I. Race vs. Ethnicity

A. Race = H & B p. 12  Book Definition = “Biological concept that refers the gene frequencies in a population. Races are differentiated by inherited characteristics....” racial categories are often define based on physical appearance.

- Race is not an empirically derived concept; rather it is socially constructed
- There is no genetic basis for mutually exclusive racial categories, simply because features and characteristics are distributed along a continuous distribution.
  - There is more variation within a group than between groups
    75% of all known genes are present in all people
    25% remaining differ in their forms, but all forms are found in all groups.
  - Supported by the results of the Human Genome Project

- There are no A Priori Necessary and Sufficient Criterion for Class Inclusion.
  - There is not a single characteristic or set of characteristics that can be found in all members of one racial group that is not found in any other racial group.
  - Grouping Criteria are Post Hoc. There groups are defined first (based on sociocultural conventions, and classification criteria were selected based on their usefulness in discriminating between the socially constructed categories.

Question: What defines the cutoff between groups?
What % of race you do have to be in order to be considered a member of that race?
- 1870 US Census
  Mulatto = any mix of Caucasian and African blood
- 1890 US Census
  Quadroons = 1/4 african blood (e.g. one grandparent)
  Octoroons = 1/8 african blood (e.g. one great-grandparent)
- 1930 US Census
  If mixed then your race was the same as the non-white parent.
  - The single drop view.

Brazil has between 5 and 30 “racial categories” depending on the area.

B. Racism
Prejudice = making assumptions about an individual based on beliefs (accurate or inaccurate) about a group to which they are perceived to belong.
Discrimination = acting based on ones prejudices.
Racism = using pseudo-scientific explanations of racial superiority to justify discrimination.

C. History of the Race Concept
- Based on Ruth Hubbard- “Race and Sex as Biological Categories” & Robert V. Guthrie- “Even the Rat was White”
  1. Religious Views
    - When missionaries and explorer returned from Africa, they told stories of “Black Soules.”
    - European Christianity believed that the Adam was White, so where did the Black Soules come from.
    - The Bible offers no direct explanation for these phenotypic variations, though some
biblically based explanations were developed. All of these were based on the assumption that Blackness was a curse by god.

a. The Canaanites: Genesis 9:20-9:26. - After the flood, Noah planted a vineyard, drank wine, got drunk, and got naked in his tent. His sons (Ham, Shem, & Japheth) found him. Ham looked at his father’s nakedness, and the other sons turned their heads and covered him up. Ham was punished for his disrespect. Noah cursed Ham’s son, Canaan, and Canaan’s descendants and decreed that they would be servants to Shem and his descendants.

b. Jewish oral (presented in the Babalonian Talmud) tradition suggests that Ham was cursed because he violated god’s order that no one could have sex while aboard the arc. Ham was cursed with blackness and servitude.

c. The Book of Mormon: The Curse of Laman (2 Nephi 5:21-25)
-Laman and his people are cursed with “a skin of blackness” for rebelling against Nephi who had kept gods commandments.
-God forbade race mixing: “And cursed shall be the seed of him that mixeth with their seed”
-The curse explains the laziness of non-whites. “And because of their cursing which was upon them they did become an idle people, full of mischief and subtlety…”
-God also warns Nephi that the other races are dangerous to whites. “They (Blacks) shall be a scourge unto thy seed,... they (blacks) shall scourge them (whites) even unto destruction”

- This is very much in keeping with the popular opinion of whites, regarding blacks, during the time the Book of Mormon was written by Joseph Smith (1823’s).

