

12

The Dilemmas of Race



October 1995 was a sadly illuminating month. Just as with the assassination of President Kennedy, everybody can remember where he was when he heard of the O. J. Simpson verdict. On October 3, I was looking out a window on Connecticut Avenue. Four or five black people stood on the sidewalk listening to the radio in a parked cab. A few minutes after one o'clock, the people on the sidewalk suddenly began shouting, leaping in the air, and pumping their fists. The driver honked his horn repeatedly and then got out of his cab to dance in the street. I knew at once that the verdict was in and what it was. Scenes like that happened all over America. Blacks of all levels of education and income were jubilant, even those who thought Simpson guilty.

Not quite three weeks later, on October 16, Louis Farrakhan, head of the Nation of Islam, convened his Million Man March in Washington. Despite Farrakhan's deserved reputation as a racist and anti-Semite, several hundred thousand men came. The event was billed as a day of atonement and reconciliation, but there was racist rhetoric from the platform and racist sentiment in the crowd. Six days later, during a visit to the United Nations, Fidel Castro went to a Harlem church in the evening and was greeted

Farrakhan: racist & antisemite
- still several thousand people came

by enthusiastic chants of "Fidel, Fidel." Why? The black people in that church were hardly admirers of communism. It is difficult to avoid concluding that the Simpson verdict was cheered, Farrakhan's summons heeded, and Castro cheered because a great many black people wanted to express hostility to white people.

October jolted white Americans into a shocked and belated awareness that racial tranquillity is not in our immediate future, perhaps, or even probably, not in any foreseeable future. It has been over four decades since the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* ended governmental discrimination against blacks, over three decades since the 1964 Civil Rights Act outlawed private discrimination in employment and public accommodations, three decades since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 brought blacks to polling places as never before, and over two decades since the inception of affirmative action. Outside the welfare-ravaged inner cities, black economic and social progress has been dramatic.

Yet after all this, we learned that race relations had only grown worse. How could that be? The answers are complex, but, as black scholar Glenn Loury noted, the roots can be traced to the excesses of the 1960s: "We learned too well during the upheavals of that decade how to be America's pre-eminent victims." He cites the series of killings of black children in Atlanta, which the activist Dick Gregory said was the work of a disease control center pursuing a cancer-fighting drug allegedly found in the tips of their sex organs. Jesse Jackson said: "It is open season on black people. . . . These murders can only be understood in the context of affirmative action and Ronald Reagan's conservative politics." There was great disappointment when the killer turned out to be black and was convicted before a black judge and a largely black jury.

In one way, there is no mystery to this. Americans have been intensely conscious of race throughout their history. Race has been central to our politics since Africans were brought to the colonies as slaves in the seventeenth century. Race was a difficult issue in the framing of the Constitution, which, in order to make union possible, awkwardly attempted to accommodate the fact of slavery, without ever using the word. Slavery caused the bloodiest war in our history. And race has been a subject of political and social agitation ever since. It is hardly a matter for surprise that the

22/10/1995
Castro visiting UN - greeted at Harlem

CONCLUSION
Black people supported their hostility to the white people
WHITE PEOPLE'S REACTION
- shock

a lot has been done to elevating the Blacks
- their living conditions have in most cases improved.
STILL AFTER THAT RACE RELATIONS WORSE
WHY?

Black Americans learnt how to be prime victims

↓
no mystery to this
RACE central to American politics

= no wonder that the subject has not disappeared.

10/1995
O. J. Simpson decision trial
everyone of Afro-Am origin celebrating

16/10/1995
Louis Farrakhan
- Million Man March on Washington

subject has not disappeared. Nor is it really surprising that blacks are not reconciled to their position in America. The underclass is, for the time being, largely black, and even blacks who have moved into the middle class often remain edgy. Memories of aggressive discrimination and oppression do not fade so quickly. Nor do suspicions that latent hostility is still present and may become overt once more.

to the black people - difficult to reconcile to their position in America - memories of discrimination

BUT in another way - it is a mystery because - blacks have so many opportunities - racism at 66

EXPLANATION: resulting from civil rights movement - broadening of opportunities, new choice, freedom - FEAR ∴

race-holding using race to cover up

OFTEN: Black choose to believe their inferiority ∴ RACE ENABLES THEM TO EVADE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

But in another way, the intensely unsatisfactory state of race relations is a mystery. The opportunities for blacks to advance in the United States have never been greater. Despite the incessant talk about racism, by white liberals as well as by blacks, racism has never been at a lower ebb. Yet black anger seems at its zenith. Shelby Steele, a professor of English and black intellectual, offers a partial explanation that is remarkably similar to Midge Decter's explanation for the anger of the feminists. In both cases, the problem is the sudden and dramatic widening of choices about life, a new freedom and responsibility that frightens. For women the new choices are available largely because of technology, for blacks because of the success of the civil rights movement. Steele speaks of "race-holding" and defines a "holding" as any self-description that justifies to that person or camouflages his fears, weaknesses, and inadequacies. Race-holding allows a black to retreat into his racial identity as an excuse for not using his talents to the full out of fear that he really cannot compete. "With the decline in racism the margin of black choice has greatly expanded, which is probably why race-holding is so much more visible today than ever before. But anything that prevents us from exploiting our new freedom to the fullest is now as serious a barrier to us as racism once was."

Steele thinks that the black students in his classes perform far below their abilities because they expect to do poorly and fail to recognize the margin of choice open to them. "I think they choose to believe in their inferiority, not to fulfill society's prophesy about them, but for the comforts and rationalizations their racial 'inferiority' affords them. They hold their race to evade individual responsibility. Their margin of choice scares them, as it does all people."

