

ATI Programs: Liberal Arts: Late Adolescence (11th/12th)

Unit 2: Race in Human Life

Key Questions

- (1) What are different schools of thought about what race is and what is (or should be) its significance?
- (2) What are different schools of thought about what racism is and what its effects are?
- (3) What are different schools of thought about the role that race does (or ought to) play in society at large or in public policy?
- (4) What are different schools of thought about how racism can (or should) be combated or redressed?

Unit Description

In this Unit, students will be examining, discussing, and evaluating several prominent theories about foundational debates concerning race and racism. They will gain a deeper understanding of each theory also by (a) studying them in comparison to and contrast with one another, (b) applying them to specific issues, (c) placing current issues in historical context, and (d) reading literature to analyze characters and their choices through the lens of different theories.

General Outcomes

- (1) Students will understand different definitions of race and racism.
- (2) Students will raise to consciousness issues of racial identity and discrimination in their own and others' lives, experience, and challenges.
- (3) Students will understand and evaluate how the lenses of different theories about race accurately inform (or fail to inform) these experiences and offer (or fail to offer) solutions to their particular challenges.
- (4) Students will understand how different philosophies justify approaching the U.S. Civil Rights movement.

Topics and Readings for Unit 2

(1) Nature of race: Is it biologically grounded or socially constructed?

Readings

- Ron Mallon, excerpts from “‘Race’: Normative, Not Metaphysical or Semantic”
- Ian Haney Lopez, excerpts from “The Social Construction of Race”
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: Tommaso Caiazza, excerpts from “Are Italians White? The Perspective from the Pacific”]
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: On the phenomenon of “passing” from *Harriet*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RVMRncOzt2I> (3:02)]
- Robin Andreasen, excerpts from “The Cladistic Race Concept: A Defense”
- Massimo Pigliucci and Jonathan Kaplan, “On the Concept of Biological Race and Its Applicability to Humans”

(2) Race and identity: How is (or should be) race related to identity? Should one celebrate one’s racial difference or not see it as important or central to one's self-identity?

Readings

- Toni Morrison, preface and excerpts from *The Bluest Eye*
- Maya Angelou, “Getups”
- Karen Brodtkin, excerpts from “How the Jews Became White Folks”
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: Clara Rodriguez, excerpts from *Changing Race*]
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: John Oliver Siy and Sapna Cheryan, excerpts from “When Compliments Fail to Flatter: American Individualism and Responses to Positive Stereotypes”]
- Frederick Douglass, excerpts from *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*
- James Baldwin, excerpts from “Down at the Cross,” in *The Fire Next Time*
- Glenn Loury, “The Call of the Tribe: The Role of Identity in Our Politics and Our Lives”

(3) Defining racism: What does it mean to be racist? Can anyone be racist?

Readings

- Beverly Daniel Tatum, “Defining Racism: Can We Talk?”
- Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson, “The History and Conceptual Elements of Critical Race Theory”
- Lawrence Blum, excerpts from “Racism: What It Is and What It Isn’t”
- Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz, “‘Only White People Can Be Racist’: What Does Power Have to Do with Prejudice?”

(4) Race in society: What are various approaches to and effects of race in public policy?

Readings

- Michael Omi, excerpts from “Racial Identity and the State: The Dilemmas of Classification”
- Brief excerpts from various key U.S. laws and U.S. Supreme Court cases: 13th (1865), 14th (1868), and 15th (1870) Amendments; *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896); Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882; *Ozawa v. United States* (1922); Executive Order 9066 (1942) and *Korematsu v. United States* (1944); *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954); Civil Rights Act (1964); Executive Order 11246 (1965); *Loving v. Virginia* (1967)
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work for *Loving v. Virginia*: Brief interviews with interracial couples 50 years after *Loving v. Virginia*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RseBL4eC0ok> (6:02)]
- R. M. O’Neil, excerpts from “The Case for Preferential Admissions”
- Linda Chavez, “No Thanks to Affirmative Action”
- John McWhorter, “The Gift of Competition”
 - [OPTIONAL alternative to previous three readings: Podcast debating pros and cons of affirmative action in college admissions:
<https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/affirmative-action-campus-does-more-harm-good> (1:32:37)]

(5) Combating and redressing racism: What are the best ways to address racism?

(a) Non-violent versus violent approaches to resistance

Videos/Speeches

- Martin Luther King, Jr., speech on “On Nonviolence and Civil Disobedience”:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sQPAlqfFCsU> (7:48)
- Malcolm X, speech on “The Ballot or the Bullet”:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sc4BPYIqm6k> (7:42)
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: Debate between Malcolm X and James Baldwin (September 5, 1963):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sVNVb7sKwoU> (27:44)]

(b) Competing strategies for change: economic, social, art, psychological, educational, legal/political

Readings

Economics vs. Politics Module

- Booker T. Washington, excerpts from *Up from Slavery*
- W. E. B. Du Bois, excerpts from *The Souls of Black Folk*

Literature/Art Module

- James Baldwin, “Everybody’s Protest Novel”
- Barbara Christian, “What Celie Knows that You Should Know”
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: Scenes of Celie standing up to Albert and saying, “I’m here!” from *The Color Purple*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yqmreq-dV84> (1:16)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z4Up4nh2AD4> (0:52)]
 - [OPTIONAL as Follow-Up Work: Cheryl Wall presentation on “Zora Neale Hurston: Her Eyes Were Watching God”:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dP3o46vJkj8> (54:32)]

