Understanding Systemic Inequality by Exploring Race and Immigration through a Sociological Lens

Michele Aronica, RSM, Ph.D.

"In everything, therefore, treat others as you would like them to treat you"
Mt 7:12

The scope of this paper is to provide an overview, a context for thinking about our societal diversity rooted primarily in the areas of race, immigration and its consequences from a sociological perspective. Its purpose is to deepen our understanding of these areas in order to surface and if need be, challenge the way we see, feel and act toward others whom we label as "different". Lastly, this paper raises questions for reflection, with the intention that the answers may prompt a deepened personal commitment to positive action of some type.

Context:

Our American society is composed of individuals and groups who are of European (Northern, Eastern, and Southern), African, Asian, Latino, Mid-Eastern and Native American origin; who are male and female, and who hold or operate out of many religious traditions-Jewish, Christian, Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist, in addition to new spiritual groups and movements. All these are diverse in their color, size, wealth, education, culture and language. Often times, these "differences" we see among us prompt us to perceive and act toward people in ways that convey a belief that the differences we see are absolute in nature, when in fact they are arbitrary and proven to have no basis

in biological or genetic origin. Behaving in ways that place people into categories violates basic human dignity, a fundamental principle of social justice, and has profound personal, organizational and societal consequences.

From this reality, questions arise: Why do groups relate to other groups the way they do? How can we recognize both similarities and differences and yet move to a place of oneness as a human community which respects the dignity and rights of all people? What do we need to change in our understanding of a "unified" American Society in order to have and provide equal access and opportunity across ALL our institutions for ALL Americans from ALL backgrounds? Since our country's foundation, we have thought of ourselves as "unified", when in reality, "unified" has often been portrayed as an Anglo-Saxon society.

Before discussing race and immigration which, hopefully, will help to answer these questions, it is important to note that each of us operates out of a cultural system in relation to one another and this may, indeed, impact our patterns of thinking and acting. An illustration of this point: When I entered the Portland Regional Community of the Sisters of Mercy, as an Italian American from New York, after a short time, I became intensely aware that I was becoming part of an Irish community located in Maine. For me, several differences were quickly noted:

- Food. Within Italian households, the preparation of and the shopping for food, the discussion of what will be eaten, the conversation over it, and, during the meal itself, discussing what the next meal will be is a major focal point.

- Conversation. The impassioned expression of ideas, open conversations, direct questions and heated discussions and debates (usually at the table with food) are very much a part of everyday life.
- Expressing Affection. Family members greet each other in the morning with an embrace, kiss goodbye for the day, hug hello in the evening, and embrace again before going to sleep. We cry together in sadness, laugh heartily in joy and embrace warmly as a sign of love on all occasions great and small!
- Organizational Church. Faith and the development of spirituality are extremely important, with less emphasis being paid to the institutional Church *per se*, its rules and regulations. The latter are thought about as "guidelines" which need serious consideration, but which need not be taken literally.
- Geographic Culture. My style of conversation is impacted by my experience of living in New York, where culturally communication is often direct and assertive, not aggressive, although it can be interpreted as such. In Maine, conversation is often more indirect and reticent in style.

This cultural background, in relationship to the Irish-Maine culture I encountered, caused me at times to be puzzled as to why food did not appear to be important; why asking questions directly, expressing ideas with intense feeling, or demonstrating affection were not the normative pattern for communication within the religious community and why the Church "guidelines" were taken so seriously, instead of being relegated to the "noble" role of "suggestions" to be considered.

To recognize and understand that we are shaped by and act out of our own "cultural" experience, is meaningful as we move to explore and deepen our knowledge of diversity.

Understanding Race and Diversity:

Race is a term which has been used to convey a variety of different ideas, all focused on categorizing peoples into different groups. It has been used to separate people in terms of skin color (White), or religion (Muslim), or nationality/ancestry (Egyptian) or even the entire human species (race). In effect, the notion of race as a human construct is arbitrary since it is based on both what is understood as biological differences and the subsequent social meanings (Marger, 2015: 15).

