects of the social and political life of South Africa and on social theory.

Abdias do Nascimento is professor emeritus, State University of New York at Buffalo, and Doctor Honoris Causa, State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ). Founder of the Black Experimental Theater in Rio de Janeiro in 1944, Nascimento was the first Afro-Brazilian Congressman who championed Black people's human and civil rights in the Brazilian national legislature. He is now president of the Afro-Brazilian Studies and Research Institute (IPEAFRO) in Rio de Janeiro. As an artist, he has exhibited his Afro-Brazilian paintings throughout the United States and Brazil. He has a long history of political activity both internationally and domestically. He represents Rio de Janeiro State in the Brazilian Senate and is an appointee to the newly created Rio de Janeiro State Government post of Secretary for Human Rights and Citizenship. He is author of *Brazil: Mixture or Massacre?* (Dover: Majority Press, 1989) among other works.

Elisa Larkin Nascimento is co-founder and director of the Afro-Brazilian Studies and Research Institute (IPEAFRO) in Rio de Janeiro. She is a graduate of the State University of New York where she received a master's degree and a law degree. Since 1975, Larkin Nascimento has participated actively in political and academic activities related to Afro-Brazilian affairs, including work with the Municipal Institute of Arts and Culture in Rio de Janeiro. She has translated or edited several published books and is co-author of *Africans in Brazil: a Pan-African Perspective* (Trenton, NJ: African World Press, 1992).

Nelson do Valle Silva is a professor at the University Institute for Research of Rio de Janeiro (Instituto de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro) and senior researcher at the National Laboratory of Scientific Computation (LNCC). He holds a doctorate in sociology from the University of Michigan. Silva has published widely on demographic and racial trends in Brazil, including "Racial Differences in Income: Brazil, 1988," in *Race in Contemporary Brazil: From Indifference to Equality* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No effort of the scale, breadth and complexity of the Comparative Human Relations Initiative, including the writing, editing, and production of this report, could be mounted without the guidance, support and wisdom of many people and institutions. Listing their names without singing their praises is inadequate recompense to thank them for the many contributions they have made to bring the Initiative into being, sustain it and make its contributions possible.

First, we thank our supporters of this international and comparative effort: Susan V. Berresford, Barry G. Gaberman, Mary E. McClymont, Anthony Romero, Alan Jenkins, Edward Telles, and Melvin Oliver (The Ford Foundation); Lori Villa Rosa (The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation); Robert Haas, Judy Belk, Gina Warren and Henry Ramos (Levi Strauss and Company); Ingrid Saunders Jones and Michael Bivens (The Coca-Cola Foundation); and Colin Campbell (Rockefeller Brothers Fund).

Several people who worked very hard to make this volume possible should be thanked publicly. We are deeply indebted to the authors whose names, words and wisdom grace this report. Steve Suitts helped to develop all aspects of the Initiative's work, including this volume. Thanks also to Pam Auchmutey and staff members of the Southern Education Foundation (SEF), Janet Keene, and Brenda McClendon. Tim Lane, a graduate student at Stanford University, expertly prepared the Chronology of Major Events. We also thank Cynthia Jones and Susan White of Jones Worley Design for carefully designing all of the Initiative's publications.

Lastly, the Initiative is indebted to Elridge McMillan, the president of the Southern Education Foundation (SEF), Norman Francis, Board Chair, and SEF Board members for sponsoring the Initiative.

Lynn Huntley

Director
The Comparative Human Relations Initiative
January, 2000

PUBLICATIONS

The Comparative Human Relations Initiative has developed a number of linked publications that amplify on the themes and ideas set forth in this volume, drawing on original sources, and in the voices of the people in these three countries. Reports include:

- **Beyond Racism**, an overview of findings by the Initiative's International Working and Advisory Group, featuring first person profiles of outstanding Americans, Brazilians and South Africans involved in the struggle against racism and reflections of International Working and Advisory Group members.
- **Three Nations at the Crossroads**, in-depth and data-rich portraits and accessible historical reviews of Brazil, South Africa and the United States by Dr. Charles V. Hamilton, professor emeritus, Columbia University; Ira Glasser, executive director, the American Civil Liberties Union; Dr. Wilmot James, dean, and Dr. Jeffrey Lever, professor, University of Cape Town; Colin Bundy, University of Witwatersrand; Dr. Abdias do Nascimento, Rio de Janeiro State Secretary of Human Rights and Citizenship; Dr. Elisa Larkin Nascimento, director, IPEAFRO; Brazilian scholar Nelson do Valle

Silva, and a comprehensive historical timeline of key events related to race in the three countries.

- **In Their Own Voices**, a topically organized reader featuring articles, quotable quotes, and excerpted speeches by participants in Initiative meetings such as Ellis Cose, journalist; Dr. Frene Ginwala, speaker of the South African Parliament; Dr. Alex Boraine, vice chair, South Africa Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Dr. Emmett Carson, president, the Minneapolis Foundation; Gloria Steinem, contributing editor, Ms. Magazine; Dr. Mahmood Mamdani, professor, University of Cape Town, Dr. Njabulo S. Ndebele, vice chancellor, University of the North; Susan V. Berresford, president, the Ford Foundation, and many others.
- **Color Collage**, occasional papers on issues such as the origins of racism, the role of the media, truth and reconciliation efforts, globalization, economic inequality, the religious community, among others, by authors such as Sig Gissler, professor, Columbia University School of Journalism; Maria Aparecida Bento, director of CERT; George Reid Andrews, professor, University of Pittsburgh; C. Eric Lincoln, professor emeritus, Duke University; William Taylor, Esq., Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights; and many others.