Reparations Module

- Bernard Boxill, “The Morality of Reparation”
- Chandran Kukathas, “Who? Whom? Reparations and the Problem of Agency”
 - [OPTIONAL alternative to the previous two readings: Podcast debating the pros and cons of reparations: <https://freakonomics.com/podcast/reparations-part-2/> (40:58)]

Police Violence Module

- Taylor Marie Darden and Surbhi Godsay, excerpts from “Hands Up, Don’t Shoot”
- John McWhorter, “Racist Police Violence Reconsidered”

Psychology and Anti-Racism Module

- Ibram Kendi, excerpts from *How to Be an Antiracist*
- Erec Smith, excerpts from *A Critique of Anti-Racism in Rhetoric and Composition*
 - [OPTIONAL alternative to Smith: John McWhorter, “The Virtue Signalers Won’t Change the World”]

General Topics, Concepts, and Distinctions

A note about approach and method: The following distinctions and meta-commentary are primarily for the Guide’s high-level conceptual understanding of the topic of and material in this Unit (and in any Unit generally). When opening conversations with students, they will have already done the related readings and each will have their own unique life experiences to draw on with all of the issues that they have been confronted with and may have (more or less) reflected on. They also will have previously read a good deal of literature and know some history, and there will be some literature and/or history selections integrated in relevant Units. Between real-life experiences, fiction, history, case studies, and assigned readings, it will work best to start with concrete examples (as well as suggested opening questions) for discussion openers and then work up to higher-level conceptual issues and distinctions. The higher-level understanding achieved with each reading will be helpful to keep in mind while going through subsequent readings, as students build up their understanding and compare and contrast how different approaches address foundational issues. You’ll need to exercise judgment about when it would be best to insert a brief didactic presentation about background material or to clarify some important distinctions and concepts that would otherwise be unfamiliar to students.

Nature of race: Is race biologically grounded or socially constructed?

While the question of whether race is biologically grounded or socially constructed has been fiercely debated primarily since the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century, when the science of modern biology developed and theory of evolution emerged, taxonomies for sorting human populations have been around since ancient times. Older taxonomies captured origin or ancestral descent in highly local ways—such as family, tribe, or nation—and often ascribed alleged character or temperament variation to differences in climate or geography.

As human populations grew, travel over long distances became feasible, and political boundaries enlarged with the development of the state system, many began to view populations in terms of

continental races rather than localized nations or tribes. By the late eighteenth century, travelogues and ethnologies reflected an increasingly common view that there were only a few races that could roughly be tracked by morphology and phenotype (e.g., skull shape, skin color, hair texture), such as Caucasian, African, Asian, Amer-Indian. They advocated polygenesis (multiple origins) over Charles Darwin's monogenesis (single shared origin) account of the evolution of the human species.

The polygenesis view of human races hardened into what is referred to as "race essentialism" or "racialism," which holds that members of racial groups share certain heritable physical, behavioral, and intellectual characteristics with one another that members of other races don't have. They believed that underlying genetics explained racial variation at various levels. (While some who believed in race essentialism did not think that race differences implied the superiority or inferiority of races, others used it as grounds to establish social, political, and legal hierarchies within and between states. This issue is explored in other sections of this unit.)

Beginning in the mid-twentieth century, race essentialism came under intense scientific and moral scrutiny, which has led to a significant shift in debates over (1) what it means for race to be biologically grounded and, as a result, (2) whether race is biologically grounded or socially constructed.

With respect to (1), relatively few scientists or social scientists defend race essentialism. Most who argue that race (whether for humans or non-human species) is biologically grounded hold instead to theories such as cladism (classification based on recency of common descent) or ecotypes (classification based on adaptation to a particular ecosystem). Whether such theories have much explanatory value is hotly debated. The implication of these theories for understanding variations in human physiology, psychology, etc. is complex, often tenuous, and contentious. Much hinges on the significance of population genetics, how much environment or culture affects the development of human characteristics, and the extent and role played by individual volition.

With respect to (2), the currently more popular view is that race is socially constructed rather than biologically grounded. Social constructionists point to linguistic variation between cultures and to how racial categories have been used to oppress others as evidence that races do not occur naturally. They also point to the fact that "folk theories" of race—which often reflect a skin-color criterion, e.g., white, black, brown, red, yellow—do not overlap with race essentialism, for there is skin-color variation within race-essentialist groupings. Folk theories would thus reflect arbitrary social categories that can take on moral and political significance.

Race and identity: How is (or should be) race related to identity? Should one celebrate one's racial difference or not see it as important or central to one's self-identity?

Whether race is biologically grounded or socially constructed, it is an open question whether—and if so, how—race should be related to identity. Several distinctions are at play in this debate,

which is complicated by the fact that not everyone means the same thing by race: some employ the “folk theory” of skin color, some refer to race essentialism, some mean scientific species, and some conflate race with ethnicity or national origin.

Even if race is biologically grounded, some argue that so long as there are no race essences, then there is no good reason to classify individuals by race. To do so would be akin to classifying them by whether they wear size 8 shoes, have long necks, or have wisdom teeth. At best, such classification would seem to be arbitrary and based on characteristics non-essential to one’s personhood or individuality. At worst, it could perpetuate continued harmful stereotyping that sees people in terms of groups (whether viewed as inferior or superior) rather than as unique individuals and undercuts self-esteem. Additionally, such theorists argue that the harm cuts both ways, adversely affecting both oppressor and oppressed.

Others argue that especially given the long history in various countries of using racial categorization to oppress some groups of people and privilege others, we should continue to use race categories for identification purposes. Doing so would allow members of historically oppressed groups to seek social solidarity with one another as well as fight for legal restitution on racial grounds that those who are not of their race are not entitled to.

