Saint Xavier University

Fighting Racism: A Philosophical and Practical Inquiry into Creating Change

Honors Project
Submitted
In Partial Fulfillment
of the
Requirements of HONOR 352-353
and for Graduation with Honors
Spring 2020

By
Tajah Thomas

Mentor
Forrest Perry Ph. D

Abstract

With the recent resurgence of white supremacy, ethnocentrism and general race issues, this paper aims to unravel the source of persistent racism and how to remedy it. Both the United States and France are examined to understand two different responses to racism and how the recognition of racialized and ethnic identities and the redistribution of socioeconomic goods can aid in providing solutions. In the United States, affirmative action has been utilized in an attempt to redistribute opportunities, but common models that have been used consistently fall short. Racial discrimination and its consequences are complex in that there are present day discriminatory practices and incidents impacting minoritized groups and historic practices that are imbedded in certain structures of society that continue to impact these same groups. In France, the traditional assimilation model that is typically associated with France is shown to no longer be a complete representation of French values as multiculturalism has become more prominent. However, it is shown that even multiculturalism can fall short of recognizing the intricate identities and needs of individuals within cultural groups. Starting by defining racism and analyzing its structural consequences, this paper argues that the essential components to effectively fight racism include recognition, redistribution and an understanding of participatory parity.

Key Terms: France, United States, Racism, Recognition, Redistribution, Participatory Parity

Introduction

In France and the United States—as well as other countries—there has been a resurgence of white supremacy, ethnocentrism and general race issues. In the United States in 2017, "…neo-Nazi groups saw the greatest growth [of hate groups]—soaring by 22 percent from 99 to 121. Anti-Muslim groups also rose for a third straight year. After tripling from 2015 to 2016, they grew by another 13 percent, from 101 chapters to 114" (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2018). Although these are examples of extremist cases and generally it has been well established that racism is unacceptable and most people would never outwardly call themselves racist. However, its consequences continue to persist despite efforts to combat it. According to the Pew Research Center, "Muslims faced social hostilities in seven-in-ten (71%) countries in Europe, an increase from 58% the year before" (Global Restriction on Religion, 2015). In the United States, "about three-quarters of blacks and Asians (76% of each), as well as 58% of Hispanics say that they have experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly regularly or from time to time" (Key Findings, 2019). Racism contributes to socioeconomic problems such as the lack of access to safe neighborhoods with quality public services, and lack of access to employment opportunities, health related goods, professional services and the like, which disproportionately impact people of color. In the United States, this problem has endured despite decades of civil rights-inspired federal policy that have aimed to reinforce integration of different races and provide equal opportunity. Even in France, where one's nationality has been deemed as more important than one's race, racism has persisted. Despite two vastly different approaches, the persistence of racism is undeniable, therefore we should be asking ourselves why racism isn't going away, what we are doing wrong and how we can move forward in a way that challenges racism effectively.

In studying the question of how one should combat the issue of racism, I aim to establish that if we want to deal with racism in an effective manner, we must be able to do two things: 1) utilize recognition based ideas that promote cultural understanding and 2) redistribute socioeconomic goods to stop the continual and unintentional perpetration of advantaging one racial group over another. I will do this first, by introducing concepts or race-thinking that can be considered both racist and non-racist. Then, I will discuss the ambiguity involved in labeling something racist and talk about the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing definitions of racism that are both narrow and all-encompassing. After the ideology of racism has been examined, I will then discuss systemic racism and the way in which housing segregation has created unequal access to resources. Following this, I will examine the ways in which recognition and redistribution can be utilized through the standards of participatory parity to combat racism, arguing that both are necessary to effectively deal with racism. Lastly, I will pursue a comparison between the United States and France by analyzing the ways in which each nation has chosen to address racism and the ways in which the standards of participatory parity can play a role in creating solutions.

Racism is Both Structural and Ideological

Two important dimensions of racism are ideology and structural systems. According to Tim Wise in *Between Barack and a Hard Place,* racism is "an ideological belief in the racial or cultural superiority or inferiority of certain people defined racially as members of a group" as well as "a system of inequity based on race, or perceived racial difference" (15). Ideology and systemic racism are interconnected in that often the ideology or beliefs are used to validate the systemic inequities that are put in place in societies. Philosopher Paul Taylor refers to this process as a "racial project." Racial projects involve a semantic side in which societies "decide

how to interpret the concept of race" and a structural side in which "social goods are [distributed] along racial lines" (25).

