

Introduction

I am the poor white, fooled and pushed apart,
I am the Negro bearing slavery's scars.
I am the red man driven from the land,
I am the immigrant clutching the hope I seek—
And finding only the same old stupid plan.
Of dog eat dog, of mighty crush the weak . . .
O, let America be America again—
The land that has never been yet—
And yet must be—the land where every man is free.
The land that's mine—the poor man's, Indian's, Negro's

ME—

Who made America,
Whose sweat and blood, whose faith and pain,
Whose hand at the foundry, whose plow in the rain,
Must bring back our mighty dream again.

—LANGSTON HUGHES, "LET AMERICA BE AMERICA AGAIN"

Langston Hughes's poem "Let America Be America Again" (1938) bridges the gap between the American dreams proclaimed in Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* and the *Declaration of Independence* and the American nightmares of James Baldwin's *The Fire Next Time*. Baldwin himself speaks to this gap when he says, in 1960, "This country is yet to be discovered in any real sense." Writing in the midst of the civil rights movement, he is pondering the responsibility of the writer to lay bear the myths that shroud the often oppressive, racialized character of American national identity. Baldwin elaborates as follows: "There is an illusion about America to which we are clinging which has nothing to do with the lives we lead . . . this collision between one's image of oneself and what one actually is is

always very painful and there are two things you can do about it, you can meet the collision head-on and try to become what you really are or you can retreat and try to remain what you thought you were, which is a fantasy, in which you will certainly perish.”¹ The character of American myths has surely changed since 1960, in no small part because of activists in the civil rights movement and visionary thinkers like Baldwin. These brave souls dared to instruct people about how, when they consider the racial history of the United States, the American dream has too often been, in Baldwin’s words, “something much more closely resembling a nightmare, on the private, domestic, and international levels.”²

In this critical spirit, we propose in this book to revisit the debasing role of “race” and racism in the development of American political thought and national identity and in constructions and transformations of what it has meant to be an American.³ As we will explain later, we regard the terms *America* and *American* as somewhat dubious since the Americas span the Western Hemisphere, and the nation-state that encompasses our inquiries is the United States of America. Yet *America* and *American* remain symbolically and ideologically potent self-designations for the United States of America and its citizens. Thus, we still see the same need that Baldwin sees to confront two contending Americas: the mythical America of the Founders’ rhetoric, which proclaims freedom and justice for all, regardless of race, sex, religion, or national origins, and the historical nation-state, haunted by its legacy as an exclusionary, white, *herrenvolk* republic.⁴ In short, for much of U.S. history the country’s liberal and democratic ideals, along with full-fledged American identity and citizenship, have been reserved for those who were racially defined as white and also for those who were Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, male, propertied, and sexually “up-right.” Yet the crux of the matter lies deeper than this formulation suggests: white supremacy and racialized slavery arguably were the ground upon which the American ideals and practices of civic freedom and equality were established.

As Edmund Morgan has shown persuasively, it was no coincidence that American freedom—particularly the rise of revolutionary republicanism and white male democracy in the 1820s and 1830s—emerged in tandem with racialized and racist slavery.⁵ Tellingly, the democratic republican ideals of freedom and equality were celebrated more boldly by republican com-

mentators in the United States than by English ones and within the United States by members of the southern planter elite—for instance, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison—more than by northern elites—such as John Adams and Alexander Hamilton. The rather unique (at the time) Virginian (and American) love of freedom and equality caught the attention of Sir Augustus John Foster, the English diplomat who served in Washington during Jefferson’s presidency. Foster observed that the Virginians “can profess an unbounded love of liberty and democracy in consequence of the mass of the people, who in other countries might become mobs” but who in the United States “nearly altogether composed their own slaves.”⁶ Morgan comments, “Aristocrats could more safely preach equality in a slave society than in a free one. Slaves did not become leveling mobs, because their owners would see to it that they had no chance to.” The Virginian elites could celebrate republican ideals more boldly than the English and New England republicans “partly because they had solved the problem [that the poor posed to democratic republican ideals]: they had achieved a society in which most of the poor were enslaved.”⁷ He notes further that in republican thought poverty “was as much a threat to liberty as the ambition of monarchs and of over-rich landlords.”⁸ Morgan’s analysis sheds light on Jefferson’s well-known concern about the threat posed to a virtuous democratic republic by urbanization and the kind of concentration of poor working people in cities that he had witnessed in France (see the essay by Harris and Baum).⁹

In short, as the essays in this collection make clear, it is no coincidence that the United States, which was deeply shaped from its beginnings by racism, led the way among the North Atlantic nation-states in asserting democratic ideals.¹⁰ The relatively early development in the United States of a democratic ethos was closely connected to the *herrenvolk*, white supremacist character of the polity.¹¹ Ever since there has been a profound, ongoing tension in the country’s egalitarian commitments: notably, U.S. egalitarianism has been limited across classes *and* across racialized groups (as well as between men and women) by the investments of the white majority in what W. E. B. Du Bois called the “wages of whiteness.”¹² Thus, the project to achieve the larger promise of democracy in the United States—and of the American dream—is integrally bound up with the stalled effort to overcome fully the legacy of the country’s white racism.

The Racial Politics of American Studies and American Political Thought

Like Baldwin, we see two options in responding to this gap between American myth and reality: the people of the United States can either meet it head-on and strive to make the reality approach the ideal, or retreat to what they thought they were, which was often a perilous fantasy. To envision new ways to close the gap between American ideals and American actuality, we will pursue another closely related but somewhat different contrast: that between the exalted ideals, entangled with racism as they are, of canonical American thinkers and leaders like Jefferson, Lincoln, and Samuel Gompers and the as-yet-unrealized hopes of American race rebels such as the Paiute activist and memoirist Sarah Winnemucca, the African American activist Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and the Filipino writer Carlos Bulosan for an anti-racist, egalitarian republic. While the canonical thinkers are deeply associated with constitutive American ideals—freedom, equality, democracy, a living wage—the race rebels have worked, as Ben Keppel says, to redraw “the boundaries of political possibility” regarding the race-inflected promise of America.¹³