As a biological notion, race classifies people on the basis of certain hereditary characteristics that differentiate them from other human groups (Smedley, 1993: 303-305). It is important to note that hereditary differences, as a way to classify people, only became a primary focus of identifying groups in the 1500's (Smedly, 2007). One dimension which needs to be clearly articulated is that we, as "homo sapiens," are variations on a single theme, and we can interbreed (Feagin and Feagin, 1996:8). If we could not, then there would be some biological basis for race which would have meaning (Gordon, 1978). The basis of racial classification simply focuses on externals: skin color, hair texture, body and facial features such a nasal and lip shapes; this is, in effect, arbitrary (Van den Berghe, 1967:9-11). The Genome Project begun in 1990 and officially ending in 2003 indicates that some populations, due

to genetic make-up, are more predisposed to certain medical conditions than are others [1]. (NIH The Human Genome Project, 2003; 2015; NIH The National Human Genome Research Institute, 2020). The Genographic Project which ran from 2005-2015 led by Wells, a genetic anthropologist, continued genome research which found that extensive inbreeding over many generations and adaptations to different physical environments have produced overlapping of genetic characteristics with the net result being that about 99.8 percent of human beings have the same genetic material according to geneticists (Wells, 2017 [2002]; Tishkoff and Kidd, 2004: S22). Furthermore, it is proven that "most genetic variation occurs within populations, not between them" (Hoffman, 1994:4). Geneticists Ossorio and Duster further clarified that "most human genetic variation, approximately 85%, can be found between any two individuals from the same group (2005:117), which confirmed what geneticists Bamshead and Olson found previously (2003:78). The conclusion is that race, based on selected genetic characteristics, is essentially a myth, without grounding in science (Sussman, 2016; Roberts, 2012). Mukhopadhyay et al. state that "…races are unstable, unreliable, arbitrary, culturally created divisions of humanity. This is why scientists…have concluded that race as scientifically valid biological divisions of the human species is fiction not fact" (2007:14). Unfortunately, some people continue to believe it is a foundation.

---

[1] Research continues in exploration of blood characteristics and internal features, including metabolic rate, genetic diseases, hormonal activity and blood composition.

What is more critical to be aware of is the social meaning which is affixed to race and its political and social consequences. Fundamentally, "isms" (racism, agism, feminism, etc.) are the outgrowth of the social meanings persons attach to qualities and characteristics (diversity) that persons "see and believe" as essentially different. As long as people believe the differences in selected features/qualities are important characteristics, their beliefs, attitudes and values will be shaped by them and will impact how they act on them and thus structure social interactions accordingly (Cox, 1948:400-402).

Therefore, the development of the ideology/belief system of racism which underlies social relationships is to some extent socially agreed upon. "Racism is the belief that humans are subdivided into distinct hereditary groups that are innately different in their social behavior and mental capacities and can, therefore, be ranked as superior or inferior" (Marger, 2015: 18). Based on this belief system, it not only justifies but legitimizes and perpetuates inequality in treatment in all spheres of society.

In the case of race, *if* people believe that external physical differences are important distinctions, it will impact the extent to which it influences their behavior, which Berger (1966) termed the "social construction of reality". Furthermore, racism in all its forms is learned behavior from varieties of sources and experiences, including family, friends, schools, peer groups, churches and social media, to mention only a few. Higginbotham and Anderson contend that "the actual meaning of race lies not in people's physical

characteristics, but in the historical treatment of different groups and in the significance that society gives to what is believed to differentiate so-called racial groups" (2012:13).

Due to a lack of clarity around the concept of race as a biological base [2] and the lack of scientific research validity regarding it as a genetic differentiator of peoples, social scientists since the 1960's have used *ethnic group* as an overarching term to understand this reality. (Marger, 1994:25; Berreman, 1972; Gordon, 1964; Schermerhon, 1970; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965; Williams, 1979). [3]

The use of the label *ethnic groups* does not suggest that differences do not exist, which is implied by the use of the term "color blind". This term, "color blind" implies that biological features are not seen, or acknowledged, or no longer matter and nor is inequality experienced by people of color. Additionally, it suggests that people do not see injustice, prejudice, or individual structural-institutional discrimination (Friedman, 2013; Wise, 2010). Rather, the term "ethnic groups" is used to include groups and organizations identified by national origin, cultural distinctiveness, racial affiliation or religious affiliations and who experience prejudice, discrimination,

[2] In the 1940's, Anthropologists have used the term *ethnic groups* to include race because these we no connection /link between different cultural groups " …[since] the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated genetic connection with racial traits" (Mertraux, 1950 : 145).