The Ideology of Racism

Race-Thinking

The term "race-thinking" refers to a process in which we assign meaning to "human bodies and bloodlines" (Taylor, 16). The body is phenomenal, meaning that it is perceptible through the senses. Race-thinking is about humans receiving information about other human bodies through the senses and assigning meaning to these bodies based on inferences. When we are talking about inferences, we are talking about using our perceptions of bodily characteristics as justification for the meaning being assigned. For example, noticing that white people are more likely than non-white people to go to college would be the information we are receiving. The inference we are making comes from the white body that we are perceiving and connecting it to the likelihood of one person going to college over another. This type of race-thinking has to do with likelihoods or probabilities, which are revealed by statistical analyses. In this particular example, we are saying that the perception that we have of this person as white has something to do with this likelihood that we have observed. Taylor explains, "Statistical correlations like [the ones being discussed here] pick out populations that overlap considerably with the things we call races. This enables us to say that a person we'd call black […] is more likely to live in substandard or overcrowded housing, or lack health insurance, or be unemployed, than someone we'd call white" (Taylor, 88). Furthermore, race-thinking is about grouping human bodies together into kinds or types based on these likelihoods. What determines whether a particular instance of race-thinking is racist or non-racist is the kind of explanation that is offered for the likelihoods assigned to bodies.

Non-racist race-thinking. Non-racist race-thinking involves offering what Taylor calls a "social explanation" for the meaning assigned, an explanation that highlights the history and persistence of oppressive social relations between racial groups. As above, when race-thinking is taking place, the meanings assigned to bodies typically have to do with likelihoods or probabilities, the sorts of things revealed by statistical analysis. Providing a social explanation of the likelihoods that we correlate with certain kinds of bodies means saying that "the correlations exist because political, economic, and cultural forces connect appearance and ancestry [that is, bodies and bloodlines] to social location…racial identity" (Taylor, 89). Statistics and likelihoods show factual inequalities that exist because of social forces—political, cultural and economic—that have conspired to connect appearance to occupying a certain social position in society. These social forces are representative of a history, as well as the persistence of unjust and unequal social relations. Non-racist race-thinking points to racism in its explanation of these social disparities between different racialized groups. Therefore, it would be non-racist race-thinking to notice that a human in a black body is less likely to go to college than a human in a white body, if your explanation for that likelihood points to a causal connection between that likelihood and the inadequacy of funding in majority black public school districts.

Racist race-thinking. By contrast, racist race-thinking attribute disparities between different racialized groups to suppose biological or cultural inferiority. This type of race-thinking uses demeaning and false explanations to encourage the inaccurate belief that there are physical and non-physical "traits that are supposed to define the races [and…] present themselves in reliable clusters" (Taylor, 49). Whereas race thinking, of any type, groups these races and specific traits together, in attempting to explain certain likelihoods, and non-racist race-thinking points to something contingent, racist race-thinking, at least the biological variant of it, points to

something that is more immutable or unable to change. If we again, notice that a human in a black body is less likely to go to college than a human in a white body, our thinking would be racist, if we were to identify as the cause of that likelihood a supposed biological or cultural inferiority. Therefore, if we were to say that humans in black bodies are less likely to go to school because they are not intelligent enough or are too lazy, regardless of whether we attribute those traits to biological or cultural factors, without giving due consideration to the impact of racism (perhaps in the form of underfunded majority black schools), we would be engaging in racist race-thinking.

Defining Racism

Racism as unethical disregard. The terms racism and racist are very broad in what they refer to, encapsulating a multitude of ideas, beliefs and actions. The concept of racism extends from individual prejudice all the way to societal structures. Describing the behavior of someone as a racist can vary considerably, from a person who feels uneasy around individuals who have a particular appearance, to someone who expresses outright hatred towards an individual because of that appearance. Some of these concepts even have different focuses, such as when we talk about whether or not racism depends on the intentionality of an individual or just the impact. What we find, however, is that all these ideas fall under the flexible concept of "disregard." If we use Taylor's definition of racism as "an unethical disregard for people who belong to a particular race," we are creating a space in which many different types of arguments for what racism really is can potentially coexist (Taylor, 32).

