



PROceedings Paper Abstract

Ronald Schmidt, Sr.. "Public Policy and Racial Equality: A Framework for Analysis." Paper prepared for delivery at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, August 30-September 2, 2001.

HOME

[Paper \(requires Acrobat Reader\)](#)

HELP

Keywords: racial equality, public policy, racial and ethnic politics

SEARCH

Abstract:

BROWSE

This paper seeks to provide an analytical framework for making sense of the multiple public policy proposals aimed at greater ethno-racial equality in the United States over the past half-century. The paper argues that these policy efforts may be best understood in relation to the debates surrounding three core questions that must be addressed by policy advocates in relation to the question of ethno-racial equality: (1) should government's role be "active" or "passive" in relation to ethno-racial equality?; (2) should public policies prioritize "human resource development" or "structural change"?; and (3) should public policies aim for a ethno-racially "monistic" or "pluralistic" conception of U.S. society? The paper concludes with the suggestion that policy advocates' answers to these questions are systematically linked to deeper assumptions about the roots of contemporary ethno-racial inequality, and that these assumptions are in need of further critical analysis.

PROJECT

[Contact the author regarding the paper.](#)

(c) 2001 American Political Science Association. Contact proceedings@apsanet.org.

“Public Policy and Racial Equality: A Framework for Analysis”

by

Ronald Schmidt, Sr.
Department of Political Science
California State University, Long Beach
Long Beach, CA 90840
Email: rschmidt@csulb.edu

ABSTRACT: This paper seeks to provide an analytical framework for making sense of the multiple public policy proposals aimed at greater ethno-racial equality in the United States over the past half-century. The paper argues that these policy efforts may be best understood in relation to the debates surrounding three core questions that must be addressed by policy advocates in relation to the question of ethno-racial equality: (1) should government’s role be “active” or “passive” in relation to ethno-racial equality?; (2) should public policies prioritize “human resource development” or “structural change”?; and (3) should public policies aim for a ethno-racially “monistic” or “pluralistic” conception of U.S. society? The paper concludes with the suggestion that policy advocates’ answers to these questions are systematically linked to deeper assumptions about the *roots* of contemporary ethno-racial inequality, and that these assumptions are in need of further critical analysis.

KEY WORDS: racial equality, public policy, racial and ethnic politics.

Prepared for presentation at the
Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association
San Francisco, CA
August 30 – September 2, 2001
Copyright, American Political Science Association

“Public Policy and Racial Equality: A Framework for Analysis”

Ronald Schmidt, Sr.
 Department of Political Science
 California State University, Long Beach

It has been nearly a half-century since both litigation and political activism in the streets began to stimulate policymakers toward renewed efforts to achieve greater racial equality in the United States. Apart from the interpretation and analysis of judicial decisions, however, most of the “racial politics” literature in political science has been focused on public opinion, voting behavior and electoral representation. Relatively little attention has been devoted by U.S. political scientists to a synoptic overview of substantive *public policy* efforts toward racial equality once candidates committed to that goal have attained some measure of real influence over governmental decisions.¹

During the past four-plus decades, nevertheless, a large number of publicists, political activists, scholars, policymakers, and members of the general public have entertained and debated a bewildering variety of public policy proposals aimed at overturning and overcoming the negative effects of centuries of the racialization that characterizes a central component of the U.S.’ historical development. Some of these proposals have been enacted into law, while others have been rejected. Some proposals have been enacted with great fanfare, then subsequently curtailed or even ended. Political conflict and controversy about these efforts and public policy proposals, however, have continued unabated throughout this long period.

How can students of public policy and racial politics make sense of this wide array of policy proposals and the frequently rancorous debates surrounding them? What is really at stake in the policy alternatives proposed, discussed and debated in relation to the achievement of greater racial equality? This paper aims to fill a perceived gap in the literature of political science by offering a conceptual scheme, a framework for analysis, for making sense of a number of arguments about and approaches to realizing greater racial equality in the U.S. through public policy. It does so by outlining and discussing some of the key questions that are necessarily addressed (either implicitly or explicitly) in coming to terms with this relationship.

Underlying Assumption

The central premise structuring this paper is that racial inequality has been a long-standing characteristic of U.S. society. That is to say, “goods” highly valued in U.S. society (e.g., income, wealth, land ownership, health care, educational attainment, occupational and social prestige, residential choice, public office, executive authority) are not distributed randomly or proportionately among the country’s primary ethno-racial groups² (following widespread social

¹ A partial exception to this generalization can be found in the urban politics “minority political incorporation” literature. See, e.g., Browning, Marshall and Tabb (1997).

² I use the term “ethno-racial groups” to indicate that, while human “races” do not exist in nature, powerful social forces of racialization in the historical development of the United States have constructed these five “groups” for a time period long enough that they have begun to take on certain characteristics of “ethnic” groups. Some scholars use the term “pan-ethnic groups” to designate the same groupings, but I wish to emphasize the role of racialization in their social construction.

convention, and for convenience, these may be color-coded as “red,” “black,” “brown,” “yellow,” and “white”). Moreover, this racial inequality has been characteristic throughout the country’s history, with members of the “white” group receiving a disproportionate share of most of these goods most of the time. While the 2000 Census data to demonstrate the continuing validity of this assumption was not yet available at the time of this writing, the author is willing to give long odds that when it is available, the new data will continue to support this assumption.

The Core Questions.

In the political world of U.S. policy decision-making, policy advocates (policymakers and political activists attempting to influence policymakers) face three core questions when addressing the proper role of public policy in realizing greater racial equality:

First, should government play a relatively active or passive role in attempting to move U.S. society toward greater racial equality?;

Second, to the degree that government should play an active role in realizing greater racial equality in the U.S., should public policy aim primarily at human resource development or at structural change?; and

Third, to the degree that government should play an active role in realizing greater racial equality in the U.S., should public policy aim at realizing an ethno-racially monistic or pluralistic conception of U.S. nationhood?

