The Occlusion of Empire in the Reification of Race: A Postcolonial Critique of the American Sociology of Race

Author: Julia C. Bates

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:108103

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

The Occlusion of Empire in the Reification of Race: A Postcolonial Critique of the American Sociology of Race

Julia Christine Bates

Boston College
Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences
Graduate School

June 2018

The Occlusion of Empire in the Reification of Race: A Postcolonial Critique of the American Sociology of Race

Julia C. Bates

Zine Magubane, Ph.D.
Stephen Pfhol, Ph.D.

In a series of case studies, I problematize the reification of race in the American Sociology of race from a postcolonial perspective. I argue prominent theories within the American sociology of race tend to essentialize race as a cause of racial inequality in the United States. These theories assume the existence of racial categories and then discuss how other entities become racialized into racialized social systems (Bonilla-Silva 1997), or racial projects (Omi & Winant 1994). These theories emphasize national structures, but occlude empire. I argue the occlusion of empire in the American sociology of race, particularly in theorization of racial categorization, is problematic. Empire is the structure that links race to class inequality, and produces race as a social category of exclusion. Therefore, a sociological theory of American racial inequality, which does not analyze imperialism as a structure that produces race, and rather focuses solely on national-structures, or a definition of capitalism severed from imperialism, cannot provide a thoroughly structural explanation for the persistence of racial inequality in the United States.

In a series of case studies, I problematize the reification of race in the American Sociology of race from a postcolonial perspective. I argue prominent theories within the American sociology of race tend to essentialize race as a cause of racial inequality in the United States. Some theories assume the existence of racial categories and then discuss how other entities become racialized into racialized social systems (Bonilla-Silva 1997), or racial projects (Omi & Winant 1994). These theories emphasize how national structures produce racial categories within the United States; however, they do not look at the global imperial structure. I argue the occlusion of the imperial structure in the sociology of race, and more specifically theorization of racial categorization, is problematic. Empire is the structure that links race to class inequality, and produces race as a social category. Therefore, a sociological theory of American racial inequality, which does not analyze imperialism, and rather focuses solely on national-structures, or a definition of capitalism severed from imperialism, cannot provide a thoroughly structural explanation for the production and persistence of racial inequality in the United States in the post Civil-Rights era.

Early theories in the sociology of race primarily focused on the marginalization of African Americans *within* the nation-state. According to contemporary overviews of these theories there were three broad types: assimilation, class and racial prejudice theories. The assimilationist approach, pioneered by Robert Park, argued black Americans in the United States moved through a series of successive stages, like immigrants, which eventually led to their assimilation into the dominant political and economic institutions (1914; 1928). The class approach framed racial oppression as an

aberration, rather than a fundamental principle of American society. This theory contended black migration from the South to the North of the United States would force black and whites into an overarching class system, which was the primary system of social inequality in the United States (Becker 1957; Dollard 1957; Johnson 1939; Warner and Srole 1945; Wilson 1978). Racial prejudice theories focused on racial attitudes as the source of racial inequality in the United States. They hypothesized through time the lessening of racial prejudice would destroy structures of racial inequality in the United States (Blumer 1958; Hyman and Sheatsley 1964; Myrdal 1944).

In the post Civil-Rights Era three prominent paradigms of race challenged the prevailing orthodoxy of earlier theories. They critiqued them for lacking a structural explanation for the persistence of racial inequality in the United States in the post-Civil Rights era. They noted that despite the assimilation hypothesis that black Americans would assimilate like other immigrants, they hadn't (Blauner 1972; Omi and Winant 1994; Bonilla-Silva 1997, 2006). Furthermore, they noted the class hypothesis appeared false. Race had not become a less salient category of social exclusion as capitalism advanced (ibid). Lastly, the prejudice theory failed to predict the persistence of racism in the United States. White Americans' racial prejudice didn't decrease, but simply morphed (briefly) into a less overt form (Bonilla-Silva 2006).

In response to the failure of these three hypotheses to predict the persistence of racism in the United States, Robert Blauner (1972), Omi and Winant (1986), and Bonilla-Silva (1994) developed three alternative theories rooted in conceptions of the U.S. racial state. Blauner's theory of *Internal Colonialism* used the metaphor of Empire to argue African Americans' experience of racial subjugation in the United States was structurally

similar to third world peoples' experience of colonial subjugation. Blauner insisted colonialism was part of the inception of the U.S. state and as a result the struggles of Native Americans, Chicanos, and African Americans were interrelated colonial struggles (1972). Dissatisfied with prejudice theories, Michael Omi and Howard Winant developed *Racial Formation* theory. They argued prejudice theories "reduced" race to discrimination, or race relations; therefore, sociologists needed to make social structure the analytical focus of their theories of race. They asserted scholars needed to analyze "racial formations", which they defined as sociohistorical processes, in which human bodies and social structures were represented and organized, but *also* a type of institutional hegemony, in which society is organized and ruled (1994: 56). In their overviews of "racial formations" they provide a succinct analysis of how structures like national laws and policies, produced and reproduced racial hierarchy within the United States. Likewise, Bonilla-Silva developed a theory of *Racialized Social Systems*, which he defined as societies in which economic, political, social and ideological levels are partially structured by the placement of actors in racial categories or races (1997: 476). In this definition, Bonilla-Silva emphasizes racial structure and categorization. Nonetheless, the racial categories, or races, are taken as a structural given.

Likewise, in the 1990s there was a growth of empirical studies on the ways various social processes and institutions become "raced". Sociologists discovered these "races" were unstable in the way they were constructed and applied to other facets of social life. For instance, in an analysis of the social construction of "whiteness" *within* Puerto Rico in the early twentieth century, Loveman and Muniz showed how boundary shifting led more people in Puerto Rico to identify as "white" on the Census between

1910 and 1920 (2007). Other scholars show how racial categories and hierarchies are central to the nation-building process (Sierlis 2004; Weiner 1995), as well as practices of capitalist exploitation (Winant 2001).

There was also growth in scholarship, which analyzed how national legislation served to maintain racial categorization in a given society. For instance, some scholars analyzed how states attempt to maintain racial order through regulation of interracial intimacy in anti-miscegenation law (Nagel 2000; Pascoe 2009). Other scholarship developed analysis on how explicit and implicit policies on national immigration served to control the racial order of countries around the world (Bashi 2004; Calavita 2007). Furthermore, feminist scholars showed how racial projects around identity and citizenship are also gendered (Dorr 1999; Luidheid 2004; Vacante 2007). Likewise, Critical Race scholars employed the racial formation perspective to show how race and law are mutually constituted (Carbado & Harris 2012; Gomez 2010).

However, in the late 1990s and early 2000s some sociologists began to critique these more structural theories of race for reifying race. Mara Loveman contended Bonilla-Silva's theory of racialized social systems seemed to take racial categorization as a given, and seemed to universalize the United States racial structure (Loveman 1999). Likewise, in history, Barbara Fields broadly critiqued the social sciences for treating race as an ahistorical, reified entity. Both Loveman and Fields note these new structural theories don't fully account for what structural mechanisms produce and reproduce race as a social category within the United States (Fields 1994, 2001, 2014; Loveman 1999) In her critique of "Rethinking Racism" (1999), Mara Loveman asserts Eduardo Bonilla-Silva talks about the placement of "actors" into racial categories as if bounded, clearly

demarcated races existed objectivity "out there" (893). Likewise, Barbara Fields argues that while social scientists note that race is "socially constructed" they precede with their analysis as though race is a static, ahistorical substance that has a life of its own external to the mechanisms that produce it (Fields 2014: 100).

Other historians have argued the occlusion of Empire in the American social sciences, is rooted in the academic discipline's support of U.S. racism and imperialism. Aldon Morris, notes that sociologists of race, like W.E.B. Du Bois, who theorized on the connection between U.S. imperialism and racism were marginalized by the University of Chicago and other American universities (Morris 2015). Likewise, historians, Dudziak, Von Eschen and Singh document how black Marxists during the Civil Rights movement, which connected the fight for racial justice in the United States to the fight against U.S. Empire, were purged from the academy, or silhoed into the humanities, or interdisciplinary fields. As a result racism went from something "understood in the history of slavery and colonialism" to something conceptualized as a "psychological" or a "domestic" problem (Von Eschen 1997).

I argue the occlusion of Empire limits sociologists' understanding of the mechanisms that produce race as a category of exclusion in the United States. Postcolonial scholars argue sociologists' repression and exclusion of the perspectives and theories of the colonized led social scientists to misunderstand the production of modernity (Bhambra 2013, 2014, 2017; Connell 2006, 2007; Go 2017). More specifically, they argue sociologists can't understand the processes that led to the development of the modern-bourgeois culture in Europe without understanding the ways European Empire in Africa and Asia, reverberated through the Metropole in the

development of "modernity" (ibid). Other scholars have examined the effects of U.S. Empire on racial ascription in South America, the Caribbean and South Pacific and vice versa (Grosfoguel 2006; Hardt & Negri 2000; Kaplan 2002; Mignolo 200). However, there is a real lack of analysis on how U.S. Empire has shaped sociological theories on racial categorization of black Americans and their subordination within the United States.

I argue the exclusion of Empire from prominent theories within the sociology of race, limits sociological understanding of the structural basis and persistence of racial inequality in the United States. In the first article of the dissertation, I question whether the occlusion of Empire within prominent theories of race produces a substantialized conception of race. More specifically, I analyze whether the same U.S. state actors ascribe the same racial meanings to black bodies within U.S. Empire as they do within the nation-state. I hypothesize if they ascribe different meanings within Empire verses within the nation-state then a racial theory that occludes Empire will produce a more simplistic and substantialized conception of race than a theory that examines Empire. I theorize that if they do ascribe different meanings it will correlate with the imperial objectives of the U.S. state.

As a case study, I examine General Armstrong's mutual advocacy of the importation of an industrial training school from Hawaii to the Southern United States, and exportation of black labor from those schools to Hawaii. Using records from the General Armstrong and State Department, I find in both cases General Armstrong highlighted the similarities between black Americans and Hawaiians; however, he applied different racial codes to both groups relative to the third group of comparison. In the case of the importation of the industrial training school from Hawaii to the Southern

United States, Armstrong applies a Lamarckian racial code to both Hawaiians and black Americans in his comparison to white Americans. However, in his advocacy for the exportation of black American labor from the Southern United States to Hawaiian plantations he applies a biological racial code to both Hawaiians and black Americans in comparison to Chinese migrant workers. In the first case, he positions himself as an agent of the U.S. nation-state and uses a Lamarckian racial code, which emphasizes civilizational difference, to symbolically distance both Hawaiians and black Americans from the U.S. polity. In the second case, he positions himself as a colonizing agent of U.S. Empire in Hawaii and uses a biological racial code, which emphasizes natural difference, to symbolically link black Americans to the U.S. polity as expanders of U.S. Empire in the South Pacific. General Armstrong shifted the racial meanings he ascribed to black and Polynesian bodies, relative to how he positioned himself within the U.S. polity. I question how evidence that racial ascription shifts relative to the ascriptors' social positioning within U.S. Empire problematizes theories, which conceptualize race as endogenously produced within the U.S. nation-state

I chose this case because it is an example of a colonial policy imported in to the United States, i.e. the industrial training model, and a product from it exported back out, i.e. black labor. This facilitated an analysis of how meanings ascribed to black American bodies were constructed and reconstructed relative to policy transactions within U.S. Empire. Furthermore, this case is ideal because it involved the same actor, i.e. General Armstrong, positioning the same two groups relative to one group depicted as within the U.S. citizenry, i.e. white Americans and one seen as definitively outside the U.S. citizenry, i.e. Chinese migrant workers in Hawaii. Lastly, I chose this case because it was

at a time, i.e. the Reconstruction period, where conceptions of U.S. citizenship and nation-hood were shifting.

In the second article of the dissertation, I analyze whether occlusion of Empire in analysis of the U.S. racial state reifies race as a cause of policy diffusion. More specifically, I examine whether a sociological understanding of the U.S. as a nation-state leads to the construction of "race" as an explanation for policy diffusion. I theorize that a sociological understanding of the U.S. as a Nation-state, rather than as an Empire-state will epistemologically lend itself to the reification of race as a causal variable.

As a case study, I compare two prominent sociologists of race conceptualizations of the U.S. state and how they connected these conceptions to their explanation of why the U.S. exported policies used for African Americans to Africa following WWI. In particular, I examine Thomas Jesse Jones and Du Bois' conceptions of the U.S. racial state in *Education in Africa* and *Dark Water*. I examine how they used this conception to explain why the industrial education school, first developed in Hawaii, was then exported to Africa following WWI. I supplemented the examination of Education in Africa and Dark Water with documents from the Phelps Stokes Records on the relationship between the two sociologists.

I note that Thomas Jesse Jones' theory of race conceptualized the U.S. as a nation-state. His theory and his contemporaries, like Robert Park, were canonized within the University of Chicago in the sociology of race curriculum (Morris 2015). Conversely, the Phelps Stokes Fund explicitly marginalized Du Bois' conception of the U.S. racial state, and left out *Dark Water* from its development of race curriculums for Universities. I argue Jones and Du Bois' conceptions of the U.S. racial state influenced their views on

policy diffusion. Furthermore, the occlusion of Du Bois' theory of the U.S. racial state as an Empire-state from the sociology of race has fostered theories, which reify race as the cause of policy diffusion.

I chose this case because there has been a recent resurgence of debate within American sociology on the effects of the marginalization of Du Bois on sociological theories of race. Likewise, there is renewed interest in Robert Park and Booker T. Washington who were associates with Thomas Jesse Jones and impacted one another's intellectual work. Robert Park and Booker T. Washington had a tremendous influence on the development of race-relations theory at the University of Chicago. In turn race relations theory, had a strong influence on the development of theories of race in the 1970s, 80s and 90s. These structural theories eluded Empire just like Thomas Jesse Jones. Yet the effects of this history on the sociology of race's conception of the U.S. racial state have remained unexamined.

In the third article of the dissertation, I examine whether the occlusion of Empire within American sociology produces an artificial bifurcation of race and class in sociology's typology of racial theories. Many prominent theories of race begin with an overview, or a lit review that typologically splits racial theory in to three groups: prejudice/race-relations, class-based, and nation-based theories. In this typology, class-based theories are often negatively compared to prejudice and nation-based theories. More specifically, they are critiqued for reducing racial inequality to class inequality, and as a consequence, reducing the analytical significance of race.

In this framing, it is suggested Marxist theories don't take "race" seriously because they analyze class inequality. Furthermore, it is implied race and class are two

separate structures of inequality. In these overviews, black Marxists that conceptualized race and class as two parts of the same imperial system are left out. I question whether the occlusion of these black Marxists from overviews of "class-based" theories of race, produces a problematic bifurcation of race from class in the sociology of race.

As a case study, I examine the occlusion of William Lorenzo Patterson from overviews of "class-based theories" of race. William Lorenzo Patterson was one of the first African Americans prosecutors. He was also a self-ascribed Marxist. Although William Patterson was not a sociologist, he did have close intellectual relationships with sociologists of race, like W.E.B. Du Bois. Furthermore, in sociologies typology of racial-theories they include other non-sociologist, activists such as Stokely Charmichael in "nation-based" theories of race. Black Activists, such as Charmichael and Patterson tend to be silhoed and homogenized into the "nation-based" grouping and framed as politicians, rather than academics. This is despite the fact that many of the scholars lumped into the "nation-based" theories have very different structural theories of race. Likewise, self-ascribed black Marxists, like Patterson tend to be taken less seriously as Marxists in overviews and critiques of "class-based" theories of race.

This is despite the fact, that these black Marxist, activist-intellectuals played a large role in applying sociological theory to global issues, and leveraging their theories within international institutions. Using documents from the State Department Records, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers, NAACP Papers and Civil Rights Congress Papers, I examine William Patterson's "We Charge Genocide" petition to the U.N. and the U.S. State Department's repression of it. In December 1951, William Patterson presented his theory of the imperial roots of U.S. racial inequality in the "We Charge Genocide" petition to

the United Nations. The theory presented in this petition launched a racial program added to the U.S. State Department's "Campaign for Truth": a global propaganda effort to decouple capitalism from imperialism and racism to promote the U.S. as the rightful leader of the world over the Soviet Union. Yet, William Lornezo Patterson's theory of race is not included in prominent sociological theories of race overviews' of Marxist thought on race.

I use this case to examine whether the occlusion of black Marxists, like William Patterson from sociology of race is significant. William Patterson was a self-ascribed Marxist who had close ties to sociologists of race like W.E.B. Du Bois. It is significant that William Patterson defined himself as a Marxist and studied Marxist theory in relation to race. Secondly, it is significant he had ties to other prominent sociologists of race that were also recently found to be marginalized within the the American sociology of race (Morris 2015). Lastly, it is significant that Patterson did leverage the United Nations with his theory of race, and that the U.S. State Department saw his actions as a threat that needed to be neutralized through a global propaganda effort.

It is not incidental, that theories of race, like William Patterson's which connect U.S. imperialism to U.S. racism are not included in sociological overviews' of Marxist thought on race. The U.S. government systematically repressed the development and dissemination of these theories during the Cold War. Empire structurally encompasses both class and racial inequality and fundamentally links the two in such a way that racism can't be seen as a unitary logic that is produced, or can be resolved within the nation state. In this dissertation, I use three historical case studies to show how the occlusion of

Empire leads to the reification of race, and its bifurcation from class within the American

sociology of race.

Multiple Racial Logics, One Dispossessed Subject: The Production of the Black American Citizen through U.S. Imperialism in Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This article examines the United States government's construction of Black Americans as objects of political intervention in two interrelated policy proposals. More specifically, it examines the construction of Black Americans as objects of political intervention in the transfer of an industrial education model from Hawaii to the Southern United States and the transfer of black American workers from the Southern United States to Hawaii. I specifically compare these two proposals because they were developed in and through the United States' colonization of Hawaii, both involved black Americans and the same state actors. Despite these similarities, I find the U.S. government did not use one coherent racial logic in their construction of black Americans as objects of political intervention, but rather applied multiple, contradictory "racial codes" (Go 2004). Why did the United States government apply contradictory racial codes to black Americans in their construction of them as objects of political intervention in these two policies?

"It meant something to the Hampton school, and perhaps to the ex-slaves of America, that from 1820 to 1860, the distinctively missionary period, there was worked out in the Hawaiian Islands, the problem of the emancipation, enfranchisement and civilization of a dark-skinned Polynesian people in many respects like the Negro race."
- General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, *From the Beginning* (p. 614)

In 1866, Union General, Oliver Howard, summoned General Samuel Armstrong from Hawaii to Hampton, Virginia to scatter the surplus population of freemen gathered on the peninsula. In an attempt to disperse the population, General Armstrong developed Hampton Industrial Institute. This school employed the same "adaptive education" model his father developed for Polynesians education in Hawaii to Negro education in the American South (Southern Workman, June 1880, p. 839). In 1870, the U.S. government also asked General Armstrong to convince some freemen to migrate from the Southern United States to Hawaiian plantations. They hoped these freemen could replace Hawaiian workers dying from diseases introduced by American and European settlers in Hawaii (Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report to the Legislature, 1890, p. 144). Although both policy proposals linked black Americans and Hawaiians as similar objects of political intervention, they did so using multiple, contradictory "racial codes" (Go 2004). Why did the United States government apply multiple contradictory racial codes to black Americans in these two policies?

Drawing upon statements made by General Samuel Armstrong, the U.S. State Department, and reports of the Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration, I find these state actors applied both Lamarckian and biological racial codes to black American citizens. In their advocacy for transferring the "adaptive education" model from Hawaii to the Southern

United States, Armstrong emphasized the civilizational differences between black Americans and white Americans. In highlighting these civilization differences, Armstrong applied Lamarckian racial codes, which placed black Americans outside of the U.S. polity in the same space and time as Hawaiians. In the case of advocacy for the transfer of the "adaptive education" model from Hawaii to the Southern United States, Hawaiians and black Americans were constructed as similar objects of political intervention in opposition to white Americans. In this comparison, the difference between black Americans/Hawaiians and white Americans was constructed around civilizational difference through Lamarckian racial codes. Black Americans and Hawaiians were placed in a different space and time removed from the U.S. polity relative to white Americans who were depicted as enmeshed in the same space and time as the U.S. polity. In advocacy for the "adaptive education" model, racial difference was constructed in spatial and temporal terms, not biological terms.

However, Armstrong and the U.S. State Department's advocacy for the transfer of black American labor from the Southern United States to Hawaii emphasized biological similarities between black Americans and Hawaiians. They highlighted these biological similarities in opposition to the supposed biological characteristics of Chinese migrant workers in Hawaii. Interestingly, in opposition to Chinese migrant workers U.S. state officials placed black Americans in the same space and time as the U.S. polity.

I conclude U.S. state officials applied contradictory racial codes to black Americans, in which in one case they applied Lamarckian racial codes to symbolically distance black Americans from the U.S. polity, in the other they applied biological racial codes to black Americans to symbolically link black Americans to the U.S. polity.

Although these racial codes appear contradictory, I argue they follow an imperial logic. Why did the United States government apply multiple contradictory racial codes to black Americans within U.S. Empire? Furthermore, how does this challenge sociological understanding of mechanisms, which produce the subordination of black Americans in the United States?