Our approach to this task is rooted in a merging of our respective academic disciplines: political theory and American studies. While American political theory goes back to the seventeenth-century Puritans of New England and to the eighteenth-century founding of the United States (notably, in Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence and *The Federalist Papers* of James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay), the field of American studies was established between the late 1930s and the 1950s. Its founding scholars sought to clarify, describe, and analyze a way of thinking and acting that was unique to the historical experience of the United States—that is, to comprehend the defining features of “American exceptionalism.”¹⁴ They focused on several characteristic images operating in the national culture—chiefly myths and symbols—including the ability of Europeans to start life anew in a new world or virgin land; the relative strength of liberal democratic society in relation to a weak aristocracy; a personality type called the American Adam, characterized by extravagant optimism, individualism, and innocence; and especially the Western frontier, which promised escape from the corruptions of the Old World and the renewal of American values. These themes were assumed to relate more or less uniformly to all citizens but to

be expressed with special clarity and profundity by selected elites—for example, novelists like Nathaniel Hawthorne and political leaders like Thomas Jefferson.¹⁵

In this book we engage the field of American studies primarily through the tradition of American political thought. We reconsider this tradition, which has expounded on American identity from its colonial beginnings, in two ways. First, we reread the legacy of canonical, white, and generally racist American political thinkers—George Washington (1732–99), Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826), Abraham Lincoln (1809–65), Theodore Roosevelt (1858–1919), Samuel Gompers (1850–1924), and Margaret Sanger (1879–1966)—along with Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–59), the great French chronicler of Jacksonian America. Their writings and activities put forward noble republican and democratic visions of America and Americans, but at the same time constructed a racially (and often otherwise) exclusionary republic. Tocqueville stands somewhat apart among this group, not only because he was a French visitor to the United States, but also because he critically scrutinized the racialized contradiction in Jacksonian democracy.

With regard to the tribunes of the white republic, our intent is not to simply dismiss their contributions—such as Jefferson’s declaration that “all men are created equal,” Gompers’s call “to secure a larger share of the [national] income” for workers, Roosevelt’s “New Nationalism,” or Sanger’s advocacy of women’s liberation.¹⁶ Rather, we wish to show how their beneficial ideas can be realized only by racially rewriting the republic—that is, by fully dismantling its racially exclusionary character. With this goal in mind, we are committed to exposing the false neutrality of a racially white America that their theories presume and to making visible the various ways in which exclusionary racialized power has been deployed in the construction of American identity, freedom, and citizenship.

Second, we look to a set of race rebels who improvised audaciously on the salutary parts of the American dream while vigorously contesting its oppressive manifestations.¹⁷ Our rebels range from the well-known African American writer-activists W. E. B. Du Bois (1868–1963) and James Baldwin (1924–87) to several important but lesser-known figures: the Mexican Texan Juan Nepomuceno Cortina (1824–92), who led an armed resistance to Anglo racism against Mexican Texans; Sarah Winnemucca (c. 1844–91), a memoirist and daughter of Chief Winnemucca of the Northern Paiutes, a tribe of Nevada and California; Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1862–1931), who

crusaded against lynching and for women's rights; the Filipino American poet and migrant worker Carlos Bulosan (1911–56); and the playwright Lorraine Hansberry (1930–65). As race rebels, these thinkers struggled for social justice from perspectives that were explicitly informed by their own subordinated, racialized identities. And yet, their visions of a good society—their not-yet-visible republic—are, in Martin Luther King Jr.'s famous phrase, “deeply rooted in the American dream.”

In this task, the essays in this collection build upon the recent flourishing of critical race scholarship to reexamine the racial transformations in American identity from the founding of the republic up to 1965.¹⁸ We have chosen this time period because the 1770s mark a pivotal moment in the racial writing of the American republic and because U.S. racial formations have changed significantly—i.e., have been substantially rewritten—after 1965, the culmination of the civil rights movement, the so-called second reconstruction that followed the epochal events of 1963: the assassination of the civil rights leader Medgar Evers; the March on Washington, featuring Martin Luther King's “I Have a Dream” speech; the publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*; and the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.¹⁹ The great victories of the civil rights movement, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, ushered in a new era; equally important was the Immigration Law of 1965, which produced major demographic changes in the United States, opening the country to new immigrants from Mexico and Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe.

The post-1965 period was marked by the rise of the Black Power movement and related radical insurgencies—the Black Panthers, the American Indian movement (AIM), the Chicano movement, the second wave of the women's movement, and the Revolutionary People's Constitutional Convention. Through these movements members of subordinated groups asserted vigorously their claims to dignity, nationhood, freedom, and power. Yet the past forty years have also been deeply shaped by a white backlash to the civil rights initiatives of the sixties.²⁰ Our contention is not that the country's ethnic and racialized hierarchies have been magically dismantled in this era. Instead, we maintain that these hierarchies are still alive, though in altered form, and that understanding the racial writing of the republic between the 1770s and 1965 is crucial to tackling current racial challenges in the United States.²¹

As scholars of political theory and American studies, we are responding to the traditional ways in which American political thought and American culture have been framed. The essays that follow focus on representative U.S. public intellectuals from different racialized groups—Founding Fathers and other influential figures, racists and race rebels—who helped constitute and transform the racial character of the country at key junctures.²² Typically, figures like Jefferson, Washington, Roosevelt, Lincoln, and Gompers have been whitewashed in texts and monographs on American political thought.²³ That is, the political thought of, say, Jefferson, Roosevelt, and Gompers commonly is presented in such a way that readers encounter samples of their more seemingly inclusive, republican, and humanistic speeches but find little evidence of the racist and nativist elements of their thinking and activism.²⁴ Meanwhile, many important writer-activists from subaltern racialized groups—including Cortina, Winnemucca, Wells-Barnett, and Bulosan—have generally been excluded from the canon of American political thought. Moreover, while thinkers like Du Bois and Baldwin are sometimes included in the canon of American political thought (along with Frederick Douglass and King), they are frequently considered in narrow ways: for example, Du Bois is sometimes presented primarily as the more militant counterpoint to Booker T. Washington’s accommodationism and Baldwin as the literary voice of the civil rights movement.²⁵

Such selectivity in the construction of a canon of American political thought is perhaps defensible insofar as this tradition of thought is construed expressly in terms of systematic theories of government, constitutionalism, democracy, political economy, and abstract citizenship. Yet, when we shift our angle of vision to reconsider American political thought in terms of racial writings and rewritings of the republic, we must rethink the existing canon and reread established, canonical thinkers in new ways. This calls upon readers to confront how canonical thinkers often articulated ennobling ideals within racist frames. In addition, we need to look outside the established canon for race rebels who have perceptively reworked ideals of freedom, equality, dignity, race, republic, and nationality to envision an antiracist America—or, as Hughes says, to “let America be America again—The land that has never been yet—And yet must be.”