This paper will articulate the core choices lying at the heart of each of these questions, provide examples of public policies premised on these choices, and then critically analyze the stakes that underlie these choices. The aim is to provide a framework for making sense of the policy alternatives involved in the problematic relationship between public policy and racial equality in the United States, and assessing what is at stake in making choices among these alternatives.

Question 1: Should government play a relatively active or passive role in attempting to move U.S. society toward greater racial equality?

This first question confronts policy decision-makers in the U.S. today with the relatively heavy baggage of political ideology and party alignment. That is, since the 1960s, most Democrats and “liberals” have tended to take the *active* position on this question, while most Republicans and “conservatives” have typically supported the *passive* answer. Underlying these positions are a host of political commitments previously made, with attendant organizational and interest group ties that reinforce their continuation. Ideologically, the argument over this question tends to revolve around two contested points: first, is racial inequality a *public*, societal problem that requires a societal resolution?; and second, is *government policy* the appropriate instrument for attempting a societal remedy for racial inequality? The argument against a strong role for public policy will be outlined first, followed by the opposing position.

• *The “laissez-faire” argument on public policy and racial equality:* As noted, proponents of a relatively passive position on public policy’s role in promoting greater racial equality argue, first,

that inequality between ethno-racial groups is not a public or societal problem requiring a public remedy. Most Americans taking this position follow the classic stance of liberal individualism. That is, a person's standing in society, in relation to most of the social goods sketched out above, is the responsibility of that person and not the responsibility of society. Each of us is dealt certain "cards" in life, and each of us is responsible for "playing" those cards as best we can to realize our personal aspirations for living the "good life." Only by ensuring that individuals retain responsibility for their own choices and the consequences of those choices can we protect the "freedom to choose" that is the foundation for a good society, a society that privileges individual "liberty" as its highest value.

The appropriate role of government in this understanding is highly attenuated, limited to ensuring that members of the body politic enjoy formal, legal equality, and that the safety and property of the members are protected by a well-developed and authoritative system of security (e.g., police, military, courts, etc.). Beyond these limited functions, the "pursuit of happiness" is to take place in the private sector and not through public policy or other forms of authoritative collective action. Using the authoritative might of government to intervene in the private sphere nearly always leads to bad results. This is so because the inherently monopolistic power of government stifles individual freedom, limits the development of initiative, creativity and productivity among free individuals, and generates inevitable organizational inefficiencies and waste (see, e.g., Nozick, 1974; Friedman, 1981).

Laissez-faire advocates approach the issue of racial inequality through the lenses of this liberal individualistic ideology. Moving toward greater racial equality is fundamentally a matter of individual responsibility. So long as formal, legal barriers to equality of opportunity (e.g., state supports for racial discrimination) have been removed, each individual is responsible for making the most of her own life chances. Every society is filled with people who feel slighted or disadvantaged for a multitude of reasons in a multitude of ways. Using government to try to sort out these perceived wrongs and provide public remedies is certain to cause more problems than it solves, and this is especially true when dealing with the tangled web of "racial" identity.

A good example of this line of argument is found in the writings of Shelby Steele, who argues against public policies such as Affirmative Action, on the grounds that they discourage Black Americans from taking responsibility for their own lives, and indeed, undermine Black individuals' self-esteem and self-development (Steele, 1990). Steele argues that while African Americans suffered terrible injustices in U.S. history, and while they might still expect to encounter occasional instances of racial prejudice and hostility, the legal and social reforms of the 1960s marked a major watershed that freed them to pursue the goods of U.S. society in a new way. This individual freedom, however, stimulates a high level of performance anxiety that too often induces Blacks to "race-hold" (Steele, 1990, Chapter 2), by which he means that Blacks "hold" onto the secure familiarity of anticipating racial opposition and oppression, thereby excusing themselves from meeting the challenges of life in a competitive but free society. Steele faults the political leadership of African Americans for constantly reiterating the group's continuing victimization through racial injustice (thereby encouraging Black individuals to persist in the practice of "race holding"), and for supporting activist government policies that are bound to further limit the capacity for self-determination and self-improvement of individual Black Americans. Linda Chavez (1991) has made a very similar argument with respect to the

achievement of social equality for U.S. Latinos, and has extended it with the assertion that giving government the authority to interpret and promote “minority” cultures would deprive adherents of those cultures of the freedom to interpret the meaning and significance of their cultural practices and languages for themselves.

In sum, the passive position on the relationship between public policy and achieving racial equality in the U.S. is that of “hands off” or *laissez-faire*. Having achieved the elimination of arbitrary (such as “racial”) formal, legal barriers to individual equality of opportunity in the 1960s, in the U.S. individuals are now “free to choose,” responsible for the formation and realization of their own aspirations for the good life, pursuing opportunities of their own choosing and being responsible for the consequences of their own choices. Beyond the minimalist enforcement of formal, legal equality for each individual member of the polity, using the “crutch” of government authority through public policy has the inevitable result of stultifying individual growth and creativity, and freezing a reified *racial* conception of the American people as divided among “non-white” victims and “white” oppressors.

•The “active government” argument on public policy and racial equality. Proponents of an active government role in realizing greater racial equality, in contrast, argue that the long-standing inequalities between U.S. ethno-racial groups is certainly a *public* and societal problem requiring a societal remedy. Further, proponents of this position argue that the state is the only institutional complex with sufficient authority and power to move us toward this critical public goal. Proponents of an active role for public policy point to a glaring contradiction in the *laissez-faire* position: while claiming to support “equality” for each individual, *laissez-faire* individualists ignore the gaping inequalities in life chances between those born in an advantaged social position versus those born in a disadvantaged position. That is, the “cards” we are dealt in life – taken as “given” in the *laissez-faire* view of an individual’s social life – are dealt from a “stacked deck” in the real world. Several politically important factors contribute to the “stacking” of the deck (e.g., the *racial* advantage of those born into “white” families, the *class* advantage of those born into wealthy families, the *gender* advantage of those born male, etc.), but the point is that those born with both advantages and disadvantages in the competition of social life are given these “cards” without having earned them. John Rawls used this reality as one of the principal foundations for his “difference principle,” in which the “least advantaged” in society are to be given moral priority in questions of distributive justice (Rawls, 1971).