2. The “Scientific View”
Racism comes after the slave trade began in order to reconcile the discomfort that many people felt about treating humans in inhumane ways. It’s acceptable to beat a workhorse but not man. So African become animal because of lack of intelligence (smaller cranium = smaller brain) and lack of moral judgement
- 1500 European slave trade begins
-Carl Von Linnaeus 1735 - arranged races into subspecies
  - Homo Americanus - ruled by custom (superstition)
  - Homo Asiaticus - ruled by rites (ritual)
  - Homo Afer - ruled by caprice (whim)
  - Homo Europaeus - ruled by opinion (intelligence)
- 1800's Scientists further strengthen racist argument
- Anthropometry & the Eugenic Movement
  - Francis Galton (Darwin’s Cousin) -Social Darwinism / Eugenics, 1869: Hereditary Genius: Its Laws and Consequences The genetic transmission of genius in British Families (including his own)
  - The Founders of statistics were Eugenicists : focused on quantifying differences, not similarities.
    - Pearson - Expanded on Galton’s mathematical method for determining the degree of association between intellectual functioning and heredity. Pearson developed the correlation coefficient ($r$) to further test these assertions.
    - Spearman: Expanded the work of Galton, Binet, and Pearson; Developed the Concept of Global Intelligence.
  - Craniometry (http://skepdic.com/cranial.html)
    - Paul Broca (french)
    http://fates.cns.muskingum.edu/~psych/psycweb/history/broca.htm
Believed that cranial size was an indicator or intelligence. Men were more intelligent that women, bc their skulls were smaller. He also studied the ratio of bone lengths in humans and primates in an effort to establish that europeans were more distantly related to ape than non-european peoples.
- Samuel George Morton (American)
http://www.scienceonions.com/racism.html
http://65.214.34.85/eugenics/content/section_02/morton.htm
-Cranial size = Intelligence
White men
Native American men
African men
White women
Black women
-measured by filling skulls with flax seed or lead shot (got smaller differences). He also tended to exclude small skulls of white men and large skulls of women, native americans, and blacks. When adjusting for body mass the superiority of european males disappears. In fact the white males have smaller cranial capacity to body mass ratios.
-Both researchers tampered with their data to make it fit their a priori assumptions
- Discard ratio of long bones in lower and upper arm (ratio is greater in apes than humans) bc white men were closer to the ape ratio than black men.
- Ratio of brain size to body mass rejected when women found to have larger ratio

-Samuel A. Cartwright (1850) - Louisiana Physician
- blood atmospherization defect (e.g. cycle celled anemia) + smaller cranial size (therefore reduced intellect) combine to give the African the mind of a child. (A white men should take up their role of benevolent protectors)

*Dysaethesia Aethiopis*, Cartwright claimed, “differs from every other species of mental disease, as it is accompanied with physical signs or lesions of the body discoverable to the medical observer....” The “treatment” was to “put the patient to some hard kind of work in the open air and sunshine.... The compulsory power of the white man, by making the slothful negro take active exercise, puts into active play the lungs, through whose agency the vitalized blood is sent to the brain to give liberty to the mind.” [emphasis added]
http://www.cchr.org/art/eng/page27.htm

http://www.swagga.com/racism.htm

- Lewis Terman (1916) : Stanford Psychologist, APA president revised Binet’s IQ test (Stanford Binet) using 1000 children and 400 adults (all white). “(mental retardation) represents the level of intelligence which is very, very common among Spanish-Indians and Mexican Families of the Southwest and also among negroes....(through future IQ testing) there will be discovered enormously significant racial differences which cannot be wiped out by any scheme of mental culture...There is no possibility at present of convincing society that they should not be allowed to reproduce,
although from a eugenic point of view they constitute a grave problem because of their unusually prolific breeding” (Guthrie, 1998).

- A.L. Crane (1923) Race difference in Inhibition: The study of immorality in Blacks. (Guthrie p. 50-52). An appalling example of unethical and unscientific science.

- Cyril Burt (articles published between 43-66)- British Psychologist: studied class and racial determinants of intelligence: Identical Twins reared apart: Claimed 80% of intelligence is genetic (accused of faking his data, after his death in 1971).

His modern day followers include:

Arthur Jensen (1970)

Herrnstein & Murray = The Bell Curve

racially linked IQ diffs predict : crime, poverty, unwed pregnancy, and immorality

- Bottom Line.

While Racism does exist. Race Does not. It has always been and will always be a tool to justify social and political inequity.

- It has little scientific value.

Our goal is to predict variability. If there is as much variability withing racial groups as between groups then there is little predictive value. We need a tool that actually predicts behavior

D. Ethnicity

- Has the potential to be a better predictor of human behavior.

- defined by a sense of shared experience and peoplehood, defined by a unique socio-cultural heritage that is transmitted across generations.

- Similar to culture, though more context specific. E.g. there are many ethnicitys contained within a culture.