Yet others maintain that the question of whether race should be important to one’s identity depends on who places one in racial categories: one’s self or others. On this account, it should be up to an individual whether they think that their race (however it is understood) is central to their identity and sense of self, a difference in virtue of which one could be proud without being better or worse than others. Racial classification would be seen as pernicious only if it were imposed by someone else contrary to how one sees one’s self.

Defining racism: What does it mean to be racist? Can anyone be racist?

Being called a racist is considered by nearly all (except those who think that race essentialism is true and justifies disparate moral and legal regard) to be a serious charge that warrants condemnation. There is far less agreement, though, about what it means to be racist or about who can be labeled racist.

The view prevalent until the 1970s held that anyone who believed that people were inherently morally inferior or superior in virtue of their race were racially prejudiced. Those who acted in light of that belief were racist. According to this view, anyone who holds such beliefs or acts in such ways—regardless of what race they are—is racially prejudiced and/or racist.

That view came under challenge by the “critical race theory,” with its view of systemic racism. This theory holds that racism need not be intentional, can be implicit rather than explicit, and is manifested through various social institutions in ways that are ubiquitous and damaging unless

actively combated. In addition, it holds that only members of a society's dominant group (typically whites) can be racist, maintaining that "racism = prejudice + power."

The theory of systemic racism, while still prevalent, has been critiqued on several grounds. Some argue that it undermines individual responsibility by ignoring the role of intention, creates a double standard that causes resentment, undermines agency, and renders charges of racism nearly meaningless in their pervasiveness. Such critics offer, instead, theories of racism that disentangle racism from other phenomena—such as racial prejudice, exclusion, and insensitivity—and take into account factors such as intention, knowledge, and effect in order to assign gradations of accountability.

Race in society: What are race-informed public policies and their effects?

Excerpts from a select series of post-U.S. Civil War race-related laws, public policies, and court decisions are included here. Since public policies are, by their nature, relative to political societies, the ones included focus on United States law and policies. [While it would be interesting and illuminating to examine those of other countries (whether in their own right or in a comparative perspective), and students can be encouraged to engage in such research as part of summative and/or independent projects, time constraints require focus on those most relevant for our current student population. In addition, fundamental points to keep in mind are that students need to gain crucial historical context for current issues and to appreciate both intended and unforeseen effects of law and public policy.]

Part of U.S. history includes compromises reached about tolerating slavery in its southern states and how to calculate enslaved people for congressional election purposes under the U.S. Constitution's federal system of government. A resolution of the fraught slavery issue could be deferred for only so long, with threats of secession or civil war looming on the horizon for decades until abolition was achieved through the northern Union's defeat of the southern Confederates in the U.S. Civil War (1861-1865). [For students who have not taken or need a refresher on U.S. history prior to 1865, they could be guided to ATI's U.S. History course resources or to a solid online overview of the relevant legal materials, including the Declaration of Independence, U.S. Constitution (with amendments), the Fugitive Slave Acts of 1793 and 1850, and *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857).]

Much of the legal and public policy materials included here relate to slavery's abolition at the federal level and legacy of Jim Crow laws at the state level. However, they also reflect other race-related legal issues, such as immigration, war-time internment camps, and affirmative action. As such, they provide a glimpse into how all races have been affected—rightly or wrongly, for good or ill—through legal and political institutions. Even well-intended legal remedies for past legal discrimination can have unanticipated effects, leading to significant controversy over whether and to what extent law can or should be used in race-based ways. One

such debate (i.e., affirmative action) is included here, but students can be encouraged to research any number of others (e.g., busing for school integration, housing, zoning, immigration, employment). This issue is complicated by debates over the nature of race, reliance on self-reporting, and the shifting boundaries over time of how race is tracked administratively via racial categories.

Combating and redressing racism: What are the best ways to address racism?

Even were people to agree on the nature of race and racism, there is significant disagreement over the best approaches for redressing past injustice and combating current discrimination. One fundamental debate concerns whether racial injustice should be resisted through nonviolent or violent means. Those advocating nonviolence maintain that the moral high ground of love, peace, and dignity is the way to win hearts and minds and transform others. Those advocating using violence argue that innocent people have been victimized for generations by a system that won't change without being jolted out of complacency by any means necessary to achieve racial justice.

Those advocating peaceful means of confronting racism and achieving social change often sharply disagree over the best domains and strategies for doing so. From the post-U.S. Civil War Reconstruction era through our present day, scholars and activists debate whether racism is best addressed through political and legal channels or through private and/or public domains such as economics, education, personal relationships, psychological introspection, or art.

Several such debates are included here, including whether economic strategies are more efficacious than political ones, whether literature (or art more broadly) should be used as a vehicle for social protest, whether reparations are moral, whether (and if so, to what extent) police practices and violence are caused by racism, and whether anti-racism is a beneficial approach to combating racism. Most of these debates began during Reconstruction and continue to the present day in some form.

It's unlikely that all of these debates could be covered in this unit, so selecting two or three modules to focus on for class discussion—based on local student interest—will likely be necessary. However, all of these materials should be made available for students to engage with, so that those who are interested can do so.