With respect to racial inequality, President Lyndon B. Johnson summarized the proactive government argument in his now-classic defense (in a speech delivered in 1965 at Howard University) of what became widely known as “Affirmative Action”:

You do not take a person who for years has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race and then say: “You are free to compete with all the others.” . . . Legal equity is not enough. We seek not just equality as a right . . . but equality as a fact and as a result. (Johnson, 1965).

This position has come to be described as an argument for “*fair* equality of opportunity,” as compared to the “*formal* equality of opportunity” argument of *laissez-faire* proponents. That is, simply ensuring “formal, legal equality” leaves those disadvantaged through no fault of their

own in an unfair competitive relationship with those who have unearned advantages deriving from the social positions into which they were cast by birth or circumstance.

In this view, “creating a level playing field” becomes one of the fundamental obligations and responsibilities of government. This is so, in part, because undeserved racial inequality was created and perpetuated over several centuries through state action (Smith, 1997), and state action in its eradication is therefore both necessary and just. It is also necessary and just because only the state has sufficient authority and institutional capability to begin to counteract the historical inertia and social perpetuation of racial inequality that remains embedded in U.S. daily life at both the personal and organizational-institutional levels of both private and civil society (see, e.g., Omi and Winant, 1994). While governmental institutions may have tendencies toward inefficiency and the stultification of individual “freedom of choice,” the “free market forces” of individual choice offer no incentives for those empowered by unjust advantage to rectify the very unearned advantages that create their advantageous way of life. “Free” markets do not work in that manner. Only the intervention of political forces and governmental authority can provide for “public goods” such as racial equality.

Question 2: to the degree that government should play an active role in realizing greater racial equality in the U.S., should public policy aim primarily at human resource development or at structural change?

Politically, this question begins from the assumption that government has some legitimate role in trying to achieve greater racial equality in the United States. For political or other reasons, even those who argue (in principle) in favor of the *laissez-faire* view often find themselves immersed in argument over this question as well. The fundamental division here is usefully characterized as follows: a *human resource development* emphasis for public policy involves trying to *change the people* who consistently receive less than a proportionate share of the social goods described above, while policies taking a *structural* approach aim to *change the rules* under which individuals participate in the social structures most involved in the allocation of those social goods. It should be noted here that while there is a clear division between these two approaches, they are not mutually exclusive. It is possible (and, indeed, not unusual) for policy makers and political activists to support versions of both approaches. Still, taking note of the distinction clarifies an important choice of emphasis because the two approaches involve fundamental differences in accounting for the origins of and social obligations engendered by ethno-racial inequality, as will be seen below.

• The case for a human resource development policy approach to racial equality. The argument here begins from the view that those who have been disadvantaged by social circumstances – among which circumstances the following are frequently cited: familial, economic, geographic, racial, gender, etc. – need to receive special public policy assistance to better “equip” them to compete for the “goods” at stake in social life. Put differently, this approach assumes that “disadvantaged” individuals have personal “deficits” that hinder their capacities (e.g., intellectual, social, cultural “capital”) for “equal participation” in the social roles that are thought to allocate the goods outlined above (e.g., income, wealth, occupational prestige, etc.). Children raised in poverty – in single-parent homes, for example – are often viewed as less likely to attain the educational success linked to occupational mobility and prestige than will children raised in

more advantageous familial and economic circumstances. In an attempt to level the playing field to create *fair* equality of opportunity, therefore, government policy should focus “extra” resources and attention on those individuals by providing them with access to opportunities provided “privately” by more advantageously situated families.

With respect to *racial* inequality, the position here is that the long history of racial (and sometimes cultural) domination in the United States has operated to systematically disadvantage communities of color, rendering their members more likely to suffer from the social circumstances sketched above. That is, members of most U.S. minority groups have a greater *than proportionate likelihood to be poor, to have less personal wealth, to have less educational attainment, to have less residential choice, to have less occupational prestige, etc.* That this is so means as well that, individually, they will more likely suffer from personal limitations that hinder their competitive capabilities in the market-place. Leveling the playing field, therefore, requires a substantial governmental effort to develop their individual “human resources,” thereby enabling them to compete more successfully in U.S. society. The *focus* of these governmental policy efforts, again, is on *changing the people*, rather than on changing the societal rules through which they participate in social life. During the past four decades, governments in the United States have adopted a wide array of policies aimed at creating a more fair equality of opportunity by better equipping disadvantaged individuals for fuller participation in U.S. society. Some prominent examples follow:

- *Head Start* – first begun in President Lyndon Johnson’s “War on Poverty,” this program of structured pre-schools was designed to provide children from poor families the kinds of learning experiences thought to be provided in the home for middle and upper class children by their more affluent and educated parents. A relatively high percentage of the children enrolled in these programs have been from communities of color.

- *Women, Infants and Children’s Health Programs* – this Federally-funded and family-centered program is designed to improve the life chances of children growing up in low-income families by enhancing their health and their mothers’ health, knowledge and capabilities.

- *Federally-Subsidized School Lunch (and Breakfast) Programs* – begun in the 1950s, this program is based on the assumption that children who are hungry are not likely to make successful students. Federal funds help schools provide meals for children whose parents are unable to provide sufficient nutrition to them for successful learning experiences.

- *Title I – Federal Funding for Compensatory Education* – begun in 1965 under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, this policy sought to provide “extra” funds for schools with high concentrations of impoverished children. The aim was to give teachers and schools better educational materials and equipment, which could be used to off-set the typically older and relatively under-funded school rooms populated by a disproportionate number of poor children.

- *Title VII – The Bilingual Education Act* – begun in 1968, this policy provides Federal funds to school districts with concentrations of non- and limited-English speaking students. The assumption here is that without this “extra” attention and focus, these children will be at an unearned disadvantage in achieving educational success.