[3] A term introduced in the early 1970's, developed by Stuart Hall, is "multiculturalism" which describes ascribed characteristics to include ethnic and racial groups as a way to understand diversity and the challenges of inequality and understanding between different groups which exists in society (Drew, 1998: 187-191).

inequality and exclusion (Sollors,1989: Sowell, 1981).

"Ethnicity", a relatively new term, (Glazer and Moynihan,1975) has typically referred to cultural traits which contain customs, thought patterns, behaviors, attitudes, common language and heritage. It is important to understand that ethnicity and ethnic groups are not looked at as isolated entities but rather in relationship or comparison to each other (Marger, 2015: 7). As a result, a sense of community, a "we-ness," a peoplehood emerges (Gordan, 1964) which, therefore, implies the establishment of an "in group" (to denote members) and an "out group" (Hughes and Hughes, 1952).

Ethnicity, taken to the extreme "ethnocentrism", may be the outcome of a group's self-pride since it refers to that "we" feeling which tends to judge other groups by the standards and values of one's own group. "In group" ways are seen as correct, natural; "out group" ways are thought of as odd, wrong, unnatural, perhaps even immoral (Sumner, 1960:27-28). Territoriality is also a dimension of ethnicity, since it refers to a place, one's own land, and which includes language. There is the potential, if political autonomy is obtained among ethnic groups, that a society can become a "nation within a nation" (i.e., Bosnia of Yugoslavia, or the Province of Quebec in Canada, or Catalonia of Spain).

Members of all ethnic groups are potentially subject to prejudice, which refers to values, beliefs and attitudes that convey the social ranking of one group as higher or lower than another ethnic group because of perceptions

based on physical or cultural traits, social behavior, intelligence or personality. Therefore, prejudices often articulated in labels such as "inferiority" and "superiority" are attributed to terms such as racism, sexism, ageism, ethnocentrism, etc. An attitudinal system of prejudice may be based upon a psychological orientation which stresses the need for certain groups to satisfy personality needs (authoritarian) to engage in hostility (Pettigrew: 1971, 134-135). Oftentimes tied to frustration-aggressive behavior, the authoritarian personality type exhibits discrimination in the form of scapegoating of individuals and groups to satisfy the need to control and not necessarily based in hatred of the group according to Jackman (2005: 89-90). On the other hand, a sociological perspective/lens focuses upon the role society has in socializing members into systems (groups, organizations and institutions) which are prejudiced. Essentially, people are influenced by the groups/people with which they associate and influence the groups to which they belong.

Institutional Discrimination and Immigration:

Historically and presently, there is no society in which all people receive an equal share of rewards, i.e. politically, economically or socially. In a multi-ethnic society, an ethnic group (ethnicity) is a critical factor in determining who gets "what there is to get." The creation and implementation of policies and practices (social structures) which, implicitly or explicitly limit people from sharing in scarce resources is termed "discrimination" (Myrdal, 1964 [1944]: 52). It is important to note that prejudice is an attitude and discrimination is behavior. Neither is innate, but, rather learned behavior. Discriminatory

behavior can exist with varying degrees of intensity, from verbal abuse to the extreme behavior of genocide. There are two broad types of discrimination, individual, which refers to people operating out of their own personal prejudice, and institutional. The latter type of discrimination, whether consciously or unconsciously, is imbedded within social structures of a society which manifests itself as systemic and becomes part of "the fabric" of society. In many instances institutional discrimination is legally sanctioned, may be considered tradition, and may not be socially unexpected or disapproved. This type of discrimination oftentimes results in differential treatment: the denial of jobs, housing, education, health care and justice, since not everyone has equal access to the various components within society. For instance, poor education can lead to poor jobs which leads to poor housing, inadequate access to health care, etc. Several striking examples of systemic institutional discrimination follow: The Criminal Justice System favors white Americans over people of color, as illustrated by the fact that a high proportion of those who are "stopped" by police may simply be stopped and questioned because they are persons of color (profiling) or may have excessive force used on them and be arrested. All too often, those convicted of crimes are minorities who cannot afford high legal fees and who receive sentences which are longer or more severe than white persons convicted of the same crimes (Golash-Boza,2015: 295-320). Let us also be reminded of the profound discrimination which faced veterans of color, particularly African Americans who returned from fighting in World War II. They experienced the widespread denial of the VA federal low