1. Problems

- Viewing Ethnicity as mutually exclusive categories suffers the same problem as race.

- It may not be very descriptive of all group members

- Ethnicity may not be as useful for prediction as other considerations

- Need to find aspects that can be measured on a continuum rather than in categories

2. Ethnic Identity

1. Jean Phinney: Ethnic Identity - subjective sense of ethnic group membership held by group members.

   To what degree is ethnic identity part of self

   - Sense of Belonging
   - Positive evaluation of the group
   - Preference for group membership
   - Ethnic Interest & Knowledge
- Involvement with group activities

Process of ethnic identity development
1) ethnicity taken for granted (based on what others/society thinks)
2) Exploration: Investigate meaning & implications of group membership.
3) Achieved ethnic identity: Fully integrated view of ethnicity w/ self view. Not a static point of development (Always in Flux)

2. William Cross - Nigressence / Negro to Black Conversion (H & B: 18-20)
1) Pre-Encounter = Af. Am. identity is devalued/ believe in White Superiority
2) Encounter = experience discrimination / begin to value Af. Am. identity
3) Immersion/Emersion =
   - Immersion = investigate Af. Am. identity / complete rejection of White culture
     (Radicalization / Militancy)
   - Emersion = begin to accept white culture
4) Internalization = achieve a self confident and secure Af. Am. identity. Can learn from other cultures.

II - Culture
A. Define Culture (Probe)
   - Explicit - Marriage, Employment, Education, Laws
   - Implicit- Norms - unspoken rules lubricating social interaction
     - Roles - norms associated with a particular situation
2. Transmitted across generations
3. Culture is Relational
   - our culture is in many ways what we are, but it is also what we are not (in relation to a specific group; e.g. stereotypes).
   - E. G. part of being black in America is not being white and vice-versa
   - cultures can often best be seen when they are clashing with another culture.
   - What forms the boundary of a culture?
     - I can't tell you, but I know it when I see it.
4. Culture is usually unconscious: we are usually not aware of the rules and processes that are operating to guide behavior until they fail.
5. Culture Simplifies an Ambiguous World
   - They provide Expectancies: Help us fill in the blanks
6. Culture is a shared social construction, and is real only because we believe it to be real, but it also has real consequences:
   - Real emotional reactions occur when cultural values are violated or when cultural norms are ignored
- Wars, Violence, and Aggression are quite often the result of cultural conflict.

B Some Consequences of Culture

1. Emics, Etics, and Ethnocentrism:
   a. **Emics** = Culture specific social and psychological phenomenon.
   b. **Etics** = Species specific social and psychological phenomenon
   c. **Culture** = Emic-Etic combination
   d. **Ethnocentrism** = Viewing one's own emic-etic combinations as Universally True and Right and other's as wrong. Also, Viewing a cultural other's behavior from the self's emic-etic combination.
      - In many ways Ethnocentrism is responsible for other dogmatic -isms: -sexism, racism, classism, ageism.
   e. **Cultural Relativism** = viewing self and other's behavior from the perspective of the emic-etic combination from which it was generated.

C. Individualistic Vs. Collectivist Cultures (P. 14, L&M)

- **Individualistic Cultures**: Rugged Individualism (e.g. U.S., Western Europe). The critical task in life is to become self sufficient and independent of society and family.
   1. Social Skills: Self promotion, being interesting, putting others at ease, having good conversation skills.
   2. Distribution of Rewards for group effort: Reward are distributed equitably (each according to their inputs).

- **Collectivist Cultures**: Group orientation is emphasized. The need of the group come before one's own needs (e.g. Asia, Africa, Central & South America, Pacific Islands).
   Identity is largely in terms of the group (family, village, organization).
   1. Social Skills: Group loyalty, cooperation, contributing to the group w/o expecting rewards, public modesty about abilities, deference to higher status individuals, distribution of resources to low status individuals who defer.
   2. Distribution of rewards for group effort: Equality (all get equal share). Group effort is rewarded not individual effort.

D. Minority Status: experiences associated with powerlessness, discrimination, prejudice, and overt hostile oppression.

E. Level of Acculturation (H & B: 21-24):

Acculturation- the process of second culture acquisition. The degree to which knowing your culture of origin depends on what degree and in what manner you have adapted to the new culture