• *Job Training Programs* – a large number of these programs have been enacted and implemented over the past four decades, from the “Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962” to the plethora of “Welfare to Work” programs being implemented by states following the Congressional welfare reform law of 1996. In every case, the assumption is that those eligible for funded training programs lack the skills, knowledge, and/or other behavioral characteristics necessary for upward mobility in an ever-changing job market.

A multitude of other examples could be outlined, but these are sufficient to illustrate the type of policy effort being described here: these government policies are aimed at *changing people* to better enable them to participate successfully in the economic and social arenas of U.S. life. In terms of *racial* inequality, the assumption is that each of these policies will help to overcome *personal disadvantages or limitations experienced disproportionately by people of color in this country*.

• *The Case for a Structural Change Approach to Public Policy for Racial Equality.*

The argument for a *structural change* approach is premised on the belief that, beyond any presumed personal limitations, there are powerful and continuing *social forces* at work that help account for the disadvantageous social position of peoples of color in the United States. In other words, rather than changing the people who have been disadvantaged by the social circumstances of racial (and/or class, gender) injustice, for which they bear no personal responsibility, this approach attempts to change those unjust circumstances themselves. Some of the factors thought to make for an unfair competition for this country’s most prized social goods are rooted in the society’s institutions, in the social processes, relationships and practices through which decisions are made involving the allocation of those goods. The argument for governmental intervention here, once again, is that public policies are necessary and justified to level the playing field where inequalities result from sources beyond the responsibility of those who are disadvantaged by these structural forces. Intellectually, of course, this category has expanded steadily over the past four decades as studies continue to pile up that trace the roots of social inequities to a wide range of social causes (e.g., patriarchy, capitalism, imperialism, racialism, Eurocentrism, homophobia, misguided immigration policies, liberalism, to name only a few). Politically, nevertheless, the number of public policies aimed at making structural changes in the rules under which people participate in U.S. institutions is more limited.

With respect to “race,” the rationale for policies aimed at structural change asserts that U.S. institutions have operated in racialized ways for many centuries, and that leveling the playing field to make for *fair* equality of opportunity requires governmental policies that will change the rules (i.e., organizational structures, social processes and relationships, institutional practices, etc.) to ensure greater racial equality. Perhaps the most common charge of this nature is that of “institutional racism,” the assertion that, quite apart from individual white persons’ personal likes or dislikes, prejudices or biases, our dominant economic, social and political *institutions* operate systematically to advantage White Americans and to disadvantage Americans from communities of color.³ Public policy efforts are needed, accordingly, to overcome these systematic practices

³ For elaboration of this argument, see Omi and Winant (1994), and Kim (2000).

of discrimination and domination that perpetuate racial inequality. Again, we find a wide number of recent policies aimed at changing the rules to ensure greater racial equality in the U.S. Among the most prominent are the following:

- *Civil Rights Act of 1964* – among other things, this foundational policy changed the rules of U.S. institutions in key public, private and civil society arenas by outlawing racial discrimination in public facilities (e.g., restaurants, hotels, motels, public transportation) and in employment; it also forbids racial discrimination by recipients of federal funds (including schools, universities, defense contractors, state and local governments, etc.). In addition, the law created a federal agency, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, to implement portions of its provisions, and gave new implementation powers to other federal agencies.

- *Voting Rights Act of 1965* – another foundational policy, this law changed the rules of political life by “federalizing” voter registration and voting in resistant state and local governments to ensure the right to vote for African Americans. Subsequent amendments broadened the policy to nationalize the Act’s reach (1970), to include protection for “language minorities” (i.e., Latinos, Asian Pacific Americans, Native Americans)(1975), and to protect minority voters against “vote dilution” as well as “vote denial” (1982).

- *Title VIII-The Fair Housing Act (Civil Rights Act of 1968)* – this amendment to the Civil Rights Act changed the rules to forbid racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, establishing a right to “fair housing” as an additional civil rights protection.

- *School Integration Policies* – though most of the key decisions regarding this policy approach have been articulated and implemented through litigation rather than legislation, the policy aim of racially integrating the public schools of the United States may be understood as an attempt to change the rules under which students participate in one of the most omnipresent institutional settings of U.S. society.

- *Affirmative Action Policy* – based on a series of Executive Orders, as well as the Civil Rights Act amendments of 1992, this set of policies changed the rules of employment by requiring covered employers to take “affirmative” steps to ensure that protected groups are included for full consideration at various stages in the employment process. A number of states built on this policy to also change the rules under which applicants are admitted to professional schools, universities and colleges.

- *Targeted Tax Incentive Policies* – A variety of Federal programs, supported by both “conservative” and “liberal” administrations have sought to change the rules under which investors select locations for new or refurbished residential, commercial or industrial facilities. By targeting central cities with large concentrations of people of color, some policy advocates see increased opportunities for higher-paying employment that will help “level the playing field” toward greater racial inequality.

- *Federal Urban Infrastructure Investments* – by investing federal funds in the physical infrastructures of central cities with large concentrations of people of color, some policy

advocates see increased opportunities for education, health care, employment, housing, thereby changing the institutional structural context in which these residents participate in urban life.

In sum, a number of policies have been adopted, and many more advocated, which have aimed at greater racial equality in the U.S. by altering the country's institutional processes, relationships and practices to ensure a higher level of racial inclusiveness and social equality. The structural reach of these policies ranges from changing the rules governing state institutions to using public policy (through both inducements and mandates) to change institutional rules of operation in both "private" and civil society.

Question 3: to the degree that government should play an active role in realizing greater racial equality in the U.S., should public policy aim at realizing an ethno-racially monistic or pluralistic conception of U.S. nationhood?

This third question has generated intense controversy among public policy decision-makers and policy advocates through the past four decades by raising a fundamental division over the perceived character of U.S. nationhood. Often referred to as the "culture wars," the underlying question driving this political conflict is whether public policies should be based on a conception of the United States as an ethno-culturally homogenous and "race-neutral" political community, or whether the country should be understood as one that is historically and foundationally *multicultural* and in which ethno-racial divisions should be understood as relatively permanent social formations constitutive of our national character.