interest mortgage benefit, which prevented their movement from being a "renter" to a "homeowner". This denial signaled not only the type of housing available, but the denial of movement into the middle class, since homeownership proved to be a significant investment in one's future, not only at the point of sale, but to having access to quality education and health care. And again, Feagin, (1977:177-200), and Feagin and Feagin, (1986) indicate that if jobs are located in suburban areas where there is little or no public transportation, the only persons who have access are those who have cars and, thus the poor, often persons of color are automatically excluded. "Steering" is another example of institutional discrimination that occurs when real estate agents' direct certain categories of people away from specific residential areas, which impacts not only the quality of housing but the education and health care that are available. A final example included here is the discrimination directed to the Japanese. Two months after Pearl Harbor was bombed, approximately 120,000 Japanese persons, most of whom were American citizens, were ordered by the federal government to sell their possessions within two weeks and were brought to internment camps in Rocky Mountain area states and released shortly before the end of the World War II (Marger, 2015: 266-267). In essence, these examples, in very poignant ways, point to what has been established and operating, that is, a series of powerful relationships between dominant groups and minority groups. Louis Wirth defines "minority groups" as "groups of people who, because of their physical or cultural characteristics, are singled out from the others in the society in which

they live for differential and unequal treatment, and who, therefore, regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination" (1945:347). The term minority is not necessarily tied to numbers or percentages of people. For example, in the South African society, under Apartheid (from 1948-1990's) 90% of its population, African, held little/no political power and had little/no access to jobs or economic power. While the end of Apartheid allowed South Africans of all races the vote since 1994, there continues to be the ongoing struggle for equality (Congressional Research Service, 2020: 8; Cornish-Jenkins, 2015).

Discriminatory relationships that exist among diverse groups come as a result of contact between previously separate groups, which may be in the form of conquest (colonialization), annexation (Louisiana Purchase), voluntary immigration (better economic conditions), or involuntary immigration (slavery) (Lieberson, 1961). The type of contact according to Noel, which occurs between groups when they meet, is a critical factor in explaining the form that the ethnic inequality i.e., discrimination can take (1968). Following contact, groups engage in competition; ultimately, one group imposes its superior power over another ethnic group and emerges as the dominant group (Park, 1950). Ordinarily, there are four types of relationships that exist among minority and dominant groups: pluralistic minorities, each of which seek to maintain some degree of separation from the larger society; assimilationist minorities, each of which aims for full integration into the dominant society, which includes culturally changing patterns to be similar/same as the dominant society (acculturation); secessionist minorities, each of which seeks political autonomy

from the dominant society; and militant minorities, each of which try to establish dominance themselves (Park, 1950; Gordon, 1964).

As illustrations of Noel's theory of initial contact, several striking examples of profound inequality, prejudice and discrimination have been a part of our American society from its beginning. Since the time Europeans came to the "new world", there were consistent, concerted efforts to encroach on the land inhabited (owned) by the Native American tribes. It did not take long before the Native indigenous people were robbed of their land, killed-depopulated, and/or displaced to areas of the United States which were remote and oftentimes barren. All these efforts were to expand the white American footprint across the continent (Marger, 2015: 137-160). In the United States during the colonial period, the dominant Anglo group imposed its power over minority groups because of the Anglo group's demand for the land to produce more and more for those who were the new owners. African people were bought to Virginia in 1619, though it was not until the 1660's that the Slave Codes legalized slavery, which was in place until the end of the Civil War in 1865. Next, beginning in the 1870's the Jim Crow laws ushered in a new form of social, economic and political servitude. Finally, the Civil Rights Acts in 1964, followed by the Voting acts law in 1965, confirmed the legal system's acknowledgement of the equality of Black Americans as citizens and their right to vote (Marger, 2015: 163-205; Golbash-Boza, 2015: 73-77). The expansionist mentality was also carried out and severely impacted Hispanic indigenous people, mostly from Mexico, since the Southwest was a territory which

belonged to Mexico. Finally, after numerous battles and illegal land seizures, in 1848 the American Southwest was ceded to the United States by Mexico after losing the Mexican American War.