U.S EMPIRE AND RACIAL CODES

In my examination of the production of "racial codes" in U.S. Empire, I make two broad theoretical interventions. First, I challenge the reification of race as one unitary logic produced within the nation-state. In particular, I show how black Americans were ascribed different racial meanings relative to other racial groups within U.S. Empire. Second, I challenge the bifurcation between the nation-state and the global, which is prominent within social theory (Bhambra 2007, 2013, 2014; Go 2016; Go & Lawson 2017; Jung 2015). I show how the U.S. government not only produced the subordination of black Americans from ascription of racial meanings relative to other groups within the nation-state, but also through the conquest and subordination of other groups in U.S. Empire.

In one of the most prominent sociological theories of race, *Racial Formations* (1994), Omi and Winant argued "a sort of 'exceptionalism'" is needed to address racial dynamics in the United States (50). More specifically, they argued American "racial formations" were distinct from global colonial or class formations (ibid). This led to a growth in sociological research that examined the construction of racial formations *within*

the U.S. (Saperstein 2013). While Racial Formations did help to overcome a kind of class reductionism in sociological theories of race, it also reinforced a conception of the U.S. as a contained nation-state. To overcome the analytical bifurcation between the United States and the global, I seek to challenge the conception of "race", particularly blackness, being produced from within the United States. I examine the relational production of "blackness" relative to other groups within U.S. Empire (Bhambra 2014; Go 2016; Magubane 2017; Sassen 1999; Steinmetz 2005; Von Eschen 1997). In particular, I argue the subordination of black Americans within the United States is not produced in isolation from the subordination of other peoples within U.S. Empire. Rather the subordination of black Americans is produced through policies that also subordinated other colonized groups.

Studying the different imperial mechanisms, which produce racial objects, or "race" can also further challenge the reification of race, or substantialism, prevalent in sociological theories of race (Fields 2013; Go 2004; Loveman 1999). Barbara Fields notes "race" is not an actual substance and therefore, it cannot cause other social phenomenon to occur. Rather "race" is a product of other socio-political mechanisms within U.S. Empire. If "race" is in fact produced within specific contexts then blackness will take on different meanings in different imperial contexts. I argue race cannot be bifurcated from those contexts, or mechanisms, without risking its reification.

An ongoing debate within the sociology of race is the extent in which "race" exists as a substance that *causes* or produces other social phenomena (Boxill 2001; Brubaker 2009; Fields 2014; Graves 2015; Omi & Winant 1994; Loveman 1999; Magubane 2017; Mason 1994). In prominent theories in the sociology of race, scholars

argue race must be taken seriously as its own independent axis of social inequality. In *Racial Formations* (1994), Michael Omi and Howard Winant argue racial formations must be studied in their own right and cannot be reduced to class, or colonial formations. Likewise, in "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation" (1997), Eduardo Bonilla-Silva argues race is not just an ideology, but also a structure that places actors into racial categories, or races (469).

However, other scholars have critiqued these theories for reifying race as a consistent, unitary categorization. They argue that when race is separated from other axis of power it is substantialized, rather than conceptualized as something produced through multiple structures of power. They note these theories don't fully account for what political mechanisms produce and reproduce race as a social category (Fields 1994, 2001, 2014; Loveman 1999; Mason 1994). In her critique of "Rethinking Racism" (1999), Mara Loveman argues Eduardo Bonilla-Silva talks about the placement of "actors" into racial categories as if bounded, clearly demarcated races existed objectivity "out there" (893). Likewise, Barbara Fields argues that while social scientists note that race is "socially constructed" they precede with their analysis as though race is a static, ahistorical substance that has a life of its own external to the mechanisms that produce it (Fields 2014: 100).

The reification of race, and the denial of the ongoing role of American imperialism in producing race, has a long history within American sociology. In the early twentieth century, the University of Chicago advanced the "race-relations cycle" theory, which became the hegemonic theory of race in American sociology. More specifically, the premiere American sociologist of race, Robert Park who worked as a

ghost writer for General Armstrong's student, Booker T. Washington (Morris 2015), argued races went through a series of stages that eventually led to their assimilation into the dominant Anglo-Saxon American culture (1914; 1928). In this theory, race was deemed an attribute of the group, rather than something grafted on to groups by institutions (Steinberg 2007: 50).

In the post Civil-Rights Era, sociologists have developed new theories to challenge the prevailing orthodoxy of race-relations. More specifically, Michael Omi and Howard Winant developed *Racial Formation* theory. Dissatisfied with theories that "reduced" race to discrimination, or "race relations", Omi and Winant argued sociologists needed to make the analysis of broader racial formations the conceptual focus of their work. They defined "racial formations" as a sociohistorical process, in which human bodies and social structures were represented and organized, but *also* a type of institutional hegemony, in which society is organized and ruled (1994: 56). Rather than showing how racial conflicts were actually class antagonisms, Omi and Winant asserted sociologists needed to show how other facets of social domination, i.e. gender, sexuality and class became cloaked in racial language.

Likewise, in the 1990s scholars employed the language of social construction in its analysis of the U.S. racial state's development of racial categories. Sociologists employed this perspective to show how racial categories and their associated meanings are unstable and historically contingent. For instance, in an analysis of the social construction of "whiteness" *within* Puerto Rico in the early twentieth century, Loveman and Muniz showed how boundary shifting led more people in Puerto Rico to identify as "white" on the Census between 1910 and 1920 (2007). Other scholars show how racial

categories and hierarchies are central to the nation-building process (Sierlis 2004; Weiner 1995), as well as practices of capitalist exploitation (Winant 2001).

There was also growth in scholarship, which analyzed how legislation served to maintain the racial order in society. For instance, some scholars analyzed how states attempt to maintain racial order through regulation of interracial intimacy in anti-miscegenation law (Nagel 2000; Pascoe 2009). Other scholarship developed analysis on how explicit and implicit policies on national immigration served to control the racial order of countries around the world (Bashi 2004; Calavita 2007). Furthermore, feminist scholars showed how racial projects around identity and citizenship are also gendered (Dorr 1999; Luidheid 2004; Vacante 2007). Likewise, Critical Race scholars employed the racial formation perspective to show how race and law are mutually constituted (Carbado & Harris 2012; Gomez 2010).

However, all these analyses tended to conceptualize the production of race within the nation-state framework. Within these analyses the U.S. racial state is analytically conceptualized as a contained unit with clear boundaries that produces "race" from within. I argue placing the production of racial meaning, particularly blackness, back into the global context in which it is produced, overcomes this reification. In particular, it shows how blackness was constructed relative to imperial objectives of the U.S. state. Drawing on post-colonial theory, I challenge the theory that "race" is primarily produced "within" the nation. Rather, I argue it is a "code" that takes on multiple, contradictory meanings relative to other groups within U.S. Empire. Furthermore, I specifically focus on the role colonial dispossession and geographic displacement play in producing and reproducing "race", particularly blackness, within the United States.

Furthermore, I argue these racial codes were not only symbolic, but also correlated with different imperial policies on the ground. Different racial codes were applied to black Americans in the Southern United States vs. Hawaii. In the Southern United States, General Armstrong applied a Lamarkian theory of racial development to both black Americans and Hawaiians. Lamarck (1744-1829) theorized all species had the power to progress if given the right environmental conditions, or education (Banton 1998, p. 33). This theory posited black Americans were inferior due to cultural circumstances, rather than biological characteristics.

Conversely, in their advocacy for the exportation of black labor to Hawaii, General Armstrong and U.S. government officials applied biological, rather than Lamarckian racial codes to black bodies. In this coding, they argued black Americans were a suitable replacement for Hawaiian workers because of their innate characteristics (Fields 2013; Graves 2002). More specifically, they argued that because they were a tropical race like the Hawaiians, they were better suited both temperamentally and physically to work on the Hawaiian plantations than Chinese workers.

In conceptualizing race as a code that is produced relationally within transnational networks, I seek to overcome the tendency towards analytic bifurcation and susbstantialism in sociological theories of race. I also seek to expand upon calls within the sociology of race to advance a structural theory of race that identifies mechanisms that produce race (Eduardo Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi & Winant 1994). I argue these mechanisms cannot be conceptualized within the nation-state framework because many of them are not national. In the post-emancipation context, black Americans were resubordinated through global imperial policies. More specifically, their race was

constructed relative to the subordination of Hawaiians and Chinese in Hawaii. The implication for future sociological research is the subordination of black Americans is not only something that is endogenously produced within the U.S. nation-state, but is also relationally produced within U.S. Empire relative to other racial groups.

LAMARCKIAN CODING IN ADVOCACY FOR THE "ADAPTIVE EDUCATION" MODEL IN THE SOUTHERN UNITED STATES

In 1872, General Armstrong decided to apply the same education model his father established for Polynesian education in Hawaii to Negro education in the Southern United States. He employed the "adaptive education" model at Hampton Institute, which emphasized manual labor and Christian character formation as a form of racial uplift. Booker T. Washington later advanced this model at Tuskegee Institute and it became the hegemonic model for Negro education across the American South (Ellis 2013; Spivey 2007). General Armstrong argued manual labor helped to evolve inferior races. He reasoned inferior races had weak characters because they had been sheltered from racial competition. Therefore, they had to develop moral character through hard labor (Engs 1999; Spivey 2007). Applying Lamarckian racial codes, General Armstrong argued Hawaiians and black Americans existed in a similar time and space separate from the U.S. polity. More specifically, he evoked conceptions of "panoptic time" and "anachronistic space" to argue for the use of the "adaptive education" model in the American South (McClintock 1995).

"Panoptic time" is a linear conception of time that positions European civilizations in the present-soon to be future, and non-European civilizations in the past. The end of this line is represented as the pinnacle of progress and Europeans are depicted

as agents in progression. Conversely, non-European civilizations are depicted as trapped in the past. These people are deemed non-agents trapped in a space that European peoples already traversed (McClintock 1995: 37). Likewise, "Anachronistic space" is conceptualized as a static space separate from the modern. It is conceptualized as bifurcated from the modern, and not produced in relation to it (40). I argue General Armstrong evoked these conceptions of time and space in his advocacy for the adaptive education model. More specifically, he applied Lamarckian racial codes to argue black Americans and Hawaiians weren't innately inferior because of their biology, but rather, because they were trapped in backwards time and space and needed to be educated in civilization.

In his advocacy for the transfer of the "adaptive education" model from Hawaii to the Southern United States, Armstrong depicted black Americans and Hawaiians as existing in the past. On August 27, 1880, in an address to the YMCA regarding the "Hawaiian problem", he stated, "The condition of the Hawaiian people is the product of centuries of barbarism followed by fifty years of civilizing influences…Their institutions of today do not represent a development from within, but, rather an envelopment from without…" (Hawaiian Gazette Extra, August 30, 1881). General Armstrong argued Hawaiian civilization had for centuries been separate from modern civilization. Therefore, it developed its own peculiar qualities. Its institutions were not "a development from within, but rather an envelopment from without" (ibid). More specifically, its institutions were not produced from within or in relation to civilized societies, but rather dropped in fully formed from modernity.

He likened this to the condition of the American Negro in the United States. He stated, "The closest historical analogy to the Hawaiian experiment was the creation of the negro empire in the Southern States of America, by giving the right to vote to four millions of ex-slaves. They received as a gift what others had attained by struggle" (ibid). Armstrong suggested that slavery, or more specifically "the negro empire in the Southern States of America" was also a form of anachronistic-colonial space. It too had trapped black Americans in the past. Armstrong conceptualized the backwards space and time that black Americans existed in as a separate colony from the U.S. polity. Likewise, he did not conceive of the U.S. polity as being produced in relation to this space. Rather, he conceptualized these two spaces as bifurcated both in time and space.

Expanding upon this argument, he argued black Americans and Hawaiians had no true sense of patriotism because they did not exist in the same time or space as civilization. More specifically, he depicted "patriotism" as a product of civilization and therefore, "foreign" to black Americans and Hawaiians:

> Other people have been left to struggle up to place and hold it for themselves; their place is that which that have made fit for by the discipline of the struggle; they stand not on what has been done for them, but on what they have done for themselves; to attain which has taken ages and tremendous sacrifice. The flag of each nation is the symbol of their struggles…Hence love of country and a certain hero worship that we call "patriotism"… (ibid).

Armstrong reasoned Hawaiians had no true sense of "patriotism" because their institutions were not developed from within.

He also suggested black Americans lacked a sense of patriotism because they were handed rights other Americans worked for. More specifically, he argued black Americans were "given" the right to vote: "They received as a gift what others had attained by a struggle. With the best dispositions these voters are dangerous, not because

they are bad, but because they are weak, easily misled and mischief-makers everywhere" (ibid). According to General Armstrong, black American voters were dangerous to democracy not because they were biologically inferior, but because they existed in a backwards space and time. Therefore, democracy was foreign to them, and they had no sense of responsibility towards their role in it because they didn't produce it.

Although Africans were amongst the first settlers of the United States, General Armstrong did not conceive of them as a part of the production of American civilization. Rather, he asserted black Americans were separate from American civilization and therefore a threat to American democracy:

> Self-government is possible and proper only for those who have developed through experience, certain guiding instincts that save them from rule or ruin courses, that teach them to yield to majority rule, to bide their time when aggrieved, to use moral force, and yet when and how to use physical force by revolution (From the Beginning).

He asserted black Americans hadn't developed experience biding "their time when aggrieved", and didn't have any guiding instincts in how to participate in democracy because they hadn't been a part of the development of democracy in the United States.

Likewise, he argued Hawaiians and black Americans were not developed enough to serve in leadership roles within democracy. He stated, "The Hawaiian or Negro College graduate among his people is at once a general…The temptation to abuse power without gradual fitting for its use is well nigh irresistible…Character does not develop as rapidly as mind. They do not crave what they most need, moral strength" (Southern Workman. June 1880. P. 845). Armstrong argued black Americans and Hawaiians were *not* a part of civilization's morality or democracy and therefore, had to be taught and ruled by the people who created it.

He reasoned black Americans like other colonized peoples had to be pulled forward in time and space through educational interventions. He reasoned intellectual training alone couldn't pull them forward because it didn't expose them to the bodily struggle necessary to evolve. Rather, the adaptive education model, which exposed its students to bodily toil through manual labor, could act as a substitute for the struggle Euro-Americans supposedly experienced in conquering and settling North America. Regarding the value of coeducational "adaptive education", Armstrong stated, "Contrary to the strongest convictions in the South, Northern teachers have been able, in the leading institutions for those who lately were slaves (whose weakness is on the moral side), to bring the sexes together…The plan is equally good with Indians, and I believe for all people in the early stages…of progress" (The Hawaiian Gazette Extra, 1881). Armstrong reasoned an education model rooted in manual labor was best for both black Americans and Hawaiians because it subjected them to toil, which progressed them into civilization.

He also saw the "adaptive education" model as a means to establish indirect rule in the American South. In a letter to the Hawaiian mission, he stated that the method used within the "adaptive education" schools in Hawaii to train an elite could also be used in the American South:

> This is a theological method as wise as it is now should be helped. Dr. Hyde expects his graduates as pastors to cultivate the ground two days a week, visit two days a week, and study two days. I give the above details because it is the plan I have long had in mind for the colored pastors of the South…The preacher of a race like the Negroes, especially in country regions, shouldn't for a long time to come be a farmer or teacher who doesn't depend on his church revenue (Southern Workman, 1877, p. 772).

Armstrong suggested the "adaptive education" model could be used to create an independent colonial elite amongst black pastors. These pastors would be educated to be

farmers and teachers so they would be less dependent on the black community for income. Rather, they would be dependent on philanthropic aid for their teaching salary, or white land-owners for farming.

Evoking conceptions of panoptic time and anachronistic space, General Armstrong depicted black America as a colony that had distinct geographic and temporal features from the rest of the U.S. polity. In particular, he depicted black America and Hawaii as a part of the past. In placing both groups in the past, he temporally and geographically bifurcated them from civilization. More specifically, in the case of black Americans he separated them from the production of American democracy, and more broadly the founding of the United States as a country. In his advocacy for the transfer of the "adaptive education" model to the American South, he argued black Americans and Hawaiians' inferiority was caused by the environment, rather than biology. Therefore, he reasoned black Americans and Hawaiians could be advanced gradually through new environmental conditions that trained them for civilization. However, he also used this coding to argue that black Americans and Hawaiians were not really a part of the U.S. polity and therefore, should be kept separate from its political institutions.

BIOLOGICAL CODING IN ADVOCACY FOR BLACK LABOR IN HAWAII

This contrasted with Armstrong and U.S. state officials' advocacy for the exportation of black labor to Hawaii. In this advocacy, they depicted black Americans as a part of the same space and time as the U.S. polity, but biologically inferior. In particular, they depicted black Americans as agents in producing and expanding the United States Empire. In doing so, they were forced to position black Americans as part of the United States' present and future. However, to counteract this linkage they

emphasized biological distinction. More specifically, as U.S. state officials placed black Americans in the same time and space as the U.S. polity they highlighted biological difference.

The U.S. government did not officially annex Hawaii until 1898; however, in the 1880s it did have control over the Hawaiian legislature. This was primarily achieved through the Bayonet Constitution, which forced the Hawaiian King to relinquish most of his executive powers to the legislature, and disenfranchised most native Hawaiians from voting for the legislature (Horne 2007). Within this political context, the U.S. government conceptualized the exportation of black American labor as a means to thwart the agency of other groups in Hawaii. More specifically, they believed replacing Chinese workers with black American workers, would prevent an alliance between the Hawaiian King and Chinese Empire. Unlike advocacy for the "adaptive education" model, U.S. state officials applied biological, rather than Lamarckian codes to advocate for the use of Black American labor in Hawaii. I argue, their use of biological codes correlated with their desire to expel, rather than educate Chinese workers in Hawaii. Furthermore, it correlated with attempts to distinguish black Americans from other Americans, while still placing them in the same civilizational space and time as U.S. Empire.

In the 1870s the Supreme Court of Hawaii began discussing the Negro exodus in the United States as a means to secure cheap plantation labor for Hawaii. Hawaiian Judge, Walter M. Gibson made a trip to the United States in 1870 and made enquiries into the feasibility of importing Negro laborers from the Southern United States to Hawaii. According to Gibson, many Negroes were willing to leave and their old masters rather see them leave than vote (Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report, 1890, p. 143).

Following this trip, the U.S. State Department advocated for the exportation of black American labor as a replacement for Chinese labor in Hawaii. In 1886, after a full and tedious debate, the Hawaiian legislature decided to restrict Chinese immigration (Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report, 1886, p. 37). The U.S. Secretary of State, James Blaine and U.S. Minister to Hawaii, James Comly suggested the importation of African Americans as a solution to the labor crisis. In particular, they asked General Armstrong to convince African Americans to leave the Southern United States and work as teamsters on sugar and rice plantations in Hawaii (Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report, 1890, p. 144).

In 1881, the U.S. Secretary of State wrote a memo to Hawaiian minister, James Comly arguing African American labor migration to Hawaii was key to the U.S.'s annexation of Hawaii. He stated what was needed was a replacement of labor in Hawaii in an American, "not in an Asiatic, or British sense" (USDS Dispatches no. 114, 1881). He asserted,

> By Annexation or distinct protection, a part of the territory of the Union, their fertile resources for the growth of rice and sugar would not only be controlled by American capital, but so profitable a field of labor would attract intelligent workers tither from the United States. A purely American form of colonization in such a case would meet all the phases of the problem…labor trained in the rice fields of the southern states could be induced to go to from our shores to the islands (ibid).

James Comly argued an "American form of colonization" involved the exportation of black American labor from the Southern United States to Hawaii. He stated, "…our own colored race can supply a more desirable population without drawing too heavily upon our resources…" (USDS Dispatches, No. 213, 1882). He conceptualized Asian labor as a British form of labor that threatened the United States' imperial interests in Hawaii.

Conversely, he thought of the exportation of black American bodies to Hawaii as a means to mark Hawaii as a part of the United States.

U.S. Minister to Hawaii, James Comly also argued for the use of black American labor in Hawaii. He worried the use of Asiatic labor would increase Chinese control over the South Pacific. Writing the current Secretary of State, William Evart, he asserted the Hawaiian King Kalakua desired to import more Chinese labor because he wanted a Great Pacific Empire allied with China. More specifically, he stated King Kalakua was "longing for a splendid alliance with the great oriental Empire of China." (USDS Dispatches, No. 121, 1880). Putting it more bluntly, the next Secretary of State, James Blaine asserted, "The Hawaiian islands cannot be joined to the Asiatic system." He asserted labor recruitment efforts "must be toward assimilation and identification with the American system, to which they belong by the operation of political necessity." (USDS Dispatches, No. 113, 1881). Secretary of State, James Blaine believed making Hawaiian sugar planters dependent on the importation of black American labor would solve not only the labor shortage problem, but also give the United States a competitive edge in taking political and economic control over Hawaii.

Other U.S. government officials supported the migration of black American labor to Hawaii as a means to solve the Southern United States' "Negro problem." Initially, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, a Senator from Georgia named Michael Hoke Smith opposed the U.S. annexation of Hawaii. He stated it would burden the U.S. government with another racially inferior population. However, he modified his attitude when he considered the possibility that it might help the South rid itself of its black inhabitants. In particular, he thought that black vagrants could be exported to Hawaii. He thought

dispersion would prevent the vagrant freemen from organizing and posing a threat to Southern planters' interests (Horne 2007: 140). Furthermore, he believed their literal expulsion to Hawaii would reproduce them as a form of colonial labor for the U.S. government; dispossessing them from land and the right to vote within the United States (Gatewood 1975: 298).