The implications of this question for public policy efforts to achieve *racial equality* are profound. Does "equality" require that all be treated exactly "alike," so that cultural and/or behavioral differences and group loyalties play no part in a person's public *persona* in relation to one's social roles in employment and commerce, civil society or the political realm? That is, should our ethno-racial identities be considered "private" matters to be "left at home" (similar to the way our religious affiliations have come to be perceived by most, under the "wall of separation" between religion and the state)? Or should our conception of "equality" entail an understanding of "difference" (cultural; ethno-racial) as a valuable, inevitable and *public* part of any complex human society? Or, is our norm of equality so complex that it might require the *first (monistic) understanding in some circumstances, and the second (pluralistic) in other circumstances*? These extraordinarily difficult questions cannot be resolved in this paper, but the next several paragraphs will outline rationales for the two primary sides in the debate, and will be followed by examples of public policies illustrating each side of the question.

• *The Case for a "Race-Neutral," Culturally Monistic Public Policy Approach to Racial Equality*

In the United States, liberal nationalism provides the core of the case for a "race-neutral" and culturally homogenous – a "monistic" – conception of the country's people. Nathan Glazer articulated the core of the conception very well two decades before his grudging conversion to a multicultural understanding of the country (1997). According to Glazer, the second of three foundational principles for American nationhood was the following: "This was to be a union of states and a nation of free individuals, not a nation of politically defined ethnic groups (1978: 5)." Rejecting the purported view of pluralists that "racism defines our history," Glazer asserted

instead “that the American polity has . . . been defined by a steady expansion of the definition of those who may be included in it to the point where it now includes all humanity; [and] that the United States has become the first great nation that defines itself not in terms of ethnic origin but in terms of adherence to common rules of citizenship. . . .” (1978: 6-7). In short, liberal nationalism asserts that politically, we must conceive of ourselves as individuals bound together in a nation by “common rules of citizenship” rather than through ethno-racial ties.

This view of the relationship between individuals and the state led Glazer and many others to argue that achieving racial equality will require that we cease to include ethno-racial identifications and differences in all matters of public policy. Borrowing heavily from the Civil Rights Movement’s rhetoric demanding racial *inclusion*, this approach urges the country to become a “color-blind” society, in which we perceive ourselves as unique *individuals* whose only publicly significant identity is our shared nationality as Americans. While we may continue to value our ethno-racial and cultural communities, these are to be understood as voluntary and private organizational commitments, analogous to our fraternal, service club or religious attachments. Embedding ethno-racial differences and identities in our public policies, as Justice Sandra Day O’Connor argued for the Supreme Court’s majority in *Shaw v. Reno* (1993),

. . . may balkanize us into competing racial factions; it threatens to carry us further from the goal of a political system in which race no longer matters -- a goal that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments embody, and to which the Nation continues to aspire. It is for these reasons that race-based districting by our state legislatures demands close judicial scrutiny.⁴ (U.S. Supreme Court, 1993).

Many advocates of an ethno-rationally monistic policy approach are also political “conservatives” who generally urge a *laissez-faire* stance on government’s responsibility for achieving greater racial equality. Their position favoring a “race-neutral” policy approach is often linked to their generalized resistance to governmental intervention in social and economic life.

Among proponents for an *active* public policy role in realizing greater social equality, however, perhaps the most influential advocate for a “race-neutral” approach has been the prominent sociologist and social democrat William Julius Wilson. Wilson’s controversial book, The Declining Significance of Race (1978), argued that social inequality between racial groups in the post-1960s period is best accounted for by economic inequalities and their behavioral consequences rather than by continuing racial discrimination. In subsequent books (1987, 1996), Wilson has further developed that argument by tracing the conjoined evolution of the structural economic disadvantages *and* behavioral deficiencies among many “underclass” Blacks that continue to trap them in a devolving cycle of persistent impoverishment. As Wilson sees it, meanwhile, the life chances of middle-class African Americans are no longer determined by their racial identities in a fundamental way.

Wilson has supplemented his policy analysis for racial equality with a *political* analysis aimed at the Democratic Party. That is, he urges a strong governmental effort combining both human resource development policies and economic structural changes to address the continuing social

⁴ O’Connor’s specific reference was to “racial gerry-mandering” by the State of North Carolina, seeking compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

inequalities that exist in the United States, particularly in central cities. Wilson emphasizes, however, that these policies should be based on socio-economic and geographic criteria and not on racial classifications, in part because using the latter as the basis for public policy divides, rather than unites, the historic multi-racial coalition that remains the best hope for Democratic Party electoral victory (particularly in presidential elections), and therefore the best hope for enactment of his proactive proposals. For political as well as analytic reasons, therefore, he urges (1990) that policies such as Affirmative Action be based on non-racial criteria. Thus, among the policy approaches advocated by Wilson (and by others who agree with this aspect of his position) are the following, all of which it is claimed will help in achieving greater racial equality in the United States:

- *Human Resource Development policies* – many of these policies, outlined above under question 2 are based on economic needs criteria, rather than on ethno-racial criteria. These include Head Start, Title I assistance to school districts, “transitional” bilingual education programs, job training programs, etc.

- *“Class-based” Affirmative Action programs* – the aim here would be to “change the rules” of employment and admission to advanced educational opportunities to overcome obstacles created by economic disadvantage, rather than ethno-racial disadvantage.

- *Other Economic and Geographic Structural Change policies* – those “structural” policies outlined above under question 2 that attempt to change the rules on economic and/or geographic bases, rather than using ethno-racial criteria, would enable a broader-based political coalition and overcome the inherently divisive elements of identity politics. Examples include targeted tax incentive investments to inner city or low-income areas, governmental infrastructure investments in low-income areas, a more steeply graduated income tax, etc. Some policy advocates also claim that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were originally aimed at achieving a “color-blind” society before their implementation was “captured” by ethnocentric pluralists (see, e.g., Thernstrom, 1987; Thernstrom and Thernstrom, 1997).