In the industrial age, the technology of the day became oppressive and impoverished the minority groups, particularly those who worked the factories. The legal system enacted various immigration laws that sought to impose discrimination and provide arbitrary quotas on people arriving from different countries. While Chinese men were brought to the United States in 1864 to work on the Trans-continental railroad, connecting the West coast to the East, at its completion, the government banned Chinese immigration by enacting the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, which was active for ten years and was extended until 1910. Policies continued to exclude the Chinese from becoming citizens until 1943 when they were repealed (Mooney, 2017: 288). There were also restrictive and punitive policies designed to limit immigration directed toward the Japanese and other East Asians since the 1880's and ultimately banned them from entering the United States by the Immigration Act of 1924 (Marger, 2015: 245-253; Golbash-Boza, 2015:43- 48).

As a developing nation, the number of new ethnic minority groups increased, initially from Northern Europe; immigration policies directed discrimination first to the Irish in the 1830's and later in the 1880's to the Southern and Eastern Europeans (Italian, Jewish, Polish) and Asians. As time passed, new immigrant groups replaced the old ones, since rapid industrialization in America seemed an attractive destination for those people

who were poor that were migrating from poverty, violence, political instability, war and oppression in their homelands. Armed with only the personal belongings that could be carried, and with hope for a better future through economic opportunity and freedom from political instability, many immigrants over time moved up the economic ladder into the working class and some, after a generation, into the middle class.

Joseph Healy suggests that "our society has grown to its position of preeminence in spite of, or perhaps because of, our diversity. In fact, many have argued that our diversity is a fundamental and essential characteristic of U.S. society and a great strength to be cherished" (1995:509). Our diverse population has provided opportunities for differing perspectives, and ideas to become part of the American culture in the form of creativity and innovation. However, this does not imply that diversity has been without tension, discrimination and conflict (Van Alstine, et el., 2015: 125-128). Looking at several ethnic groupings indicates that African Americans, though highly acculturated, still struggle for inclusion, equality and integration (housing, schooling, jobs, etc.) (Mooney, et al, 2017: 299-314; Golash-Boza, 2015; Lieberson, 1980:377-83; Feagin and Feagin, 1996:281). Native Americans are less assimilated than are African Americans; Hispanic Americans are less acculturated than African Americans, since the Spanish language has been sustained by the ethnic communities of Hispanic people who live within the United States (Golash-Boza, 2015:340-341; Feagin and Feagin, 1996:370).

Immigration laws passed in 1965 loosened quotas and finally officially allowed immigrants from Mid-Eastern and African countries. However, with the bombing of American sites on September 11, 2001, animosity, prejudice, discrimination and intolerance heightened toward persons who emigrated from Mid-Eastern and Muslim countries to the United States. Over the last five to seven years in the Middle East, events (civil war and terrorism) have triggered millions of persons to emigrate from their countries primarily to Europe for a safe and secure life. The massive migration of Middle Eastern people has heightened concern in some Americans regarding our own immigration practices. Shortly after taking office, President Trump, one of whose platform goals intended to limit if not stop immigration of persons from all countries, started to "make good" on his promises by using media to heighten division, prejudice and fear toward both legal and illegal immigrants. The ongoing animosity has resulted in initiatives and laws (federal and state) aimed at stopping all immigration, whether legal or illegal, closing the borders, separating children from parents, deporting people, "building the wall", not addressing the needs of the "dreamers" by delaying passing the DREAM Act (Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act), originally designed in 2001, and filing court cases to undo policies such as DACA (deferred action for childhood arrivals) and DAPA (deferred action for parents of Americans) instituted under President Obama.