Of course, we cannot avoid being selective in our choice of representative figures; and we are aware of the problems involved in putting forward any group of thinkers, no matter how seemingly diverse, as truly representative

of the diverse but intertwined racialized struggles for justice in the United States. Therefore, we make no claims about offering a definitive account of racial formations in the United States between the 1770s and 1965. Our aims are more modest. First, we believe there is much to be learned about the racialized and often contradictory character of American political ideals and American nationalism by focusing on the ideas of influential public intellectuals.²⁶ Second, while any choice of presumed representative public intellectuals is bound to be selective, we are convinced that our selections enable us to tell important stories about the racial writing and rewriting of the republic.

Furthermore, we are well aware that there is much more to say about each of the individuals and each of the eras that this book examines. For instance, some of the rebels whom we discuss have notable limitations of their own that these essays only begin to address. These limitations range from Baldwin's nearly exclusive focus on the black/white divide to the failures of other rebels to incorporate adequately social justice struggles concerning gender, class, and sexuality into their emancipatory visions. In this regard, we recognize that all individuals hold "multiple social locations." That is, all people simultaneously have racialized, gendered, class, national, and sexual identities, each of which informs or shapes the other aspects of their social identities.²⁷ Hansberry, for example, was a black, middle-class lesbian, straddling positions of subordination and privilege at the same time. Jefferson and Washington, by contrast, were white, male members of the landed gentry and thus were persons of privilege in a quite all-encompassing way.

Several of the essays that follow highlight such intersections of race, class, gender, and sexuality in the construction of American nationality: the essay by John Kuo Wei Tchen, on Washington, addresses the entwinement of race, class, and gender in American orientalism toward China; the essays on Jefferson and Sally Hemings and on Wells-Barnett highlight issues of race, gender, and sexuality; the interplay of race and class is featured in the essays on Tocqueville, Gompers, Du Bois, Baldwin, Sanger, and Bulosan, while those on Sanger and Bulosan also address notions of sexuality; and the essays on Washington, Cortina, Roosevelt, and Bulosan foreground the role of visions of masculinity in American racialized nationalism. The essays on Washington, Roosevelt, and Hansberry also begin to consider the interplay of global racial politics and U.S. domestic racial politics. Inevita-

bly, each essay highlights some aspects of the identities, ideas, and struggles of its subject (or subjects) at the expense of others. Here we invite further critical investigation, dialogue, and debate to complement our work.

Finally, we have made a conscious effort in this book to go beyond the narrow black/white model of reading the racialization of America. The way we have done so will surely not satisfy everyone—not least because scholars disagree about the extent to which the black/white divide has overriding significance for understanding the racialized politics of the United States.²⁸ We maintain that from the start, given the virtually concurrent English colonial projects of conquering the indigenous peoples of North America and enslaving Africans, the racialized hierarchies in colonial America and the United States have been more complex than a simple binary opposition between one dominant group (whites) and one subordinate group (blacks). Accordingly, we have tried to address not only the changing places of blacks and whites in American racialized hierarchies, but also (at least tentatively) the respective and changing places of Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinos.²⁹ We recognize, moreover, that racialized minority groups in the United States have suffered from the ideology of white supremacy to different degrees and in distinct ways.³⁰

Still, we believe that in light of how African Americans have been uniquely oppressed by slavery and Jim Crow segregation from the colonial era through 1965—not to mention similar patterns since then—there are good reasons to foreground the black/white relationship to some extent while insisting that it does not exhaust the racialization of American identity. As Patricia Williams says, “The violently patrolled historical boundary between black and white in America is so powerful that every immigrant group since slavery has found itself assimilated as one or the other, despite the enormous ethnic and global diversity we Americans actually represent.”³¹

Racial Writings and Antiracist Rewritings of the American Republic

To establish a clearer sense of the history to which this book responds, we want to offer a brief sketch of key markers in the racial and antiracist writings and rewritings of America. We understand the racial writing of the republic in terms of the compound of racially coded laws, political and scientific theories, public speeches and declarations, literary works, and public

performances that have given a racialized—largely white supremacist—cast to such guiding political conceptions as American, citizenship, freedom, equality, republic, civic virtue, and democracy. Even the terms *America* and *American* are problematic in this regard. Following the voyages of Christopher Columbus and Amerigo Vespucci, these terms not only assigned new names to peoples and places that already had names and identities, but also the United States of America is just one part of the Americas. For our purposes, however, it is appropriate—if somewhat regrettable—that we retain *America* and *American* to designate the United States of America and its citizens precisely because of the role of these particular identities in the racialized history of American Manifest Destiny.³²

The race problems of the Americas can be traced back generally to Columbus's brutal encounter with the Arawak people of the Bahamas (1493–1502), to Hernando Cortés's equally deadly conquest of the Aztecs of Mexico (1519–21), and to Francisco Pizarro's conquest of the Incas of Peru (1531–35).³³ Racial domination became a central part of American colonial development with the founding of English colonies in Jamestown and New England in the early seventeenth century and with the sale of the first African slaves in Virginia in 1619. Jamestown was established within a so-called Indian confederacy, headed by the chief Powhatan, and eventually the English exterminated Powhatan's people to solidify their own American presence.³⁴ In the Puritans' Massachusetts Bay Colony, Governor John Winthrop set out a communal vision of "Christian charity," in 1630 that set the tone for much of the subsequent racial writing of America: "Wee must delight in eache other, make others Conditions our owne reioyce together, mourne together, labour and suffer together . . . the Lord will be our God and delight to dwell among vs, as his owne people . . . that men shall say of succeeding plantacions: the lord make it like the New England; for wee must Consider that wee shall be as a City vpon a Hill, the Eies of all people are vpon us."³⁵ In this spirit, the Puritans justified the taking of Indian land by declaring it legally empty. As Howard Zinn explains, Winthrop maintained that the Indians "had not 'subdued' the land, and therefore had only a 'natural' right to it, but not a 'civil right.' A 'natural right' did not have legal standing."³⁶