In the 1880's, Hawaiian planters also had reason to support the use of black American labor. In 1875, Hawaii had signed a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States government, which lifted tariffs placed on the entry of Hawaiian sugar into the United States. However, by 1881, opposition to Reciprocity Treaty had grown within the United States. Protectionists believed the American people were being forced to pay tribute to a foreign country with no reciprocal benefits. Second, many Americans resented Hawaiian planters use of Chinese labor. In particular, they felt that Asians were taking over American industries; including the sugar and rice industries (Beechert 1985: 81).

In his public statements and speeches, General Samuel Armstrong provided a strong foundation for the U.S. government to make a "racial" case for the use of black American labor in Hawaii. In his advocacy for the exportation of black American labor to Hawaii, he argued both populations were *biologically* similar. He attributed this to the fact that both peoples belonged to tropical races. He stated, "Of both it is true that not mere ignorance, but deficiency of character if the chief difficulty…Especially in weak tropical races, idleness, like ignorance, breeds vice" (From the Beginning, p. 614). According to Armstrong, both races had an innate tendency to engage in disruptive behavior if they were idle. However, they did not have an inherent tendency to engage in vice if they were engaged in labor.

Likewise, the U.S. secretary of the Navy, General George E. Belknap wrote to the U.S. Secretary of State that African American workers were a suitable substitute for native Hawaiian labor because both groups were from tropical climates and therefore less discontent when they worked in tropical climates. Regarding the Hawaiian Islands, he stated, "These islands with their delightful climate and rich soil would be a veritable paradise for the discontented colored people of the south." (1882). General Belknap suggested African Americans would enjoy working on Hawaiian plantations because they were biologically suited to tropical climates. Furthermore, he suggested African Americans are discontent in the American South because they are working in a non-tropical climate. Therefore, moving these discontented African American workers would assuage their discontent, and rid the South of the "Negro problem."

In his advocacy for the exportation of black labor to Hawaii, Armstrong emphasized similar biological characteristics, rather than similar civilizational qualities between black Americans and Hawaiians. He also acknowledged the role black Americans played in crucial events in the development of the United States. He stated,

> Negroes are born teamsters. How would the Federal Army have marched on to victory, had not colored drivers coaxed the nation's mules to move its baggage? The better class of colored men would do well here as teamsters; there is no end of demand for them at say, $20 per month, or $12 and found (Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report, 1890, p. 839).

General Armstrong highlights the innate capacity of black Americans to carry large loads; arguing they are "natural teamsters." He creates a biological distinction between black Americans and white Americans; however, he also acknowledges the role black Americans played in the Civil War. Black Americans are depicted as agents, even if in a

limited capacity, in the progress of the nation. They are not depicted as in a backwards time and space separate from the Civil War, but rather as a part of it. He also describes them as patriotic, which contrasts sharply from his advocacy for the "adaptive education" model where he describes them as incapable of patriotism.

Yet at the same, Armstrong highlights a biological distinction to distance them from the U.S. polity: their "teamsters", not citizens. He continues to highlight these biological distinctions as reason for why they should be used as labor on Hawaiian plantations, and not Chinese labor. Comparing the Negro race and the Asiatic races, General Armstrong stated work amongst the Polynesians and Africans was "parental" because they were "childish" races. However, with the "Moheammedans and Chinese" it was "controversial" because they did not "accept missionaries as superior beings."(Lessons from the Hawaiian Islands, 1884, p. 214). Likewise, in a report on supply of labor, William Hellebrand stated, Chinese were not like "a Negro nor a Polynesian in character," however, in that they were said to possess "strong tenacity of rights, quick ebullition of temper and readiness for fight" (1867). In the statements, General Armstrong and William Hellebrand translated the relative agency of Chinese workers within U.S. Empire as a biological characteristic.

Interestingly, in his advocacy for the "adaptive education" model in the Southern United States, General Armstrong depicted the Chinese as capable of change through education. He stated, "The value of attention to physical, moral and religious matters is evident, and is a lesson to other plantations that even a Chinaman has a soul somewhere in him and it pays to work at it" (Southern Workman, 1880, p. 841). Yet, when he described Chinese land-owners, he emphasized their negative biological qualities.

Regarding how they interacted with Hawaiians, he stated, "They are an incendiary lot; they are knocking the bottom out of things by destroying both the physical and moral quality of the people" (The Hawaiian Gazette Extra, 1881). He did not advocate for the application of the "adaptive education" model to their education in Hawaii, but rather presented their innate political temperament as reason to diversify the types of labor used on Hawaiian plantations.

At the Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration, General Samuel Armstrong's brother, William Armstrong, who also served as the President of the Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration provided his own thoughts on why the Chinese had this "innate" racial capacity for political agency. In a statement, made in 1882 in the Board of Immigration Report, he stated,

> The situation of the Chinese in the Kingdom, their disinclination to bring women with them, their intermarriage with native women, or alliances with them; their great thrift, their aptitude for every kind of business, raise a number of social and political questions…(Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report, 1882, p. 4).

William Armstrong's statement suggested that he believed the Chinese workers were harder to dispossess because they easily integrated with the native population and moved into business.

U.S. officials repeatedly depicted the relative agency of Chinese workers as a biological characteristic of the Chinese that was an existential threat to the United States' annexation of Hawaii. In a reply of the Cabinet to a petition by citizens of Honolulu to lift restrictions on Chinese immigration to Hawaii, it stated,

> Even if more Chinamen are introduced, there is no guarantee to either the planter or the country that they will remain on the plantations. It is of no use to bind them by contract. They look so much alike, and with the assistance of their countrymen so easily desert service and hide themselves, that the contracting of Chinese

laborers has almost entirely ceased (Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report, 1890, p. 90).

The report described Chinese workers as having too much agency because they worked together collectively to desert the plantations. Furthermore, once they deserted plantations they easily blended and integrated with the native Hawaiians in the cities.

The Chinese were also described as natural agitators. In the same reply, the Cabinet stated, "The Chinese are secretive, systematically shielding and assisting Chinese criminals. It is but rarely that a China-man will testify against a fellow country man…The Chinese have the faculty of combination and organization developed to such an extent that their secret societies number many thousand members in the country"(p. 88). The report also described how the Chinese lived in an "oriental" way that white men could not economically compete. The report stated, "there can be no 'competition' between a Chinese and a white mechanic…A Chinese mechanic can, and does, live in his Oriental style, on wages which a person with the requirements of Anglo-Saxon civilization cannot live…"(p. 73). Repeatedly the report ascribed the ability of Chinese to advance economically as a negative attribute of the race, rather than as a product of the relationship between the U.S. government and Chinese workers compared to the relationship between the U.S. government and black American workers.

Secretaries of State, William Evart and James Comly advanced the exportation of black American workers as a means to mark Hawaii as a part of U.S. Empire. Interestingly in this framing, although they were still depicted as colonial subjects, black Americans were also depicted as a part of the United States present and future. Rather than being depicted as stuck in the past, they were presented as agents in producing the United State's future Empire. I argue this is one reason why U.S. state officials reverted

to highlighting their biological inferiority. They still had to be distinguished from white Americans; however, in this context they also existed in the same space and time as the U.S. polity. Therefore, state officials highlighted their biological difference instead of their civilizational difference.

Likewise, I contend they used biological racial codes in this context because they sought to expel, rather than educate Chinese workers in Hawaii. In the case of the Southern United States, they were advocating for education as a means to dispossess African Americans from the right to vote. However, in this context they were advocating for the expulsion, not the education of the Chinese. Therefore, they evoked biological codes, which depicted African Americans as innately submissive, and Chinese as naturally aggressive to argue for the expulsion, rather than the education of Chinese workers in Hawaii.

MULTIPLE RACIAL LOGICS – ONE DISPOSSESSED SUBJECT

I argue the U.S. government recast black Americans as colonial subjects through imperial policy in Hawaii, but they did so using different racial codes. More specifically, they did so through policies, which ascribed both Lamarckian and biological racial codes to their bodies. Therefore, the subordination of black Americans is not something that can be conceptualized as produced endogenously within the U.S. nation-state, but rather is relationally produced using multiple codes, relative to other racial groups, within U.S. Empire.

U.S. State officials produced the subordination of Black Americans through multiple racial logics. In their advocacy for the transfer of the "adaptive education" model from Hawaii to the Southern United States, they applied a Lamarckian logic to

justify the education of both groups. However, they also used this same logic to argue for the dispossession of African Americans' from the right to fully participate in American political institutions. Armstrong argued both Hawaiians and black Americans existed in backwards time and space and needed to be drawn into civilization through an education that emphasized manual labor. He argued relative to Hawaiians, black Americans were also malleable and could eventually be assimilated into the U.S. polity. Nonetheless, like Hawaiians, they also existed in a separate space and time from the U.S. polity. Therefore, they should be temporarily dispossessed from full political participation in the United States government until they reached their full civilizational potential.

Conversely, in their advocacy for the exportation of black labor from the Southern United States to Hawaii, U.S. state officials applied a biological logic to justify the replacement of Hawaiian workers with Black American workers. More specifically, they argued that like Hawaiians, black Americans were innately submissive and content to work in tropical climates. They contrasted this to the Chinese, who they depicted as innately aggressive, political and territorial. Rather, than applying a Lamarckian racial logic to all three groups, in which all three could be brought into civilization through adaptive education, they applied a biological argument to argue limited Chinese immigration to Hawaii.

In both cases, the U.S. government constructed the inferiority of black Americans relative to other groups within U.S. Empire. In their advocacy for the transfer of the "adaptive education" model from Hawaii to the Southern United States they used comparisons to Hawaiians to argue black Americans were inferior because they belonged to an archaic civilization. This coding correlated with a colonial policy that sought to

dispossess black Americans through a rhetoric of assimilation. They reasoned black Americans should be educated because their inferiority is rooted in environmental conditions; however, they also should be dispossessed from the right to vote because they are not yet assimilated to civilization.

In the case, of their advocacy for the exportation of black American labor, they used comparisons to argue black Americans were biologically inferior compared to other sources of white labor, but superior to Chinese labor for plantation work. This coding correlated with a colonial policy that sought to dispossess Chinese in Hawaii through expulsion *not* assimilation. Although the "adaptive education" model was already used for Hawaiian education in Hawaii, they did not advocate for the application of the "adaptive education" model to Chinese workers in Hawaii. Rather they reasoned black Americans should be exported from the United States to replace Chinese workers. To argue for expulsion they depicted Chinese's racial inferiority as rooted in their biology. This was a coupled with construction of blackness in biological, rather than civilizational terms.

Unlike their advocacy for the "adaptive education" model, in their advocacy for exportation of black labor, they described black Americans as having a particular role *within* the U.S. polity. In this way, they positioned them as within civilization, rather than in a backwards space and time. More specifically, their bodies were conceived of as a means to mark Hawaii for future U.S. Empire. They were depicted as a part of the U.S. polity in the extension of U.S. Empire.

The United States government constructed the source of black Americans inferiority relative to other groups within U.S. Empire. The meaning of blackness

changed in relation to the imperial policy proposed. In both cases, black Americans were recast as colonial subjects through imperial policy in Hawaii, but there was different reasoning depending on what groups were involved. In the case of the "adaptive education" model they were recast as colonial subjects through Lamarckian codes that placed them in the same time and space as Hawaiians. In the case of labor exportation, they were recast as colonial subjects in biological terms compared to the Chinese. Therefore, the subordination of black Americans is not something that can be conceptualized as produced endogenously within the U.S. nation-state. It is produced through global policies that link black Americans and other groups within U.S. Empire as similar objects of political intervention. Likewise, race is not a substance, but a code produced through imperial mechanisms applied to multiple racial groups within U.S. Empire.

In placing the production of "race" back into the global imperial context, I show how imperial mechanisms, which produce "race" are the root of racial inequality in the United States. These mechanisms also correlate with the different meanings that were attached to black bodies. Blackness took on multiple contradictory meanings, which correlated with imperial objectives of the United States government. More specifically, U.S. state officials symbolically positioned black Americans differently relative to the U.S. polity depending on their imperial objective and what group they were comparing black Americans to.

Works Referenced

Armstrong, General S.C. From the Beginning. Ludlow Collection Personal Memories and Letters of Armstrong. Vol. 3. Williams College Manuscript Division.

Armstrong, General S.C. 1881. "Address by S.C. Armstrong at the Lyceum Before the YMCA, August 27, 1880." Hawaiian Gazette Extra. Box 1. Samuel Armstrong Collection. Williams College Manuscript Division.

Armstrong, General S.C. December 1877. *Southern Workman*. Ludlow Collection Personal Memories and Letters of Armstrong Vol. 3. Williams College Manuscript Division.

Armstrong, General S.C. June 1880. *Southern Workman*. Ludlow Collection Personal Memories and Letters of Armstrong Vol. 4. Williams College Manuscript Division.

Armstrong, Samuel Chapman. 1884. "Lessons from the Hawaiian Islands." *The Journal of Christian Philosophy*: Box 15. Folder 2. Samuel Armstrong Collection. Williams College Manuscript Division.

Banton, Michael. 1998. Racial Theories 2nd. Ed. New York: Cambridge University.

Bashi Vilna. 2004. "Globalized anti-blackness: transnationalizing Western immigration law, policy, and practice." *Ethnic and Racial Studies 27:*584–606

Beechert, Edward. 1985. *Working in Hawaii: A Labor History*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii.

Belknap, George E. Letter to secretary of the navy, Sept. 22, 1882, enclosed acting secretary of the navy to the secretary of state, Oct. 11, 1882, United States Department of State Papers. Micellaneous Letters, Oct. 1882, Part II.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2014. *Connected Sociologies:* London: Bloomsbury.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2007. *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2013. "The Possibilities of, and for Global Sociology: A Postcolonial Perspective." *Political Power and Social Theory 24*: 295-314.

Blaine, James to James Comly. No. 113, Foreign Relations, 1881, United States Department of States Dispatches, Hawaii, pp. 638-639

Blaine, James. Dispatch to James Comly. No. 114. Dec. 1, 1881, United States Department of State Dispatches, Instructions, Hawaii.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation" in *American Sociological Review 62 (3):* 465-480.

Boxill, Bernard. 2001. *Race and Racism.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University

Brubaker, Rogers. 2009. "Ethnicity, Race and Nationalism" in *Annual Review of Sociology 35*: 21-42.

Calavita Kitty. 2007. "Immigration law, race, and identity." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science 3*:1–20

Carbado, Devon and Cheryl Harris. 2012. The new racial preferences: rethinking racial projects. *California Law Review 96 (5*): 1139-1214.

Comly, James. Dispatch to Secretary William M. Evarts, no. 121, July 21, 1880, United States Department of State Dispatches, Hawaii, XIX.

Dorr, Lisa 1999. Arm in arm: gender, eugenics and Virginia's Racial Integrity Acts of the 1920s. *Journal of Women's History 11*:143–66

Ellis, Mark. 2013. *Race Harmony and Black Progress*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University.

Engs, Robert Frances. 1999. *Educating the Disenfranchised and Disinherited: Samuel Chapman Armstrong and Hampton Institute, 1839-1893*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee.

Fields, Barbara. 2014. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. New York: Verso.

Gatewood, Willard B. 1975. *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden*, 1898-103. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Go, Julian. 2004. "'Racism' and Colonialism: Meanings of Difference and Ruling Practices in America's Pacific Empire." *Qualitative Sociology 27 (1):* 35-58.

Go, Julian. 2016. *Postcolonial Thought and Social Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Go, Julian and George Lawson eds. 2017. *Global Historical Sociology*. Cambridge University: New York.

Gomez Laura. 2010. "Understanding law and race as mutually constitutive: an invitation to explore an emerging field." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science.* 6: 487–505

Graves, Joseph L. Jr. 2015. "Why the Nonexistence of Biological Races does not mean the Nonexistence of Racism." *American Behavioral Scientist 59(11*): 474-495.

Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report to the Legislature. 1886. Accessed April 1, 2018. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433075934145

Hawaiian Bureau of Immigration Report to the Legislature. 1890. Accessed April 1, 2018. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112062945008

Hellebrand, William 1867. *Report on supply of labor, etc., by the Hon. Wm. Hillebrand, M.D., Royal Commissioner to China and India, to the Honorable Board of Immigration of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: Government Pres. TDB p.v.167, no7. New York City Public Library.

Horne, Gerald. 2007. *The White Pacific: U.S. Imperialism in the South Seas after the Civil War*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii

Jung, Moon-Kie. 2015. *Beneath the Surface of White Supremacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University

Loveman, Mara. 1999. "Is 'Race' Essential?" in *American Sociological Review 64 (6)*: 891-898.

Loveman, Mara and Jeronimo Muniz.. 2007. "How Puerto Rico became white: boundary dynamics and intercensus racial reclassification." *American Sociological Review 72*: 915–39

Luibheid Eithne. 2004. "Childbearing against the state? Asylum seeker women in the Irish Republic." *Women's Studies International Forum 27*: 335–49

Magubane, Zine. 2008. "The (Product) Red Man's Burden: Charity, Celebrity, and the Contradictions of Coevalness." The Journal of Pan African Studies 2 (6): 102.1-102.25

Magubane, Zine. 2017. "Following 'the Deeds of Men': Race, 'the Global,' and International Relations." Pp. 101-124 in *Global Historical Sociology*, edited by Julian Go and George Lawson. New York: Cambridge University

Mason, David. 1994. "On the Dangers of Disconnecting Race and Racism" in *Sociology 28 (4):* 845-858.

McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.

Morris, Aldon D. 2015. *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Oakland, CA: University of California.

Nagel, Joane. 2000. "Ethnicity and sexuality." *Annual Review of Sociology 26:*107–33

Omi, Michael & Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Park, Robert. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology 33 (6):* 881-893.

Park, Robert. 1914. "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups with Particular Reference to the Negro." *American Journal of Sociology 19 (5):* 606-623.

Pascoe Peggy. 2009. *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America*. New York: Oxford University. Press

Saperstein, Aliya & Andrew Penner & Ryan Light. 2013. "Racial Formation in Perspective: Connecting Individuals, Institutions and Power Relations" in *Annual Review of Sociology 39*: 359-378.

Sassen, Saskia. 1999. "Embedding the Global in the National: Implications for the Role of the State." *Maccalester International 7:* 31-44.

Seirlis Julia Katherine. 2004. "Islands and autochthons—coloureds, space and belonging in Rhodesia and Zimbabwe (Part 1)." *Journal of Social Archaeology 4*::405–26

Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Steinmetz, George. 2005. "Return to Empire: The New U.S. Imperialism in Comparative Historical Perspective." *Sociological Theory 23 (4):* 339-367.

Tate, Merze. 1962. "Decadence of the Hawaiian Nations and Proposals to Import a Negro Labor Force." *The Journal of Negro History 47 (4)*: 248-263.

Vacante Jefferey. 2007. Evolving racial identity and the consolidation of men's authority in early twentieth-century Quebec. *Canadian Historical Review 88*:413–38

Von Eschen, Penny M. 1997. *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Weiner, Michael. 1995. "Discourses of race, nation and empire in pre-1945 Japan." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18:433–56

Winant, Howard. 2001. *The World is A Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War II*. New York: Pearson Books.

U.S. Empire and the "Adaptive Education" Model: The Global Production of Race

Abstract

Following WWI the United States Department of Labor worked with a large-scale commercial philanthropy called the Phelps Stokes Fund to transfer educational policies designed for African Americans to West and South Africa. They specifically promoted the "adaptive education" model used at Tuskegee and Hampton institutes for African American education. This model emphasized manual labor, Christian character formation and political passivity as a form of racial uplift. They relied upon the sociologist and educational director of the Phelps Stokes Fund, Thomas Jesse Jones, to advocate for the transnational development of the model. Juxtaposing Thomas Jesse Jones' advocacy for the adaptive education model in *Education in West Africa* and W.E.B. Du Bois' critique of the model in *The Crisis* and *Dark Water*, I find two different conceptions of the U.S. racial state emerge. According to Thomas Jesse Jones and W.E.B. Du Bois, why did the U.S. racial state decide to link African Americans and Africans as similar objects of political intervention? Furthermore, can this dynamic be conceptualized within a theory of race that conceptualizes the U.S. racial state as a Nation-state?