Decter and Steele have identified a major part of the problem in each case. But neither of them would deny that there is more to

the problems of male-female and black-white relations than the sudden expansion of choice. It is difficult for most whites to realize the intensity and depth of blacks' suspicion of whites. A New York Times/CBS News poll of black New Yorkers in 1990 found that 10 percent agreed that AIDS "was deliberately created in a laboratory in order to infect black people." Another 19 percent thought that it "might possibly be true." And 25 percent of blacks agreed that the government "deliberately makes sure that drugs are easily available in poor black neighborhoods," while another 35 percent said that was possibly true. Clarence Page, a black syndicated columnist for the Chicago Tribune, said, "There's a lot more talk about conspiracy than there used to be. You could call conspiracy theories about AIDS and drugs fringe ideas, but they seem to have a large following among the black intelligentsia. And it's present at the grass roots too. You find it at all levels." John Singleton, who made Boyz 'N the Hood said, "If AIDS was a natural disease, it would have been around 1,000 years ago. I think it was made in order to kill undesirables. That would include homosexuals, intravenous drug users and blacks."

2 BLACK SUSPICION OF WHITES - something whites don't realize

blacks believe in white conspiracy x them - belief held in all levels of black soc. even entrepreneurs & intelligentsia

Paranoia is fed by the race hustlers, most visibly men like Farakhan and Al Sharpton, but also by many others, including some university professors of black studies, who teach resentment and fear. These are persons whose careers would be diminished or ended by progress in racial reconciliation; it is in their interest to preserve and exacerbate racial antagonisms.

paranoia fed even by uni. professors

particularly multiculturalists whose career is dependent on race.

An additional factor which suggests we will never know racial peace is that the problem is not peculiarly American or black-white. It is more often the rule than the exception that different ethnic groups living in close proximity display hostility to one another. That is evident from Canada to the former Yugoslavia to Rwanda to Malaysia. There have been few, if any, completely peaceful multiethnic societies, and America is becoming ever more multiethnic. Still, matters are worse than they have to be.

3 groups close to each other - more hostility

Whites' responsibility for the present state of race relations goes beyond the obvious point that they oppressed blacks for centuries. Whites—and here I mean primarily modern liberals—deserve blame as well for the way they went about ending discrimination and seeking to eliminate discrimination's lingering ill effects. No one doubts the good intentions of modern liberals,

state of race relation: can be blamed on whites ∴ a) oppression b) way discrimination ended

Critique of modern liberals approach
EQUITARINISM
their multicultural enhanced tribalism

at least on this topic, but there is every reason to doubt their intelligence and prudence. Radical egalitarianism leads them to believe that, absent discrimination, equality of results in every area of endeavor would be the natural outcome for different ethnic groups. Their cultural relativism insists that no culture is superior to any other in preparing individuals to succeed in a complex commercial society. The danger of tribalism is always present when ethnic groups share the same territory, but nothing could have been better calculated to intensify tribalism than the rhetoric and prescriptions liberals have advanced. For decades they have told blacks that their problems were caused entirely by racism. It should not be surprising that many blacks came to believe just that. It is human to want to blame your troubles on someone else and, in the case of American blacks, that message rang true because for centuries their troubles were caused by someone else. The unacknowledged difficulty was that if racism had utterly evaporated in 1964, most blacks were in no position to compete on equal terms. The years of segregation and discrimination had produced educational, attitudinal, and cultural disadvantages that would take years to overcome.

Black told that their problems were caused by racism - they believe that - for centuries, their problems were caused by someone else

BUT if racism evaporated in 1964 - Black could not compete on equal terms - there were other problems

BUT liberals continued that the only problem was discrimination and that it should be immediately outlawed BUT it didn't happen - disappointment

for many, compassionate welfare policies were even worse

anger at WHITES

But liberal rhetoric continued on the line that discrimination was the only problem long after the dangers of that rhetoric had become apparent. The civil rights statutes and reforms were pushed on the implicit and sometimes explicit promise that all would immediately be well once discrimination was outlawed. It did not turn out that way, of course; it could not have, and black hopes were disappointed. For many blacks, indeed, the results of compassionate welfare policies made matters worse than they had been under segregation and discrimination. The predictable result was increased anger at whites, who must be responsible since whites themselves had said that racism was the only problem.

There were two other unhappy consequences. One was that some blacks developed a fatalistic attitude that hampered their progress. Why try if whites made it impossible to succeed? The second was the belief that nothing need be done but demand more laws, more subsidies, more affirmative action. Surely civil rights laws could have been advocated to deal with real discriminations without teaching such simplistic, false, and destructive lessons.

- 2 consequences: 1) fatalistic attitude of the Blacks why even try if whites made it impossible. 2) belief that nothing need be done but demand more laws, subsidies, AP

To make matters worse, white anger is rising, too, precisely because of the liberal effort to produce equality of results. Affirmative action, in the sense of preferential policies, is really a euphemism for quotas, and it is a perfect prescription for racial animosity. At the beginning of the civil rights movement's successes in the 1960s, what we now know as affirmative action was unthinkable. The 1964 Civil Rights Act explicitly forbade all forms of discrimination on the basis of race or sex. Even so, it would not have been enacted without the assurances of its backers, most prominently Hubert Humphrey, that there was no possibility of discrimination against white males. Today, that discrimination is everywhere, from schools and universities to employment, promotion, government benefits, and more.

white anger... attempt at equality of results
AA = quotas preferential policies
1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT = discrimination forbidden
=> no AA policy could go thru.