This pattern of American thought and action led to King Philip's War in 1675–76. This deadly war pitted New England Puritans and their Indian allies (mostly Christian converts) against resisting Wampanoag Indians, led

by King Philip, the name the Puritans gave to the Wampanoag chieftain Metacom. In proportion to the size of the population, this was the most fatal war in American history; it nearly decimated the Puritan colonies, and Wampanoag casualties were even greater.³⁷ In this same era, white Anglo-American colonists enacted the first instance of clear-cut statutory racial discrimination, a Virginia law of 1662 that established a fine against “inter-racial fornicators.” Thereafter a Maryland law of 1681 declared marriages of white women to “Negroes” a “disgrace not only to the English butt also many other Christian Nations.”³⁸

Later, in the founding of an independent United States of America, the Declaration of Independence (1776) was silent about slavery and warned of the “merciless Indian savages” even as it asserted, “All men are created equal.”³⁹ The U.S. Constitution (1787) sanctioned slavery with its infamous three-fifths proviso and a stipulation that Congress could not alter its provisions concerning slavery before 1808.⁴⁰ In 1790, Congress limited rights of naturalization and citizenship among immigrants to “free white persons.”⁴¹ In the nineteenth century, struggles over Negro slavery were exemplified by the Supreme Court’s *Dred Scott* decision (1857), in which Chief Justice Roger Taney wrote that Negroes are “so inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect”;⁴² the election in 1860 of the Republican Abraham Lincoln as president; the establishment of the Confederacy (1860–61); the Civil War (1861–65); the deadly New York City Draft Riot of 1863, in which Irish-American Catholics lynched free blacks;⁴³ and Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. The postwar period was marked by the enactment of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution in 1865, 1866, and 1868, respectively, which were basic to the Reconstruction (1865–77); the establishment of the Ku Klux Klan in 1866; and the Supreme Court’s assertion in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) of the “separate but equal” doctrine.⁴⁴ *Plessy* upheld the new Jim Crow system of black/white segregation.

Between the 1820s and 1840s, white Americans also enacted other components of their *herrenvolk* republic. For instance, President Andrew Jackson spoke in his first presidential address to Congress as the democratic tribune of the people and, in the same breath, outlined his policy for moving eastern Native Americans west of the Mississippi. In *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832), the Supreme Court declared the Cherokees of Georgia (and by extension every Native American tribe) a “domestic dependent” nation,

related to the U.S. government like “a ward to his guardian.”⁴⁵ The physician and craniologist Samuel George Morton launched an “American school” of white supremacist “race science” in 1839 with his book *Crania Americana*.⁴⁶ In the 1840s, white nationalists stated the idea of an American Manifest Destiny.⁴⁷ This notion culminated in the U.S. government’s annexation of the Mexican territories in the Mexican–America War of 1846–48, the near annihilation of the Plains Indians between 1865 and 1890—capped by the General Allotment (Dawes) Act of 1887 and the massacre at Wounded Knee in December 1890 of more than two hundred Lakota Sioux by the U.S. Seventh Cavalry—and the Spanish–Cuban–American War of 1897, which established the United States as an imperialist power.⁴⁸

The 1840s also saw the rise of a racial Anglo-Saxonism in response to a wave of Irish immigrants. This movement eventually produced a new hierarchy among supposedly distinct white races. Anglo-Saxon elites now held that some supposed white European peoples—Celts, Slavs, Hebrews, Iberians, and Mediterraneans—were unfit for self-government.⁴⁹ The same racial logic later materialized in a eugenics-influenced Nordic supremacism in reaction to a new wave of immigrants—mostly from southern and eastern Europe—between 1880 and 1910. It yielded the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924, which sharply restricted immigration by those deemed members of the unsuitable “European races.” The Immigration Act of 1924 also completed “Asiatic” exclusion, including statutory exclusion of Japanese persons, and made all the peoples of the Far East ineligible for U.S. citizenship.⁵⁰

The color lines of the United States between the 1870s and 1963 included a wide array of additional elements, both exclusionary and expansive. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 suspended all Chinese immigration for ten years and forbade the naturalization of Chinese persons already in the United States.⁵¹ In a related series of crucial court cases, from *In re Ah Yup* (1878) to *United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind* (1923), U.S. courts adjudicated claims to naturalization rights by a number of non-Europeans in light of the standing restriction of these rights to “free white persons.”⁵² Finally, the first sixty-five years of the twentieth century witnessed the following notable developments in the country’s racial order, among others: the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1909 and of the Society of American Indians in 1911; D. W. Griffith’s cinematic ode to a Klan-ish America, *Birth of a Nation*, in 1915; the Nineteenth

Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (1920), which prohibited restrictions of suffrage on the basis of sex but did not address obstacles faced by black and Native American women and men; the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924, which established citizenship for Native Americans but without fully securing their voting rights;⁵³ the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which sought, with only partial success, to promote tribal self-government and economic development; the establishment by white property owners' associations of thousands of racially restrictive covenants (sometimes called Caucasian Codes) between the 1910s and 1940s—the era of the “great migration” of millions of African Americans from the South to northern cities;⁵⁴ a threatened mass march on Washington by African Americans in 1941, organized by A. Philip Randolph, which pushed President Roosevelt to integrate the war industries; the wartime internment, in 1942, of more than 110,000 Japanese Americans in relocation centers; a series of lawsuits by the NAACP, between the 1930s and 1950s, which led to the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in 1954, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, to overturn the old “separate but equal” doctrine; the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952, which *finally* established that the right of persons to become U.S. citizens “shall not be denied or abridged on the basis of race”;⁵⁵ and the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.

Many other acts of resistance to American racism between the 1770s and 1965 gestured toward a nonracist, inclusive America. Among these were the suppressed slave uprising led by “General” Gabriel in Richmond, Virginia, in 1800; Nat Turner's rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia, in 1831, and other slave rebellions; the Seneca Falls Convention for women's rights in 1848, which joined Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Frederick Douglass, among others, to declare that “all men and women are created equal”; Harriet Tubman's work on the Underground Railroad from slavery to freedom; the Colored National Conventions of 1848 and 1853; Sojourner Truth's speech at the Fourth National Women's Rights Convention, in New York, in 1853; John Brown's raid on the federal arsenal at Harper's Ferry in 1859; the “trail of tears” march of Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce in 1877; the Ghost Dance of the Lakota Sioux at Wounded Knee in 1890; fleeting efforts at “interracial unity” among late nineteenth-century Populists and the Knights of Labor; and the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s and 1930s.