- *The Case for “Race-Based,” Culturally Pluralistic Public Policy Approaches to Racial Equality.*

Advocates for “race-based” and culturally pluralistic public policy approaches to ethno-racial equality do so on the basis of two fundamental claims: first, that a genuinely “race-neutral” or “color-blind” policy approach is *not feasible* because it is conceptually and politically unrealistic; and second, that a “color-blind” and/or culturally monistic policy approach is *not desirable* because it is unjust.⁵ The first argument holds that ethno-racial diversity has been an inherent characteristic of U.S. society since our founding, and there is no realistic possibility that it will soon disappear. Because ethno-racial communities help to constitute the social, economic and political realities of American life, social inequality in the United States is not only economically-based but also deeply racialized. White Americans enjoy countless advantages (“white privilege”) by virtue of their historically dominant position in the country’s political economy. Because they do enjoy these advantages, further, most will fiercely resist any systematic efforts – public or private – that will move the country toward a more truly *random*

⁵ For examples of this line of analysis, see Turé and Hamilton (1992 [1967]), Bell (1992), Carr (1997), Smith (1997), Kousser (1999), Reed (1999).

(i.e., “color blind”) allocation of social goods.⁶ In short, “class” inequalities in the United States have been thoroughly “racialized” by the country’s historical development so that attempting to disentangle them in the manner advocated by W.J. Wilson and others is hopelessly unrealistic. Put differently, because our social inequalities are so thoroughly racialized, moving toward greater social equality inherently means that a large number of European-origin or White Americans believe they will lose ground.

Another part of this line of argument points out that not all aspects of racial inequality are linked to “class” factors – i.e., “race” operates as a separate independent variable in maintaining and sustaining white privilege. A prominent example is the “glass ceiling” operating to restrict the opportunities of even those people of color in the U.S. with high levels of educational attainment and with extensive work experience, as attested to by several prominent studies. This line of argument does not mean that political coalitions between whites and peoples of color are impossible, but it does mean that such coalitions cannot be based realistically on “color-blind” assumptions.

The *second* position argued by advocates of a pluralistic approach to ethno-racial equality is that a “color-blind” or culturally monistic policy approach is *undesirable* because it is unjust. The foundational core of this argument is the belief that the United States has been constituted in its historical development as a *pluralistic* society composed of multiple ethno-racial and cultural communities. And this pluralistic foundation has occurred not only through immigration but also through conquest and annexation, and through the holocaust of enslavement. In this context, aiming policies toward assimilation to one ethno-cultural community inevitably involves the “normalization” of the dominant “white,” “Anglo” (i.e., European-origin) group such that members of other ethno-racial groups are required to “give up” their “differences” in order to realize social equality. It gives to Euro-Americans the dominant position of saying “we are the standard by which ‘American-ness’ is measured, and we will ‘allow’ you be our ‘equals’ only if you become as much ‘like’ us as you possibly can.” This is inherently unjust, pluralists argue, because it is nothing more than another form of “white privilege” in which “equality” is purchased at the price of the loss of one’s ethno-cultural community.⁷ As Turé and Hamilton put it in their now-classic argument against an assimilationist understanding of racial “integration”:

“Integration” . . . means that black people must give up their identity, deny their heritage. . . . The fact is that integration, as traditionally articulated, would abolish the black community. The fact is that what must be abolished is not the black community, but the dependent colonial status that has been inflicted upon it.

The racial and cultural personality of the black community must be preserved and that community must win its freedom while preserving its cultural integrity. Integrity includes a pride--in being black, in the historical attainments and contributions of black people. No person can be healthy, complete and mature if he must deny a part of himself; this is what “integration” has required

⁶ See Bobo (1997) for public opinion data in support of this assertion.

⁷ For elaborations of this argument, see Barrera (1988); Kymlicka (1989, 1995); Schmidt (2000); Turé and Hamilton (1992 [1967]), Chapter Two; Young (1990).

thus far. This is the essential difference between integration as it is currently practiced and the concept of Black Power. (Turé and Hamilton, 1992: 55)

In short, the assimilative assumptions of a monistic ethno-racial policy are themselves inherently unequal because they reduce minority ethno-cultural communities to marginalized and “privatized” spaces in American society. These inegalitarian premises can only result in unjust public policies, not in ethno-racial “equality.” Pursuant to these lines of analysis, the following are among the public policies proposed by ethno-cultural pluralists:

- *Human Resource Development policies, governmentally funded, operated through ethnically-based, culturally distinct Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)* – e.g., Head Start and other pre-school programs, Afro-centric academies, job training, housing development, economic development programs, etc.⁸

- *Pluralistic Language Policies* – both “human resource development” and “structural” policies to ensure that language minority children are educated bilingually, in their heritage languages as well as in English, and that language minority adult citizens are given equal access to civil and political rights such as voting, employment opportunities, social services, etc.⁹

- *“Affirmative Action” and “Minority Set-Aside” policies* – changing the rules of employment, government contracting, and admission to advanced educational opportunities to ensure ethno-racially “balanced” participation in these vital social sectors.

- *Ethno-racial criteria for political representation* – changing the organizational rules of operation to ensure “proportionate interest representation” of ethno-racial minority groups in public decision-making bodies.¹⁰

- *American Indian “Self-Determination” policy* – increased Federal government support for sovereignty and self-determination of American Indian tribal governments.

Summing Up: A Typology of Policy Approaches for Racial Equality

Putting the above varying approaches together, with examples, yields the following typology of policy approaches to ethno-racial equality:

⁸ See Schmidt (1988) for an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of this approach to culturally pluralistic policy implementation.

⁹ See Schmidt (2000), Chapters 7-8, for an elaborated justification of these policy proposals.

¹⁰ Lani Guinier (1994) has been the most prominent advocate for this proposed enhancement to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. A more theoretical justification is provided by Young (1990).

Figure 1: Typology of Policy Approaches for Racial Equality.