When affirmative action was first mentioned, the policy was conceived as one of outreach. Governments and businesses would reach out to find qualified minority individuals, or individuals who could quickly become qualified, but who might not know of the opportunities available to them. The policy was enforced, however, by bureaucrats who believed that if significant numbers of minorities were not hired as a result of an outreach program, the employer was not trying. The Supreme Court made matters worse by ruling that any employer's test or practice that resulted in racial "imbalance" or had a "disparate impact" on minorities required extensive and often difficult justification. Hiring and promotion by the numbers began. This followed directly from the modern liberal notion that equality of results is natural. Instead of monitoring the good faith efforts made, the bureaucrats demanded results.⁵ Goals and timetables were insisted upon. An employer who must reach a goal of a certain percentage of minority employees by a stated time is under a quota requirement. Affirmative action was transformed from an outreach program to a quota program, and the Supreme Court, in direct violation of the anti-discrimination provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, approved.

AA = originally an outreach -> to get minorities qualified into a position
Policy reinforced by bureaucrats who forced employers to follow the program + by SC decisions (there must have been justification for imbalance)

outreach program changed into quota

SC: approved in direct violation to 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

The civil rights organizations changed direction. During the long judicial and legislative battles for anti-discrimination laws, they insisted over and over again that they wanted no special status for minorities. Now they sought special status and preferential treatment. The switch was surely partly due to the fact that blacks were not advancing as rapidly as these organizations had expected,

CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS
originally, wanted anti-discrimination law without special status to minorities
NOW changed: wanted special status & preferential treatment
ESPECIALLY FOR BLACKS: slow advancement.

so that something in addition to non-discrimination seemed required. But there were surely also individual and organizational imperatives. If individuals and organizations had been working full time for anti-discrimination laws for decades and decades and finally achieved those goals, what were they to do? Could the individuals concede that there was nothing more to do and seek other employment? Could the organizations admit that they had no further purpose and disband? Humans rarely act that way. Affirmative action, or preferences, provided a new purpose. The step was the easier to take because, being modern liberals, these folks found equality of results an even more congenial goal than equality of opportunity.

All of this was done mindlessly and without public debate. As happens all too frequently in the United States today, courts and bureaucrats made the important and sensitive decisions about public policy. The public was, at best, reduced to the status of onlookers. Nobody asked whether blacks should be the only group to benefit from affirmative action, how long the preferences would last, or what the effects would be on race relations. What happened in the United States is what has happened around the world where affirmative action has been tried. Thomas Sowell, a conservative black intellectual, made an international study of government-mandated preferences for government-designated groups and found common patterns:

1. Preferential programs, even when explicitly and repeatedly defined as "temporary," have tended not only to persist but also to expand in scope, either embracing more groups or spreading to wider realms for the same groups, or both. Even preferential programs established with legally mandated cut-off dates, as in India and Pakistan, have continued far past those dates by subsequent extensions.

2. Within the groups designated by government as recipients of preferential treatment, the benefits have usually gone disproportionately to those members already more fortunate.

3. Group polarization has tended to increase in the wake of preferential programs, with non-preferred groups reacting adversely, in ways ranging from political backlash to mob violence and civil war.

after removing discrimination

- equality of results becomes another goal

all of this done without public discourse by bureaucrats courts

general characteristics of preferential program
temporary programs tend to become permanent

AA = found problematic

4. Fraudulent claims of belonging to the designated beneficiary groups have been widespread and have taken many forms in various countries.*

The United States is no exception to the international experience. Preferential policies here were put forward as temporary measures, but Lyndon Johnson gave the game away when he announced that in "the next and more profound stage of civil rights" the object would be "not just equality as a right and a theory but equality as a fact and equality as a result." We have been at affirmative action for over two decades now and, as could have been predicted, such equality of result as has been achieved is artificial. Proportional representation in various fields has been reached by diktat, by depriving people of freedom, which is what a policy of racial preference does.

We have expanded the area of tyranny by expanding the number of groups entitled to preferences. We now extend affirmative action to women, Hispanics, Asians, Aleuts, Pacific islanders, and American Indians. People who have suffered no discrimination whatever are entitled to preferences. As Terry Eastland points out, heavy immigration has brought large numbers of Hispanics and Asians who are at once entitled to preferences though they have suffered no wrong at the hands of this society." A wealthy Spanish businessman who has just arrived in this country is entitled to preference in, say, getting a government contract, though a poor Frenchman would be entitled to no advantage whatever. Altogether, 60 percent or more of the population of the United States are entitled to preferential treatment. Only white males are not (unless they happen to be Hispanic) and only white males may be discriminated against.

It is inevitable that once the favoritism game begins, other groups will demand their share of its benefits. Those demands are difficult to resist precisely because there is no respectable rationale for preferential policies. Thus, there is no criterion that can be stated to explain why other groups are not entitled to favoritism. It is necessary, of course, that the group demanding advantages be able to articulate some way in which they have been unfairly treated, but that is not at all difficult. Simple lack of proportionate representation will do.

U.S.

temporary program becomes permanent
equality of opportunity = equality of result

EXPANSION of tyranny by expanding the beneficiary group

ONLY WHITE MALES CAN BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

once one group gets preferential treatment, another will want too

Here, as elsewhere, the scope of preferences keeps expanding. There are now 160 federal government preferences alone. The number of state and municipal preferential programs is probably countless, and the private sector also practices affirmative action. Universities routinely practice discrimination in admitting students and hiring faculty. I know young lawyers looking for academic positions who suffer the very considerable handicap of being white males. One of them was told by a law school faculty member on the appointments committee that the school was hiring but had only one place for a white male. At another school, the interviewer looked over the young man's resumé and said, "This is very good. You have had two important clerkships, with Bork and then Scalia, and in the Solicitor General's Office you have argued cases in the Supreme Court. You have accomplished a great deal in a short time." He paused and then said thoughtfully, without a trace of irony, "Of course, it's not as good as being black."