U.S. Empire and the "Adaptive Education" Model: The Global Production of Race

When this responsibility is placed definitely upon us, the most important contribution we can make both to the League of Nations and to the mandatories especially committed to us is to see that the educational systems of the countries concerned are adapted to the needs of the people
 - Thomas Jesse Jones (1920), "Introduction," *Educational Adaptations*, (p.1)
It is curious to see America, the United States, looking on herself, first, as a sort of natural peacemaker, then as a moral protagonist in this terrible time
 W.E.B. Du Bois (1920), "The Souls of White Folk," *Darkwater*, (p.49)

In 1913, Thomas Jesse Jones, a White sociologist of race and advocate for Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes became the first educational director of the Phelps Stokes Fund.[i] His thinking on race relations was largely inspired by his sociological training under Franklin Giddings: the first sociology department chair at Columbia University and President of the *American Sociological Society* (Go 2017: 3). Giddings argued sociology should be concerned with "territorial expansion and…rule over alien peoples" (1911: 580-581). Building from this mission, Jones promoted the "adaptive education" model as a means to "rule over alien peoples" in Africa. Within the newly formed League of Nations, Jones worked with the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a sociological survey of education in West and South Africa. Despite Jones' rhetorical commitment to adapting education to the needs of local communities, he advocated for the universal application of the adaptive education model to every colony he surveyed. These colonies included widely disparate territories like Sierra Leone, Nigeria, British Cameroon, British Togo, South Africa, Nyasaland, Liberia, the Gold Coast, the Belgian Congo and Angola. Jones asserted the adaptive education model was a humanitarian effort to meet the needs of the "Negro race" (Jones 1922: xi); however, Du Bois (1920)

suggested the model was a means to subordinate both Africans and African Americans to the needs of American imperialism (p.58). Juxtaposing Thomas Jesse Jones' advocacy for the adaptive education model in *Education in West Africa* and Du Bois' criticism of the model in *Dark Water*, I find Jones' conceptualization of the U.S. racial state as a Nation-state reified race as a causal explanation for the transfer of the adaptive education model. Conversely, Du Bois' conceptualization of the U.S. racial state as an Empire-state illuminated imperial mechanisms, which produced Africans and African Americans as similar objects of political intervention for the U.S. government.

In 1922, Thomas Jesse Jones in cooperation with the Phelps Stokes Fund, and U.S. Department of Labor published a survey of education in West and South Africa. In this survey he critiqued teaching academics to Africans. He argued that the academic skill set did not meet the general needs of Africans to farm and mine for subsistence. Five years prior, he made the same critique in *Negro Education* (1917) in the United States. In this survey he worked with the U.S. Department of Education to evaluate schools developed for African Americans in the Southern United States. He critiqued schools that used an academic curriculum and discouraged philanthropic and government investment in them. In both surveys Jones argued the gap between the educational aims of the academic model and the needs of the Negro race promoted political agitation against the U.S. state.

In opposition to Thomas Jesse Jones, W.E.B. Du Bois advocated for an academic model of education. W.E.B. Du Bois, also a sociologist of race, was largely marginalized in the American academy compared to Jones and his associates: Franklin Giddings, Robert Park and Booker T. Washington (Morris 2015). W.E.B. Du Bois argued that

Jones' promotion of the adaptive education model in *Negro Education* was an attempt to curb the development of African American leadership and participation in U.S. politics. In a February edition of *The Crisis* he stated, the adaptive education curriculum was not designed for "the chief work for which the school ought to exist," but rather designed for future "servants and laborers" (Du Bois 1918: 175).

In 1920, W.E.B. Du Bois reiterated this critique in *Dark Water: Voices from Within the Veil*. In *Dark Water*, Du Bois argued that the expansion of the adaptive education model to Africa promoted a new form of industrial slavery. In this form, American commercial philanthropies enslaved Africans in their own lands through policies developed for African Americans in the United States. He insisted the application of the adaptive education model to Africa not only curbed Africans' fight for self-determination, but also strengthened the subordination of African Americans' in the United States.

In a letter to the Anson Stokes, Jones lamented Du Bois' criticism of the model, but insisted on its continued expansion (SCBC, Phelps Stokes Fund Records, Box 44, Folder 4415, January 4, 1917). Jones argued that the application of the model to colonial education in Africa would increase resource extraction and limit movements for self-determination. In doing so, it would help the British Empire pay back war debts to the United States government and curb the need for a heavy-handed form of colonial rule over Africans (Jones 1922: 9). Jones belief that the same educational policy should be applied to both Africans and Africans Americans was largely influenced by his sociological conception of the U.S. racial state.

CONCEPTIONS OF THE U.S. RACIAL STATE

Early theories in the sociology of race approached the economic and political marginalization of African Americans *within* the U.S. from three main theoretical standpoints. The three theories focused on assimilation, class subordination and racial prejudice as the root causes of racial inequality in the United States; however, none of them focused on the role of the U.S. racial state in producing racial inequality. The assimilationist approach, pioneered by Robert Park (1914, 1928), argued races in the United States moved through a series of successive stages, which eventually led to their assimilation into the dominant political and economic institutions of the United States. This approach conceptualized racial assimilation as similar to the ethnic assimilation of immigrants in the United States (Glazer and Moynihan 1970; Gordon 1964). The class approach framed racial oppression as an aberration, rather than a fundamental principle of American society. This theory contended black migration from the South to the North of the United States would force black and whites into an overarching class system, which was the primary system of social inequality in the United States (Becker 1957; Dollard 1957; Johnson 1939; Warner and Srole 1945; Wilson 1978). Racial prejudice theories focused on racial attitudes as the source of racial inequality in the United States. They hypothesized through time the lessening of racial prejudice would destroy structures of racial inequality (Blumer 1958; Hyman and Sheatsley 1964; Myrdal 1944).

In the post Civil-Rights Era three prominent paradigms arose that directly challenged the prevailing orthodoxy of earlier theories of race: Internal Colonialism, Racial Formations and Racialized Social Systems. These paradigms sought structural explanations, rooted in conceptions of the U.S. racial state, to explain the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Internal Colonialism, which was advanced by

Robert Blauner, postulated African Americans' experience of racial subjugation in the United States was structurally similar to third world peoples' experience of colonial subjugation. Blauner noted that colonialism was traditionally understood within American sociology as European conquest of Africa, South America and Asia; however, the conquest of North America was typically overlooked. Blauner insisted colonialism was part of the inception of the U.S. state and as a result the struggles of Native Americans, Chicanos, and African Americans were interrelated (1972). Sociologists later critiqued this theory for homogenizing the experiences of racial minorities. They argued the theory collapsed class, sexuality and gender differences in how racial minorities experienced racial inequality in the United States (Gutierrez 2004).

In the early 1980s, Michael Omi and Howard Winant developed Racial Formation theory. In opposition to Internal Colonialism, they argued racial inequality had to be understood as a distinct structure from colonialism. They also critiqued earlier sociological theories of race, which emphasized racial prejudice as the cause of racial inequality. They argued that U.S. racial formations were not only psychological, but also institutional. They defined "racial formations" as a sociohistorical process, in which human bodies and social structures were represented and organized, but also a type of institutional hegemony, in which society is organized and ruled (Omi and Winant 1994: 56). They also developed a definition of the U.S. racial state as a state that constituted itself through political exclusion rooted in racial categories (Omi and Winant 1994: 82).

Building from Racial Formation Theory, in "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation," (1997) Eduardo Bonilla-Silva questioned how the U.S. racial state reproduced itself in the post Civil-Rights era despite structural changes that lessened

the saliency of race as a category of political exclusion. Bonilla-Silva (1997) advanced

the concept of "racialized social systems," which he defined as societies partially

structured at the economic, political, social and ideological levels by the placement of

actors in racial categories or races (p. 469). He also differentiated racism from the

racialized social system. He argued that racism was the ideological component of the

system; however, the racialized social system was constituted by *more* than ideological

mechanisms (ibid).

Internal Colonialism, Racial Formation and Racialized Social System theory

contended that political and economic mechanisms integral to the U.S. racial state

perpetuated racial inequality. However, they also conceptualized the U.S. racial state as a

Nation-state: contained and severed from the transnational context. Although Blauner

suggested the colonialism *metaphor* could be used to understand racial inequality in the

United States, he did not explicitly identify the relational production of race through

ongoing policies, which linked African Americans to Africans. In his analysis of the

"colonial labor principle," he notes that the introduction of plantation slavery in the "New

World" became a pattern for labor practices in the colonial regime of Africa (Blauner

1972: 57). However, he does not identify what specific policies in plantation slavery were

introduced to labor practices in Africa, or how they were introduced. Likewise, in Racial

Formation theory, Omi and Winant (1994) discussed the "breaching of the seal" between

the New World and Old World in the founding of the United States and its racialized

social structure (p.61). However, they do not expand on the continued breaching of this

seal by U.S. imperialism, and how it constitutes racial formations in the United States.

Lastly, Bonilla-Silva used the term racial-state, but treated it as synonymous with the

Nation-state (Jung 2015: 34). One is left wondering in all three theories, whether the U.S. racial state is produced in and through transnational structures and policies, and how.

Interestingly, Patricia Hill Collins notes that racial inequality in the United States is mirrored on a global scale with people of African descent on the bottom. She states, "…on a global scale, wealth and poverty continue to be racialized with people of African descent disproportionately poor…" (Hill Collins 2004: 54). Furthermore, she theorizes the persistence of poor housing, poor health, illiteracy and social problems in the United States all constitute new variations of colonialism (ibid). An analysis of how U.S. racial policy was formed in the colonial context would further illuminate how colonialism became a part of new variations of inequality in the United States.

Other scholars have more explicitly examined how the U.S. state forms policy in the global context. In particular, Educational Policy Diffusion and World Systems theory, examine the global circulation of U.S. policies. Scholars, who work with educational borrowing theory, hypothesize the United States exports educational models when they are facing criticism within the United States (Halpin and Troyna 1995; Novoa and Lawn 2002; Steiner-Khamsi 2002; Steiner-Khamsi and Quist 2000; Yamada 2008). However, these theories don't elaborate on the way policy diffusion informs racial categories and hierarchies within the United States.

World systems theory also analyzes transnational policy diffusion. In particular, world-systems theory theorizes the transfer of policies from the core to the periphery as an integral part of global capitalism (Wallerstein 2004). This analysis draws attention to how policy diffusion from core to periphery produces an exploitive labor structure for resource extraction from the periphery to the core (ibid). However, James Robinson

(2011) also critiques this theory for reproducing the analytic bifurcation between

metropole and colony:

> …world system theory insists that this axial division of labor must take not only a geographical/territorial form, but specifically a nation-state form, so that core and periphery by definition are *spatially distinct zones* in the world system (P. 739).

Thus, the theory lends itself to seeing the core and periphery as distinct and separate,

rather than produced in relation to one another. In his own critique of World Systems

theory, Julian Go (2016) argues the theory is unidirectional and obscures the integral role

that mechanisms on the outside of the core play on the inside of the core:

> …Arrighi's model divides up the complex and sprawling relations and networks extending around the globe into an 'inside' and 'outside'; an internal system and an external system set of relations that are ostensibly irrelevant for the inside of the system (P. 139).

Go contends that mechanisms conceptualized as external to the core are actually an

integral part of the core.

A post-colonial perspective, which emphasizes how imperial policies are shaped

by the agency of the colonized (Bhambra 2014; Go 2016) and challenges the analytic

bifurcation between metropole and colony (Barkawi 2017; Go 2013; Go and Lawson

2017; Hung 2017; Magubane 2017; Norton 2017), provides useful new directions for

analysis in the sociology of race. It theoretically highlights why political-economic

mechanisms in American Empire are also an integral part of producing and reproducing

the subjugation of African Americans the United States and vice versa. In this analysis of

the transfer of the adaptive education model, I examine how the U.S. racial state

produced and reproduced itself through U.S. Empire in Africa following World War I.

Broadly, I define U.S. Empire as a non-territorial form of control, in which the United States controlled space outside of its national borders for economic gain and security (Steinmetz 2005: 342). It is also a relationship of political domination, which encompasses transfers of practice from center to margin (Steinmetz 2005: 356). Additionally, I examine how the relationship of political domination between the periphery and core blurs distinctions in racial formations between the periphery and core. I also employ Moon-Kie Jung's (2015) conception of the U.S. as an Empire-state that usurps the political sovereignty of foreign territories and links its racially marginalized citizens to peoples in those territories (p. 81).

To get at two sociological perspectives on why the U.S. racial state linked African Americans to Africans, I juxtapose Thomas Jesse Jones advocacy for the adaptive education model in *Education in West Africa* and Du Bois's critique of the model in *The Crisis and Dark Water*. I focus on these two sociologists because between 1919 and 1925 Thomas Jesse Jones was the primary advocate for the model and Du Bois was its primary critic (King 1971). Furthermore, it is an interesting epistemological case for sociology because the Phelps Stokes Fund advanced Thomas Jesse Jones' conception of the U.S. racial state in sociology departments, while they marginalized Du Bois'. More specifically, Anson Phelps Stokes insisted that Jones' *Education in Africa* and *Negro Education* be included in the Encyclopedia of Negro Education used in sociology of race curricula in southern universities; however, Du Bois' *Dark Water* was left out for being "excessively bitter" (SCRBC, Phelps Stokes Fund Records, Box 16, Folder 9, February 8, 1921; January 29, 1921). Ultimately the immediate aftermath of World War I heightened tensions between Thomas Jesse Jones and W.E.B. Du Bois and led to their divergent

views on the U.S. racial state and its transfer of the adaptive education model from the United States to Africa.

W.E.B. DU BOIS, THOMAS JESSE JONES AND THE U.S. RACIAL STATE

Many historians have studied the conflict between Thomas Jesse Jones and W.E.B. Du Bois in the domestic context (Ellis 2013; Kliebard 1994; Yellin 2002). Likewise, they have looked at the transfer of the adaptive education model to German Togo (Zimmerman 2010) and East Africa (King 1971). However, there is little analysis on how global events shaped Jones and Du Bois's relationship, or their sociological conceptions of the U.S. racial state.

In February 1918, W.E.B. Du Bois published his first full-length critique of the adaptive education model in *The Crisis*. In this editorial he discussed Thomas Jesse Jones' advocacy for the model in *Negro Education* (1917). He argued the report had strengths but was ultimately detrimental for Africans Americans' fight for civil rights. On the report's strengths, he stated, "It is published with the prestige of the United States government and has many excellent points" (Du Bois 1917: 173). He praised the report's statistics on public expenditure for Negro school systems, philanthropy given private schools and Negro property. He also praised the report's advocacy for increased philanthropic aid to private schools (ibid).

However, he also cautioned against the report describing it as "dangerous" and in "many respects" an "unfortunate publication" (ibid). Du Bois (1917) described how the publication criticized curriculums, which prepared African Americans for college:

> The whole trend of Mr. Jones' study and of his general recommendations is to make higher training of Negroes practically difficult, if not impossible, despite the fact that his statistics show (in 1914-1915) only 1643 colored students studying

college subjects in all the private Negro schools out of 12,726 pupils (P. 174)

Furthermore, Du Bois (1917) contended Jones' advocacy for the adaptive education

model encouraged philanthropies to spend more money "in helping Negroes learn how to

can vegetables than in helping them to go through college" (p. 177).

Du Bois also critiqued the report for misrepresenting African Americans'

criticism of the adaptive education model. Du Bois (1917) contended African Americans

did not have a problem with industrial training per se, but with its inclusion at the cost of

college prep:

> It is not a dislike on the part of the Negroes for having their children trained in
> vocations, or in having manual training used as a means of education; it is rather
> in having a series of schools established which deliberately shut the door of
> opportunity in the face of bright Negro students (P. 175).

Furthermore, he noted that African Americans didn't just have some "silly desire to study

'Greek' as Mr. Jones several times intimates," but rather desired to develop educated men

to free themselves from dependence on philanthropic aid (Du Bois 1917: 174).

Global events following World War I heightened tensions between Thomas Jesse

Jones, W.E.B. Du Bois and the U.S. government. On December 8, 1918 W.E.B. Du Bois

sailed to Paris, France aboard the *Orizaba* with Thomas Jesse Jones and the principal of

Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Robert Russa Moton. Du Bois was on a mission to collect data on

the abuse of African American soldiers by the U.S. military. He also hoped to obtain an

invitation to attend the Paris Peace Conference to present an African American

perspective on colonial policy in Africa. Likewise, Dr. Moton and Jones were on a

mission for President Woodrow Wilson and the Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, to

improve the morale of African American troops before their return to the United States

(Lewis 1993: 561).

Both President Wilson and Newton Baker feared American Negro discontent in France would translate into racial riots in the United States. Du Bois (1919) wrote in a May edition of *The Crisis* that Dr. Moton took him aside on the *Orizaba* and told him of "…the rampant American prejudice against black American troops and officers and the bitter resentment of the victims" (p. 9). However, according to Du Bois, neither Dr. Moton nor Dr. Jones took the opportunity to collect evidence, or report on racism towards African American Troops by the U.S. military during their visit. Rather, Dr. Moton, "rushed around as fast as possible," didn't ask for any additional information from black troops or white commanding officers and took with him that "evil genius of the Negro race," Thomas Jesse Jones (ibid). He also noted Dr. Moton was asked by Colonel House to speak at the Paris Peace Conference about U.S. race relations, but instead returned to the United States with Thomas Jesse Jones (Lewis 1993: 574).

While in France, Du Bois contrasted Dr. Moton's and Dr. Jones' ease of access to camps with the resistance he encountered. He observed the American Secret Service followed him from camp to camp, and the commanding officers refused to speak to him (p. 8). He also noted despite multiple attempts to gain an invite to the Paris Peace Conference, the U.S. government made it practically impossible for him to attend (Lewis 1993: 561-565).

In response, Du Bois organized an alternative conference. The Pan-African Congress gathered Africans and members of the African diaspora from around the world to develop points to present to the League of Nations on international policy in Africa. The Pan-African Congress was held from February 19-21, 1919 at the Grand Hotel in the boulevard des Capucines, Paris. Du Bois observed in an April edition of *The Crisis* that

the Conference particularly highlighted the similar treatment of African Americans by the U.S. state and Africans by European Empires. M. Candace, Deputy from Guadeloupe noted, "…the rights of black Americans were met with so little respect in the United States…" (1919: 271). Two other French deputies from the French West Indies also spoke about their "inability to understand how Americans could fail to treat as equals those who in common with themselves were giving their lives for democracy and justice" (ibid). Representatives from the United States echoed these negative assessments of the U.S. William Walling appealed to the U.S. Congress to increase racial diversity to reflect the diversity of the population like the French Chamber of Deputies (Lewis 1993: 576).

Anticipating this "anti-American edge," the United States Army hired Thomas Jesse Jones to attend Civil Rights events prior to the Pan-African Congress and report African Americans who were "disloyal" to the U.S. government. In June 1918, Jones attended the National Liberty Congress and marked twenty-five attendees as disloyal. These twenty-five disloyal attendees included Ida B. Wells and William Monroe Trotter, who were later prohibited by the U.S. State Department from attending the Pan-African Congress (Ellis 2001: 190).

Likewise, the U.S. State Department sent Harry F. Worley, the U.S. financial adviser to Liberia, to report back on the Pan-African Congress. In this report, Worley (1919) stated, "…I learned that the speeches of the American Negroes were highly inflammatory and condemnatory of the social conditions of the United States and inveighing against the Government of the United States…" (p. 1). According to Worley, African Americans at the Pan-African Congress represented their treatment as worse than colonial subjects (ibid). He added that American attendees passed out Marcus Garvey's

"The Negro World" to the Congress, "each containing large headlines and inflammatory wording, emphasizing the wrongs of the Negro race, calling on them for retaliation, and prophesying a day of judgment and retribution for the American people" (ibid).

Following the Pan-African Congress, the U.S. government pushed through policies in the League of Nations to ensure greater American control over African colonial policy. In particular, the United States passed draft mandates to allow American commercial philanthropies, like the Phelps Stokes Fund, to expand their educational activities in the African colonies. In the draft mandate developed for British East Africa, Article 7 stated, "…the mandatory shall ensure to all nationals of States Members of the League of Nations, on the same footing as to his own nationals, freedom of transit and navigation and complete economic, commercial, and industrial equality…" (Beer 1923: 522). This was followed by Article 8, which stated, "Missionaries of all such religions shall be free to enter the territory and to travel and reside therein, to acquire and possess property, to erect religious buildings and to open schools…" (Ibid). These stipulations were also written into a revision of the General Act of Berlin (1885) and of Brussels (1890), which bound France, Portugal and Belgium to respect freedom of trade and equal treatment of American missionaries in their mandates.

Du Bois feared the United States' government's effort to develop an open-door colonial policy in Africa was connected to their efforts to block African Americans' fight for self-determination within the United States. He observed the United States' Department of Labor's attempt to prevent African American labor migration from the Southern United States to the North was coupled with efforts to secure new sources of cheap labor abroad. In an April edition of *The Crisis* he stated,

> The United States Department of Labor has been doing all it can to put this light out. Long since it stopped helping Negroes to find jobs in the North. Lately it has forbidden firms from advertising for Southern labor. More lately it has begun what prove a new slavery of 100,000 workers from the West Indies (Du Bois 1918: 267).

To counter the U.S. Department of Labor, he argued African Americans must unite with Africans to "teach the world the ABC of American color prejudice" (Du Bois 1919: 270). Du Bois (1919) warned if African Americans fell prey to intellectual provincialism, the "'nigger'-hating Anglo-Saxon idea" would dominate the League of Nations and the world (p. 269). Indeed, there is evidence in *Education in West Africa* and *Dark Water* that the transfer of the adaptive education model to Africa was part of a broader movement by the U.S. state to counter a transnational black movement for self-determination.

THE U.S. RACIAL STATE IN *EDUCATION IN WEST AFRICA* AND *DARK WATER*

In *Education in West Africa*, Thomas Jesse Jones suggests the adaptive education model should be applied to the African colonies to curb the Pan-African movement and to increase resource extraction. Likewise, in *Dark Water*, Du Bois suggests the model was introduced in Africa to bolster a new form of industrial slavery, which could make Africans into politically docile laborers for U.S. corporations.