	<u>Monistic</u>	<u>Pluralistic</u>
<u>Human Capital</u>	compensat. educ English "immersion" job training programs health care <i>Head Start</i>	ethnic preschools "maintenance" bilingual ed. ethnic NGOs
<u>Structural</u>	infrastructure invest. targeted investment tax reform corporate reforms	Affirm Action minority set-asides ethnic CBO EconDev AI Self-Determ. policy. linguistic access policies

Concluding Analysis.

Having outlined a way of making sense of the multiple and conflicting public policy approaches to realizing greater ethno-racial equality in the United States, it remains to point toward the analytical usefulness of this framework for understanding. There is some usefulness in simply describing a way of organizing these multiple approaches according to the core questions that are posed in the policy process – i.e., whether government should actively use public policy to attempt greater ethno-racial equality, whether such policy approaches should prioritize "human resource development" or "structural change," and whether public policy should be based on a "monistic" or "pluralistic" conception of U.S. society and social equality.

Beyond this descriptive usefulness, however, it is possible as well to point toward a form of critical analytical utility. And this level of critical analysis comes from recognizing that the varying answers to the three questions outlined above are rooted in certain core assumptions regarding the *causes* of ethno-racial inequality in the United States. That is, the *roots* of the political conflicts over the above varying positions on the appropriate relationships between public policy and ethno-racial equality may be traced to the partisans' (often unarticulated) assumptions regarding the origins of this country's social inequality. Thus, the prior question that underlies the answers to the positions of policy advocates on the three core questions articulated above might be formulated as follows: *how can we account for the absence of social equality among ethno-racial groups in the United States?* The concluding argument I want to make here is that the policy positions of advocates is inevitably linked to their responses to this underlying question. I will conclude, therefore, by sketching out some of the most prominent responses to this underlying question, linking those responses to the policy positions articulated above in the main body of the essay.

1. Answer One: "*Ethno-Racial Inequality Derives from Essentialist, Biological Factors*": This is now a discredited answer to explaining racial inequality in the United States; nevertheless it

lies, often hidden as a “shadow” answer, at the root of many racist assumptions that continue to haunt the American political landscape. Indeed, without some kind of essentialist assumptions there can be no “racial” explanation at all for the inequality that has persisted throughout U.S. history. In its barest form, this answer to the question of racial inequality assumes or argues that people of color are *inherently less fitted for the rigors of modern social, economic and political life*. Accordingly, in the “natural” competition for social goods that characterizes human existence, members of these “inferior” groups “naturally” fare less well than members of more robust groups. While this position has been discredited both intellectually¹¹ and politically, and while this linkage is not logically necessary, it seems very likely that it still accounts for part of the support for a *laissez-faire* position on the relationship between public policy and greater ethno-racial equality. For if ethno-racial inequality is ordained by “nature” (or by “nature’s God”), then why should it be proclaimed a public problem in need of correction?

2. Answer Two: “*Ethno-Racial Inequality Derives from Cultural, Behavioral Factors*”: This answer accounts for ethno-racial inequalities by pointing to the cultural commitments and/or behaviors of the different ethno-racial groups in American society. The assumption here is that there is a “culture of success” in the United States and that becoming successful in the acquisition of the social goods at issue in this debate over inequality requires the successful acquisition by individuals of the appropriate cultural beliefs, practices and behaviors. Thus, ethno-racial inequality may be attributed to a *failure of acculturation* on the part of members of certain ethno-racial groups.

Depending on how one assigns responsibility for this lack of acculturation in the “culture of success,” one can draw from this account either “conservative” or “liberal” implications for public policy development. Thus, “conservatives”¹² argue that individuals (and sometimes families) are responsible for the acquisition of the appropriate cultural beliefs, practices and behaviors that lead to success in U.S. society. This reasoning, of course, leads directly to a *laissez-faire* position on the relationship between public policy and greater ethno-racial equality. Individuals (and their families) who want to “succeed” in U.S. society should take steps to acculturate by acquiring the attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, practices and behaviors that enable one to compete successfully in the dominant culture. “Liberals” who attribute social inequality, at least in part, to cultural, behavioral factors also believe that members of less successful ethno-racial groups need to better acculturate to the dominant society if they are to become more successful at acquiring the social goods at issue here. Liberals, however, are more likely to perceive and attribute responsibility for, social obstacles successful acculturation by members of ethno-racial minority groups that have suffered disadvantage through no fault of their own. In this view, as noted above, our national heritage of racialized domination and oppression have left handicaps that require governmental intervention before “fair” equality of opportunity can be realized. These liberals, therefore, tend to strongly support *human resource development* policies aimed at enabling culturally “disadvantaged” individuals to acculturate more successfully.

¹¹ But see Jensen (1973) and Herrnstein and Murray (1994), for evidence that these explanations survive in academia.

¹² One of the most noteworthy of these accounts was that of Edward Banfield (1974).

It should be noted, in addition, that proponents of a “monistic” conception of U.S. society, supportive of “race-neutral” and culturally assimilative policies also tend to account for ethno-racial inequality through cultural, behavioral factors. Support for both English-immersion and “transitional” bilingual education policies, for example, are premised on the assumption that English is the sole legitimate “public” language in the United States, and that speakers of other languages (e.g., Spanish) are therefore “foreign” and “handicapped” and in need of personal change before becoming successful participants in U.S. society.

3. Answer Three: “*Ethno-Racial Inequality Derives from Structural Factors*”: This answer attributes the origins and on-going causes of ethno-racial inequality to factors in the social context of various members of the society. Rather than looking to “faults” or “wrongs” in the attitudes or behaviors of individual human beings that need “correction” before success for them is possible, this answer looks to the social world within which those individuals live and finds powerful social forces at work to explain why members of some groups get “more” of the society’s most valued goods while members of other groups get “less.” As hinted at above, a wide variety of these social forces have been identified by scholars and policy advocates. Among the most influential of these are the following, and each may be linked to a particular approach to public policies aimed at greater ethno-racial equality in the United States:

- *Economic Structural Factors* – some scholars and policy advocates see “economic” forces at work that are primarily responsible for perpetuating ethno-racial inequality in the United States. As noted above, for example, W.J. Wilson has argued that structural economic factors are more responsible for continued racial inequality in the U.S. than are more directly “racial” factors. Many Marxists, too, have argued that “racial” inequality is reflective of more basic and fundamental economic structural forces. Unless these more basic economic forces are corrected, social inequality will continue to plague all capitalistic societies, including those societies that are ethno-racially diverse. Both Wilson’s social democratic analysis and various Marxist analyses, accordingly, point in the direction of “race-neutral” and culturally monistic structural policy approaches to attempts at achieving greater ethno-racial equality.