Along the way, there has been a wide array of rebellious rewritings of America. Many of these efforts have remained submerged—an invisible

republic—for most of this history.⁵⁶ Although our present focus is on political thought more narrowly construed, the range of significant texts here includes Native American speeches, stories, and testimonies; slave narratives; David Walker's *An Appeal in Four Articles* (1829); William Lloyd Garrison's launching of the abolitionist newspaper *The Liberator* in 1831; the writings of Martin R. Delaney, Alexander Crummell, Douglass, Wells-Barnett, Anna Julia Cooper, and Du Bois; the anti-imperialist autobiographical sketches of the Yankton Sioux writer and reformer Gertrude Bonnin for the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1900, published under her Lakota name, Zitkala-Sa ("Red Bird"); the poetry of Langston Hughes; the novels and essays of Zora Neal Hurston, Richard Wright, and Ralph Ellison; Billie Holiday's powerful rendition in 1939 of the Jewish schoolteacher Abel Meeropol's antilynching song "Strange Fruit"; the contralto Marion Anderson's performance of "America" and "Nobody Knows the Trouble I've Seen" at the Lincoln Memorial in April 1939; Woody Guthrie's song "This Land Is Your Land," his answer to Irving Berlin's "God Bless America"; the mid-twentieth-century antiracist books of Carey McWilliams, including *Brothers Under the Skin* (1943), *Prejudice: Japanese-Americans* (1944), *A Mask for Privilege* (1948), and *North from Mexico* (1950); the Civil Rights anthem "We Shall Overcome"; the jazz drummer Max Roach's album *Freedom Now Suite* (1960); Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail" and "I Have a Dream" speech; and Bob Dylan's anthems of 1962–63, such as "Blowin' in the Wind" and "Only a Pawn in Their Game" (originally, "The Ballad of Medgar Evers").

As we were finishing this book, Barack Obama, a black man (or "mixed-race" person generally regarded as black), son of a white mother from Kansas and a black father from Kenya, was elected the forty-fourth president of the United States by a commanding margin (52.7 percent to 46 percent of the popular vote; 365 electoral votes to 173). This outcome quickly led many people to declare that the United States had overcome its racist past. The *New York Times* reported, "Barack Hussein Obama was elected the 44th president of the United States on Tuesday, sweeping away the last racial barrier in American politics with ease as the country chose him as its first black chief executive." When his victory was declared on election night, President-elect Obama himself remarked, "If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible, who still

wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time, who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer.”⁵⁷ Obama’s victory undoubtedly is a historic moment in the racial writing and rewriting of the American republic. Yet the essays that follow indicate a need for circumspection regarding the deep and persisting legacy of U.S. racism and systemic racial inequalities.⁵⁸

Essays and Topics

In speaking to this history, the essays that follow pursue an interdisciplinary approach to the racial writing and rewriting of America. The contributors draw creatively from the fields of U.S. history, American studies, political theory, critical race theory, and gender studies. John Kuo Wei Tchen brings to light the little-discussed role of early American orientalism with respect to Chinese people, things, and ideas in the construction of American national identity. Tchen focuses on the “patrician orientalism” of George Washington and other American revolutionaries who regarded rare consumer goods from China as a mark of distinction and cultured sociability. American patrician orientalism was distinctly American in that, on the one hand, it manifested both admiration for and differentiation from China and the Orient, and, on the other hand, it expressed an American mode of class distinctions that, in opposition to European aristocracy, was embedded in a meritocratic individualist ethic of life, liberty, and happiness. Duchess Harris and Bruce Baum reconsider Thomas Jefferson’s legacy through the lens of his sexual relationship with his slave Sally Hemings, with whom he sired children. Harris and Baum pay special attention to the efforts of black-identified Jefferson-Hemings descendants to gain public recognition for having a white president in their family tree.

Laura Janara rereads Alexis de Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America* (1835–40), along with a novel by his traveling companion Gustave de Beaumont, *Marie, or, Slavery in the United States* (1835), to illuminate dimensions of Jacksonian-era America that entrenched enduring racism. Janara dissects Tocqueville’s separation of Anglo-American egalitarianism from American racism by unearthing his portrait of European American desire for equality and hierarchy. In Tocqueville’s account, Janara demonstrates, anxiety over democracy’s flux generates European American yearning for race privilege as a postaristocratic form of psychic and material security. Tocqueville’s

European Americans symbolically fraternalize relations with Native Americans while radically othering Negroes—two distinct psychopolitical dynamics that enable hierarchy amid passion for the idea of equality.

Jerry Thompson addresses the struggles of Mexican Texans against Anglo-American racial nationalism and expansionism into Mexican territory, behind the leadership of Juan Nepomuceno Cortina. In the Cortina War of 1859–60, Cortina led a valiant struggle for racial equality in Texas, becoming a hero to downtrodden Mexicans in Texas. He lost the battle but left an important legacy that is little known in the United States outside of Texas. Catherine Holland takes a novel look at President Abraham Lincoln, avoiding the usual efforts to cast him as either a savior or a cynical demagogue. Holland approaches Lincoln as a statesman who embodies the promise and dangers of the American political tradition. Engaging the legacy of slavery and civil war, she argues, requires deliberate faithfulness to the past to creatively reimagine it.

Cari Carpenter turns to Sarah Winnemucca's revision of America's founding narrative in *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims* (1883). Carpenter finds in Winnemucca's narrative both an alternative origin story of the United States and a direct challenge to the myth of the vanishing Indian. Winnemucca retells her grandfather's Paiute origin story to give a challenging multigenerational narrative of America. She reinterprets race in America so that *white*, *civilized*, and *citizens* come to signify savagery and broken promises. At the same time, she uses familial rhetoric from her grandfather's story to critique white Americans'—and the U.S. government's—failure to honor kinship responsibilities to the Paiutes.

Patricia Schechter establishes Ida B. Wells-Barnett's place in the intellectual and activist ferment of progressive era America through a reading of her personal narrative, *Crusade for Justice* (1930). Schechter argues that Wells-Barnett's social commitments and sense of self took profound inspiration from religious faith and gave rise to a “visionary pragmatism” that sustained a lifetime of agitation for social justice. Wells-Barnett's visionary pragmatism links the prophetic traditions of African American religion, the intellectual flowering of turn-of-the-century America, and black women's particular legacy of creative resistance under slavery.