Prior to Jones' survey of West Africa, British colonial officials expressed concerns over the threat the Pan-African movement to the world order. Warning of the dangers of the Pan-African movement, in 1921 a British colonial official in German East Africa, wrote:

> Much as we may desire to isolate the several fields and problems of the Negro world, the presence of the European with his world-wide interests…will defeat our purpose. West Africa, South Africa, East Africa, and the Negro element in America will not always remain separate entities in a black world. The interests of the negro are no longer tribal in extent, and his instincts will prompt him to seek a wider federation for his self-expression…The only way to counter-act the

complications which will arise is to foresee them, and to provide without delay a wise and liberal education…(Hooper 1921: 8)

Likewise, Charles T. Loram, a South African social scientist, who worked with the Phelps Stokes Fund to transfer the adaptive education model to South Africa, argued the academic model of education fueled Pan-African resistance. He stated, "We should take cognizance of the danger (so apparent in India and Egypt) of educating any number of individuals beyond the requirement of their race" (Loram 1917: 310). He asserted providing any type of academic training to inferior races, led them to revolt, and must be replaced by a model that oriented them towards labor (ibid).

In *Education in West Africa*, Jones also argued the adaptive education could curb Pan-African resistance. He stated,

The only cure for the so-called "rising tide of color," and "the revolt against civilization," heralded abroad with such anxiety by some alarmists of the present time, is in the development of genuine and sincere cooperation of peoples of all races based upon an education of the Native masses and Native leaders in the common essentials of life (Loram 1922: 10)

Indeed, Jones views on the Pan-African movement were largely negative. Jones (1922) stated the calls for self-determination, magnified by the Pan-African movement were "extreme" and represented a desire to "reverse the most important lessons of history" (7). He argued, Africans should realize they have to progress through cooperation with colonizers: "The evidence indicates that the history of the African people resembles that of all other peoples in the world, in that their progress has been and will continue to be the result of cooperative relationships with other peoples" (ibid). He also argued that academic education fueled movements for self-determination: "It is significant that some of the Indian leaders of thought have recently charged much of the unrest in India to the

fact that the schools have too exclusively prepared the young Indians for literary and clerical occupations…" (Jones 1922: 17). He concluded native Africans must work with the "white group" to develop as a race (p. 7).

Likewise, Jones (1922) argued that the adaptive education model would increase resource extraction from Africa. In the beginning of the survey, he stated, "Civilization, exhausted by the destruction of war and the confusion of an unsettled world, looks to Africa to help replenish its resources" (p. 9). Throughout the report, Jones highlights the potential opportunities for trade development for U.S. corporations. He noted, "the diamond fields of Kimberley, the gold ridge of Johannesburg, the coalmines of Rhodesia, the Katanga copper plateaus of Belgian Congo, and the oil areas of Angola. Every colony has some of the precious metals in forms and quantities profitable for industry and commerce…" (p. 2). However, he also lamented that opportunities to develop African's natural resources were scarcely touched because Africans didn't know how to work large plantations or use technology for mining like African Americans (ibid).

Jones (1922) particularly, focused on opportunities for American corporations to profit from the development of the sugar, cotton and gold industries in Africa. In his observations of Nyasaland, he states "One of the most interesting developments of cotton planting in Nyasaland has been the participation of Natives in the industry. This somewhat unusual cooperation opens up wider possibilities in the direction of large exports than cultivation by Europeans alone…" (p. 3). Jones implied that if African labor was disciplined in the same way African American labor was to produce cotton, it would profit both the United States and the British Empire. He highlighted similarities in the role the Natives in Nyasaland play in increasing the efficiency of cotton production for

the British Empire, and the role Black Americans play in increasing the efficiency of cotton production for the United States.

In *Dark Water* Du Bois (1920) also argued that the function of the adaptive education model was to counter Pan-African resistance and increase resource extraction. More specifically, he argued American corporations could no longer take slaves *from* Africa, so now they were taking slavery *to* Africa (Du Bois 1920: 25). He stated,

> Today instead of removing slaves from Africa to distant slavery, industry built on a new slavery approaches Africa to deprive the natives of their land, to force them to toil and to reap all the profit for the white world…Negroes of ability have been carefully gotten rid of, deposed from authority, kept out of positions of influence, and discredited in their people's eyes, while a caste of white overseers and governing officials has appeared everywhere (Du Bois 1920: 36).

Du Bois also argued that Jones discredited African American leaders in his visit to the African colonies. In a letter, he stated, "I have documentary evidence that Jones is at present in South Africa discrediting American Negroes, even those of the most conservative type" (UMA, Du Bois Papers, May 19, 1921). Indeed, in Jones' travel diary he noted in many of the colonies he visited James Aggrey, a Gold Coast graduate of Tuskegee, spoke about the questionable moral character of African American leaders in the United States like Marcus Garvey: "Aggrey heaps ridicule on the Marcus Garvey movement. At the same time, he inspires them to a strong belief in their own future" (SCRBC, Phelps Stokes Fund Records, Box 46, October 11, 1920, p. 29)

Although Du Bois and Jones agreed the model was designed to counter political agitation and increase resource extraction, they had different theories on why the United States sought to apply the same educational policy to Africans and African Americans. Jones argued the U.S. state sought to do this because both groups belonged to the same race. More specifically, he argued the U.S. state was a Nation-state that sought to give all

its citizens equal access to national rights and privileges. However, he also argued because innate racial differences existed between black Americans and white Americans, the U.S. government had to develop policies, which linked them to members of their own race in other countries. In this explanation, Jones reifies race as a sociological explanation for the diffusion of the adaptive education model. In doing so, he left the role of the U.S. state in producing racial groups unquestioned, and the imperial relationship between the U.S. state and African Americans unquestioned.

In general, Jones argues African Americans and Africans have the same racial needs and this is why the same educational policy should be applied to both groups. In *Education in West Africa*, he argued their similar needs derived from shared ancestry and biology. Jones argued African Americans are biologically similar to Africans because they are the descendants of Africans. He stated, "The future possibilities of the African natives may be somewhat forecast by the success of Negroes in other parts of the world, notably in America where the descendants of Africans are living in such large numbers" (1922: 6). He also argued they were culturally similar because they shared biology. More specifically, Jones depicted African Americans educated by the adaptive education model as the upper limit of cultural advancement for Africans. In his survey of Sierra Leone, he stated, many inhabitants of Sierra Leone have a "belief in the witchery of their medicine-men" and "enslavement to many forms superstition"; however, they also "show a remarkable capacity for developing as a civilized people" (1922: 103). However, "Even within a few years of civilization have brought a considerable number of them to status equal that of the most capable American Negroes" (ibid). Then in his survey of the Gold Coast, he repeated that the most educated people resemble African Americans. He stated,

"In appearance and manner they resemble the educated classes of American Negroes"

(1922: 124). Interestingly, throughout the survey, Jones did not compare Africans to one

another, but consistently compared them to African Americans.

Ultimately, Jones (1922) argued that the same education model should be applied

to both groups because they belonged to the same race.

> As the most important work of the Fund to date has probably been the preparation
> of a two-volume report on 'Negro Education,' published by the United States
> government, it seemed fitting that the Fund should apply the same methods of
> study that had proved helpful in improving educational conditions among
> American Negroes to members of their race in Africa (p. xi).

For Jones it seemed "fitting" to apply the same model to Africans because African

Americans were more similar to members of their own racial group on another continent

than to white Americans. Furthermore, he implied that their racial characteristics

superseded any cultural, historical, or geographic distinctions.

Furthermore, even as Jones acknowledged similarities in the U.S. state's

treatment of African Americans and the British Empire's treatment of its colonized

subjects, he maintained the United States was a democratic Nation-state. More

specifically, he argued the United States was a democratic Nation-state because it *sought*

to give all its citizens equal access to national rights and privileges. Regarding why the

U.S. government developed a different education policy for African Americans, Jones

(1922) stated

> …although the door was and always should be kept wide open for a higher
> education through some institutions specially intended for those men and women
> of the black race who have the ability and the character to profit by the training of
> the academic college…Experience shows that those who can profit by such
> advanced work are in the small minority among white people, and they will
> doubtless continue, at least during our generation, to be in an even smaller
> minority among black people. (P. xxiv)

Jones contended the United States *did* provide equal opportunity for all its citizens to access national rights and privileges; however African Americans' cultural and biological characteristics kept them from accessing them. Therefore, it wasn't the U.S. state itself that was producing vertical distinctions amongst its citizens (characteristic of an Empire-state) it was the existence of races that produced these distinctions.

He also used the reification of race to argue it was the race of African Americans that linked them to Africans and not their similar treatment by an imperial state. Jones (1922) stated,

> Though village conditions in Africa differ in many respects from those in America where these activities have had great influence for the improvement of rural life, the resemblances are sufficiently numerous and real to warrant the belief that the plans above described may be adapted to colonial conditions in Africa. Some observers who know Africa and who have visited certain sections of the American states where the Negroes form a large proportion of the population have maintained that the conditions are strikingly similar (P. 35)

Jones notes the "conditions" of African American and African communities are strikingly similar. He attributes this similarity to the cultural and biological characteristics of the racial group, rather than their similar treatment by an imperial state.

Conversely, Du Bois argues that the racial distinction does not simply exist, but rather is constructed by the U.S. state. More specifically, he argues that the U.S., in collaboration with other empires, is producing the "Negro" race, by subjecting both African Americans and Africans to similar policies. According to Du Bois, the U.S. racial state linked Africans Americans to people subject to U.S. imperialism in Africa. In doing so, it discursively produced a homogenous black race as an object of political intervention.

Unlike Jones, Du Bois conceptualized the U.S. as an Empire-state. He argued the United States was not structurally designed to give its citizens equal access to national rights and privileges. Rather the U.S. racial state was an Empire-state that usurped the sovereignty of foreign territories and then linked its own marginalized citizens to those populations through policy diffusion. In conceptualizing the U.S. as an Empire-state, Du Bois illuminated political and economic mechanisms that produced similarities in the two populations that had little to do with supposed biological or cultural similarities. In fact, in a February issue of *The Crisis* Du Bois actively challenged the notion that African Americans were more African than American because of their race. Du Bois (1919) stated,

> Once for all, let us realize that we are Americans, that we were brought here with the earliest settlers, and that the very sort of civilization from which we came made the complete adoption of western modes and customs imperative if we were to survive at all. In brief, there is nothing so indigenous, so completely 'made in America' as we. It is as absurd to talk of a return to Africa, merely because that was our home 300 years ago as it would be to expect the members of the Caucasian race to return to the fastnesses of the Caucasian mountains from which, it is reputed, they sprang (P. 166)

For W.E.B. Du Bois what linked African Americans and Africans, was not their biology nor their culture, but rather, their political treatment by the U.S. Empire-state. The U.S. racial state then in turn pointed to the low status of African Americans and Africans as a reason for their continued subjugation; consequently, turning an action of the U.S. Empire-state into a characteristic of the group.

Regarding this similarity, Du Bois argued U.S. government officials knew the adaptive education model worked in a colonial context because it worked in the Southern United States. Following the Civil War, the adaptive education model helped rebuild the Southern agrarian economy and repay the Southern states' debts to the federal

government. Therefore, the United States government reasoned it would help other

Empire-states repay their debts to the United States and build their agrarian economies.

Du Bois observed,

> The South has invested in Negro ignorance; some Northerners proposed limited
> education, not, they explained, to better the Negro, but merely to make the investment
> more profitable to the present beneficiaries. They thus gained wide Southern support
> for schools like Hampton and Tuskegee…And the reaction toward this caste
> education has strengthened the idea of caste education throughout the world (1920:
> 122)

Like its function in the American South, the U.S. government sought to use the adaptive

education model in Africa as a means to make native Africans into "hand maids of

production." The model would make African laborers exist "…for the sake of its mines,

fields and factories…" It would make education train a "mass of men as servants and

laborers and mechanics to increase the land's industrial efficiency" (Du Bois 1920: 123)

Indeed, during and right after the war, the British Empire, alongside American

corporations confiscated land for resource extraction. In *Dark Water*, Du Bois described a

law in South Africa following the war, which assigned nearly two hundred and fifty

million acres of natives' land to a million and a half whites, leaving only six million acres

of swamp to a half million blacks. Another law in Rhodesia resulted in the confiscation of

ninety million acres from natives. In the Belgian Congo, all the land was declared

property of the Belgian government. Likewise, in St. Thome and St. Principe all but

slavery in name was established in the cocoa industry. He contends, "Is it a paradise of

industry we then contemplate? It is much more likely to be hell…All the industrial

deviltry, which civilization has been driving to the slums and backwaters, will have a

voiceless continent to conceal it. If the slave cannot be taken from Africa, slavery can be

taken to Africa" (Du Bois 1920: 64).

Collapsing the distinction between the United States as a Nation-state and European states as Empire-states, Du Bois argued the United States had a chance to emerge as a national democracy following the Civil War, but instead decided to usurp the sovereignty of peoples in foreign territories and then link them to African Americans through policy diffusion. Du Bois (1920) stated,

> But what of this? America, Land of Democracy, wanted to believe in the failure of democracy so far as darker peoples were concerned. Absolutely without excuse she established a caste system, rushed into preparation for war, and conquered tropical colonies. She stands today shoulder-to-shoulder with Europe in Europe's worst sin against civilization (p. 50).

By linking African Americans in the United States to peoples it usurped sovereignty from in other countries, the United States created hierarchical differentiations amongst its own citizens. It linked African American citizens to peoples subject to imperial rule through policy transfers, and in practice gave African Americans the same limited access to national rights and privileges as those peoples it usurped sovereignty from. Thus, what linked African Americans and Africans was not their "race," but rather their relationship to the U.S. Empire-state and the policies it used to produce their economic and political subjugation.

CONCLUSION

Juxtaposing Jones' *Education in West Africa* and Du Bois' *Dark Water,* two different conceptions of the U.S. racial state emerge. For Jones the United States is a racial state because it creates specific policies for particular "races" of people. Races exist out there so the U.S. Nation-state represents them by creating policies rooted in those categories. For Jones, the U.S. racial state is also a democratic Nation-state that in the

long term seeks to overcome the existence of races by providing opportunity for all people to gain equal access to national rights and privileges.

Conversely, Du Bois conceptualized the U.S. racial state as inherently racial because it *produces* races through transnational policies that link Africans and African Americans as similar objects of political intervention. The U.S. racial state is *not* a Nation-state, but rather an Empire-state that structurally links African Americans to colonized peoples. It does not produce a horizontally homogenous population characteristic of the Nation-state, but rather a vertically differentiated population with unequal political access to the national institutions.

Today commercial philanthropies continue to link African Americans and Africans as similar objects of political intervention. The Bridge International Academies, developed in 2009, and funded by Pearson, Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg and the World Bank International Finance Corporation, amongst others, developed the "academy in a box" to educate populations in Africa living on less than two dollars day. This program delivers scripted curriculum from U.S. based teams in Cambridge and other U.S. cities on Internet-enabled tablets to Africa. Its mission is to improve social conditions through transformations in human "reason". Most strikingly, this program was modeled on the *Success for all Program* to improve numeracy and literacy amongst urban youth labeled "at-risk" in U.S. schools (Kirschgasler 2016).

According to the sociologist, Thomas Jesse Jones, the impetus for this is because both groups belong to the same racial group. The United States is a Nation-state, which simply responds to the existence of races and creates policies to try to address this fact. In other words, the U.S. racial state simply responds to the existence of races, rather than

producing races through imperial policies that link African Americans to peoples subject to U.S. imperialism. In this conception of the U.S. racial state as a Nation-state, the imperial policies, linking African Americans to Africans, producing and reproducing "race," are obscured. One is left wondering why the saliency of "race" as a category of exclusion within the U.S. racial state remains despite national political changes guaranteeing equal access to national rights and privileges.

However, in Du Bois' conception of the U.S. racial state as an Empire-state, the political economic and social construction of "race" through imperial policies developed by the United States, are illuminated. One is not forced to reify race as a causal explanation for the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Within a conception of the U.S. racial state as an Empire-state the imperial policies, which produce race despite national structural changes are revealed. Unfortunately, Du Bois' conception of the U.S. racial state as an Empire-state was left out of many early sociology of race curriculums. Rather, the Phelps Stokes Fund advanced the conception of the U.S. racial state as a Nation-state that sought to overcome the existence of races through national policies.

I argue this narrowing of the conception of the U.S. racial state to the confines of the Nation-state is still reflected in contemporary sociological theories of race. Despite historical and legal evidence of a very blurred boundary between the "domestic" and "foreign" in U.S. racial policy (Bell 1980; Dudziak 2011; Grosfoguel 2004; Kaplan 2002; Mignolo 2000; Singh 2004; Von Eschen 1997), many sociological analyses of the U.S. racial state remain provincial. Describing this provinciality, Penny Von Eschen (1997) states following the Cold War studies of racism within the American academy went from

"something understood as rooted in the history of slavery and colonialism to something seen as a psychological problem…a 'domestic problem'" (p. 5).

I conclude, the exclusionary policies, which make the U.S. state inherently racial, are also inherently imperial, and must be conceptualized within a broader framework, which doesn't limit its analytical scope to the nation-state. The development and function of racial policy for African Americans in the United States cannot be understood in isolation from U.S. imperialism. More specifically, the subjugation of African Americans in the United States cannot be understood or addressed in isolation from the United States political and economic subjugation of peoples outside the United States.

NOTES

[1] The Phelps Stokes Fund was established as a Protestant missionary philanthropy in 1911 by the state of New York. During the nineteenth century, the Phelps Stokes Family made its money in global mercantilism in Africa and helped develop the American Colonization movement in Liberia. Upon her death, Caroline Phelps-Stokes left a million dollars of her family's money to the founding of the Fund, (Yellen 2002) and stated its mission was "for educational purposes in the education of Negroes both in Africa and the United States" (Jones 1922: xii).

REFERENCES

Barkawi, Tark. 2017. "States, Armies and Wars in Global Context." Pp. 58-76 in *Global Historical Sociology*, edited by J. Go and G. Lawson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Becker, Gary. 1957. *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago, IL: University of

Chicago   Press.

Beer, George Louis. 1923. *African Questions at the Paris Peace Conference: With*

Papers on Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Colonial Settlement.

New York: MacMillan Company.

Bell, Derrick. 1980. "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest Convergence

Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review* 93(3): 518-534.

Berman, Edward H. 1972. "Tuskegee-In-Africa" *The Journal of Negro Education* 41

(2): 99-112.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. 2014. *Connected Sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury.

Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper and Row.

Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *Pacific*

Sociological Review 1(1): 3-7.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural

Interpretation" *American Sociological Review* 62(3): 465-480.

Callahan, Michael D. 1999. *Mandates and Empire: The League of Nations and Africa,*

1914-1931. Portland, OR: Sussex Academic Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2004. "The Past is Ever Present: Recognizing the New Racism" Pp.

53-85 in *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender and the New Racism*.

New York: Routledge.

Dollard, John. 1937. *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*. New York: Harper and Row.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1918. "Negro Education" Pp. 173-178 in *The Crisis* 15(4). The

Modernist Journals Project. Brown University and the University of Tulsa.

http://www.modjourn.org/render.php?id=1292429973367250&view=mjp_object

Accessed December 12, 2016.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1918. "Editorial" Pp. 267-270 in *The Crisis* 15(6). The Modernist

Journals Project. Brown University and the University of Tulsa.

 http://www.modjourn.org/render.php?id=1292429973367250&view=mjp_object

Accessed December 12, 2016.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1919. "Editorial" Pp. 163-166 in *The Crisis* 17(4). The Modernist

Journals Project. Brown University and the University of Tulsa.

 http://www.modjourn.org/render.php?id=1292429973367250&view=mjp_object

Accessed December 12, 2016.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1919. "Opinion" Pp. 7-14 in *The Crisis* 18(1). The Modernist Journals

Project. Brown University and the University of Tulsa.

http://www.modjourn.org/render.php?id=1292429973367250&view=mjp_object

Accessed December 12, 2016.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1919. "The Pan-African Congress" Pp. 271-274 in *The Crisis* 17(6).

The Modernist Journals Project. Brown University and the University of Tulsa.

http://www.modjourn.org/render.php?id=1292429973367250&view=mjp_object

Accessed December 12, 2016.

Dudziak, Mary L. 2000. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American*

 Democracy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ellis, Mark. 2001. *Race, War and Surveillance: African Americans and the United*

 States Government During World War I. Indianapolis: University of Indiana
Press.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 1970. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City.* 2nd edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Go, Julian. 2016. *Postcolonial Thought and Social Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Go, Julian and George Lawson, eds. 2017. *Global Historical Sociology.* New York: Cambridge University.

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

Giddings, Franklin. 1911. "The Relation of Social Theory to Public Policy." *American Journal of Sociology* 16(5): 577-592.

Grosfoguel, Ramon. 2006. "Geopolitics of Knowledge and Coloniality of Power: Thinking Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans form the Colonial Difference" Pp. 479-507 in *Culture, Power and History: Studies in Critical Sociology*, edited by S. Pfohl and A. Van Wagenen et al. Boston, MA: Brill.

Gutierrez, Ramon A. 2004. "Internal Colonialism: An American Theory of Race." *The Du Bois Review* 1(2): 281-295.

Halpin, David, and Barry Troyna. 1995. "The Politics of Education Policy Borrowing." *Comparative Education* 31(3): 303-310.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hooper, Hadley D. 1921. Leading Strings: Native Development and Missionary Education in

Kenya Colony. London: Colonial Society of Massachusetts.