Unethical disregard is the common, underlying theme found in the many different ways in which people have defined racism. When Taylor uses the term *disregard* in his definition of racism, it means "withholding of respect, concern, good-will or care from the members of a race"

(Taylor, 32). The term "disregard" has many advantages in its application to racism. One of the advantages is that it allows us to cover a "range of attitudes all at once, from outright hatred, to the simple failure to notice that someone is suffering…" (Taylor, 33). This means that these types of behaviors and anything in between could be described as racist when they start to target specific members of a race. This leads us into the second advantage, which is that "…it makes room for us to focus on the consequences of acts, without losing sight of the individual motivations that many of us put at the center of ethical evaluation" (Taylor, 33). It is in this way that the definition of unethical disregard allows two seemingly opposite trains of thought to coexist without becoming contradictory. Furthermore, unethical disregard's capacity to do this also contributes towards our third advantage, which is that we are able "to connect certain intuitions about what we call institutional racism to our strong biases in the direction of the individual agency" (Taylor, 34). A racist institution in which neither the individuals nor their actions are at fault is difficult to conceive. We are able to bridge this gap in understanding when talking about racism's impact because when institutions consistently and reliably create disparities between specific racial groups, we are talking about unethical disregard. The individuals who perpetuate the racist structure of institutions without realizing the harms being caused are thus engaging in unethical disregard. The fourth advantage of defining racism as unethical disregard is that it highlights the idea that racism goes against one of our core moral belief, which is "that people should be treated the same unless there is a morally relevant difference between them" (Taylor, 34). By opening up the meaning of racism through the use of the term unethical disregard, we are allowing for a greater flow of ideas around definitions of racism and this can lead to different ways to overcome it (Taylor, 35).

As we have seen, unethical disregard possesses many advantages in discussions regarding racism. However, there is a significant disadvantage worth considering. The issue that may arise from the use of unethical disregard is that we may be stretching the definition of racism and using it for more than it can actually account for. Take the example of a white person burning a cross in the yard of a black person. Although it is true that the white individual is lacking in concern and respect for the black person whose yard they are burning the cross in and thus is unethically disregarding the victim of their action, at the same time, it would seem that, in using just the term disregard, we are leaving out the depth of hatred reflected in this person's actions. To account for a situation such as this one, it is worth looking at Lawrence Blum's definition of racism as necessarily possessing the traits of inferiorization and antipathy.

Racism as antipathy and inferiorization. Taylor uses the phrase "unethical disregard" in an attempt to extend to the full range of attitudes and beliefs embedded in people identified as racist, as well as to encapsulate the multitude of ways in which racism has been defined. However, one of the consequences of using the term unethical disregard is that we have committed utilizing the term racism to describe all race-related wrongful acts without necessarily agreeing on racism's true definition. According to Blum, this is cause for concern because "when words lose coherent meaning, they also lose the power to shame," which disrupts the purpose behind identifying someone as a racist (Blum, 1). The hope is that when a person is called out for being racist, they immediately understand the moral condemnation and disapproval associated with their beliefs or behavior and strive for change. If the term racist is used to describe a plethora of ideas, attitudes, and beliefs, and thus used frequently, the weight and importance that should be associated with the term is lost. Blum attempts to remedy this by suggesting that "all

forms of racism" can be related to inferiorization and antipathy and that describing any other race-related phenomena requires a "more morally nuanced vocabulary" (Blum, 8).

The general categories in which all forms of racism can fall under are personal racism, which "consists in racist acts, beliefs, attitudes and behavior on the part of individual persons;" social racism, which "comprises racist beliefs, attitudes and stereotypes widely shared within a given population and expressed in cultural and social modes;" and institutional racism, which "refers to racial inferiorizing or antipathy perpetrated by specific social institutions" (Blum, 9). Each of these categories is important because they are complex and deeply interconnected. This is apparent in the way that the negative consequences of institutional racism on certain racial groups promotes the belief in, or suspicion of, racial inferiority (Blum, 9). Similarly, individual acts of racism are not simply a reflection of social racism, but also reinforce it. Furthermore, personal racism prevents society from being able to enact change on racist institutions (Blum, 9). All of these categories have distinct traits, but also involve antipathy or inferiorization in some form.

According to Blum, "Inferiorizing personal racism is expressed in various attitudes and behavior […] It can also involve a developed set of beliefs about a biologically based hierarchy of races, but it need not do so" (10). A racist individual may believe a specific racial group is inferior to them without having an actual hierarchy in mind that includes other races, or that racist individual may treat members of a particular race as if they are inferior and upon self-reflection come to the conclusion that they don't necessarily believe that particular racial group is inferior (Blum, 10). Behavior can stand alone as racist without the ideology that often times accompanies it and similarly, racist ideological beliefs are not always accompanied by racist action. It is also the case that some individuals have internalized racism and believe their own

racial group to be inferior, which can result in self-hatred that is attempting to conform to what people in other racial groups may consider to be more socially acceptable behavior (Blum, 10).