Affirmative action is being pressed into areas where it will prove positively dangerous. "The application of the principles of affirmative action to medical education is significant, implying, as it does, that their proponents' ideological commitment makes them willing to risk the graduation of incompetent physicians."¹⁰ The desire to graduate as many minority students as possible, who are often admitted with inadequate qualifications, creates a strong motivation for the administration to lower standards.

Either voluntarily or under pressure from the government, a large majority of major corporations engage in affirmative action. Some make managers' bonuses dependent on the preferential hiring of minorities and women. Paul Craig Roberts and Lawrence M. Stratton list seemingly endless programs of this sort.¹¹ Mortgage lending criteria must not have an adverse disparate impact on minorities; even small businesses are harassed to achieve proportional representation of women and minorities in their work forces; minority preferences govern the allocation of government contracts, broadcast licenses, and scientific research grants; disciplining of federal government workers must be racially proportional; the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board measures merit in part by a civil servant's support for affirmative action; accreditation agencies take into account the proportion of minorities on the

faculty and in the graduating classes of the schools they oversee.

Group polarization has increased. One has only to look into university dining halls to see the various races and ethnic groups clumped together with their own kind. Racial antagonisms on campuses are vastly worse than they were thirty years ago, and students agree that preferential admissions policies are the cause. Meanwhile, in employment as in academic admissions, people are changing the ethnic backgrounds they claim to ones more likely to bring benefits.

This has led to the systematic denigration of white, heterosexual males. Roberts and Stratton compare the rampant anti-Semitism among the educated classes even in pre-Hitler Germany to the assault in American universities on white males: "Like German anti-Semitism, the demonization of the white male is an intellectual movement."¹² And so it is. The most ardent advocates for affirmative action, and the most heated charges against white males are to be found in our universities. Nor is it hard to see why. In order to prefer certain groups it is necessary to harm others. Since the injustice of what is done is obvious, it is, unfortunately, human nature to justify it by imputing grave fault to the people harmed. For radical egalitarians who dislike the traditional culture of the West, moreover, it makes sense to attack those historically identified with that culture, white males. White females are exempt because it is politically astute to identify them as victims and so add to the coalition against white males, and because the powerful feminist movement is also hostile to Western culture. Besides, feminists make far more formidable adversaries than do white males.

Starting the policy of preferential treatment was a serious mistake. Continuing it would be a disaster. There is no respectable rationale for continuation. The most frequently heard argument is the claim that active discrimination against minorities and women continues in this country. For reasons to be discussed, it is extremely doubtful that such discrimination is at all common. Let us assume, however, that it is. The attempted justification fails, nonetheless. There are laws upon laws forbidding discrimination in employment and promotion, in housing, in voting, in access to places of public accommodation, in lending, and much more. We have the Civil Rights Acts of 1866, 1871, 1964, 1968, and 1991; we have the Voting Rights Acts of 1965, 1975, and 1982. There is

GROUP ANTI-SEM
SM
- racism on campus
- preferential treatment

agency upon agency devoted to finding and ending discrimination: the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, the Department of Education's Civil Rights Office, civil rights sections in various government agencies, as well as state and municipal laws and enforcement agencies. There are thousands of such agencies, and more than 100,000 government lawyers, investigators, and agents who spend hundreds of millions of dollars enforcing the laws and regulations. If that were not enough, there are laws providing for private lawsuits and an army of private attorneys bringing discrimination claims. If discrimination is provable, we have far more than adequate means of dealing with it.

This means that affirmative action is generally applied to a pool of minorities who have suffered no discernible discrimination. Imagine a group of one hundred Hispanic men, ten of whom are to be admitted to Stanford under a policy of preference. In order to imagine that discrimination is being cured, it is necessary to suppose that, by a rare coincidence, preference is given to an individual who has actually suffered discrimination but cannot prove it, and may not even suspect it. If there are any victims of undetected discrimination in the pool of one hundred—suppose that there are ten—the likelihood is that none of them will receive preferential admission to Stanford or, at best, one or two will. Statistically, therefore, any person who has been the victim of unprovable discrimination will usually go without a remedy, while a person who has not been discriminated against will be given an undeserved benefit. It is difficult to see how a windfall for one cures an unsuspected injustice to the other. Affirmative action is simply irrelevant to discrimination.

This point is not met by shifting the accusation to one of institutional or structural racism and sexism. Not only does it raise the problem of the pool, just discussed, but structural charges are merely silly, a way of insisting that there must be discrimination although no one can see it. Structural racism or sexism would have to manifest itself in a series of individual acts of discrimination. That equally or better qualified blacks, Hispanics, or women were denied jobs or promotions in favor of white males would be provable and anti-discrimination laws and agencies would come

it does not make sense to treat preferentially the whole group → only individuals can suffer from discrimination.

AA
- generally applied to groups that have not suffered from discrimination

into operation. Structural theories are simply an admission that actual discrimination cannot be shown, coupled with an unsupported assertion that it must nevertheless be pervasive. Only modern liberals and people with a vested interest in discovering racism would advance such an empty theory.

It is doubtful, in any event, that much discrimination occurs now that governments are no longer requiring it. Any fair-minded observer would have to admit that this country has undergone a drastic decline in racism. Discrimination is alleged much more often than it exists. When job discrimination complaints get a fair hearing, it usually turns out that the complainant was not hired because he or she had poor job qualifications.¹³ Recently, to take another instance, there have been widely reported allegations of discrimination in mortgage lending, based on the observation that a higher percentage of blacks than whites are turned down. That kind of statistic, by itself, is meaningless, but most people, including government bureaucrats, take it as proving discrimination. The allegations were shown to be baseless by the fact that the default rates of the two races were the same. Had blacks been rejected who had financial qualifications equal to accepted white borrowers, so that blacks had to be more qualified to get loans, the default rates for whites would have been higher than those for blacks.