COVID-19 has had and continues to have a sweeping and profound impact on the global community. In our country this virus has exposed the

inequalities which exist and its disproportionate impact on certain segments of our population. The disruptions to ordinary living, in an attempt to contain spread of the outbreak, have many Americans working from home or/and doing child-care and, as a result, media have brought the "outside world" into our living spaces. Consequently, Americans nationwide have become more attuned to the injustices seen in the daily news and have called for the end of racial profiling and the brutality by police and institutional-systemic discrimination by participating in demonstrations and riots and have engaged political leaders to effect change. The current social unrest is not enough to effect systemic change, though it may bring some added changes in laws and policies.

Challenges:

I submit, the point of the above overview is to clearly show that prejudice and discrimination are "baked" into our society. The challenge for us is to recognize that the profound inequality and inhumanity leveled at people because of selected characteristics must stop since it is a matter of violating basic human rights. In my opinion, due to the ongoing discrimination, to those who are rendered "different" and consequently valued differently will then continue to struggle "to make ends meet"; if they have little education or little access to good education, healthcare, childcare, and little opportunity to gain occupational/technical skills they will remain an underclass in underpaid sectors of the economy. Since the threat of competition between and among groups increases prejudices and leads to greater discrimination and more

repression, my sense is that the distribution of scarce resources will continue to mark the future. As a society, over decades we have moved from a manufacturing sector to one which is service oriented, i.e., which offers both high income opportunities in the information-based, high technology, health care, education sector and low compensation jobs such as those in the hospitality/tourism and agriculturally based sector. This change in the primary focus of the workforce, in effect, has established a bifurcated economy which favors those with education and leaves those who are not able to have access to education relegated to work at low paying jobs, consequently continuing their membership in the underclasses. Members of this class compete for jobs essentially when newer immigrants arrive seeking employment. Discrimination actively increases almost exponentially.

I believe we still have to address the reality that the most pressing problem which will continue to face us as a nation is the existence of institutional discrimination. From what has been presented in this paper, I believe inclusivity and equality are not a matter of legislative policies, as these are already on the "books". Rather, it is a matter of informing and reforming each person's heart and mind to recognize we need to work to end these injustices.

Perhaps, *now* is *really* the time; maybe *we* are the people, and *these* are the circumstances to bring an end to the dehumanization of all people, due to the importance we place on the "differences" we see. The age-old questions surface: *If not now, When??? If not us, Who???*

There are other pressing questions also to grapple with: How can we recognize both our similarities and differences and move to a place of oneness as a human community which respects the dignity and rights of all people? How do we—because of our diversity —live out and create communities which acknowledge our distinctions and celebrate our diversity, our desire to unity, inclusiveness and equality?

What is our role as individuals and as members of organizations? How do we create an environment in which our policies and practices promote opportunities for people to become sensitive to multi-cultural issues? How do we engage with family, friends, and colleagues to encourage the deepening of our knowledge, understanding, awareness and, if necessary, encourage changes in our values, beliefs and attitudes which may be prejudicial? How do we demonstrate by our lives, formally and informally, the dignity which all human beings have and the rights which flow from simply "being"? How do we empower ourselves and those around us to be courageous in upholding the rights of those who bear the brunt of prejudice and discrimination? How do we encourage critical analysis and motivate ourselves and others to work toward systemic change? How do we use language in a way that conveys the power which it has in shaping our thoughts and attitudes, as well as recognize that our thoughts and attitudes shape the language, we use to convey messages, verbally, and physically and, thereby, construct our social reality? What is the language we need to develop in order to reflect our diversity and our oneness? What do we need to change in our understanding of a "unified" American

Society in order to have equal access and opportunity across ALL our institutions for ALL Americans of ALL backgrounds? Finally, given the ongoing institutional discrimination: How do we reach persons/groups who still strongly believe that genetic differences sanction prejudicial and discriminatory treatment of people?