- *Structural Racialization* – other scholars and policy advocates, as noted above, believe that racialization operates as an independent structural variable that needs to be taken into account in explaining ethno-racial inequality in the United States. That is, ethno-racial identity formation processes have operated historically to advantage some groups at the expense of other groups. In one example, Martin Marger has argued (1994) that the nature and dynamics of initial contact between two groups often leaves one group dominant over another (this can occur through differential military technology, differential ideological interpretations of the contact, differential population size, differential immunity to disease, etc.). This dominance then becomes institutionalized and rationalized so that inter-generational dominance is consolidated and perpetuated over time, embedded in the shared society’s institutions. Ideology is employed to further justify the dominance of one group over another, and that ideological behavior may attain hegemonic status so that the “normality” of one group’s dominance becomes “common sense” in the dominant cultural institutions of the society.

A more recent example of a structural racialization analysis may be found in Kim’s (2000) rich work on Korean-Black conflict in New York City, which extends the “racial formation” theory

of Omi and Winant (1994). Kim theorizes an historical pattern in the U.S. leading from “racial power” to the construction of a “racial order” structured with distinct patterns of advantage and disadvantage for various ethno-racial groups. This racial order, in turn, has stimulated political “resistance” on the part of those disadvantaged by it. In the context of Kim’s work, public policy efforts aimed at greater ethno-racial equality may be seen as efforts to realize both material and symbolic gains from these efforts at political resistance to the extant racial order. In any case, these lines of “structural” analysis may be linked to support for “race-based” and/or culturally pluralistic public policy approaches aimed at achieving greater ethno-racial equality.

In sum, the preferences of policy advocates need to be understood in the context of these competing explanations of the *origins* of ethno-racial inequality in this country. Having articulated a framework for understanding important distinctions between different policy positions in relation to ethno-racial equality, work on this subject now needs to move toward a comprehensive and sustained critical analysis of these competing explanations. This is so because the political future of public policy efforts aimed at achieving greater ethno-racial equality in the United States may depend crucially on the (often unarticulated) understandings of policy advocates as to *why* ethno-racial inequality continues to characterize the country.

Works Cited

- Banfield, Edward. 1974. The Unheavenly City Revisited (Boston: Little, Brown & Co.).
- Barrera, Mario. 1988. Beyond Aztlan: Ethnic Autonomy in Comparative Perspective (New York: Praeger).
- Bell, Derrick, Jr. 1992. Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism (New York: Basic Books).
- Bobo, Lawrence D. 1997. “The Color Line, the Dilemma, and the Dream: Race Relations in America at the Close of the Twentieth Century,” in John Higham, ed., Civil Rights and Social Wrongs (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press), pp. 31-55.
- Browning, Rufus, Dale Rogers Marshall and David Tabb, eds. 1997. Racial Politics in American Cities, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman).
- Carr, Leslie G. 1997. “Color-Blind” Racism (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications).
- Chavez, Linda. 1991. Out of the Barrio: Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation (New York: Basic Books).
- Friedman, Milton and Rose. 1981. Free to Choose (New York: Avon Books).
- Glazer, Nathan. 1978 [1975]. Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy (New York: Basic Books, Inc.)

- Glazer, Nathan. 1997. We Are All Multiculturalists Now (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Guinier, Lani. 1994. The Tyranny of the Majority (New York: The Free Press).
- Herrnstein, Richard, and Charles Murray. 1994. The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life (New York: The Free Press).
- Jensen, Arthur. 1973. Educability and Group Differences (New York: Harper and Row).
- Kim, Claire Jean. 2000. Bitter Fruit: The Politics of Black-Korean Conflict in New York City (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Kousser, J. Morgan. 1999. Colorblind Injustice: Minority Voting Rights and the Undoing of the Second Reconstruction (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- Kymlicka, Will. 1989. Liberalism, Community and Culture (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Politics (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Johnson, President Lyndon B. 1965. "Commencement Speech at Howard University," quoted in David G. Savage, "Battle Against Bias Waged on Shifting Legal Ground," Los Angeles Times 20 February 1995, pp. A-1, A-16.
- Marger, Martin. 1994. Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives, 3rd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers).
- Nozick, Robert. 1974. Anarchy, State, and Utopia (New York: Basic Books).
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s, 2nd Ed. (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Rawls, John. 1971. A Theory of Justice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Reed, Adolph Jr., ed. 1999. Without Justice For All (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).
- Schmidt, Ronald. 1988. "Cultural Pluralism and Public Administration: The Role of Community-Based Organizations," American Review of Public Administration 18:2 (June 1988), pp. 189-202.
- Schmidt, Ronald Sr. 2000. Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

- Smith, Rogers. 1997. Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Steele, Shelby. 1990. The Content of Our Character: A New Vision of Race in America (New York: HarperCollins Publishers).
- Thernstrom, Abigail. 1987. Whose Votes Count? Affirmative Action and Minority Voting Rights (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, for the Twentieth Century Fund).
- Thernstrom, Stephan, and Abigail Thernstrom. 1997. America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible (New York: Simon and Schuster).
- Turé, Kwame (formerly Stokeley Carmichael) and Charles V. Hamilton. 1992 (1967). Black Power: The Politics of Liberation (New York: Vintage Books).
- U.S. Supreme Court. 1993. *Shaw v. Reno*. 509 U.S. 630.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1978. The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Wilson, William Julius. 1990. "Race-Neutral Programs And The Democratic Coalition," The American Prospect.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1996. The Disappearance of Work: The World of the New Urban Poor (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. Justice and the Politics of Difference (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