Mortgage lenders, not surprisingly, were more interested in economics than in race. What is true in that business is true generally. The prevalence of discrimination is to be doubted because it is economically irrational in any business where rivalry between firms exists. The employer who hires the best people, regardless of skin color or sex, will have a significant competitive advantage over any rival who discriminates. Hence discrimination is likely only where rivalry is muted or nonexistent.

As Thomas Sowell put it, "Prejudice is free but discrimination has costs."¹⁴ That is the reason private businesses have resisted government-ordered discrimination. Even in South Africa, Sowell points out, private firms, run by folks presumably as racist as the government, persistently evaded the laws discriminating against blacks in employment. In the American South, bus companies publicly opposed and then tried to ignore municipal laws requiring separate seating of whites and blacks. The difference in attitudes was entirely due to the fact that governments bore none of

JE East Berlin.

criticism of structural theories → discrimination can only be proved on individual basis.

racism in U.S. → on decline

discrimination is often perceived in places it does not exist e.g. in place of poor job qualification

discrimination in business → irrational hiring the best in the interest of employer → success in competition

discrimination possible in places with no competition

THE LAW OF THE MARKET HARDLY ALLOWS FOR DISCRIMINATION

the costs while businesses did. Discrimination against Jews was practiced far more often in regulated industries than in competitive ones, discrimination being costless where the firm was shielded from competition by regulators.¹⁵ Businesses would, of course, discriminate when it paid, usually when their customers preferred not to associate with minorities. Hence the days of segregated lunch counters in the South. The phenomenon of private business resistance to discrimination when discrimination costs money is universal.

Sometimes preferential policies are justified as a form of reparations for a past history of discrimination. That would make sense, however, only if we ignore individuals and think of races as undifferentiated blocs whose members live forever. The individual beneficiaries and victims of past discrimination are now almost entirely unknowable. It is hardly sensible to prefer a person who has not suffered discrimination because a member of the same race or sex suffered it thirty years ago. Whatever happened in the past, in the present the policy does harm to guiltless individuals and benefits those who have suffered no harm. At some point, history must be accepted for what it is, history.

Though affirmative action has few if any legitimate benefits, it does have heavy adverse effects. To start with what many will think the least significant, it is obvious that jettisoning the achievement principle for reward according to skin color or genital arrangements has a serious economic cost. Peter Brimelow and Leslie Spencer estimated that affirmative action's direct and indirect costs in 1991 were about \$115 billion; opportunity costs added another \$236 billion; the lowering of the gross national product may have been about 4 percent.¹⁶ Worse, it all may be wasted. The authors quote Charles Murray: "There's hardly a single outcome—black voting rights, access to public accommodation, employment, particularly in white collar jobs—that couldn't have been predicted on the basis of pre-1964 trend lines." "That's pretty devastating," the authors say. "It suggests that we have spent trillions of dollars to create an outcome that would have happened even if the government had done nothing."

If affirmative action had merely squandered trillions to accomplish little or nothing, that would be a considerable misfortune; but the truth is worse than that. This misbegotten policy has

preferential policies as a remedy for the past discrimination

— however remedying individual for discrimination impossible → therefore: remedy given to the whole group MAKES NO SENSE

ADVERSE EFFECTS OF AA → jettisoning achievement principle for reward

caused serious damage to blacks and Hispanics, to whites and those of Asian extraction, and to relations between those groups. Though these consequences are felt throughout our society, we may use the venue of higher education to illustrate the point.

Blacks and Hispanics do not currently perform as well on standardized tests or in school as do whites and Asian-Americans. If admissions were made on the basis of academic achievement, blacks and Hispanics would not be represented in the most prestigious and demanding universities in the same proportion that they bear to all university students. In their zeal to get minority numbers up, universities admit members of these groups with lower SATs and lower high school grades than they demand of whites and Asians. At many universities the practice is to compare black and Hispanic applicants only against others in the same ethnic group. The result is often startling differences in the academic qualifications of those groups and white and Asian students. Not only do some such admittees find themselves overmatched as they would not have at schools one rung down the prestige ladder, but the latter schools, deprived of minority students who would have done well there, must also admit lesser qualified minority students to get their numbers up. The result is a mismatching of universities and minority students at every level. This probably accounts for the higher drop-out rate for students who would have gotten good educations and graduated had the universities not done them so harmful a favor. Since everyone knows about affirmative action, those who do graduate are likely to be suspected by prospective employers and fellow employees of not really having the credentials their diplomas suggest.

Perhaps even worse than this, overmatching minority students may lead them to reject the standards for achievement that they will need to succeed after graduation. Sowell points out that the overmatched black or Hispanic student who does not keep up with his classmates has a choice. He can admit to himself that he is not qualified to compete at this level or, in an effort to retain his self-respect, he can attack as illegitimate the standards by which he is judged. It is hardly surprising that many choose the latter course. Most humans would. But a student who rejects the criteria by which our society judges achievement is himself handicapped, probably for life. The admissions office has done him no favor.

VIZ HIGHER EDU

MISMATCHING STUDENTS & UNIVERSITIES

第一的物... 要地利

The problem is not simply that minority students are placed in universities where they have difficulty competing. The recipient of preferential admission has his self-doubt increased, which will in turn tend to encourage race-holding and underperformance. It is now fashionable to speak of seeking diversity, but the change in terms does not disguise the fact of preference. Whites seek innocence through absolution for their treatment of blacks in the past, while blacks seek power, which they can achieve by playing on white guilt. Shelby Steele writes,

[D]iversity became a golden word. It grants whites an egalitarian fairness (innocence) and blacks an entitlement to proportionate representation (power).