In order for lasting meaningful change to occur, it requires that we, individually, organizationally and societally do the soul-searching work necessary to change our hearts, minds, values and attitudes. It is through this internal work that it will become possible to be committed, to take a stand, in whatever way one is able to individually and organizationally, to eliminate, or dis-mantle practices which foster exclusivity, inequality, discrimination and non-acceptance directed to people and groups, considered to be "different".

We have the ability to encourage openness with ourselves and with those with whom we engage both formally and informally, to love ourselves and others, not only family, friends and relatives, but all people of "every place and tongue" who share life on this planet. We have an opening to encourage people to appreciate in themselves—and, therefore, in others—their uniqueness, which collectively is called "diversity." We have an opportunity to empower generations of people to think of the U.S. as a nation rather than as a "melting pot" or "stew" which starts as separate ingredients that lose their individual flavor to become one taste. Rather, I prefer the image of the tossed salad or a fruit salad [4] one composed of ingredients from all over the world. My point, in this analogy, is that each ingredient maintains its own texture, flavor and

shape; and, as we savor the taste, we find that, collectively, the flavor of each is so much more enhanced than it is separately.

We have a unique chance, to empower individuals to be informed, open-minded and sensitive human beings who, in turn, create communities that foster acceptance and appreciation, and which strive to protect human rights and promote social justice. We can potentially be, a model for the world.

I'll conclude by repeating; perhaps, *now is really* the time, and maybe *we* are the people, and *these* are the circumstances to bring an end to dehumanization of all people due to the "differences" we see.

"You shall treat the alien who resides with you no differently than the natives born among you…" Lev. 19:34

---

[4] Not just any salad, but one complete with: red peppers from Chile, green peppers from Mexico, radishes from China, onions from Egypt and Mesopotamia, chicory from Greece and Italy, avocados from Peru, watercress from Italy, lettuce from Greece, cucumbers from Asia, okra from Sudan, mushrooms from throughout Europe, and tomatoes, (perhaps the only plant of American origin, though its name is Mexican) (Brothwell, 1969:123).Or, if you prefer, fruit salad one made with: cantaloupe from Persia, watermelon from Africa, bananas from Central America, raspberries from Chile, raisins from Jerusalem, pineapples from Hawaii, plums from Chile, grapes from France, dates from India and apples from Colombia.

REFERENCES

Bamshad, Michael and Steven Olson
2003 "Does Race Exist?" *Scientific America* 289 (12): 78-85.

Berger, Peter
1966 The Social Construction of Reality : A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Anchor Books.

Berreman, Gerald
1972 "Race, Caste, and Other Invidious Distinctions in Social Stratification, Race" 13: 385-414.

Brothwell, Don and Patricia Brothwell
1969 Food In Antiquity: A Survey of the Diet of Early Peoples. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Congressional Research Service
2020 South Africa: Current Issues, Economy and U.S. Relations 1-38. https://crsreports.congress.gov accessed 20 September 2020.

Cornish-Jenkins, Haydn
2015 "Despite the 1994 Political Victory Against Apartheid, its Economic Legacy Persists" *South African Oral History Project.*

Cox, Oliver C.
1948 Caste, Class and Race. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Drew, Julie
1998 "Cultural Composition: Stuart Hall on Ethnicity and the Discursive Turn." *JAC* 18:2 171-196.

Feagin, Joe R.
1977 "Indirect Institutionalized Discrimination, "*American Political Quarterly* 5:177-200.

Feagin, Joe R. and Clairece Booher Feagin
1986 Discrimination American Style: Institutional Racism and Sexism. Malabar, FLA: Krieger Publishing Company

Frieden, Bonnie
2013 “I Don’t see Race’: The Pitfalls of the Colorblind Mindset” Washington Political Review. 18 (April) 3

Golbash-Boza, Tanya Maria
2015 Race and Racisms: A Critical Approach New York: Oxford Press.

Gordon, Milton
1964 Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins. New York: Oxford University Press

1978 Human Nature, Class and Ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hardwood, Fredrick
1911 Good Cheer: The Romance of Food and Feasting. London: Unwin.

Healy, Joseph F.
1995 Race, Ethnicity, Gender and Class. California: Pine Forge Press.