Guide Objectives and Key Questions Bank for Unit 2

Section 1: Nature of Race (Mallon, Lopez, Andreasen, Pigliucci/Kaplan)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain what “race essentialism” (or “racialism”) is.
- Students will be able to explain Ron Mallon’s summary of why an “ontological consensus” about race has been reached.
- Students will be able to explain why Ian Haney Lopez thinks that race is socially constructed.
- Students will be able to explain what cladism is as well as Robin Andreasen’s argument for why race is biologically grounded in cladistics.
- Students will be able to explain what ecotypes are as well as Massimo Pigliucci and Jonathan Kaplan’s argument for why race is biologically grounded in ecotypes.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to articulate and defend their own definition of “race.”
- Students will be able to reflect on whether they think there is any reason to think that races exist.
- Students will be able to evaluate different arguments for the view that race is biologically grounded.
- Students will be able to evaluate an argument for the view that race is socially constructed.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) What is “race essentialism” (also called “racialism”)? Explain this view in your own words.
- (2) What does Ron Mallon mean by claiming that an “ontological consensus” about race has been reached?
- (3) What are Ian Haney Lopez’s reasons for thinking that race is socially constructed?
- (4) What is cladism? What is Robin Andreasen’s argument for why race is biologically grounded in cladistics?
- (5) What are ecotypes? What is Massimo Pigliucci and Jonathan Kaplan’s argument for why race is biologically grounded in ecotypes?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Articulate your own definition of race. Swap your response with someone else and respond to their definition and reasons for their view of race. Would you change your view in light of what the other person wrote? Explain why or why not.
- (2) Do you think that there is any reason for thinking that races exist? Identify and explain at least two reasons for your position.
- (3) Evaluate Ian Haney Lopez's reasons for thinking that race is socially constructed.
- (4) Evaluate Robin Andreasen's argument for why race is biologically grounded in cladistics.
- (5) Evaluate Massimo Pigliucci and Jonathan Kaplan's argument for why race is biologically grounded in ecotypes.
- (6) Reflect on the various arguments concerning whether race is biologically grounded or socially constructed. Which position do you think is most defensible? Identify and defend your reasons for the position you support.

Section 2, Week 1: Race and Identity (Douglass, Morrison, Angelou)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain Frederick Douglass's account of the psychological effects of slavery on both the slave and the slaveholder.
- Students will be able to explain how Frederick Douglass was able to learn about and work around his society's views of racial identity.
- Students will be able to explain Toni Morrison's account of the relationship between racial contempt, ideas of beauty and ugliness, and self-esteem.
- Students will be able to identify and explain how Maya Angelou regards the role that race and fashion play (or should play) in beauty and self-esteem.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to articulate and defend their own view of how they think one's psyche can be affected by others' assumptions about one's racial identity.
- Students will be able to analyze and reflect on whether they have internalized and/or worked around their society's views of racial identity.
- Students will be able to evaluate Frederick Douglass's account of the psychological effects of slavery on both the slave and the slaveholder.

- Students will be able to analyze how the relationship between racial contempt, ideas of beauty and ugliness, and self-esteem is explored in *The Bluest Eye*.
- Students will be able to articulate whether and how larger social factors, including how race is represented in various media, might influence their clothing and self-presentation choices.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) Explain Frederick Douglass's account of the psychological effects of slavery on both the slave and the slaveholder.
- (2) Explain how Frederick Douglass was able to learn about and work around his society's views of racial identity.
- (3) Explain Toni Morrison's account of the relationship between racial contempt, ideas of beauty and ugliness, and self-esteem.
- (4) Identify and explain how Maya Angelou regards the role that race and fashion play (or should play) in beauty and self-esteem.

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Articulate how you think one's psyche can be affected by others' assumptions about one's racial identity. Swap your response with someone else and respond to their view. Would you change your response in light of what the other person wrote? Explain why or why not.
- (2) Do you think that you have internalized society's views about racial identity? If so, identify and analyze concrete examples of how you have done so. If you have resisted or avoided doing so, how have you accomplished that? Can you recall any specific ways in which you and/or others have had to work around society's views of racial identity?
- (3) Do you think that Frederick Douglass has a persuasive account of the psychological effects of slavery on both the slave and the slaveholder? Identify and develop two reasons for your response.
- (4) Reflect on Toni Morrison's view about the relationship between racial contempt, ideas of beauty and ugliness, and self-esteem. Do you think that she accurately and/or fully captures the connections between these?
- (5) How does Toni Morrison's view about racial identity show up in the characters of Pecola and Claudia in the *The Bluest Eye*?
- (6) What is it about Maya Angelou's clothing choices that causes her son to be anxious? Do larger social factors, such as how race is represented in various media, influence your clothing

and self-presentation choices? If so, provide and analyze concrete examples. If not, explain what instead motivates your choices.