But the essential problem with this form of affirmative action is the way it leaps over the hard business of developing a formerly oppressed people to the point where they can achieve proportionate representation on their own (given equal opportunity) and goes straight for the proportionate representation. This may satisfy some whites of their innocence and some blacks of their power, but it does very little to truly uplift blacks.¹⁷

Of course, no minority (or majority either) will achieve proportionate representation in all fields of endeavor. Neither sex has done that, nor has any ethnic group. But Steele's point is entirely valid: preferential policies do not build the incentives for individual development that are necessary to uplift a formerly oppressed people, or anybody else for that matter.

The mistake the universities and society have made is to treat blacks and Hispanics by different standards from the rest of us. Christopher Lasch denounced the notion that "respect for cultural diversity forbids us to impose the standards of privileged groups on the victims of oppression." He calls this "clearly a recipe for universal incompetence (or at least for a disastrous split between the competent classes and the incompetent)."¹⁸ A split between the competent classes and the incompetent would be disastrous for social stability. A more likely outcome is that if standards are lowered for minorities, they will also eventually be lowered for others. Since "privileged groups" and "victims of oppression" occupy the

same classrooms and take the same tests, it will be impossible to demand different standards of the two. Just as the training of male cadets was scaled back to levels at which female cadets can perform, so educational standards will suffer in civilian universities if the standards of the privileged are not enforced on the formerly oppressed.

If preferential admission policies for blacks and Hispanics in colleges damages them, it certainly works a serious injustice on those who lose out because of preferences to others. A law professor referred to these results of affirmative action as "transitional inequities." That is a way of avoiding thinking about what you are doing. What the universities and employers are doing is inflicting permanent harm on people who have done nothing wrong. The inequities are not transitional or temporary for those who lose what they deserve on the merits because of their race or sex. If a white male does not get into Yale because of his race, he does not get into Yale forever, and chances are he forever does not get into Harvard, Stanford, etc. either. (Or, if he does, some other white male gets left out.) He may also not get the job he wants and that his talents and achievements qualify him for; he may well not get the promotion he has earned. Perhaps in ten or twenty years some other white male will be treated fairly, but that does not restore the life the first one who endured discrimination deserved to have. The damage to the individual is permanent, not transitional.

It may be thought that affirmative action is a way of buying social peace by enforcing proportional representation for all groups in all institutions. If so, it is obvious that the policy does not work. The results of affirmative action have been greater group antagonisms and self-segregation. The demand for equality of results is surely one cause of the increasing racial acrimony in our society. It is to be seen everywhere, from the new separation of the races on campuses to racial bloc voting on juries to workplace antagonisms. Nor is this just a problem between whites and blacks. Adjustments between races were difficult enough when that was only a question of those two races, but now we have large numbers of Asians and Hispanics, with many divisions within each group. By referring to non-whites generally as "persons of color," an attempt is made to range all non-whites against all whites. The tactic cannot work in an ethnic spoils system. The chancellor of a

greater
group
antagonism
& self-segregation

suppression
paranoia

major university told me that blacks were calling him a racist. I asked why. He said, "Too many Asians." The prospects for racial and ethnic peace seem to be diminishing.

It is no wonder affirmative action creates racial hostilities. When a white male who has never discriminated against anyone loses out to a black male who has never been discriminated against, despite the former's superior qualifications, anger will flare up on both sides. The reason for the white's anger is obvious; the black will be angry because he knows that others know he has succeeded not on his own but because of his skin. The black is particularly likely to feel anger if he is placed by affirmative action in an environment in which he cannot compete equally. He may be college material but not ready for the college that takes him in. Perhaps, instead of being at Harvard, he should be at the University of Massachusetts.

It will be difficult to get rid of affirmative action. There is no reason to think that the infliction of inequities will come to an end at some unstated time in the future, at least not without acrimony and further racial anger. The rhetoric of victimhood will continue as long as there are benefits to be derived from it, which is to say as long as whites seek absolution. Judging by the universities' pusillanimity on this and similar issues for the past thirty years, unless authorities outside the universities intervene, affirmative action's inequities in the academic world will last forever, the period of transition will be eternity. Modern liberals have gotten us into a mistaken policy that we cannot continue and will have the greatest difficulty in ending.

Modern liberals in government agencies, universities, and elsewhere will do their utmost to preserve affirmative action. But there is a new mood in the public. There is a move to put the elimination of affirmative action in California to a vote in 1996, and the issue promises to become national. The initiative to be put to a vote in California states: "Neither the State of California nor any of its political subdivisions or agents shall use race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin as a criterion for either discriminating against, or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group in the operation of the State's system of public employment, public education or public contracting." This is an attempt to restore what Congress thought it was doing in the Civil Rights

removal of AA will be difficult will be opposed by modern liberals but

people's mood is slowly changing mood x AA

Calif. California 1996

attempt to restore

1964 Civil Rights Act - not would be overridden by federal preferential policies

Act of 1964. But the passage of the initiative would apply only to preferential policies put in place by the state or its subdivisions. Federal preferential policies override state law.

Interestingly enough, some liberals now think affirmative action has lasted too long. Joseph Califano, who pushed hard for affirmative action in both the Johnson and Carter administrations, wrote in 1989 that the policy was intended "only as a temporary expedient to speed blacks' entry into the social and economic mainstream" and that "its time is running out."²⁰ Susan Estrich, a law professor and campaign strategist for presidential candidate Mike Dukakis in 1992, said that "For all its good intentions, affirmative action was never meant to be permanent, and now is truly the time to move on to some other approach."²¹ Ward Connerly, a black member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, said, "I tell you with every fiber of my being that what we're doing is inequitable to certain people. . . . To those who say, 'Affirmative action now, affirmative action as it is now'—that's what George Wallace said about segregation." The Board of Regents has ordered the California university system to stop preferences, but is said to be meeting covert resistance from educators and administrators.