Hung, Ho-Fung. 2017. "The Global, the Historical, and the Social in the Making of

Capitalism." Pp. 163-182 in *Global Historical Sociology*, edited by J. Go and

G. Lawson. New York: Cambridge University

Hyman, Herbert and Paul B. Sheatsley. 1956. "Attitudes Towards Desegregation."

Scientific American 195(6): 35-39.

Johnson, Charles. 1935. "Incidence Upon the Negroes." *The American Journal of*

Sociology 40: 737-745.

Jones, Jesse. 1920. *Educational Adaptations: Report of Ten Years Work of the Phelps*

Stokes Fund, 1910-1920. Retrieved January 31, 2015

(https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015064330197;view=2up;seq=14;sk

in=mobile)

Jones, Jesse. 1922. *Education in Africa: A Study of West, South and Equatorial Africa*

by the African Education Commission, Under the Auspices of the Phelps-

Stokes Fund and Foreign Mission Societies of North America and Europe.

Retrieved February 1, 2015

(http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044029885712;view=1up;seq=7)

Jung, Moon-Kie. 2015. *Beneath the Surface of White Supremacy: Denaturalizing U.S.*

Racisms. Berkeley, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kaplan, Amy. 2002. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University Press.

King, Kenneth James. 1971. *Pan-Africanism and Education: A Study of Race*

Philanthropy and Education in the Southern States of America and East

Africa. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Kirchgasler, Christopher. 2016. "The Limits of 'Knowledge for All': Historicizing Transnational School Reforms in Kenya." *Knowledge Cultures* 2: 73-94.

Kliebard, Herbert M. 1994. "'That Evil Genius of the Negro Race': Thomas Jesse Jones and Educational Reform." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 10(1): 5-20.

Lewis, David Levering. 1993. *W.E.B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race*. New York: Henry Holt & Company

Loram, Charles T.1917. *The Education of the South African Native*. London: Longmans Green and Company.

Louis, Herbert Gray ed. 1923. "Draft Mandate for East Africa" Pp. 522-523 in *African Questions at the Paris Peace Conference*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Magubane, Zine. 2017. "Following 'the Deeds of Men': Race, 'the Global,' and International Relations." Pp. 101-124 in *Global Historical Sociology*, edited by J. Go and G. Lawson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Morris, Aldon D. 2015. *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Mydral, Gunnar. 1962. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Norton, Matthew. 2017. "Real Mythic Histories: Circulatory Networks and State-Centricism." Pp. 37-58 in *Global Historical Sociology* edited by J. Go and G. Lawson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nóvoa, António, and Martin Lawn. 2002. *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an*

    Education space. Dordrecht, Países Bajos: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States:*

    From the 1960s to the 1990s. New York: Routledge.

Park, Robert. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of*

    Sociology 33(6): 881-893.

Park, Robert. 1914. "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups with Particular Reference

    to the Negro." *American Journal of Sociology* 19(5): 606-623.

Pederson, Susan. 2015. *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire*.

    New York: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, William I. 2011. "Globalization and the Sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein:

A Critical Appraisal." *International Sociology* 26(6): 723-745.

Schomburg Center for Research on Black Culture (SCRBC), Phelps Stokes Fund

    Records, Box 44. January 4, 1917. Folder 4415. Letter from Thomas Jesse Jones

    to Anson Stokes.

Schomburg Center for Research on Black Culture, Phelps Stokes Fund Records, Box 46.

    October 11, 1920. p. 29. Thomas Jesse Jones Travel Diary.

Schomburg Center for Research on Black Culture. Phelps Stokes Fund. Box 16. January

    29, 1921. Folder 9. Letter from W.D. Weatherford to Anson Stokes.

Schomburg Center for Research on Black Culture. Phelps Stokes Fund. Box 16. February

    8, 1921. Folder 9. Letter from Anson Stokes to W.D. Weatherford.

Singh, Nikhil Pal. 2004. *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for*

    Democracy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Steinmetz, George. 2005. "Return to Empire: The New U.S. Imperialism in

Comparative Historical Perspective." *Sociological Theory* 23(4): 339-367.

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita and Hubert O. Quist. 2000. "The Politics of Educational

Borrowing: Reopening the Case of Achimota in British Ghana." *Comparative*

Education Review 44(3): 272-299.

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita, ed. 2004. *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and*

Lending. New York: Teachers College Press.

Strang, David and John Meyer. 1993. "Institutional Conditions for Diffusion." *Theory*

and Society 22(4): 487-511.

University of Massachusetts Archives (UMA). W.E.B. Du Bois Papers. May 19, 1921.

Letter from W.E.B. Du Bois to Mordecai W. Johnson. Retrieved February 27,

2018. (http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b017-i302)

Von Eschen, Penny M. 1997. *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and*

Anticolonialism, 1937-1957. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham, NC:

Duke University Press.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*.

New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wilson, Williams Julius. 1978. *The Declining Significance of Race*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL:

University of Chicago Press.

Worley, H.F. & C. G. Contee. 1970. "The Worley Report on the Pan-African Congress

of 1919." *The Journal of Negro History* 55(2): 140-143.

Yamada, Shoko. 2008. "Educational Borrowing as Negotiation: Re-examining the

Influence of the American Black Industrial Education Model on British Colonial Education in Africa." *Comparative Education* 44(1): 21-37.

Yellin, Eric S. 2002 "The (White) Search for (Black) Order: The Phelps Stokes Fund's First Twenty Years, 1911-1931" in *Historian 65(2):* 319-352.

Zimmerman, Andrew. 2010. *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press``.

The Occlusion of Empire in the Race vs. Class Inequality Debate: A Case Study of the Exclusion of William Patterson from the American Sociology of Race

ABSTRACT

In their typology of different theories of race, prominent sociologists of race treat race and class as two opposing explanatory frameworks (Fields 2012; McKee 1993; Reed & Chowkwanyun 2012; Steinberg 2007; Wallerstein 2007). In this bifurcation, prominent sociologists of race critique "class-based" theories of race, or more specifically Marxists, for treating "racism as a baseless ideology ultimately dependent on other, 'real' forces in society…" like class inequality (Bonilla-Silva 1997: 467). However, these scholars rarely analyze, or even cite, many prominent black Marxists in their typology (Blauner 1972; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi and Winant 1994). As a case study of this typology's epistemological narrowing of Marxist thought, I analyze the exclusion of William Patterson from overviews of "class-based" theories of race in *Racial Oppression in America* (Blauner 1972) *Racial Formations* (Omi & Winant 1994) and "Rethinking Racism" (Bonilla-Silva 1997). I ask, did all Black Marxists treat "racism as a baseless ideology"? If not, what did they argue the basis of racism was? Furthermore, can their inclusion in the sociological cannon contribute to a structural explanation for the ongoing persistence of racial inequality in the U.S.?

In their typology of different theories of race, prominent sociologists of race treat

race and class as two opposing explanatory frameworks (Fields 2012; McKee 1993; Reed

& Chowkwanyun 2012; Steinberg 2007; Wallerstein 2007). In this bifurcation, prominent

sociologists of race critique "class-based" theories of race, or more specifically Marxists, for treating "racism as a baseless ideology ultimately dependent on other, 'real' forces in society…" like class inequality (Bonilla-Silva 1997: 467). However, these scholars rarely analyze, or even cite, many prominent black Marxists in their typology (Blauner 1972; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi and Winant 1994). Did all Black Marxists treat "racism as a baseless ideology"? If not, what did they argue the basis of racism was? Furthermore, can their inclusion in the sociological cannon contribute to a structural explanation for the ongoing persistence of racial inequality in the U.S.?

As a case study of this typology's epistemological narrowing of Marxist thought, I analyze the exclusion of William Patterson from overviews of "class-based" theories of race in *Racial Oppression in America* (Blauner 1972) *Racial Formations* (Omi & Winant 1994) and "Rethinking Racism" (Bonilla-Silva 1997). On December 17th 1951, William Patterson presented his theory on the persistence of racism in the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the "We Charge Genocide" petition to the General Assembly of the United Nations, he claimed the United States government was complicit in the mass murder of African Americans for global profit (1948). He stated, "We shall prove that the object of this genocide, as of all genocide, is the perpetuation of economic and political power by the few through the destruction of political protest by the many" (1951: 5). Fearing this petition would threaten the national sovereignty of the United States and curb the United States' global influence relative to the Soviet Union, the U.S. State Department launched a global "Campaign for Truth" against the petition and other similar "soviet propaganda" (Dudziak 2000). In this campaign the State Department promoted the framing of race and class as two opposing explanatory

frameworks of social inequality. Furthermore, they argued race was a domestic issue that could be understood and addressed within the U.S. nation-state, while class was a global issue not particularly relevant to the U.S. nation-state.

I argue the State Department's marginalization of the "We Charge Genocide" petition and its subsequent bifurcation of race from class, and the national from the global, has been reproduced within the sociology of race. I focus on this petition because it was distributed across the world. It was also taken very seriously by the U.S. State Department and the United Nations. Furthermore, a self-ascribed Marxist wrote it and he had close ties to prominent American sociologists of race, like W.E.B. Du Bois (Horne 2013). Nonetheless, despite his political significance, Patterson is generally excluded from overviews of "class-based" theories of race.

Historically, U.S. sociology has been racially segregated with a black and white tradition of sociological thought (Bhambra 2014; Morris 2015). During the Cold War, the social sciences repressed African American scholars who employed Marxist theory in their analysis of race (Dudziak 2002; Singh 2013; Von Eschen 1997). In this process, theorists, like Patterson, who linked anti-racism to anti-imperialism were increasingly repressed under the U.S. government's anti-communist agenda. As a result racism went from something "understood in the history of slavery and colonialism" to something conceptualized as a "psychological" or a "domestic" problem (Von Eschen 1997).

Although, intersectional theorists in sociology highlight the intersection of race, class and gender *as identities* (Choo & Ferree 2013; Cho et. al. 2013; Collins 1990; Davis 2008), they rarely analyze how race and class are relationally produced as *categories* within imperialism. This type of epistemology was repressed during the Cold War, yet

there has been little analysis within sociology on how this state-sponsored repression shaped the discipline's conceptions of social inequality (Bhambra 2014).

I argue the occlusion of William Patterson, and other similar scholar-activists like Hunter Pitts O'Dell, limits sociological understanding of the mechanisms that produce race and racism in the United States. Postcolonial scholars argue sociologists' repression and exclusion of the perspectives and theories of the colonized led social scientists to misunderstand the production of modernity (Bhambra 2013, 2014, 2017; Connell 2006, 2007; Go 2017). Likewise, I argue the exclusion of black Marxists from prominent theories within the sociology of race, limits sociological understandings of the structural basis of racial inequality in the United States.

THE NARROWING OF MARXIST THOUGHT IN TYPOLOGIES OF RACE

In their typology of different theories of race, prominent sociologists of race refer to Marxist theories as "Class-based" theories of race (Blauner 1972; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi & Winant 1994). They critique this type of theory for engaging in class-reductionism. More specifically, they argue these theories do not conceptualize racism as its own structure of inequality. In addition, Bonilla-Silva assert Marxist theories of race treat racism as a psychological phenomenon, a static entity, a product of irrational thinking, or a type of overt behavior (1997). While these are valid criticisms, I argue they are based on a narrow subset of Marxist theory. More specifically, they occlude prominent black Marxists who did not reduce race to class.

In "Rethinking Racism", Bonilla-Silva asserts Marxist theories on race treat racism as a baseless ideology (1997: 467). More specifically, he argues Marxists treat racism as a product of class inequality; therefore, they think of the structure of

society as classist *not* racist. As a result, Marxist theorization does not provide an adequate framework for developing a structural theory of race (ibid). Similar to Bonilla-Silva, in *Racial Formations*, Michael Omi and Howard Winant argue class-based theories of race conceptualize race as a product and not a determinant of class relations (Omi & Winant 1994: 34). Furthermore, in his theory of Internal Colonialism, Robert Blauner asserts Marxist interpretations of race see racial subordination in purely class terms (1969: 394).

In all three of these critiques, Marxist theories of race are depicted as reducing race to class dynamics, and treating race as a product rather than a determinant of class inequality. I argue this is not true of contemporary Black Marxists who argue racism preceded capitalism (Kelley 2002; Robinson 1983), nor is it true of earlier black Marxists like William Patterson, who argued racism and capitalism developed through one another. Yet in prominent theories in the sociology of race, scholars construct an epistemological bifurcation between race and class as explanatory frameworks for social inequality. Race and class are not conceptualized as produced in and through one another, but rather seen as separate entities, or substances. Furthermore, it is implied that scholars who do see these two facets of social structure as intertwined, are reducing the significance of race.

These framings also critique class-based theories for conceiving of racism as an ideology, rather than a structure (Bonilla-Silva 1997: 467). Bonilla-Silva states, "Orthodox Marxists and many neo-Marxists conceive of racism as an ideology" rather than a structure (ibid). He notes Marxist scholars (Schuman et. al. 1985; Sears 1988; Sniderman & Piazza 1993) conceptualize racism as individuals' attitudes. He asserts, as a

result, they are unable to explain the persistence of racism in the post Civil-Rights era. Likewise, in his discussion of Internal Colonialism, Gutierrez depicts Marxist theories of racism as psychological theories. He argues, these theories depict racism as emanating from psychic structures, rather than material institutions (2004: 282).

Likewise, they note class-based theories treat racism as an overt behavior. Bonilla-Silva argues Marxist theories of race focus on slavery and apartheid as forms of racism, rather than highlighting more covert forms of racism where racial practices are subtle, indirect or fluid (1997: 468). He notes today's racial practices tend to be manifested covertly (Bonilla-Silva and Lewis 1997; Wellman 1977) and symbolically (Pettigrew 1994; Sears 1988). Therefore, Marxist theories can't recognize or structurally explain contemporary racism.

These overviews also generalize "class based" theories as theories, which treat racism as an irrational phenomenon. They argue class-based theories conceive of racism as a pure ideology with no real social basis; therefore, those who hold racist beliefs are deemed irrational (Adorno 1950; Allport 1958; Santa Cruz 1977; Sniderman and Piazza 1993). More specifically, critics contend because Marxists view racial consciousness and identification as a barrier to class-consciousness, they also view racial consciousness as non-integral to proletariat agency against capitalism.

In addition to viewing racism as overt and irrational, critics of class based theories argue these theories conceptualize racism as historically static. More specifically, they assert racism is conceptualized as either originating before slavery and/or capitalism (Jordan 1968; Marable 1983, 2015; Robinson 1983), or as a result of slavery (Glazer & Moynihan 1970) then remaining stagnant since. Bonilla-Silva asserts Marxists view

racism as a sort of "original sin" that developed in the sixteenth century, and then has been used since then by capitalists and particular workers to further their own class interests. He notes that even in contemporary analysis, such as Roediger's *Wages of Whiteness*, contemporary racism is still viewed as one of the "legacies of white workerism" (1991: 176).

Lastly, and most significantly, critics assert class-based theories provide no real structural explanation for the persistence of racism within capitalism. Rather, they treat it as a part of the development of capitalism, but not an ongoing and integral part of it. Therefore, their logic doesn't explain its persistence. Bonilla-Silva argues "class-based" theories conceptualize racism as an ideology, not a structure. As a consequence, they depict racism as a belief that produces behavior. However, because they conceptualize racism as a belief, they engage in circular reasoning in their explanations for the existence of racism. More specifically they argue people engage in racist acts because they hold racist beliefs, which in turn causes them to engage in racist acts. In this circular logic, structural mechanisms, which produce race, are eluded.

Interestingly, this bifurcation of race from class mirrors another bifurcation within sociology: the bifurcation of the national from the global. Within the sociology of race, there is little sociological research on the ways global U.S. imperialism produces racism within the United States. In many sociological theories of race, it is suggested race dynamics are produced endogenously within the United States separate from ongoing global imperialism (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi & Winant 1994). I argue this limiting of scope is also integral to these theories presentation of class and race as opposing explanatory frameworks. These theories often conceptualize the U.S. state as a nation-

state, and frame their structural theories of racial inequality around national racial laws and policies, rather than global imperial mechanisms, which relationally connect race and class. More specifically, in racial formation theory, Omi and Winant define "racial formation" as "a sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed and destroyed" (1994: 56). Omi and Winant place the state at the center of their sociohistorical of race and argue the U.S. state is inherently racial; however, they also conceptualize the U.S. state as a nation state, and generally present its history as insulated from global structures and events (Jung 2015).

Likewise, In *Racism without Racists* (2015), Eduardo Bonilla-Silva analyzes the formation of a new racial ideology called "color-blind racism", yet Bonilla-Silva's also appears to conceptualize the U.S. state as a Nation-state. For instance, throughout "Rethinking Racism: Towards a Structural Interpretation" (1997), "…he invoked the terms social system, society, and less frequently social formation and social order to indicate the scale of his analysis. Used interchangeably, they all appear to refer to what is usually called the 'nation-state'" (Jung 2015: 34). Like Omi and Winant, Bonilla Silva's conceptualizes the U.S. state as a nation-state and focuses on ostensibly domestic events, such as the formation of Jim Crow laws and their demise, with little reference to their connection to global events or structures.

Omi and Winant argue the U.S. state is intrinsically racial because it developed national policies using the social category of race to explicitly repress and exclude certain groups of people within the nation (1994). However, these racial categories were also used in U.S. Empire to create hierarchical differentiations between colonized peoples/Black Americans and U.S. citizens. Therefore, one can't fully understand how

the U.S. state is "intrinsically racial", or the relationship between race and class in the United States unless one understands how these categories and policies were developed within U.S. Empire.

In general, within the sociology of race, race and class are conceptualized as two separate axis of power. Race, particularly black-white relations, is conceived of as a *national* form of inequality produced endogenously within the United States, while class is conceptualized as a more *global* form of inequality produced exogenously. It is suggested if you conceptualize national racial structures in the United States as produced relationally through global capitalism, you are reducing the significance of race. However, this assumes one is working from a definition of global capitalism, in which racism is not an integral and ongoing part of capitalism. If one conceives of imperialism as an integral part of capitalism then the significance of race is not weakened by an analysis of global capitalism. Imperialism is fundamentally both a racial and class order, in which race and class are structurally produced through one another.

To fully understand the relationship between race and class and overcome the analytical bifurcation between the two, Empire needs to be brought back into American sociological theories of race. In the "We Charge Genocide" petition to the United Nations, William Patterson did not treat racism as a baseless ideology. What he did was push back against a parochial and ahistorical narrative, that the production racism in the United States is insulated from global imperialism. Acknowledging the role of imperialism in the production of racism in the United States is not reducing race to class, but rather providing a structural basis for the relational production of the two.

From this theory of race, Patterson argued the United Nations had to intervene to ameliorate U.S. racial inequality. More specifically, he argued the mechanisms that produced U.S. racism were not confined to just race or class, or to the limits of the U.S. nation-state. In this argument, he did not treat racism as a psychological, static, irrational, or consistently overt social phenomenon. Rather, he developed a structural theory of race rooted an analysis of Empire, which did not cyclically revert back to the existence of races, racial practices, or racial structures as an explanation for the persistence of racism in the United States..

THE ONGOING RELATIONAL PRODUCTION OF RACE AND CLASS IN U.S. EMPIRE

On December 9, 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. Twenty nation-states, including the United States ratified the Convention on January 14, 1951. Soon after, the Civil Rights Congress (CRC), a New York based Civil Rights organization, charged the U.S. government of genocide against African Americans. The bulk of the Civil Rights Congress's petition consisted of documentation of 153 killings, 344 other crimes of violence against African Americans, and other human rights abuses committed in the United States from 1945 to 1951. Ninety-four individuals, including prominent American sociologist, W.E.B. Du Bois, signed this petition (Dudziak 2000: 63). William Patterson hoped the petition would help 'internationalize' civil rights efforts. For Patterson, the struggle for black liberation lay beyond the nation-state. American racism was manifested both in its toleration of racial brutality at home and in its support for colonial regimes abroad (65). Furthermore, Patterson concluded the United Nations

needed to intervene in U.S. racial inequality because it was a global issue produced by global-imperial mechanisms (Dudziak 2000; Horne 2013).

Patterson did not treat racism as a baseless ideology, nor did he reduce its basis to the material relationship between an unraced member of the bourgeoisie and proletariat. Rather he argued racism in the United States was maintained through a class and racial structure: U.S. imperialism. Likewise, he argued because U.S. Empire was both a race and class structure, racism in the United States could not be reduced to race or class.

In the introduction of the petition, Patterson stated, "We shall prove that the object of this genocide as of all genocide, is the perpetuation of economic and political power by the few through the destruction of political protest by the many" (5). In this framing, Patterson did not depict racism, or the production of racial categories as baseless. Rather he argued the production of racial categories within capitalism was an integral part of preventing political and economic insurgency against capitalist imperialism. He argued racism was not just a form of class politics, but also a form of racial politics to prevent anti-colonial insurgency.

He noted the production and reproduction of race as a category for social hierarchy was rooted in a global structure aimed to prevent revolt by colonized groups against Empire. He stated,

> This huge sum of four billions of dollars in super-profits is, then, the substantial motive for conspiracy to commit genocide against the Negro people. Added to the seven and a half billion dollars of booty from abroad, this sum brings the total of American imperialist super profits from the labor of oppressed peoples to eleven and half billions of dollars per year. The first step in breaking the grip of American imperialism abroad, is forcing it to release from bondage the American Negro people at home (137).