Higginbotham, Elizabeth and Margaret Anderson
2012 “The Social Construction of Race and Ethnicity” In Race and and Ethnicity in Society. 3rd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Hoffman, Paul
1994 “The Science of Race,” *Discover* (November) 418

Hughes, Everett and Helen M. Hughes
1952 Where Peoples Meet: Racial and Ethnic Frontiers. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Jackman, Mary
2005 “Rejection of Inclusion of Outgroups?” 89-105 in John Dovidio, Peter Glick, and Laurie Rudman (eds.) On the Nature of Prejudice: . Fifty Years After Allport. Malden, MA: Blackwell

Lieberson, Stanley
1980 A Piece of the Pie. Berkley: University of California Press.
1961 “A Sociological Theory of Race Relations.” *American Sociological Review* 26: 902-910.

Linton, Ralph
1936 The Study of Man: An Introduction. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. New York.

Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.
1996 Race and Ethnic Relations, 5th edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Marger, Martin N.
2015 Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives. 10th edition, Stamford, CT: Cengage Publishers.

1994 Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives. 3rd edition. Belmont CA: Wadsworth.

Metraux, A.
1950 "United Nations Economic and Security Council Statement by Experts on Problems of Race". *American Anthropologist* 53(1): 142-145.

Mooney, Linda, Knox, David and Caroline Schacht
2017 Understanding Social Problems. 10th edition. Stamford, CT.: Cengege Publishers.

Mukhopadhyay, Carol, Rosemary Henze and Yolanda Moses
2007 How Real is Race? Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1964[1944] An American Dilemma. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, Vol. 1.

National Institute of Health. Genome.gov
2003 The Human Genome project results [online] Available at https://www.genome.gov/human-genome-project/results accessed 10 February 2019

2015 The Human Genome Project. [online] available at: https://www.genome.gov/human-genome-project accessed 21 July

2020 National Human Genome Research Institute https://www.genome.gov./research-at-nhgri/Projects accessed 14 August 2020

Noel, Donald L.
1968 "A Theory of the Origin of Ethnic Stratification." *Social Problems* 16:154-172.

Ossorio, Pilar and Troy Duster
2005 “Race and Genetics” *American Psychologist* 60(1):115-128.

Park, Robert E.
1950 Race and Culture. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Pettigre w, Thomas
1971 Racially Separate or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill

Quijano, A
2000 “Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America”: *International Sociology*, 15(2) 215-232.

Roberts, Dorothy
2014 Fatal Invention: How Science, Politics and Big Business Re-create Race in the twenty First Century. New York: The New Press

Schermerhorn, R.A.
1970 Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. New York: Random House.

Shibutani, Tamotsu and Kian M. Kwan
1965 Ethnic Stratification. New York: McMillan.

Smedley, Audrey
2007 Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview. 3rd edition. Boulder: Westview

1993 Race in North America. 1st edition. Boulder: Westview

Sollors, Werner
1989 The Invention of Ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press

Sowell, Thomas
1981 Ethnic America. New York: Basic Books.

Sumner, William G.
1960 Folkways. New York: Mentor Books.

Sussman, Robert
2016 The Myth of Race: The Troubling Persistence of an Unscientific Idea. Boston, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Tannahill, Reay
1973 Food in History. New York: Stein and Day, Publishers.

Thishkoff, Sarah and Kenneth K. Kidd
2004 “Implications of Biogeography of Human Populations for “Race” and Medicine”. *Nature Genetics Supplement* 36(11)S21-27.

Van Alstine, Jason, Steven R. Cox and Dianne M. Roden
2015 “Cultural Diversity in the United States and Its Impact on Human Development” *Journal of the Indiana Academy of the Social Sciences* 18 (1)125-143.

Van den Berghe, Pierre
1967 Race and Racism. New York: Wiley

Wells, Spenser
2017 [2002] The Journey of Man: A Genetic Odyssey Revised edition New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Wirth, Louis
1945 “The Problem of Minority Groups” in Ralph Linton (ed.), The Science of Man in the World Crisis. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wise, Tim
2010 Colorblind: The Rise of Post-Racial Politics and the Retreat from Racial Equality. City Lights Books: San Francisco: CA.