On the other side of the issue, the head of the California branch of the National Organization for Women called the anti-affirmative action initiative "divisive scapegoating" and "one of the most significant attacks yet on our rights." A student at the University of California's law school, Boalt Hall, said of Proposition 187, which denies California benefits to illegal immigrants, and the civil rights initiatives that they were messages that "racism is O.K." and that "people of color are an O.K. target."²² The fact that preferential treatment of those who are non-white and non-male is now their "right" merely confirms that many of its beneficiaries intend never to give up their privileged status. And the further charge that requiring non-discrimination for whites is "racism" shows how deeply anti-white racism has embedded itself in our culture.

One absurd consequence of minorities' admission to universities they are not fully qualified to enter is the self-esteem movement. The underlying idea is that achievement follows self-esteem rather than the other way round. A great deal of time is wasted at

even some liberals' belief: AA lasted too long

was not meant to be permanent

abolishing AA

impact of AA on self-esteem

all levels of our educational system trying to build students' self-esteem, time that might better be spent teaching them skills and knowledge that would justify self-esteem. In higher education, self-esteem is promoted by programs dedicated to women and to ethnic groups. The results have been disastrous. The decline of, indeed disdain for, scholarly standards that is characteristic of the feminist movement and women's studies programs is also observable in ethnic studies programs. The most aggressive variety apparently is in African studies. The self-esteem of black students is, supposedly, raised by teaching them a false history of their race. Black students are, as Mary Lefkowitz puts it, taught myth as history.²² The programs tend to be indoctrination rather than education. The presence of Afrocentrism on campus, like the presence of feminism, lowers scholarly standards generally. Professors outside the program refuse to object and refuse to demand evidence and logic when impossible claims are made.

A prominent Afrocentrist lectured at Wellesley, where Lefkowitz teaches, stating that Greek civilization was stolen from Egypt and that Egyptians were black. He claimed, among other things, that Aristotle stole his philosophy from the library at Alexandria. During the question period, Lefkowitz asked the lecturer why he made that claim when the library had been built after Aristotle's death. His only answer was that he resented the tone of the question. Several students accused Lefkowitz of racism. Her colleagues, who knew that the lecturer was making historical misrepresentations, remained silent.

When Lefkowitz went to the then dean of the college to point out that there was no evidence for some of what the Afrocentrists were teaching Wellesley students, the dean replied that each person has a different but equally valid view of history. When she made the point about Aristotle and the library at Alexandria at a faculty meeting, a colleague said, "I don't care who stole what from whom." Academics are afraid to challenge the misrepresentations of feminists and Afrocentrists. The likely penalty is to be called sexist and racist. Those terms have been flung about so indiscriminately that one would have thought they had lost their power to intimidate, but that is not the case. Worse than that, many professors and students feel that women and blacks, having been oppressed, have a right to their own histories, however false they may be.

schools
-concentrate at teaching self-esteem instead of skills
-e.g. black students taught self-esteem via false history

HISTORY AS A MYTH

The damage done by Afrocentric myths includes increased racial resentment. In order to make their claims—Socrates and Cleopatra were black, Greek philosophy was pilfered from the blacks of Egypt—even minimally plausible, it is necessary for the Afrocentrists to explain why the supposed debt of Greece, and hence of Western civilization, to the blacks of ancient Egypt is not widely known. The answer they offer is that whites not only stole their civilization from Egypt but have engaged in a massive cover-up ever since to maintain white supremacy. Blacks who believe that are naturally hostile to whites.

One reason Afrocentrists are not challenged is that race is becoming a subject it is almost impossible to discuss honestly in public. Professor Lefkowitz has been praised for her courage in calling the myths of Afrocentrism what they are. She has shown courage, given today's racial climate, although it should not require bravery to point out what amounts to scholarly fraud. But intimidation on matters of race is everywhere. A finalist for the presidency of Michigan State University was forced to withdraw his candidacy because four years earlier he had said: "As blacks begin to get into sports, their natural athletic abilities come through. They have actually done research on an average black athlete versus an average white athlete in basketball, where a black athlete can actually outjump a white athlete on the average." An uproar resulted when those remarks became known at Michigan State. A black graduate student said, for example, "To try to justify racist views as science is preposterous. When other people in sports and entertainment have come up with those statements, they were axed immediately."²³ Everybody who has paid any attention knows that black athletes dominate most sports, not just basketball. That it is impossible to say so without endangering your career is preposterous.

At the University of Pennsylvania, a professor trying to elicit discussion about the Thirteenth Amendment's prohibition of "involuntary servitude" referred to blacks as "ex-slaves" and said that as a Jew he was an ex-slave of Pharaoh. Several days later, when three black students complained, the professor apologized to them. Three months later, the Black Student League demanded his resignation, and the professor issued a public apology, to no avail. The university administration suspended him for two semesters and required him to attend sensitivity training sessions.²⁴

Afrocentrist version of history

RACE is difficult to be discussed in public

In a faculty sensitivity session at the University of Cincinnati a woman was forced to stand up and be mocked as "a member of the privileged white elite" because she was blonde, blue-eyed, and well educated. The trainer implied that her three degrees from prestigious private schools were not really earned but were a genetic entitlement. When the trainer later ordered her to stand up again, presumably to be abused once more, she could only sit and sob. Not one of her one hundred colleagues who were present came to her defense.²⁵ This episode illustrates two things. Sensitivity sessions often turn into verbal assaults on representatives of a group deemed to dominate; here, whites. The more significant aspect of this episode, however, is that the woman did not respond with anger to an utterly unfair attack and that her faculty colleagues sat silent and allowed the attack to go on. We have become a submissive people, which is particularly true of whites where race is an issue.