Furthermore, inferiorization and antipathy or hatred don't necessarily have to accompany each other: "Some inferiorizing racists do not hate the target of their beliefs; [instead] they may have a paternalistic concern and feelings of kindness for persons they regard as inferior" (Blum, 10). This concern is racist because the people these individuals are directing their sympathy towards are not thought of as equals or fully human (Blum, 10). Conversely, Blum says "not every race hater regards the target of her hatred as inferior" (10). This can often be seen in antipathy towards Asians who are generally stereotyped as more intelligent and thus perceived as a potential threat or barrier to the success of a member of another racial group. In this case, the racist individual is harboring feelings of resentment, but the individual can also feel fear and hostility towards particular racial groups without the addition of inferiorization (Blum, 11). It is also important to note that the two forms of personal racism "antipathetic inferiorization and inferiorizing paternalistic concern" can coexist. Blum identifies the "paternalistic inferiorizing racist, such as a white segregationist, [as] often [hating] members of the racial group who do not maintain what he regards as 'their place'" (Blum, 11). When a racist individual regards a particular group as inferior, any attempt on the part of the supposedly inferior group's behalf to step outside of their assumed roles often results in feelings of hatred and antipathy from the racist individual (Blum, 11).

In focusing more closely on antipathy as prejudice—although not all prejudice is antipathy—we can see that racial prejudice, or racism, need not be conscious. Some individuals may feel hostility towards a particular racial group without realizing it or suppress their acknowledgement of their prejudice because of the more prevalent social disapproval of racial

prejudice (Blum, 12). It may also be unconscious in that an individual does not notice that the hostility towards that particular group is racially based (Blum, 12). Generally, prejudice involves disliking a particular group as well as having an inaccurate view of it, but it is also the case that putting racial groups in contact with one another does not always lead to understanding or a lessening of hatred or antipathy (Blum, 12). This leads Blum towards the claim that "prejudice is a kind of antipathy, toward a race-defined group, and would by definition appear to count as a form of 'racism'" (Blum 13). However, his remarks beg the question of whether or not less hostile racial-related issues should be considered racism, as he is continually trying to limit the use of the word so as to preserve the utmost importance. Unfortunately, regardless of whether there any form of racist ideology of groups and individuals, the history of systemic racism has continued into the 21st century and continues to perpetuate socioeconomic inequalities.

Systemic Racism—Socioeconomic Issues

Housing Segregation

In the United States, after WWII when soldiers were coming back from the war that had no place to live until the GI bill was introduced which would "racialize housing wealth and opportunity for decades…" (The House We Live In, 2003). The federal housing administration was created in the 1930s to provide loans for Americans to buy homes. However, for the 1 million black GOs returning from the war this was not the case because "government officials institutionalized the national appraisal system where race was as much a factor in real estate assessment as the condition of the property" (The House We Live In, 2003). This was the beginning of red-lining where communities were rated from lowest to highest in regard to risk. Communities where minority groups resided were given the highest risk ratings which were marked with red. This led to the United States being "suburbanized racially" (The House We

Live In, 2003). Black largely only had access to public housing which was mainly in the city center with few exceptions. When President Johnson signed the Fair Housing Act in 1968, racial language was removed from federal housing policy which allowed for black to move into suburban areas. The result of these integrated neighborhoods was was block busting and watching these neighborhoods decline.[1] With whites being 80% of the market, in integrated or black neighborhoods where they were discouraged from looking for homes, the value of housing declined. With banks refusing to give loans to blacks, white flight meant that whites were taking resources such as jobs, loans and better tax rates with them (The House We Live In, 2003). This led to the decline of schools and services in non-white communities. Today, without the explicit laws that put "whites on top and blacks on the bottom" we still have the same practices due to "racially inscribed geographic spaces" (The House We Live In, 2003).