Here, Patterson did not conceptualize race as a static category, or some kind of "original sin" that was passed on from U.S. slavery. Rather, he theorized racial categories particularly the category of blackness within the United States was continually produced and reproduced by U.S. Empire abroad. He argued the subordination of black Americans within the United States was dependent on the United States ability to produce the category of "race" abroad. With the production of race on a global level, the United States maintained racial hierarchy within the United States.

He noted that as U.S. imperialism gained in power within global capitalism, African Americans' internal subjugation within the United States increased. He stated,

> As American monopoly grows in strength, reaching out for control of the world, the exploitation of the Negro people in the United States grows in scope and severity. Thus, in 1947 the median wage or salary income of white wage earners was $1, 980 of non-white wage earners $863, or 43.6 per cent as much, according to the United States Department of Commerce. In 1949, according to the United States Bureau reports, while 16,800,000 Americans in 4,700,000 families had an income of less than $1,000 a year, the income of white families was two times greater than that of Negroes (136)

Therefore, the global growth of capitalism in the 21st century, did not decrease the significance of racial inequality relative to class inequality, but actually exponentially increased it. He argued race was not subsumed to class as capitalism progressed. Rather as capitalism progressed, racial and class inequality grew in strength in relation to one another. Thus, he saw the global growth in capitalism as a global growth in imperialism, or capitalist-imperialism. Imperialism was not seen as a past stage of capitalism, or something that was subsumed to a more pure form of capitalism in the future. Rather imperialism and capitalism were conceived of as integral to one another.

Throughout the petition, Patterson highlighted how the expansion of U.S. Empire abroad was integral to the maintenance of racial inequality at home. He noted the

maintenance of the slave system within the United States was maintained through U.S. imperial expansion in Mexico:

> The genocide that was American slavery, the killing of part of the group so that the remainder could be more readily exploited for profit, resulted in two wars. The first was the aggression against Mexico in 1846 seeking more territory for the expansion of slavery (24).

Like corporations within the capitalist system that expand their markets globally to maintain profit, the United States government expanded slavery abroad to maintain slavery within. More specifically, to maintain the profits of the slave system, the United States government had to engage in acts of imperial conquest to increase land and resource extraction. This integrally linked the dynamics of racial structures within the United States to U.S. imperial expansion.

Likewise, he noted that following the Civil War, the U.S. continued to repress anti-imperial insurgency within the United States through imperial expansion. He argued the U.S.'s imperial expansion into Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines helped to repress the threat posed to U.S. power by the Populist Party. The Populist Party brought together both black and white American workers against global corporate interests. By expanding into new territories, the U.S. government gained cheap labor and markets that offset the ability of the Populist Party to leverage the U.S. government for higher wages etc.:

> The Negro people fought back chiefly through the Populist parties that opposed the Wall Street trusts through the eighties, nineties of the last century. But their fight became more hopeless against the increased power of American monopoly. Terror was unleashed against them at home…Side by side went terror unleashed abroad, as American imperialism entered the international arena by subjugating the Filipino, Puerto Rican, and Cuban peoples and reduced many Latin-American countries to economic and political vassalage (25).

To put down a threat to U.S. Empire within the U.S. citizenry, the United States government expanded outwards. In doing so, they gained more land and cheap labor to use against the political threat to U.S. Empire within.

Patterson argued this pattern persisted into the twenty first century. Discussing the Korean War, they note again that the U.S.'s expansion outward was integral to maintaining the United States' Empire within:

> Jellied gasoline in Korea and the lynchers' faggot at home are connected in more ways than that both result in death by fire. The lyncher and the atom bomber are related. The first cannot murder unpunished and unrebuked without so encouraging the latter that the peace of the world and the lives of millions are endangered. Nor is this metaphysics. The tie binding both is economic profit and political control.

He observed the Korean War was coupled with an increased repression of black Americans within the United States. Thus, when the United States waged imperial wars abroad they increased the repression of African Americans within.

Patterson did not view racism as a "baseless ideology", nor did he view it as a psychological, or irrational phenomena. He asserted racism was based in global capitalist-imperialism. As a consequence, racism was not only rational, but also necessary to maintain the structure. It was not only used to produce and reproduce a class structure, but also as a means to prevent political counter-insurgency against U.S. Empire within the United States and other nations. Patterson viewed race, not just as a set of beliefs or a type of identity, but also as a structural category integral to the maintenance of capitalist-imperialism.

William Patterson argued U.S. racism has a base, and its base is imperial-capitalism; however, he also argued imperial-capitalism cannot be reduced on to the

relationship between an unraced bourgeoisie and proletariat. In this definition, race is taken out and class is deemed just a material, non-cultural relationship between the proletariat and bourgeoisie. In this definition of capitalism, imperialism and racism are not conceptualized as integral, ongoing parts of capitalism (Chibber 2014). However, black Marxists, like William Patterson *did see* imperialism and racism as integral and ongoing parts of global capitalism. He stated, "It is because we Negro petitioners have no true and real recourse in these courts, because we receive no protection from the state, because police and courts are themselves involved in the genocide directed against us…" (41). He argued, the U.S. government was able to economically exploit African Americans more thoroughly than other Americans because they had politically dispossessed and geographically displaced them within the U.S. polity. More specifically, like colonial subjects they were contained in specific areas and unable to represent themselves in the polity.

Likewise, he noted because the U.S. engaged in imperialism with African Americans it could easily use these same policies to promote U.S. imperialism abroad. Regarding the relationship between domestic genocide and global imperial genocide, they stated,

> This domestic genocide…was the foundation of predatory war and the prelude to the larger genocide that followed against the nationals of other countries, a genocide seeking the political and economic control of Europe, if not the world… (31)

Thus, William Patterson bridged race and class, national and global. He stated the increasing subordination of black Americans increased the United States ability to dominate the world economy through a racial political order.

Patterson also drew parallels between the U.S. Empire and the German Empire. He stated, "We cannot forget Hitler's demonstration that genocide at home can become wider massacre abroad, that domestic genocide develops into a larger genocide that is predatory war…" Patterson noted the internal imperial order, within Germany gave way to an outward colonial expansion that dispossessed and murdered people based on race. Thus he predicted the United States would unleash more war abroad as racial inequality developed within.

Likewise, he noted as American empire expanded outwards it would make the world's peoples dependent on consuming commodities that were produced within a racist-imperial regime. He stated, "We speak of a progressive mankind because a policy of discrimination at home must inevitably create racist commodities for export abroad…" (xi). The American imperial regime first developed by the internalization of the global European imperial would now expand back outward making the world's people dependent on cheap black American labor.

Furthermore, he highlighted how the black labor regime within the United States was produced in relation to colonial labor regimes of European empires. He asserted, "The South's plantation system, concealed by the United States census…produced for the world market in successful competition with the 'coolie' labor of Egypt and India, brought in one and a half billion dollars" (23). He noted the United States had to establish a system of colonial labor within the United States in order to be able to compete against European Empires. The United States solution to this predicament was slavery, and later, other forms of localized imperial structures to maintain colonial labor. He observed this structure within the United States can't be reduced to a simple class relationship between

an unraced proletariat and bourgeoisie. Rather with black Americans it was not just about

economic alienation from the goods, but political alienation from the state and

geographic dispossession from the territory. He stated,

> Most sharecroppers work from dawn- to dark for a living, which verges on
> starvation. Often these black Americans are not even able to quit or move not
> only because of lack of money but because of ancient debtors' laws which make it
> a crime to move while owing money…Much of the law of those states in the
> Black Belt, moreover, is directed towards guaranteeing an American peasantry
> without political or human rights available to work the land without pay sufficient
> for proper livelihood (23)

Here, Patterson argued the subordination of black Americans by the U.S. government is

not just produced by economic alienation from the production process, but also through

colonial dispossession from the land and from political sovereignty. Furthermore, he

framed the plight of black Americans as a "human rights" issue not a "civil rights" issue.

He asserted black Americans' subordination in the United States is a form of

dehumanization integral to imperial dispossession. Therefore, the subordination of black

Americans is a human rights issue, and has to be addressed through global institutions

challenging imperialism, rather than national institutions focused on political inclusion

within an imperial state.

Towards the end of the petition, he provided an example of why challenging the

racial order within the United States required challenging global imperialism. He stated,

> The Federal Government has tolerated it even where it has full authority to
> eliminate it. We have already examined the situation in the armed forces. Another
> prominent example is the record in the Panama Canal Zone." The Panama Canal
> Zone is completely under the authority of the Government of the United States.
> And in the Canal Zone exists the most complete and strictest system of
> segregation among its thousands of employees. White employees are known as
> "Gold employees" and Negro employees designated as "Silver Employees."
> Under this system, separate and unequal facilities are maintained for Negroes,
> who live in inferior "Silver" dormitories, eat in inferior "Silver"
> restaurants…(179)

He highlighted the fact that the U.S. built its Empire in Panama on the racial order it developed in the United States.. Therefore, challenging the sustenance of that labor regime within the United States would also fundamentally be a challenge to U.S. imperial orders in other countries.

William Patterson argued race was intertwined with class; however, he did not assert race was insignificant in comparison to class. He argued U.S. racism was rooted in global capitalist-imperialism; therefore, the strengthening of class inequality also increased the significance of race as a form of social inequality. In this analysis, Patterson provided a structural explanation for the production and reproduction of racial inequality. He noted capitalist-imperialism provided the structural impetus for the production of "racial practices" or "racial projects" that produce racial inequality in the United States. Furthermore, he analyzed what mechanisms within that structure produced and reproduced race. For instance, he noted that when race was challenged within the United States imperial expansion served to maintain and reproduce it. However, in response to this petition to the United Nations, the U.S. State Department used a global propaganda effort to counter the notion that U.S. domestic policy was connected to U.S. foreign policy. Furthermore, in its promotion of capitalism abroad, the U.S. State Department obscured mechanisms within capitalist-imperialism that produce and reproduce racial inequality.

U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO "WE CHARGE GENOCIDE"

A few weeks after William Patterson presented the "We Charge Genocide" petition to the U.N. General Assembly, U.S. ambassador to the U.N., Eleanor Roosevelt, wrote to President Truman about her concerns. In this letter, she argued the State

Department as well as other representatives of the U.S. government had to engage in a concerted effort to counter the theories presented in the "We Charge Genocide" petition. She stated, "we were hurt in so many little ways" by the "presentation of a pamphlet 'We Charge Genocide'" to the United Nations. She concluded, "We need something dramatic to prove to our allies that we are not planning war…" (Letter to Truman, p. 4, December 22, 1951). In response, in January and February of 1952, the State Department added Kit 5 to the "Campaign of Truth" and pushed through a human rights covenant that separated the definition of "civil" and "economic" rights. I argue this response promoted the bifurcation of race from class and more broadly occluded the role of U.S. Empire in the structural production of U.S. racial inequality.

On February 12, 1952, the U.S. Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, wrote Eleanor Roosevelt about a new kit the U.S. State Department added to "The Campaign of Truth." This kit contained materials about the status of black Americans in the United States, and was explicitly distributed within formerly colonized countries in Asia, Eastern Europe, Africa and Latin America. The U.S. government worried these countries were susceptible to communist conversion in the post-colonial moment. They launched the "Campaign of Truth" with the explicit purpose "to reach people in critical areas of the world" that were susceptible to "the Soviet-inspired hate America offensive" (Sixth Semiannual Report of the Secretary of State to Congress on the International and Educational Exchange Program, p. 1). Furthermore, in this report, the U.S. Secretary of State, noted in a section he entitled "Truth takes the Offensive" that the United States government had to actively shape knowledge production about U.S. racial inequality to counter Soviet imperialism (ibid). More specifically, the U.S. State Department had to promote a conception of U.S.

racial inequality that bifurcated race from class and occluded the role capitalist-imperialism played in producing racial inequality and genocide.

The promotion of this bifurcation is reflected in the materials that were included in Kit 5. The U.S. Secretary of State argued the beauty of the materials was that they contained statements made by African Americans that denied the role capitalist-imperialism played in their subjugation: "The chief merit of this 'kit', designed for adaptation to the special needs of the various areas of the world, lies in the fact that it is the answer of American Negroes themselves to allegations made by those either ignorant of or uninterested in the true situation" (Letter to Eleanor Roosevelt, February 12, 1952). The written materials, included articles, which argued capitalism benefitted black Americans. For instance, one article was entitled "Land Reform, U.S. Style Benefits Negro", while another stated, "'White Collar workers among Negroes Increase." In the pictures, they included captions, which stated, "Negroes Contribute Leadership in U.S. Labor Unions", "Interracial Public Housing in United States a Success" and "Skills of Workers of all Races Utilized by U.S. Industry" (Sixth Semiannual Report of the Secretary of State to Congress on the International and Educational Exchange Program).

As a part of this initiative, the State Department also flouted successful black American entertainers as proof capitalism lessened racial inequality. For instance, in a State Department report from October 1949, an Assistant Information Officer discusses a trip and performance of Louis Armstrong in Helsinki, Finland. In this report, the information officer provided a brief overview of the media coverage of the event with particular emphasis on how he thought the performance influenced the audience's view of U.S. race relations. He stated

No newspaper evidenced any color line in its story, and the larger newspapers treated the visit as a front-page feature…communist daily used only one the publicity picture of the group, but the leftist paper, Vaapa Sana used two short but favorable reviews of the concert in addition to the picture (Dispatch No. 228, File 811.4016, Box 4689, October 19, 1949)

Interestingly, the Information Officer is not only citing the performance of a musician in Finland as worthy of documentation by the State Department, but also implying the performance was a success because it convinced some leftist newspapers to portray U.S. race relations in a positive light. He suggested this positive coverage would help convey that capitalism promoted racial equality, which would benefit U.S. imperialism to the detriment of the Soviet Union in formerly colonized countries.

The State Department also surveyed other black musicians they thought were a threat to U.S. foreign interests. For instance, in the State Department records, there are many reports on Josephine Baker, who was a black American singer that later moved to France. These overviews highlighted Baker's analysis of the relationship between U.S. imperialism and U.S. racism. In one report on Baker's performance in Montevideo, Uruguay, Acting Public Affairs officer, Thomas G. Allen, stated,

Miss Baker began her remarks by referring to the racial situation in South Africa, stating that this area of the world belongs to the negro race, and that the minority group, the whites, are only guests. Nevertheless, she stated that the latter exploit the natives' resources and labor at starvation wages. The major portion of her lecture, however, was devoted to racial and religious discrimination in the United States…warning that the United States is heading for self-destruction because of the extent of discrimination…Not once was any mention made of what the American people have done and are doing to eliminate racial and religious discrimination…it was evident her spectators were impressed with her analysis of the status of the negroes in the United States…Since the Herrerista organ, El Debate (traditionally anti-U.S.), which published a previous lecture given by Miss Baker is the only local newspaper which has given any prominence to her lecture activities, the Embassy has not believed it desireable to counter her remarks with information designed to give a fair picture of the negro situation in the United States…In view of the fact that the press in other countries may give much greater coverage to Miss Baker's lectures than was the case in Uruguay, the Department

might find it advisable to prepare special material to counteract her activities (File 811.411, Box 4438, September 30, 1952)

It is interesting this document was not declassified by the State Department until March 18, 1992. In this report, Allen highlights that Baker was drawing parallels between imperialism in South Africa and U.S. racism. Furthermore, he notes with concern that Baker is tying race and class in her analysis of the exploitation of black American labor. He asserts that if this type of analysis gains more traction, the U.S. State Department should counter it with materials that depict the true situation. It is suggested from their criticism of Baker's analysis and the materials included in Kit 5, that this true depiction is one, in which racial inequality is separate from class, and a civil rights issue, rather than a global-imperial issue.

To institutionalize this bifurcation the State Department also advocated for a U.N. human rights covenant that severed "civil" rights from "economic" rights. Writing Eleanor Roosevelt, on July 11, 1949, U.S. Secretary of State, wrote, "Full consideration will be given to the economic and social rights proposed. While the Department recognizes fully the general significance of economic and social rights, it has attached great importance to a Covenant limited to Civil and Political Rights" (Dean Acheson to Eleanor Roosevelt. July 11, 1949. Box 1519). The outcome was that by June 1952 a human rights covenant was created that severed these two types of rights within the United Nations. This was driven by the desire of the State Department to sever race from class and in doing so, to safeguard U.S. racism and Empire.

This objective is reflected in the final language of the human rights covenant. Reflecting on the covenant in a statement to the media, Eleanor Roosevelt, stated

The rights in the latter covenant are quite different rights from the civil and political rights, which will go into a separate Covenant. They are of a character that cannot be brought into being by mere enactment and enforcement of legislation, as is the case with civil and political rights. They are described, therefore, in terms of goals and aspirations, and governments would agree to work toward these goals 'progressively,' within their available resources and in their own ways." (Press Release. "Statement to the Press by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, United States Representative in the Human Rights Commission, upon termination of the Human rights Commission session." June 13, 1952. Box 1941.)

Eleanor Roosevelt reasoned this human rights covenant was ideal because it made economic rights unenforceable at a national and global level. The language that was used only stated that nations had to take "steps" to address racial economic inequality, but were only legally bound to guarantee civil rights. Thus, colonized peoples, nor black Americans could challenge racial inequality within the United States on the grounds that it was tied to global imperialism because race and class were separate, and so were national racial affairs and global structures.

DISCUSSION

By presenting class and race as opposing two explanatory frameworks, the U.S. State department obscured the relationship between U.S. Empire and the maintenance of racial inequality in the United States. Rather, they argued capitalism was separate from racism, and could be promoted globally by the United States without unleashing racial genocide. Their response to the petition marginalized Patterson's theory of race. Patterson argued U.S. racism was produced in and through capitalist-imperialism. However, in their response, the U.S. State Department decoupled U.S. racism from capitalist-imperialism. They argued U.S. racism was a "civil rights" issue rooted in racial inequality, not class inequality. Therefore, it should be addressed as national issue through Civil Rights legislation, rather than through global policies that challenge

capitalist-imperialism. Conversely, class inequality was a global "development" issue: it could be resolved by exposing peoples in underdeveloped countries to capitalism. Within this framing, capitalist-imperialism would not increase racial inequality in these formerly colonized countries like it had under European imperialism *because* under American imperialism capitalism promoted racial equality.

Likewise, in the American sociology of race, particularly in overviews of "class-based" theories of race, Patterson excluded from the cannon. Furthermore, the State Department's bifurcation of race from class, national from global, is reproduced in this epistemological field. Prominent theories of race generally leave out William Patterson and Paul Robeson in their overviews of "class-based" theories. They argue "class-based" theories do not provide a structural explanation for the production and reproduction of racial inequality in the United States. Furthermore, they assert "class-based" theories of race reduce race to class.

However, Patterson did provide a structural explanation for the maintenance of racial inequality within the United States. Furthermore, this structural explanation did not reduce the significance of race relative to class, nor did it posit that race could be reduced to class, or vice versa. He argued racial inequality within the United States was fundamentally rooted in capitalist-imperialism, which was *both* a class and race structure. Therefore, as class grew in significance as a form of social inequality so too did race. Fundamentally, his theory rooted race and class in Empire and therefore, did not conceive of race and class as and/or, but rather as both/and structure. Likewise, because he saw the structural connection between race and class within the United States as produced through Empire, he did not bifurcate the national from the global or promote a form of

U.S. exceptionalism, in which U.S. imperialism promoted racial equality. Rather, he saw the global within the United States and argued that like European imperialism, U.S. imperialism integrally linked race and class on a global level.

The U.S. State Department was threatened by the political implications of this theory of race. They saw this theory as threatening the rise and expansion of U.S. Empire during the Cold War. The theory suggested the rest of the world, particularly newly decolonized nations should not allow their economies or polities to aspire to capitalism because it would expose them to racial genocide. William Patterson asserted this to a global audience in the newly formed United Nations, which had the potential to become an institution that would intervene in U.S. foreign and domestic policy. Furthermore, through the Civil Rights organization and International Labor Organization he distributed the "We Charge Genocide" petition in newly decolonized countries that were particularly open to these critiques of the United States. It is no wonder that the U.S. State Department took dramatic steps, to curb the resonance of these theories of race within the United States and abroad.

Yet, there is very little sociological research on how this occlusion shaped the American sociology's theories of race. I argue the occlusion of Black Marxists, such as William Patterson from the sociological cannon of race, reproduces the U.S. State Department's bifurcation of race from class and the global from the national. Patterson did not argue that racism was a baseless ideology. Patterson and Robeson provided a theory that linked the maintenance of racial inequality in the United States to the maintenance of U.S. Empire. In doing so, they predicted the future Civil Rights reforms that would occur in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s, would not ameliorate racial

inequality within the United States. This was not because a new "color-blind" ideology would replace a more overt ideology, but because the structural basis of U.S. racial inequality, i.e. Empire, was still alive and well.

William Patterson recognized that analyzing the intersection of race and class did not reduce the significance of race. Rather, the fact that class inequality was intertwined with racial inequality pointed to the structural foundation of race. The imperial structure the United States internalized in the founding of the country, fundamentally intertwined race and class so neither could be reduced in relation to one another. Rather, the global growth in capitalism would lead not only to a deepening of economic inequality, but also racial inequality within the United States and in the world at large.