Section 2, Week 2: Race and Identity (Brodkin, Baldwin, Loury)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain how James Baldwin characterizes—and why he rejects—both Christianity’s and Islam’s views about and religion and racial identity.
- Students will be able to explain what James Baldwin means by love and how love can transcend the “problem of the color line.”
- Students will be able to explain Karen Brodkin’s distinction between ethnoracial assignment versus ethnoracial identity.
- Students will be able to explain Karen Brodkin’s account of how Jewish people “became white” in the United States.
- Students will be able to explain how Glenn Loury connects the phenomenon of “passing” and the story about his childhood friend Woody to his view that race is socially constructed.
- Students will be able to explain Glenn Loury’s account of the tension between racial identity and authenticity and his reasoning for choosing the latter.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to reflect on their own experiences (if any) with religious perspectives about racial identity.
- Students will be able to reflect on what they would have chosen to do and why in relation to Woody, had they been in Glenn Loury’s position at the time.
- Students will be able to analyze and reflect on the ways in which race as biological versus socially constructed emerge in the work of Baldwin, Brodkin, and Loury.
- Students will be able to evaluate whether James Baldwin’s view that love can transcend the “problem of the color line” is plausible.
- Students will be able to evaluate Karen Brodkin’s account of how Jewish people “became white” in the United States.
- Students will be able to evaluate Glenn Loury’s reasoning for choosing to strive for authenticity rather than insist on racial identity.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) How does James Baldwin characterize both Christianity's and Islam's views about and religion and racial identity? What are his reasons for rejecting both of those views?
- (2) What does James Baldwin mean by love? How does he think that love can transcend the "problem of the color line"?
- (3) What is Karen Brodtkin's distinction between ethnoracial assignment and ethnoracial identity?
- (4) What is Karen Brodtkin's account of how Jewish people "became white" in the United States? How much does she think this was caused by social and political practices and how much through individual choice?
- (5) How does Glenn Loury connect the phenomenon of "passing" and the story about his childhood friend Woody to his view that race is socially constructed? What role does he think individual choice plays in racial identity?
- (6) What is Glenn Loury's account of the tension between racial identity and authenticity? What is his reasoning for choosing to cultivate authenticity?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) What experiences, if any, have you had with religion and race? Were they positive or negative? Be specific and concrete with the examples you recall.
- (2) If you had been in Glenn Loury's position as a teenager, would you have spoken up to defend Woody in that situation? Why or why not?
- (3) Analyze and reflect on the ways in which race as biological versus socially constructed emerge in the work of Baldwin, Brodtkin, and Loury.
- (4) Do you think that James Baldwin's view that love can transcend the "problem of the color line" is plausible? Identify and develop two reasons for your response.
- (5) Do you agree with Karen Brodtkin's account of how Jewish people "became white" in the United States? If so, what evidence can you provide? If not, what reasons do you have for challenging her account?
- (6) Do you agree with Glenn Loury's reasoning for choosing to strive for authenticity rather than insist on racial identity? Identify and develop two reasons for your response.

Section 3: Defining Racism (Tatum, Brown/Jackson, Blum, Sawrikar/Katz)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain Beverly Tatum’s distinctions between prejudice, internalized oppression, and racism as well as between active versus passive racism.
- Students will be able to explain Beverly Tatum’s argument for her definition of racism.
- Students will be able to explain how Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson use twentieth-century U.S. legal history to defend a definition of racism that is similar to Beverly Tatum’s.
- Students will be able to explain the key tenets of Critical Race Theory.
- Students will be able to explain what “conceptual inflation” is and Lawrence Blum’s reasons for thinking that conceptual inflation about race is bad.
- Students will be able to distinguish Lawrence Blum’s definition of racism from other race-related phenomena (e.g., racial insensitivity, racial ignorance, racial discomfort) and explain his argument for his definition.
- Students will be able to explain Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz’s reasons for rejecting the definition “racism = white supremacy.”
- Students will be able to explain Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz’s argument that their preferred definition of racism is good because it allows for “cultural competency.”

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to articulate and defend their own definition of “racism.”
- Students will be able to analyze and reflect on whether Beverly Tatum’s distinction between active and passive racism is persuasive.
- Students will be able to evaluate Beverly Tatum’s argument for her definition of racism.
- Students will be able to evaluate the main tenets of Critical Race Theory as explained by Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson.
- Students will be able to evaluate Lawrence Blum’s definition of racism and why he thinks it is important to distinguish that from other race-related phenomena (e.g., racial insensitivity, racial ignorance, racial discomfort).
- Students will be able to evaluate Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz’s reasons for rejecting the definition “racism = white supremacy.”

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) How does Beverly Tatum distinguish between prejudice, internalized oppression, and racism? Between active and passive racism?
- (2) What is Beverly Tatum's argument for her definition of racism?
- (3) How do Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson use twentieth-century U.S. legal history to defend a definition of racism that is similar to Beverly Tatum's?
- (4) What are the key tenets of Critical Race Theory?
- (5) What is "conceptual inflation"? Why does Lawrence Blum think that conceptual inflation about race is bad?
- (6) How does Lawrence Blum distinguish racism from other race-related phenomena (e.g., racial insensitivity, racial ignorance, racial discomfort)?
- (7) What are Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz's reasons for rejecting the definition "racism = white supremacy"?
- (8) How do Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz think that their preferred definition of racism allows for "cultural competency"?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Articulate your own definition of racism. Swap your response with someone else and respond to their definition and reasons for their view of race. Would you change your view in light of what the other person wrote? Explain why or why not.
- (2) Is Beverly Tatum's distinction between active and passive racism persuasive? Identify your reasons why or why not.
- (3) Do you agree with Beverly Tatum's argument for her definition of racism? If so, explain and defend your reasons why. If not, what reasons do you have for challenging her view?
- (4) Do you agree with the main tenets of Critical Race Theory as explained by Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson? Identify and defend your reasons why or why not.
- (5) Reflect on Lawrence Blum's view about "conceptual inflation." Can you think of other concepts that have become inflated? If so, what are they and how have they become inflated? Select one of these, explain how you would "deflate" that concept, and what the benefits of doing so would be.
- (6) Do you agree with Lawrence Blum's argument for distinguishing between racism and other race-related phenomena (e.g., racial insensitivity, racial ignorance, racial discomfort)? Identify and defend your reasons why or why not.

(7) Are you persuaded by Pooja Sawrikar and Ilan Katz's reasons for rejecting the definition "racism = white supremacy"? Identify and defend your reasons why or why not.