Gwendolyn Mink examines the rise of a “republic of white labor” in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth. Focusing on Samuel Gompers,

a founder of the American Federation of Labor (AFL), Mink explores the white-dominated labor movement's racist response to intensifying class-based inequalities and white workers' insecurities. Confronted by new immigrants and new and ongoing racialized divisions, organized labor pursued the claims of labor in racially exclusionary ways, epitomized by the AFL's efforts to bring about the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Thus, Gompers's aim of securing for workers a greater share of the national product was largely an endeavor to create a republic for respectable white workers.

Gary Gerstle considers how Theodore Roosevelt—historian, soldier, rancher, governor, president, and explorer—embodies the contradictions of American nationalism. Roosevelt's ideas and actions epitomize the clash between a civic creed that promises to all Americans the same rights regardless of race, religion, or sex and a racialized Americanism by which white male elites have defined an exclusionary and imperialistic nation informed by notions of racial superiority. Gerstle traces Roosevelt's self-divided and masculinist vision through his epic work *The Winning of the West* (1889–96), his racist ideas about Native Americans, black Americans, Cubans, and Filipinos, his exploits with the Rough Riders, and his New Nationalism program.

Dorothy Roberts examines Margaret Sanger's writings to confront the racial origins of the birth control movement of the early twentieth century in the United States. Roberts explains that feminist ideas about voluntary motherhood were closely connected to and soon superseded in the birth control movement by purportedly gender-neutral goals of family planning and population control. Sanger personifies the birth control movement's mixed legacy: it was meant to liberate women from compulsory childbearing; yet it was seen by many of its white proponents, through a racist and eugenic lens, as a means to control the reproduction of putative inferior races and classes and thus to control the reproduction of certain classes of women.

Joel Olson tackles W. E. B. Du Bois's political theory of race. Olson explains that Du Bois, who is best known for *The Souls of Black Folks* (1909) and his work with the NAACP, developed one of the most systematic political and sociological analyses of the race concept in the history of American social and political thought in the 1930s and 1940s. Olson examines Du Bois's theory of race and of the "public and psychological wages" of

whiteness with particular emphasis on his later writings, such as *Black Reconstruction* (1935), *Dusk of Dawn* (1940), and *The World and Africa* (1947).

Allan Punzalan Isaac considers Filipino America identity through the autobiographical novel of Carlos Bulosan, who arrived in the United States in 1930. Bulosan's *America Is in the Heart* (1946) is deeply informed by American imperialism in the Philippines and the construction of the Filipino in the United States as shifting between citizen and alien from the Spanish-American War (1898) to the end of the Second World War and Philippine independence (1946). *America Is in the Heart* considers, through the life of a Filipino migrant worker in the United States, racism and racial and working-class consciousness and the idea of America as a democracy. Bulosan articulates a vision of Filipino nationalist consciousness that counters then-prevailing notions of ethnic assimilationism as well as a critique of U.S. colonialism, class exploitation, and racist violence.

Ben Keppel continues the analysis of mid-twentieth-century America by exploring Lorraine Hansberry's effort to broaden and deepen the American discourse on race during the late 1950s and early 1960s. Keppel explains how, in the wake of the fall of Joseph McCarthy, Hansberry sought to link the American civil rights movement to campaigns in the developing world to replace European colonialism with autonomous nationhood. Her strategy challenged the more visible public approach taken by Ellison and King, both of whom pressed their protests in terms of symbols of Americanism.

Bruce Baum engages James Baldwin's effort in the 1950s and early 1960s to envision an inclusive, nonracist, egalitarian America. Baum focuses on how Baldwin struggles with his own conflicted American identity to frame the central challenge that arises out of the competing visions of American life: that for the U.S. nation-state to approach the promise of an egalitarian America, its people, especially those who have learned to define themselves as white, must squarely confront their feigned innocence concerning the brutal legacy of American racism.

In the afterword George Lipsitz reflects on the historical struggles tracked in this volume in light of the changes in U.S. racial politics in the aftermath of the civil rights movement. Writing fifty-three years after the Supreme Court's epochal decision in 1954 in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which declared legally sanctioned school segregation unconstitutional, Lipsitz finds a decidedly mixed record. While much has changed, people who are not white—particularly African Americans, Native Americans,

and Latinos—still face manifestly unequal life chances.⁵⁹ Among the most notable features of racial politics in the United States since the mid-1960s have been myriad deliberate, collective efforts by white Americans to “get around *Brown*.”⁶⁰ These endeavors, although not seamless or uncontested, effectively have sustained a privileged group position among whites and stalled the progress toward equal justice initiated by the civil rights movement. Consequently, *all* Americans confront an ongoing imperative to right the racial republic.

Notes

Epigraph: Langston Hughes, quoted in Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States, 1492–Present*, revised and updated edition (New York: Harper Perennial, 1995), 395–96.

1. James Baldwin, *Nobody Knows My Name: More Notes of a Native Son* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1961), 126.

2. James Baldwin, *The Fire Next Time* (New York: Vintage Books, [1963] 1993), 89.

3. In the spirit of recent critical race theorizing (see note 18), we place “race” in quotation marks here to indicate that it is a socially and politically constructed category and not a biologically meaningful one. Race ideas remain highly consequential, socially and materially, as a basis for racism and racialized social stratification. Racial categories should be understood in this way throughout this book even though the contributors have generally not placed them in quotes.

4. The sociologist Pierre L. van der Berghe uses the term *herrenvolk democracy* to characterize “regimes like those of the United States and South Africa that are democratic for the master race but tyrannical for the subordinate groups.” See David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, [1991] 1999), 59. Like Roediger, we prefer to speak of the nineteenth-century United States as a *herrenvolk* republic to call attention to the undemocratic relations that prevailed even among the dominant racialized group.

5. Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery–American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975). *Republican* here refers to the tradition of civic republican thought—as in the republicanism of Jefferson and Madison—rather than to the current-day Republican Party.

6. *Ibid.*, 380.

7. *Ibid.*

8. *Ibid.*, 383.

9. Jefferson championed the writings of English republican thinkers who advocated equality among propertied men but excluded the poor and the idle from their republican visions. See *ibid.*, 382.

10. Racism has been a key feature of modern politics in all Western nation-states. In the United States, however, racism has from the start been fundamentally constitutive of the

development of domestic politics. On racism and modern politics more generally, see Charles W. Mills, *The Racial Contract* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Howard Winant, *The World Is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy Since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 2001); George Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

11. Again, there is a larger story to face about the relationship between race, racism, and ideas of equality. As Fredrickson explains, ideas about race and equality emerged in Europe simultaneously and in mutual interaction with each other during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. See Fredrickson, *Racism*, 11–12.

12. Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*, 12.

13. Ben Keppel, *The Work of Democracy: Ralph Bunche, Kenneth B. Clark, Lorraine Hansberry, and the Cultural Politics of Race* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 8.

14. Mark Hulsether, “Evolving Approaches to U.S. Culture in the American Studies Movement: Consensus, Pluralism, and Contestation for Cultural Hegemony,” *Canadian Review of American Studies* 23, no. 2 (1993): 1–55.

15. *Ibid.*

16. Jefferson, Declaration of Independence (1776), in *Free Government in the Making: Readings in American Political Thought*, 3d ed., ed. Alpheus Thomas Mason (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 131; Samuel Gompers, *The American Labor Movement, Its Makeup, Achievements, and Aspirations* (1914), in Mason, *Free Government*, 658; Theodore Roosevelt, “Speech at Osawatomie, Kansas” (1910), in Mason, *Free Government*, 649–52.

17. We owe the term *race rebels* to Robin Kelley. Kelley uses it to highlight the resistance of black working people who have “struggled to maintain and define a sense of racial identity and solidarity” and whose struggles have generally been “relegated to the margins” of more conventional histories. See Robin D. G. Kelley, *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 4–5.

18. Key works of critical “race” studies include Henry Louis Gates Jr., ed., “Race,” *Writing, and Difference, Critical Inquiry* 12 (Autumn 1985); Patricia Williams, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991); Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*; Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, ed., Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas (New York: New Press, 1995); Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996); Mills, *The Racial Contract*; Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998). Our approach to American nationalism is also informed by recent “constructivist” scholarship on nationalism. See esp. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, [1983] 1991); Homi K. Bhabha, ed., *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1999).

19. Howard Winant explains the notion of racial formation, introduced by Michael Omi and himself, as an approach that “looks at race not only as the subject of struggle and

contest at the level of social structure but also as a contested theme at the level of . . . the production of meanings.” *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 40.

20. See Martin Luther King Jr., “Racism and the White Backlash,” in *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).

21. The stark *herrenvolk* republic, exemplified by the domination of Native Americans and Mexicans and enslavement and then Jim Crow segregation and subordination of African Americans, has been dismantled; but it has been replaced by a more subtle racialized hierarchy that still entails white racialized advantage and the subordination and marginalization, in varying ways, of blacks, Native Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans. As Stanford Lyman summarizes the new situation, “In America, the toppling of the outer bastion of the white republic’s institutionalized racism—legislatively established segregation, ‘Jim Crow’ laws, and juridically enforced race discrimination—has made its second line of defense—the walls built against job opportunities and occupational advancement—both more visible and less vulnerable to assault.” Quoted in David Carroll Cochran, *The Color of Freedom: Race and Contemporary American Liberalism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 48.

22. Almost all of the subjects of the essays presented here are public intellectuals who expressed their ideas in part through public speeches and popular journals or in books, articles, novels, and plays that were intended as interventions in the public life of the political community. One partial exception to this is Washington, who, despite his political prominence, is not known for his intellectual contributions.

23. Michael Eric Dyson describes such intellectual whitewashing as “the interpretation of social history through an explanatory framework in which truth functions as an ideological projection of whiteness in the form of a universal identity.” See Dyson, “The Labor of Whiteness, the Whiteness of Labor, and the Perils of Whitewashing,” in *Audacious Democracy: Labor, Intellectuals, and the Social Reconstruction of America*, ed. Steven Fraser and Joshua B. Freeman (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 169. Historical monographs and texts that engage in such whitewashing to a significant degree include the following: Ralph Henry Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (New York: Ronald Press, 1940); Henry Steele Commager, *The American Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950); Mason, ed., *Free Government*; Michael B. Levy, ed., *Political Thought in America: An Anthology*, 2d ed. (Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1988); and Kenneth M. Dolbeare, ed., *American Political Thought*, 3d ed. (Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House, 1996). A valuable corrective to these works is S. T. Joshi, ed., *Documents of American Prejudice: An Anthology on Race from Thomas Jefferson to David Duke* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).

24. Considerations of space in the difficult task of putting together anthologies representative of American political thought are undoubtedly part of the problem, but the problem nonetheless remains. Michael Levy’s presentation of Jefferson’s thought is a good example of this. He includes in his anthology the Declaration of Independence along with several significant letters in which Jefferson elaborates his liberal, republican ideas; but we find little evidence of Jefferson’s tortured struggles over race and citizenship. See Levy, *Political Thought in America*, 81–84, 97–101, 138–40, 156–63. Not surprisingly, his

selections of Lincoln's writings are a bit more complete in this regard (see *ibid.*, 217–31). Consider also Mason's selections from Roosevelt and Gompers: humanistic excerpts from one of Roosevelt's "New Nationalism" speeches of 1910 ("Whenever the alternative must be faced, I am for men and not for property") and from Gompers's statement, *The Labor Movement, Its Makeup, Achievements, and Aspirations* (1914) ("Working people—and I prefer to say working people and to speak of them as really human beings—are prompted by the same desires, the same hopes of a better life as are other people"). See *Free Government*, 652, 656–57.

25. In this vein, Mason includes an excerpt from Baldwin's essay "Letter from a Region of My Mind," in *Free Government* (876–86), along with a selection from Martin Luther King Jr. but offers nothing from Du Bois. Du Bois fares better in the anthologies edited by Levy (see, *Political Thought in America*, 375–85) and Dolbear (see *American Political Thought*, 408–21).

26. See Gary Gerstle's defense of this point in his essay below.

27. The Combahee River Collective, "A Black Feminist Statement," in *But Some of Us Are Brave*, ed. Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith (Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1982); Elizabeth Spelman, *Inessential Woman* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988); and Rose Brewer, "Theorizing Race, Class, Gender: The New Scholarship of Black Feminist Intellectuals and Black Women's Labor," in *Theorizing Black Feminisms*, ed., S. Jones and A. P. A. Busia (New York: Routledge, 1993).

28. Many scholars and popular commentators still focus largely on the black/white divide, often in illuminating ways. See, e.g., Williams, *Alchemy of Race and Rights*; Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*; Orlando Patterson, *The Ordeal of Integration* (Washington: Civitas/Counterpoint, 1997); David K. Shi, *A Country of Strangers: Blacks and Whites in America* (New York: Knopf, 1997).