The epistemological and political implications of recognizing Empire as the source of racial inequality in the United States are large. Within this framework sociologists cannot bifurcate race and class, or the national from the global. If they do so, they will not be able to get at the imperial structural mechanisms that maintain racial inequality in the United States, nor will they be able to address them. It also suggests the only way to challenge racism in the United States is to challenge global imperialism. This would require the development of transnational movements, as well as transnational institutions that actually have the power to challenge the sovereignty of nations, and the growing sovereignty of global capitalists. It also suggests a certain type of racial-consciousness, as well as class-consciousness will be integral to challenging global capitalism. Postcolonial scholars argue sociologists' repression and exclusion of the perspectives and theories of the colonized from analysis of social modernity have led social scientists to misunderstand the production of modernity (Bhambra 2013, 2014,

2017; Connell 2006, 2007; Go 2017). Likewise, I argue the exclusion of Black Marxists from prominent theories within the sociology of race, limits sociologists' ability to structurally address racial inequality within the United States.

Works Referenced

Acheson, Dean. 1951. "Launching the campaign of truth: First phase. Sixth

Semiannual report of the Secretary of State to Congress on the International

information and educational exchange program, July 1 to December 31,

1950." Retrieved May 4, 2018.

http://hdl.handle.net/2027/umn.31951d03562370p

Adorno, Theodore W. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper and

Row.

Allport, Gordon W. 1958. *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Doubleday Anchor

Books.

Bhambra, Gurminder. 2013. "The Possibilities of, and for, Global Sociology: A

Postcolonial Perspective." *Political Power and Social Theory 24:* 295-314.

Bhambra, Gurminder. 2014. "A Sociological Dilemma: Race, Segregation and U.S.
Sociology." *Current Sociology 62(4)*: 472-492.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural
Interpretation" in *American Sociological Review 62 (3):* 465-480.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and Amanda Lewis. 1997. "The New Racism: Toward An
Analysis of the U.S. racial Structure, 1960s-1990s." Department of Sociology,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. Unpublished manuscript.

Chiber, Vivek. 2014. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital.* Verso Books.

Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. *Signs: Journal of
Women in Culture and Society 38 (4):* 785-810

Choo, H.Y. and Ferree, M.M., 2010. "Practicing intersectionality in sociological
research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the
study of inequalities." *Sociological theory 28*(2): 129-149.

Collins, Patricia. 1990. "Black Feminist Thought in the Matrix of Domination", pp.

540-552 in *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings, 4th ed.* Lemert, Charles ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Connell, Raewyn. 2006. "Northern Theory: The Political Geography of General Social Theory." *Theory and Society 35 (2):* 237-264.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 2018. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of anti-discrimination doctrine, feminist theory and anti-racist politics." Feminist Legal Theory

Davis, Kathy. 2008. "Intersectionality as a Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on what Makes a Feminist Theory Successful." *Feminist Theory 9 (1):* 67-85.

Dudziak, Mary L. 2000. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fields, Barbara and Karen E. Fields. 2014. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. New York: Verso.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Institute, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers, Box 1915. December 22, 1951. Letter from Eleanor Roosevelt to President Truman, p. 4.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Institute, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers, Box 1915. July 11, 1949 Letter from Dean Acheson to Eleanor Roosevelt.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Institute, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers, Box 1941. June 13, 1952 Press Release. "Statement to the Press by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, United States Representative in the Human Rights Commission, upon termination of the Human rights Commission session."

Franklin D. Roosevelt Institute, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers, Box 1519. February 12, 1952. Letter from Dean Acheson to Eleanor Roosevelt.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1970. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negros, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Indians and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Guitierrez, Ramon A. 2004. "Internal Colonialism: An American Theory of Race." *Du Bois Review 1 (2):* 281-195.

Go, Julian and George Lawson eds. 2017. *Global Historical Sociology*. Cambridge University: New York.

Go, Julian. 2016. *Postcolonial Thought and Social Theory*. New York: Oxford

University Press.

Go, Julian. 2004. "'Racism' and Colonialism: Meanings of Difference and Ruling Practices in America's Pacific Empire." *Qualitative Sociology 27 (1):* 35-58.

Hernan, Santa Cruz. 1977. *Racial Discrimination*, Vol. 1. United Nations.

Horne, Gerald. 2013 *Black Revolutionary: William Patterson and the Globalization of the African American Freedom Struggle.* Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.

Jordan, Winthrop. 1968. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Jung, Moon-Kie. 2015. *Beneath the Surface of White Supremacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Kelley, Robin D.G. 2002. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Beacon Press.

Manning, Marable. 2015. *How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems in Race*. Haymarket Books.

McKee, James B. 1993. *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Morris, Aldon D. 2015. *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Oakland, CA: University of California.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* New York: Routledge.

Patterson, William L. 1951. "We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People." Retrieved May 4, 2018. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015074197859;view=1up;seq=20

Pettigrew, Thomas. 1994. "New Patterns of Prejudice: The Different Worlds of 1984 and 1964," Pp. 53-59 in *Race and Ethnic Conflict*, edited by F. L. Pincus and H. J. Erlich. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Reed, Adolph Jr. and Merlin Merlin Chowkwanyun. 2012. *Socialist Register 48:* 149-175.

Robinson, Cedric J. 1983. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Roediger, David. 1999. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Verso.

Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, and Lawrence Bobo. 1985. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sears, David 0. 1988. "Symbolic Racism." Pp. 53-84 in Eliminating Racism. *Profiles in Controversy,* edited by P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor. New York: Plenum.

Sniderman, Paul M. and Thomas Piazza. 1993. *The Scar of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

National Archives, State Department Records. Record Group 59. File 811.4016, Box 4689, October 19, 1949.

National Archives, State Department Records, Record Group 59. File 811.411, Box 4438, September 30, 1952

Von Eschen, Penny M. 1997. *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2007. "The Culture of Sociology in Disarray: The Impact of 1968 on U.S. sociologists" in *Sociology in America: A History*, ed. Craig Calhoun. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Wellman, David. 1977. Portraits of White Racism. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

Conclusion

In the first case, I examined whether U.S. state officials ascribed the same meaning to black bodies vis. a. vis. Hawaiians, within the United States verses in U.S. Empire in Hawaii. I found within the United States, General Armstrong emphasized civilizational similarity between black Americans and Hawaiians, to distance them from conceptions of the U.S. nation-state inhabited by white Americans. He also used this civilizational distancing to justify racially segregated education for black Americans in the Southern United States. However, in his advocacy for exporting black labor to Hawaii from industrial education schools, General Armstrong emphasized biological similarity between black Americans and Hawaiians. He framed black Americans and Hawaiians as having similar positive biological characteristics in opposition to Chinese migrant laborers. In this framing, black Americans were depicted as in the same time and space as the U.S. polity, and part of the progression of U.S. Empire in Hawaii. They were positioned as a part of the United States' future, in so far as their bodies were markers for U.S. Empire in opposition to Chinese migrant labor in Hawaii. I conclude the racial meaning ascribed to black bodies and Hawaiians shifted relative to a third group of comparison and the imperial objective of the U.S. state. Therefore, U.S. agents racial ascriptions cannot be seen as endogenously produced within the United States, but rather are produced in relation to other colonized groups and the agent's positioning of him or herself relative to the U.S. polity. This suggests more research is needed on the way racial ascriptions are constructed and reconstructed relative to other groups within U.S. Empire. Furthermore, more research is needed on the way black Americans' subjugation is produced in and through U.S. imperial expansion.

In the second case, I examined whether two sociologists of race, Thomas Jesse Jones and W.E.B. Du Bois' conception of the U.S. racial state affected their views on the diffusion of the industrial education model from the United States to Africa following WWI. I found that Thomas Jesse Jones, who worked from a conception of the U.S. as a nation-state, reified race as the cause of policy diffusion. More specifically, he reasoned the United States exported the industrial education model to Africa because African Americans and Africans belonged to the same race. Conversely, Du Bois, who worked from a conception of the U.S. as an Empire-state, identified the industrial education model as an imperial policy that constructed African Americans and Africans as a similar racial object of political intervention. This case study suggests if sociologists of race work from a conception of the U.S. as a nation-state, they may overlook the imperial mechanisms, which produce African Americans and Africans as similar objects of political intervention, in other words, the mechanisms that produce race. It also implies sociologists need to do more historical and global work to look at the ways policy diffusion within U.S. Empire produces African Americans and Africans as a similar object of political intervention, rather than taking that racial categorization as a given.

In the third case study, I examined the occlusion of William Lorenzo Patterson from the sociology of race's theoretical cannon. I questioned whether the occlusion of Patterson's theory corresponded with a false dichotomy between race and class in theories of race. I found in the "We Charge Genocide" petitio., William Patterson argued U.S. racial and class inequality were intertwined within Empire. However, Patterson's theory was explicitly repressed by the U.S. State Department. In a global propaganda effort that bifurcated capitalism and imperialism from analysis of the production of racial

inequality within the United States, the U.S. State Department promoted the idea that U.S. racism was separate from imperialism. Within the State Department's framing capitalism promoted racial equality, rather than exacerbated it. I argue this bifurcation of race from class, empire from nation, is reproduced in theories of race, which don't account for U.S. Empire in the production of U.S. racial inequality. Without a structural analysis of the overarching structure that connects class and racial inequality, U.S. sociology of race will remain entrenched in a race vs. class debate. I contend including theories like William Patterson's in the sociological cannon would help overcome this false dichotomy of race vs. class and provide a stronger basis for global remedies for the global mechanisms, which produce racial inequality in the U.S.

One of the implied critiques of the postcolonial case for Empire, particularly within the sociology of race, is that sociologists don't need to take into account Empire because the national framework is sufficient. In Racial Formations, Omi and Winant argue the analysis of U.S. racial structures requires a sort of exceptionalism (1986). These critics argue there is nothing substantial the structure of Empire can tell us about the production of racial inequality within the United States that the national structure can't explain. However, if the national is in fact produced structurally through the global and imperial, can sociologists fully understand what is national about the U.S. racial inequality without an analysis of Empire?

In the first case study, the "national" racial meanings ascribed to black bodies were structured by U.S. imperialism. In General Armstrong's advocacy for the transfer of the industrial education school from Hawaii to the Southern United States, he used imperial conceptions of backwards time and space vis. a vis. Hawaiian civilization, to

argue for a segregated industrial education for black Americans within the United States. The codes he applied to black bodies *were not in fact national* racial codes produced endogenously within the nation-state, but were *global imperial conceptions* of time and space he ascribed to both black Americans and Hawaiians. Likewise, the national-framework is not sufficient to explain the code switching General Armstrong engaged in when he was discussing black Americans within the United States vs. in Hawaii. The racial codes he developed for black Americans in the nation-state placed them outside of the U.S. polity; however, the racial codes he applied to black Americans within U.S. Empire in Hawaii placed them within the U.S. polity. Rather than using the same racial codes he used to connect Hawaiians and black Americans in the United States and exporting them out, he switched racial codes in relation to the imperial context. He emphasized biological similarity, rather than civilizational similarity. Neither the racial codes, nor the code switching, could be explained by a nation-state framework that did not look at the role global imperialism played in producing racial meaning within the United States, or assumed racial meaning was produced endogenously within the U.S. and then exported out.

In the second case, I found a sociologist of race who worked from a nation-state framework, Thomas Jesse Jones, reified race as the reason for policy diffusion. Conversely, W.E.B. Du Bois, who worked from an Empire-state framework, identified imperial policies as mechanisms that produce race as an object of political intervention for the U.S. state. In the nation-state framing, racial categories were taken as a given and then they were seen as being drawn on to develop racial projects, policies, systems etc. In the second case, the black race was not taken as a given and it was the product of policy

diffusion between Africa and the United States, rather than a cause for policy diffusion. In this comparison, the Nation-state framework lent itself towards reification of race, or substantialism. Thomas Jesse Jones did not conceptualize race as a social construct that was produced and reproduced by global imperial policies, which lumped Africans and African Americans together. In fact, in the Nation-State framework, Jones frames race as something that was produced in the past and then takes on a life of its own. In this way it becomes an ahistorical, reified entity. However, in a theory that accounts for Empire, races, or racial categories, are not taken as a given, but rather must be produced and reproduced through policy. In the case of Du Bois, he argued they were not only produced and reproduced through national policy within the United States, but also through imperial policy. In the post Civil-Rights Era, this point is particularly salient because many national policies don't evoke racial categorization, and yet racial hierarchies continue to be produced within the United States.

The third case study reveals how the occlusion of Empire within the sociology of race fosters an analytic bifurcation in the sociological analysis of race and class inequality. In the "We Charge Genocide" petition, William Lorenzo Patterson argued racial and class inequality are structurally linked by Empire within the United States. Therefore, these two forms of inequality could not be separated from each other epistemologically or politically. Yet, in the sociology of race's typology, "class-based" theories are set apart. It is suggested they "class-based" theories reduce the significance of race, by focusing on capitalism and class inequality. However, if Patterson's theory, or theories of Empire and race were included in overviews of theories of race, this critique could not be made. How could something that is seen as bolstering racial categorization

and racism, reduce the significance of race literally or figuratively? If, in fact, empire connects race and class then neither can be reduced by an analysis of the other. Overviews of these "class based" theories do not include theories like William Lorenzo Patterson. This occlusion fosters a typology within the American sociology of race that leads sociologists to conceptually sever race from class inequality. I argue this is epistemologically problematic because their imperial root remains unexamined.

Another critique of the postcolonial call for an analysis of Empire is that it has already been done. Scholars often cite "World Systems Theory", or "Policy Diffusion" theories as evidence that the global is adequately accounted for in sociology. However, these theories do not look at how sociology's basic concepts, i.e. conceptions of race and class, nation and world, are shaped by the history of imperialism, nor do they offer a different conceptual apparatus of the categorization of race to work from. Within the American sociology of race there is even more national insularity in explanations on the production and maintenance of racial categories and racial hierarchies in the United States. Most of the prominent theories of race use the term racial-state, or racialized social system interchangeably with nation-state (Jung 2015).

Likewise, when the global context is taken into account in tends to be done in a comparative way, rather than in a relational way. The nation-states are still treated as bifurcated and contained units and then compared to one another, rather than relationally produced pieces. For instance, in a relational framework, rather than comparing the racial structure in the United States to the one in Liberia, one would examine how the same imperial policies linked both places and produced their racial systems in and through one

another. Yet in much of the comparative work within the sociology of race, the points of comparison are not conceptually depicted as produced in relation to one another.

The occlusion of Empire in the American sociology of race, and particularly its theories on the structural production of racial categories, has produced two problems for the epistemological field. First, it correlates with a tendency towards the reification of race. When sociologists don't take into account Empire, they are analytically forced to revert back to the existence of races (racial projects, racialized social systems etc.) as what maintains and reproduces racial inequality in the United States. They are missing the structural origin of racial inequality so "race" is substantialized to overcome this shortcoming. In other words, they create a circular argument and revert back to the existence of races as the cause of racial inequality.

Furthermore, the occlusion of Empire is coupled with the bifurcation of racial from class inequality in the United States. The analytical bifurcation of race from class is conceptually linked to the bifurcation of the national from the global. This epistemological occlusion in the sociology of race is rooted in the history of the Cold War and its effects on the American social sciences (Dudziak 2000; Singh 2004; Von Eschnen 1997). This occlusion has narrowed sociological understanding of how the United States was relationally produced in and through Empire (Jung 2015). It has produced both limited knowledge of the structural root of class and racial inequality within the U.S., and occluded remedies to solve these issues.

Both the bifurcation of the United States from the global-imperial, and racial inequality from class inequality, reinforces a kind of U.S. exceptionalism. This exceptionalism is then used to justify the United States right to global rule. In the

bifurcation of the United States from global history, what is national about the United States is conceptualized as exceptionally different or outside of the history of European colonialism, conquest and racial violence. Furthermore, American national structures are depicted as exceptionally insulated from the dynamics, which produce racial violence and political conquest within U.S. Empire. Within this bifurcation, the United States government can frame what it pushes on the world's peoples as an endogenously produced democratic structure, rather than a political system produced in and through ongoing conquest and dispossession.

This distinction between the national and global reinforces the United States right to global rule in another related way. The bifurcation of the national from the global reinforces the bifurcation of class from race in analysis of inequality. Within this framing, capitalist-imperialism doesn't maintain racial inequality within the United States. Rather, national dynamics (that can be resolved with national policies) are the root cause of racial inequality. Within this framing the global imperial structure that produces racial inequality in the Untied States remains untouched. It is bifurcated from the ostensibly national racial structure that produce racial inequality within the United States.

Sociology of race research tends to conceptualize the U.S. state as a nation-state, and treats national laws and policies as the primary producers of racial inequality in the U.S. By this logic, progressive changes in national policy and law during the Civil Rights era have created "new" and less overt forms of racism, like "color-blind" racism (Bonilla-Silva 2006), or "laissez-faire" racism (BoBo 1996). Yet, the sociology of race literature also shows racial inequities in wealth (Oliver & Shapiro 2006; Keister 2000; Keister & Moller 2000), incarceration rates (Alexander 2011; Petit & Western 2004), housing

segregation (Flippen 2001; Lipsitz 2006) have increased, or remained consistent since the Civil Rights Era. Therefore, there is a disconnect between the supposed progress that U.S. has made in its national laws, policies, and racial ideologies, and the structural persistence of racial inequality.

These national laws and policy changes of the Civil Rights Era, sought to create inclusive policies rooted in racial categories, i.e. to overcome segregation. However, they did not structurally challenge the racial categories in and of themselves. Those who did attempt to get at the structural root of these categories were purged from the United States academy, and the country more broadly (Dudziak 2000; Singh 2004; Von Eschen 1997). This has left American sociology of race with a cannon that takes the global existence of racial categories as a given and then proceeds to use them as an explanatory variable for the production of other social phenomenon.

Omi and Winant argue the U.S. state is intrinsically racial because it developed national policies using the social category of race to explicitly repress and exclude certain groups of people (1994). However, in this theory the social category of race is taken as a pre-given. In fact, what makes the U.S. state racial is that it is imperial. It develops global imperial polices, which construct certain groups of people as similar objects of political intervention, or racial groups. Therefore, one can't fully understand how the U.S. state is "intrinsically racial" without analyzing Empire.

Sociologists of race must challenge the analytical limitations of the nation-state framework. Racial discourses within the United States are relationally produced through *global* structures and *transnational* circulations of racial ideologies (Bhambra 2007, 2014; Hardt & Negri 2000; Jung 2015; Kaplan 2002; Gilroy 1993; Go 2016; Grosfoguel

2006; Mignolo 2000; Quijano & Wallerstein 1992; Steinmitz 2005; Stephens 2005). I advance this relational perspective to broaden the possibilities of sociological theories of race, which largely conceptualize racial formations as national formations.

In recent years there has been a renewed focus on police brutality in the United States. Social scientists have examined the development of the Black Lives Matter movement (Chernega 2016; Mills 2017; Ray et. al. 2017). Others have examined the dynamics within police department departments and their relationship to black communities (Durr 2015; Duran 2016; Hayes 2015; Hughey 2015; Logan & Oakley 2017). Still others have examined the relationship between black Americans perception of police and their national political behavior (Drakulich 2016; Matsueda & Drakulich 2009). Yet there has been a surprising dearth of sociological research on the relationship between global dynamics and the production of police violence in the United States. Furthermore, there is very little research on the history of civil rights movements leveraging global institutions, or what this history means for social scientists and movements trying to address racial inequality in the United States today.

In 1951, in the "We Charge Genocide" petition, William Lorenzo Patterson suggested the structural causes of racial violence in the United States lay beyond the nation-state; and therefore, changes in national policy and law could not alleviate racial inequality. More specifically, he argued global-imperial mechanisms produce racial violence in the U.S. Therefore, national policies, which treat "race" or race relations as the cause of racial violence will never ameliorate racial inequality. Likewise, in the American sociology of race, scholars struggle to come up with a structural theory of race that avoids what Bonilla-Silva and Omi and Winant critique as a reduction of race to

class, or what Barbara Fields and Mara Loveman critique as a reification of race, which separates race from class (Loveman Fields).

Patterson's petition to the U.N. suggests imperialism is what weds race to class, national to global. It also suggests national remedies will never resolve racial inequality within the United States. What is needed is a global movement that challenges imperialism. In the past, when movements such as those led by William Patterson, in the "We Charge Genocide" petition, or W.E.B. Du Bois in "An Appeal to the World" have been launched against imperialism, they have been epistemologically defanged by severing the production of racism in the United States from global imperialism.

This epistemological bifurcation was also institutionalized. It became increasingly difficult for movements, which attempted to globally address U.S. racial inequality, to leverage international institutions against it. Following an "Appeal to the World" (1947) the U.S. State Department pushed through a clause, which prevented Civil Rights groups from petitioning the U.N. human rights commission. Likewise, following "We Charge Genocide" (1951) the U.S. State Department pushed through a bifurcated definition of human rights, which narrowed civil rights to the jurisdiction of the nation. This was coupled with the construction of an epistemological divide in the academy, which siloed the study of Empire into the humanities, and other interdisciplinary departments. To overcome the reification of race, and bifurcation of race from class theories of Empire must be brought back into the sociology of race. Without a theory of Empire we cannot challenge imperialism, and without challenging imperialism we cannot address racial inequality in the United States.