Section 4, Week 1: Race in Society: Law (Omi, various laws and court cases)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain what Michael Omi sees as problems caused by original state-defined racial classifications as well as the problems with continuing to use racial classifications in law for redress purposes.
- Students will be able to explain in their own words what the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution mean.
- Students will be able to explain how a biological conception of race was involved in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the *Ozawa v. U.S.* case of 1902, and the Virginia state court decision in 1959 involving the Lovings.
- Students will be able to explain how the U.S. Supreme Court argued in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) to overturn *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896).
- Students will be able to explain the U.S. Supreme Court's majority opinion in *Korematsu v. U.S.* (1944).
- Students will be able to explain in their own words what the U.S. Civil Rights Act (1964) was about.
- Students will be able to explain how the U.S. Supreme Court argued in *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) that Virginia's law banning interracial marriage was unconstitutional.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to reflect on whether there is a way out of the dilemma that Michael Omi sees with using racial classifications in law.
- Students will be able to reflect on what they think would qualify as reasonable limitations on civil liberties under wartime conditions.
- Students will be able to evaluate the U.S. Supreme Court's majority opinion in *Korematsu v. U.S.* (1944).
- Students will be able to evaluate the U.S. Supreme Court's argument in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) to overturn *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896).

- Students will be able to evaluate the U.S. Supreme Court's argument in *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) that Virginia's law banning interracial marriage was unconstitutional.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) What does Michael Omi see as problems caused by original state-defined racial classifications as well as problems with continuing to use racial classifications in law for redress purposes?
- (2) How would you explain in your own words what the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution mean?
- (3) What conception of race was involved in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the *Ozawa v. U.S.* case of 1902, and the Virginia state court decision in 1959 involving the Lovings? Point to specific textual evidence in each case.
- (4) How did the U.S. Supreme Court argue in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) to overturn *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896)?
- (5) What is the reasoning of the U.S. Supreme Court's majority opinion in *Korematsu v. U.S.* (1944)?
- (6) How would you explain in your own words what the U.S. Civil Rights Act (1964) was about?
- (7) How did the U.S. Supreme Court argue in *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) that Virginia's law banning interracial marriage was unconstitutional?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Do you think that there is a way out of the dilemma that Michael Omi sees with using racial classifications in law? Explain why or why not.
- (2) What do you think would qualify as reasonable limitations (if any) on civil liberties under wartime conditions? If none, explain why not. If so, be specific in identifying what they are and why those should be restricted in those circumstances.
- (3) Do you think that the U.S. Supreme Court's majority opinion in *Korematsu v. U.S.* (1944) is justified? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (4) Do you think that the U.S. Supreme Court's argument in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) to overturn *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) is justified? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (5) Do you think that there are ever contexts in which separating people based on group membership could be done while upholding equality? If so, explain why. If not, explain why not.

(6) Do you think that the U.S. Supreme Court was justified in their *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) ruling that Virginia's law banning interracial marriage was unconstitutional? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.

Section 4, Week 2: Race in Society: Affirmative Action (O'Neil, Chavez, McWhorter)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain R. M. O'Neil's argument defending race-based preferential admissions/affirmative action in education.
- Students will be able to explain why Linda Chavez rejects race-based preferential treatment/affirmative action in hiring.
- Students will be able to explain why John McWhorter rejects race-based preferential treatment/affirmative action in education.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to reflect on what it might be like to be admitted to college or get hired for a job due them being a member of a historically disadvantaged group.
- Students will be able to evaluate R. M. O'Neil's argument defending race-based preferential admissions/affirmative action in education.
- Students will be able to evaluate Linda Chavez's argument against race-based preferential treatment/affirmative action in hiring.
- Students will be able to evaluate John McWhorter's argument against race-based preferential treatment/affirmative action in education.
- Students will be able to evaluate John McWhorter's argument for the "gift of competition" in education.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

(1) What connection does R. M. O'Neil see between underrepresentation versus representation and preferential admissions/affirmative action in education?

(2) What dilemma does O'Neil think is created by affirmative action public policy and how does he address it?

- (3) What connection does Linda Chavez see between affirmative action in hiring and stereotyping? What from her personal experience contributes to her view about this?
- (4) What ill social effects does McWhorter think that affirmative action in education has?
- (5) How does McWhorter think that affirmative action in education adversely affects an individual's psychology?
- (6) What approach does McWhorter think black Americans should embrace in order to close the educational performance gap between racial groups? What role does competition play here and why?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Imagine finding out that you were admitted to college or got a job in part because you were a member of a particular group. How do you think that would affect you? Would that be a good or bad thing?
- (2) Do you think that R. M. O'Neil's argument defending race-based preferential admissions/affirmative action in education is persuasive? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (3) Do you think that Linda Chavez's argument against race-based preferential treatment/affirmative action in hiring is persuasive. Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (4) Do you think that John McWhorter's argument against race-based preferential treatment/affirmative action in education is persuasive? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (5) Do you think that John McWhorter's view of the "gift of competition" is persuasive as a way of achieving educational excellence? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.

Section 5, Week 1: Combating and Redressing Racism: Economics vs. Politics and Non-Violence vs. Violence Modules (Washington vs. Du Bois and King vs. Malcolm X)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain Booker T. Washington's argument for focusing on industrial education and business for advancing quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War.
- Students will be able to explain W. E. B. Du Bois's critique of Booker T. Washington's approach to advancing quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War.