BOOKS INCLUDE:

- **Beyond Racism, Embracing an Interdependent Future**, (working title), the Full Report of the International Working and Advisory Group to the Comparative Human Relations Initiative, including detailed citations, sources and annotated bibliography. [forthcoming]
- **The Same Beneath the Skin** (working title), a comparative anthology edited by Dr. Charles V. Hamilton, Dr. Wilmot James, Dr. Neville Alexander, professor, University of Cape Town and Dr. Antonio Sérgio Guimarães, professor, University of São Paulo, which considers educational issues in the three nations, the costs of racism, international remedies, affirmative action, and future prospects for movement beyond racism in the three nations by recognized scholars and activists. [forthcoming]
- **Beyond Racism in Brazil** (working title), a Portuguese language volume featuring papers by many leading scholars and Afro Brazilian activists. [forthcoming]
- **Grappling With Change**, Yazeed Fakier, author (Cape Town: David Philip Publishers and Idasa, 1998), a look at how South Africans are coping post-apartheid.
- **Between Unity and Diversity**, Gitanjali Maharaj, editor (Cape Town: David Philip Publishers and Idasa, 1999), a reader on post-apartheid nation-building efforts.

All Initiative reports as well as additional, commissioned papers are available on the Internet. To download Initiative reports, papers, and other documents in Adobe Acrobat format (pdf. file), to find up-to-date information about forthcoming books, or for ordering printed publications, visit the Initiative's website: www.beyondracism.org or contact the Comparative Human Relations Initiative, the Southern Education Foundation, 135 Auburn Avenue, Second Floor, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 (404) 523-0410 (phone) or (404) 523-6904 (fax). For information about receiving printed copies of Initiative publications in South Africa, inquire with the Institute for Democracy in South Africa at its website, www.idasa.org.za Information about the Southern Education Foundation is available through its website, www.sefatl.org.

L I S T O F T A B L E S

BRAZIL

Table 1: Comparative Data for "Mercosul" Countries	8
Table 2: Distribution of National Income in Brazil, 1960-2000 (in percentages)	8
Table 3: Inequality Index for Brazil, 1981-1995	8
Table 4: Composition of Brazil's Gross Domestic Product 1990-1996 (in percentages)	8
Table 5: Population Percent by Color or Race, 1996	9
Table 6: Average Earnings by Gender and Race	10
Table 7: Income and Inequality Rates by Region	11
Table 8: Average Family Income, 1996	11
Table 9: Percent of "Miserable Poverty" by Region and Color, 1998	12
Table 10: Per Capita Family Income by Color, 1998	12
Table 11: Unemployment Rates by Sex and Race, 1996	12
Table 12: Illiteracy and Enrollment Rates by Region and Gender, 1996	12
Table 13: Average Years of Schooling by Gender and Color, 1996	13
Table 14: Adult Years of Schooling by Gender and Color, 1996	13
Table 15: Life Expectancy at Birth by Race	14
Table 16: Life Expectancy at Birth by Race, Income and Education, 1996	14
Table 17: Child Mortality Rate by Gender and Color, 1996	14
Table 18: Sanitation by Race of Heads of Household, 1996	14
Table 19: Housing Infrastructure by Color, 1996	14
Table 20: Sanitation and Electricity Conditions, 1996	25
Table 21: "Miserable Poverty" by Color and Sex, 1998	25
Table 22: "Miserable Poverty" by Color and Educational Level, 1996	25
Table 23: "Miserable Poverty" by Color and Number of Dependents, 1996	25
Table 24: "Miserable Poverty" by Color and Age of Head of Family, 1996	25
Table 25: Percent of Positive Responses to the Question: "Have you ever worked?" by Sex and Color	26
Table 26: Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics by Color - Men	34
Table 27: Index of Social Distance for Occupational Groups	36
Table 28: Current Occupational Group by Color	36
Table 29: Father's Occupational Group by Color	36
Table 30: Intergenerational Occupational Mobility by Color, 1996	37
Table 31: Outflow from Occupational Groups	37

Table 32: Hypothetical Distribution by Color without "Racial Differences" in Occupational Groups	38
Table 33: Average Incomes by Occupational Stratum and Color	39
Table 34: Intergenerational Occupational Mobility of Men 20-64 Years of Age by Color, 1996	41

SOUTH AFRICA

Table 35: Education of Persons over 20, 1995	50
Table 36: Distribution of Race Groups by Selected Occupational Levels, 1995	51
Table 37: Average Annual Household Income by Race, 1990 and 1995 (R000s)	52
Table 38: Average Annual Household Income by Race, and Province, 1995 (R000s)	52
Table 39: Some Key Health Indicators	53
Table 40: Indicators of Living Conditions	53

UNITED STATES

Table 41: Life Expectancy at Birth - Number of Years by Race and Gender	83
Table 42: Infant Mortality	83
Table 43: Reported AIDS Cases, 1981-1996	84
Table 44: Conditions of Housing Units, 1995 (1,000s)	84
Table 45: Employed Civilians by Occupation, Gender, Race and Hispanic Origin	85
Table 46: Educational Attainment by Race, Hispanic Origin and Gender	85
Table 47: Earnings by Highest Degree Earned, 1996	86
Table 48: Money Income of Families - Percent Distribution by Income Level, Race and Hispanic Origin in constant 1995 dollars, 1970-1995	87
Table 49: Unemployment Rates by Education, Race and Hispanic Origin	88
Table 50: Homicide Rate by Race and Sex, 1970-1994	89
Table 51: What do you think is the single most important problem facing the country today (1998)?	94
Table 52: Would you say that you are financially better off, worse off, or about the same now as you were a year ago?	95
Table 53: Do you feel things in the country are generally going in the right direction, or do you feel things have pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track?	96