29. There is more to be said regarding, for example, Pacific Islanders (particularly with respect to ongoing struggles for recognition of indigenous Hawaiians), Arab Americans, and ethnic and even racialized divisions among blacks and among whites.

30. George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), chap. 1; and Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigration and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

31. Patricia Williams, "America, Seen Through the Filter of Race: A Conversation on Race," *New York Times*, sec. 4 (July 2, 2000), 11. See also Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*; and *Toward the Abolition of Whiteness: Essays in Race, Politics, and Working Class History* (London: Verso, 1994); Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004).

32. Michael Rogin, *Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjection of the American Indian* (New York: Knopf, 1975); Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981).

33. Peter N. Carroll and David W. Noble, *The Restless Centuries: A History of the American People* (Minneapolis: Burgess, 1973); Zinn, *People's History*, 1–11.

34. Edmund S. Morgan and Marie Morgan, “Our Shaky Beginnings,” *New York Review of Books* 54 (April 26, 2007).
35. John Winthrop, “A Modell of Christian Charity,” in *Political Thought in America*, 12.
36. Zinn, *People’s History*, 13. The Puritans appealed to the Bible, Psalms 2:8 for justification: “Ask of me, and I shall give thee, the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession” (quoted in Zinn, *People’s History*, 14).
37. Carroll and Noble, *Restless Centuries*, 53; Gordon S. Wood, “The Bloodiest War,” *New York Review of Books* 46 (April 9, 1998): 41–42.
38. George M. Fredrickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 101; Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black: Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969), 79–80.
39. For more on the Declaration, see the essay by Harris and Baum below.
40. The three-fifths proviso established that each slave would count for three-fifths of a person for the purposes of determining the number of representatives from each state to the U.S. House of Representatives.
41. Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 22.
42. Taney, quoted in Bernard Bailyn, Robert Dallek, David Brion Davis, Donald Herbert Donald, John L. Thomas, and Gordon S. Wood, *The Great Republic: A History of the American People* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1992), 1:573.
43. Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*, 148, 150.
44. The Thirteenth Amendment outlawed slavery and involuntary servitude; the Fourteenth declared that no state shall “deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws”; and the Fifteenth declared that the right to vote cannot be abridged because of race. See Bailyn et al., *Great Republic*, 482.
45. Chief Justice John Marshall, quoted in Peter N. Carroll and David W. Noble, *The Free and the Unfree: A New History of the United States* (New York: Penguin, 1977), 172.
46. Among the other influential works of this school were Josiah Nott and George Glidden, *Types of Mankind* (1854), which went through several printings. See William Stanton, *The Leopard’s Spots: Scientific Attitudes Toward Race in America, 1815–59* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).
47. The Jacksonian Democrat John L. O’Sullivan wrote, in 1845, that (white) Americans had a “manifest destiny to overspread and to possess the whole of the Continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty.” Quoted in Carl N. Degler, *Out of Our Past: The Forces that Shaped Modern America*, 3d ed. (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1984), 118.
48. With the Dawes Act, the U.S. government sought to assimilate surviving Native Americans into the national economy by dividing tribal lands into private property allocated to heads of families. See Carroll and Noble, *Restless Centuries*, 352–53; Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle, *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty* (New York: Pantheon, 1984). On Wounded Knee, see Peter Matthiessen, *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse* (New York: Penguin Books, [1983] 1992), 19–20.

49. Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 41–42.
50. Ibid., 82–86; Mae M. Ngai, “The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924,” *Journal of American History* 86 (June 1999): 80–81. The Nordic and nativist sentiments of this era were expressed in such racist polemics as Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race* (1916), and Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy* (1920).
51. Bailyn et al., *Great Republic*, 682.
52. The courts initially used the Caucasian category to interpret the phrase “white person,” but in *Thind* the Supreme Court dismissed the usefulness of that category when it rejected the claim to whiteness of a high-caste Hindu from Punjab, India. See Ian F. Haney-López, *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 2, 223–24.
53. Native Americans were still prohibited from voting in some western states. See Frances Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 2:794.
54. The U.S. Supreme Court sanctioned these covenants between 1926 and 1948. In 1948, the Court finally ruled that such covenants were “unenforceable as law.” See Clement E. Vose, *Caucasians Only: The Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Restrictive Covenant Cases* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), vii–viii.
55. See Ronald Takaki, “Reflections of Racial Patterns in America,” in *From Different Shores: Perspectives on Race and Ethnicity in America*, 2d ed., ed. Ronald Takaki (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 223.
56. The idea of the “invisible republic” comes from Greil Marcus’s account of the alternative America imagined in Harry Smith’s *Anthology of American Folk Music* (1952). Smith’s invisible republic, Marcus says, sought to subvert “what, in the 1950s, was known as . . . Americanism. That meant the consumer society, as advertised on TV; it meant vigilance against all enemies of such a society and a determination never to appear as one.” Smith’s invisible republic was “a mystical body of the republic, a kind of public secret . . . a declaration of a weird but clearly recognizable America within the America of the exercise of institutional majoritarian power.” See Marcus, *Invisible Republic: Bob Dylan’s Basement Tapes* (New York: Henry Holt, 1996), 96, 125.
57. Adam Nagourney, “Obama Elected President as Racial Barrier Falls,” *New York Times* (November 5, 2008), A1.
58. David R. Roediger, “Race Will Survive the Obama Phenomenon,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 55, no. 7 (October 10, 2008) B6–B10.
59. Asian Americans present a complex and internally differentiated grouping—sometimes put forward simplistically as the new “model minority”—whose current positioning demands further specification. See Ronald Takaki, “Race and the End of History,” in *The Good Citizen*, ed. David Batstone and Eduardo Mendieta (New York: Routledge, 2001), 81–92; Vijay Prashad, “How the Hindus Became Jews: American Racism After 9/11,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 104 (Summer 2005): 583–606.
60. The U.S. Supreme Court further whittled down *Brown in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1* (2007). In a 5 to 4 decision, the Court in-

validated programs in Seattle, Washington, and Louisville, Kentucky, that made modest efforts to maintain school-by-school racial diversity. Justice Anthony Kennedy's concurring opinion left some room for school districts to adopt carefully tailored policies to avoid "racial isolation" and "de facto resegregation in schooling." Nonetheless, the decision hobbles efforts to overcome the legacy of racism and racialized inequality in U.S. schools. See Linda Greenhouse, "Justices, 5-4, Limit the Use of Race for School Integration," *New York Times* (June 29, 2007), A1, A20.