- Students will be able to explain why W. E. B. Du Bois thinks that focusing on politics is superior to Booker T. Washington's approach to improving quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War.
- Students will be able to define eros, philia, agape, and nonviolent resistance.
- Students will be able to explain Martin Luther King, Jr.'s argument defending nonviolent resistance.
- Students will be able to explain why Malcolm X defends violent revolution over nonviolent resistance.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to evaluate Booker T. Washington's argument for focusing on industrial education and business for advancing quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War.
- Students will be able to evaluate whether they think that W. E. B. Du Bois's focus on politics is superior to Booker T. Washington's approach to improving quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War.
- Students will be able to articulate and defend their own view of love and reflect on whether or not love has helped them to resolve conflicts in their lives.
- Students will be able to reflect on occasions when they have believed themselves to be treated unjustly. They will recall how they responded to that injustice and their reasons for handling it that way as well as whether they would handle it differently (and why) should the occasion arise.
- Students will be able to evaluate Martin Luther King, Jr.'s argument defending nonviolent resistance.
- Students will be able to evaluate Malcolm X defends violent revolution over nonviolent resistance.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) Why does Booker T. Washington think that focusing on industrial education and business will advance quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War?
- (2) How does W. E. B. Du Bois critique Booker T. Washington's approach to advancing quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War?

(3) Why does W. E. B. Du Bois think that focusing on politics is superior to Booker T. Washington's approach to improving quality of life for black Americans after the U.S. Civil War?

(4) What are eros, philia, and agape? What is nonviolent resistance and how is it related to agape? What is Martin Luther King, Jr.'s argument defending nonviolent resistance?

(5) What are Malcolm X's reasons for defending violent revolution over nonviolent resistance?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

(1) Why does Booker T. Washington focus on industrial education and business development? How does he think that this approach will improve race relation in the U.S.?

(2) Why does W. E. Be Du Bois think that Booker T. Washington's approach is the wrong one? What approach does Du Bois instead recommend for the improvement of race relations in the U.S.?

(3) Do you think that Booker T. Washington or W. E. B. Du Bois had the better approach for the time in which they lived?

(4) How would you define love? Are there different kinds of love? Has love ever helped you to resolve conflicts in your life?

(5) Recall and reflect on occasions when you believed that you were treated unjustly. How did you respond to that injustice? What were your reasons for handling it that way? Would you handle it differently should the occasion arise? Why or why not?

(6) Do you think that Martin Luther King, Jr.'s argument defending nonviolent resistance is persuasive? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.

(7) Do you think that Malcolm X's argument defending violent revolution over nonviolent resistance is persuasive? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.

Section 5, Week 2 (Option A): Combating and Redressing Racism: Literature/Art Module (Baldwin, Christian)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain what James Baldwin means by a "protest novel."
- Students will be able to explain what James Baldwin's arguments against protest novels are.

- Students will be able to explain what Barbara Christian thinks we can learn about American society from studying the characters of Celie in Alice Walker’s *The Color Purple* and Frado in Harriet Wilson’s *Our Nig*.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to articulate and defend their own definition of “protest novel.”
- Students will be able to identify whether they have read any protest novels other than those discussed by James Baldwin and, if so, analyze whether or not they possess the kinds of problems pointed out by Baldwin.
- Students will be able to evaluate James Baldwin’s argument against protest novels.
- Students will be able to assess whether Barbara Christian’s argument about the significance of the characters of Celie and Frado is plausible.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) What does James Baldwin mean by “protest novel”?
- (2) What are James Baldwin’s aesthetic reasons for rejecting protest novels?
- (3) What are James Baldwin’s moral reasons for rejecting protest novels?
- (4) What does Barbara Christian think we can learn about American society from studying the characters of Celie in Alice Walker’s *The Color Purple* and Frado in Harriet Wilson’s *Our Nig*?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Articulate your definitions of “protest,” “novel,” and “protest novel.” Swap your responses with someone else and respond to their definitions and reasons for their them. Would you change your view in light of what the other person wrote? Explain why or why not.
- (2) Do you think that James Baldwin has good arguments against protest novels? Explain why or why not.
- (3) Based on what you learn about *The Color Purple* and *Our Nig* from Barbara Christian’s discussion of them, do you think that these would count as “protest novels”? Why or why not? Make sure to cite carefully several pieces of textual evidence for your claim.
- (4) Reflect on Barbara Christian’s view about what we can learn from studying the characters of Celie and Frado. Do you think that she is right in her assessment? Why or why not?

Section 5, Week 2 (Option B): Combating and Redressing Racism: Reparations Module **(Boxill, Kukathas)**

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain how Bernard Boxhill distinguishes between compensation and reparation.
- Students will be able to explain how Bernard Boxhill defends group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery.
- Students will be able to explain how Chandran Kukathas distinguishes between collective and corporate entities.
- Students will be able to explain how Chandran Kukathas rejects group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to reflect on whether the distinction between compensation and reparation is a good one.
- Students will be able to reflect on when—if ever—it is reasonable to hold groups and all of their members rather than particular individuals responsible for an outcome (whether the purpose is to praise or blame them).
- Students will be able to compare and contrast Bernard Boxhill's and Chadran Kukathas's characterizations of compensation versus reparation.
- Students will be able to evaluate Bernard Boxhill's argument defending group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery.
- Students will be able to evaluate Chadran Kukathas's argument rejecting group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) How does Bernard Boxhill distinguish between compensation and reparation?
- (2) Why does Bernard Boxhill focus on reparation rather than compensation?
- (3) What reasons does Bernard Boxhill provide in defense of group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery?
- (4) How does Chandran Kukathas distinguish between collective and corporate entities?

(5) Why does Chadran Kukathas think that arguments defending group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery are implausible?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

(1) Do you think that the distinction between compensation and reparation is a good one? Why or why not?

(2) When—if ever—is it reasonable to hold groups and all of their members rather than particular individuals responsible for an outcome (whether the purpose is to praise or blame them)? What are your reasons for doing so or not? Does the type of group matter?

(3) In what ways are Bernard Boxhill's and Chadran Kukathas's characterizations of compensation versus reparation similar to and different from one another?

(4) Do you think that Bernard Boxhill has a good argument for defending group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.