Amity Schlaes, an editorial writer for the *Wall Street Journal*, wrote an article in the *Spectator* in January 1994, describing the white middle class' fear of blacks after Colin Ferguson murdered six whites on a Long Island commuter train, and after a jury in Brooklyn acquitted a young black despite powerful evidence that he had murdered a white. She wrote that whites were frightened because Ferguson's "manic hostility to whites is shared by many of the city's non madmen."²⁶ When copies of the article were circulated among Schlaes' colleagues at the *Journal*, she became an outcast. A number of her co-workers would get out of the elevator when she got on. People who had eaten with her in the staff cafeteria refused to sit at the same table. A delegation went to the office of the chairman of the company that owns the *Journal*. It did not matter that Schlaes had pointed out that minorities were the greatest victims of minority crimes or that nobody could show that a single element of her article was untrue or inaccurate. "Her crime," wrote the then editor of *The Spectator*, Dominic Lawson, "was far greater than being merely wrong. She had written the truth, regardless of the offence it might cause. And in modern America, or at least in its mainstream media, that is simply not done."²⁷ Paul Johnson makes the same point in "Gone is the time when Americans led the world in saying what they thought."²⁸

Lawson goes on to account for the popularity of Rush Lim-

baugh and Jackie Mason by suggesting that they have "the role in modern America that underground satirists had in Russia during the late Soviet years. They were popular, and even loved, because they were the only people who could publicly demonstrate the absurdity of the official media dogma — the bogus brotherhood of man, promulgated in the USSR by *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, and in the USA by the likes of the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*."²⁹ He came to realize why the American media are so neurotic, "why they are quite so slavish to the humourless ethos of political correctness. They realise that their own country is in fact riven by social divides along racial and religious lines. But no amount of silence on the matter will make the differences disappear."³⁰

It is ironic that racism and sexism have been discovered to be the deep, almost ineradicable, sicknesses of this culture at precisely the time when they have been successfully overcome. If they have not entirely disappeared, they are mere wisps of their former selves, except when it comes to white, heterosexual males. That discrimination is now so acceptable that it applies not only to matters like college admissions, hiring and promotion in government and in companies, but even to the design of the curriculum. The best known instance occurred at Stanford. The university had a very popular required course in Western culture. The idea was that students should have at least a nodding acquaintance with the minds and works that have shaped the West and that constitute our heritage. But radicals and minorities objected both because Western culture should not be celebrated, being racist, sexist, violent, imperialistic, and not at all like those wonderful Third World cultures, and because the authors that were assigned—Aristotle, Machiavelli, Rousseau, Locke, Shakespeare—were all white males. The culmination of the campaign consisted of a conga line snaking across campus, led by Jesse Jackson, the protesters chanting, "Hey, hey, ho, ho, Western culture's gotta go." And go it did. Universities routinely collapse when hit from that end of the cul-

discrimination
acceptable
only x
white, heterosex.
men.

²⁹Some of what is happening is merely funny, or maybe it is pathetic. A few years ago some students at a major university gave a 1950s nostalgia party, using the music and dress of that decade. The next day the dean in charge of sensitivity delivered a reprimand, because the 1950s were not a good time for minorities.

What

tural and political spectrum. Stanford revised the course, eliminating some of the white male authors and replacing them with women and writers "of color," some of them bitterly hostile to Western civilization. This is a quota system for the curriculum. In capitulating, Stanford acquiesced in the claim that Western culture is at least highly suspect and that its great works are little more than justifications of white male dominance.

The problem is by no means confined to the universities. It is now rampant, for example, in the world of art. The *New York Times* carried an article asking "Is 'Quality' An Idea Whose Time Has Gone?" The story reports that the idea of quality has become a lightning rod for a stormy debate about Western values vs. non-Western values, men vs. women, and, of course, race. The division is also political, with those on the right generally embracing the word, those on the left generally deploring it. The word "quality" is denounced as racist, and those who reject the word in universities as well as in the art world, in the words of the article, "often exhibit an alarming readiness to set up a bogeyman called the heterosexual white male, make him the scapegoat for everything bad in human history, and try to discredit the word quality—and with it all of Western civilization—by identifying it with him alone."¹

Getting ourselves out of this modern liberal swamp of discrimination will not be easy. The Supreme Court seems inclined to waffle on the issue.¹ Getting rid of affirmative action by democratic means may not be easy either. Though majorities of Americans of all races disapprove of this discrimination, the modern liberal elites will fight to retain it, and they have an impact on public policy out of proportion to their numbers.

Yet it is crucial that we do end this misbegotten policy. The objection to our current treatment of race is not only that it has made honest discussion virtually impossible, though it has. Nor is

¹The Supreme Court ruled against a federal set aside program but only by a five-to-four vote, *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995), and some members of the majority are shaky on the question. Seven of the Justices, moreover, say that racial preferences may be used to remedy past discrimination, which merely means that the existence of past discrimination, perhaps only numerical imbalance, will be the new focus of litigation. We have already seen that past discrimination involving different people is no justification for present discrimination.

What about Roberts & his position on AA

it simply that it is unfair to individuals, though it is. Nor that it will destroy incentives, though it will. Nor that it will make America less competitive precisely at the time when it needs to be more competitive. Nor even perhaps that it is intensifying racial hostility. The most basic objection is that it is destroying what America means, changing us from a society whose rewards may be achieved by individual merit to one whose rewards are handed out according to group identity.

SOLUTION