(5) Do you think that Chadran Kukathas has a good argument for rejecting group reparations for historical injustices such as slavery? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.

Section 5, Week 2 (Option C): Combating and Redressing Racism: Police Violence Module (Darden/Godsay, McWhorter)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to identify and explain what Taylor Darden and Surbi Godsay think is the underlying cause of black people in the U.S. being killed in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.
- Students will be able to explain what Darden and Godsay think should be done to address that underlying cause.
- Students will be able to identify and explain what John McWhorter thinks is the underlying cause of black people in the U.S. being killed in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.
- Students will be able to explain John McWhorter's reasons for rejecting an explanation like that offered by Darden and Godsay.

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to generate multiple possible explanations for why black people in the U.S. are being killed by police in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.
- Students will be able to reflect on what research they would need to undertake in order to test their various hypotheses.
- Students will be able to evaluate whether Darden and Godsay or McWhorter has a stronger argument for what accounts for why black people in the U.S. are killed in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.
- Students will be able to reflect on what they think might be the best way to address the problem of excessive force in policing.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) What do Taylor Darden and Surbi Godsay think is the underlying cause of black people in the U.S. being killed in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.?
- (2) What do Darden and Godsay think should be done to address that underlying cause?
- (3) What does John McWhorter think is the underlying cause of black people in the U.S. being killed in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.?
- (4) What are John McWhorter's reasons for rejecting an explanation like that offered by Darden and Godsay?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Setting aside the explanations offered by Darden and Godsay, how many other possible explanations can you generate for why black people in the U.S. are being killed by police in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.? Once you identify at least a few, flesh out why you think each might be able to explain that phenomenon.
- (2) What research would you need to undertake in order to test your various hypotheses?
- (3) Does Darden and Godsay or McWhorter have a stronger argument for what accounts for why black people in the U.S. are killed in disproportionately higher numbers than are white people in the U.S.? Identify and explain two reasons why you think that explanation is stronger.
- (4) What do you think might be the best way to address the problem of excessive force in policing? Why do you think that would work? What is involved in achieving the improvement you seek?

Section 5, Week 2 (Option D): Combating and Redressing Racism: Psychology and Anti-Racism Module (Kendi, Smith)

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will be able to explain how Ibram Kendi defines racism and antiracism.
- Students will be able to explain Ibram Kendi’s argument for thinking that institutional racism exists.
- Students will be able to explain what Ibram Kendi thinks should be done about institutional racism.
- Students will be able to explain how Erec Smith defines identity politics and empowerment.
- Students will be able to explain Erec Smith’s critique of identity politics and the “primacy of identity.”
- Students will be able to explain how Erec Smith argues that the three levels empowerment theory rather than “primacy of identity” lead to “true empowerment.”

Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives

- Students will be able to reflect on whether the distinction between racism and antiracism is a good one.
- Students will be able to articulate and defend their own view of what it means to be empowered.
- Students will be able to reflect on their own personal narratives—or stories they tell themselves—and consider whether that is empowering or disempowering.
- Students will be able to evaluate Ibram Kendi’s argument for thinking that institutional racism exists.
- Students will be able to evaluate Erec Smith’s critique of identity politics and the “primacy of identity.”
- Students will be able to evaluate whether Kendi or Smith has a better approach to addressing racism.

Key Questions

For Knowledge Objectives:

- (1) How does Ibram Kendi define racism and antiracism?
- (2) What is Ibram Kendi’s argument for thinking that institutional racism exists?

- (3) What does Ibram Kendi think should be done about institutional racism?
- (4) How does Erec Smith define identity politics and empowerment?
- (5) What is Erec Smith’s critique of identity politics and the “primacy of identity”?
- (6) How does Erec Smith argue that the three levels empowerment theory rather than “primacy of identity” lead to “true empowerment”?

For Intellectual Autonomy Experiential Objectives:

- (1) Do you think that Kendi’s distinction between racism and antiracism is a good one? Explain why or why not.
- (2) Articulate what you think empowerment means. Swap your response with someone else and respond to their definition and reasons for their view of empowerment. Would you change your view in light of what the other person wrote? Explain why or why not.
- (3) Identify one of your personal narratives—that is, a story that you tell yourself about yourself. Is that story empowering or disempowering for you? Is that story true? If not, what story is more true about yourself? What do you think might be different about your life, if you were to adopt this different story?
- (4) Do you think that Ibram Kendi has a good argument for thinking that institutional racism exists? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (5) Do you find plausible Erec Smith’s critique of identity politics and the “primacy of identity”? Identify and defend two reasons why or why not.
- (6) Do you think that Kendi or Smith has a better approach to addressing racism? Identify and defend two reasons for your response.

Final Two Weeks: Creation/Processing of Summative Unit Work

- Identify Type and mode of work that each student will create for the Summative Unit Work.
- Set up various ways for students to scaffold and process their work on their own, in peer-review groupings, and in dialogue with their Guide/Writing Coach.
- Be sure to set up clear standards and parameters around the use and integration of research, so as to avoid plagiarism and/or inadequate paraphrasing.
- There are lots of possibilities for different sorts of assignments that can equally well reflect a student's understanding of the material in this unit. Here are examples of possible work (illustrative, not exhaustive):
 - An essay explaining how X.
 - A careful comparison and contrast essay showing how X.
 - An argumentative essay defending X, taking seriously objections that the others could raise.
 - Writing a short story in which different characters are in conflict with one another due to holding competing views about X.
 - Analyzing the character and choices of one of the assigned literary works through the perspectives of X theories.
 - Podcast of a dialogue between competing theorists about issue X.