Unequal access to employment. One of the consequences of residential segregation is limited access to employment—a combination of spatial mismatch and job segregation. The spatial mismatch hypothesis claims that "urban blacks suffer higher unemployment and lower wages than whites due to their difficulties in obtaining distant suburban jobs" (Anderson, 27). Black people that live in urban areas are potentially dealing with two different disadvantages: proximity to work and wage rates. Assuming that an individual knows about any job openings outside of their area, if a person lives in an urban area and doesn't have access to a car, they are forced to take into consideration whether or not public transportation is in walking distance from both their home and potential place of work (28). Furthermore, even if a black person were to find public transportation that accommodated their needs, they would also have to face the

[1] Block busting involved white homeowners being convinced to sell their homes for cheap (due to blacks coming in and decreasing market value) and then those same homes being sold to non-whites for inflated prices (The House We Live In, 2003).

reality that "employers located far from black neighborhoods may be more likely to discriminate against blacks" (28). What accompanies the issue of being able to get jobs located in suburban areas is lower wages in urban areas. "Urban employers report far more applications per job opening than suburban employers" which then allows them to lower their wages in relation to the high demand for a job (28). Because of this, low level jobs that require the same skill level will offer lower wages in urban areas than in suburban areas.

Human, cultural and social capital. Job segregation also forces a black individual also has to deal with having insufficient amounts of capital or "assets that constitute one's socioeconomic status or enable one to achieve a higher socioeconomic status" (Anderson, 31). Elizabeth Anderson identifies three types of capital—lacking due to segregation—that contribute to a lack of access to employment: human, cultural, and social. Social capital is defined as "networks of people in social relationships that serve as resources for individual and collective action" and in this case, is useful for "providing information channels" (33). Within social relationships, there are "strong ties" that are comprised of "emotional intensity, investment of time, intimacy and reciprocity" and "weak ties" that do the same things but to a lesser extent (Anderson, 33). Although ties between people with different identities—or races in this context—tends to be of the weak sort, any sort of tie is vital in regard to gaining access to a job because "half of employers frequently recruit new employees by word-of-mouth through a firm's employees or business contracts" (Anderson, 34). If a black individual does not have an outer circle that spans wider than contacts within their neighborhood or community, one will either not hear about opportunities outside of their area or be at a disadvantage as an applicant. In addition to this, even social ties within "communities of concentrated marginalization" where identities are more homogenous, there is a lack of trust that leads to "employed blacks [being] less likely

than whites to recommend their unemployed male relatives and friends for a job because they do not trust them to do a good job" (Anderson, 34). This has the impact of not just black males being denied social connections to obtain jobs, but also leads to black men being less inclined to ask for a referral to avoid the rejection.

While social capital is hugely important in regard to the spread of information about job openings and gaining a referral, cultural capital is crucial because it will not only aid one in obtaining a job, but also in retaining that position and finding opportunities for mobility. Cultural capital is defined as cultural habits acquired by adaptation to the social environment in order to succeed in school, work and one's community (Anderson, 35). Cultural habits are important because "some habits that help individuals in intensely segregated, disadvantaged environments undermine their ability to succeed in integrated more advantaged environments" (Anderson, 35). Individuals who have developed a more defensive demeanor in order to survive in their communities can easily be misinterpreted as aggressive or otherwise dangerous. These misinterpretations lead to individuals within specific communities becoming either unemployable or only employed in inferior, segregated jobs (Anderson, 36).

Cultural capital puts black individuals at a disadvantage independent of being identified as poor or middle-class citizens. According to Anderson, "Subtle cultural differences in body language, habits of emotional expression and management, styles of personal appearance, and interaction rituals can impair the ability of untutored blacks to navigate white-dominated social worlds successfully" (36). Hairstyles can be perceived as unprofessional and ordinary frankness can be misunderstood as having an attitude. Cultural miscommunication happens on both sides, but because blacks are often in subordinate positions due to racial inequalities, they have to deal with the negative consequences (Anderson, 36). Even when blacks do succeed in navigating

these spaces, it becomes difficult to move up the career ladder as qualifications become less objective. Black individuals must deal with how comfortable their superior feels in their presence, a superior's levels of trust and confidence and the ability of the individual to be perceived as loyal with leadership potential (Anderson, 37).

> [Whites] are more likely than blacks with equivalent objective qualifications to win the confidence of an employer that they can handle a job one or two tiers higher than any job in which they have higher experience, and more likely to attract promotion offers from outside employers (Anderson, 38).

The subjective qualifications needed to obtain higher job positions are often not seen from white superiors because "whites' habits of social closer" don't give substantial opportunity for blacks to demonstrate that they have them (Anderson, 38). This leads to stunted career growth as blacks are confined to specific or dead-end positions.

Ultimately, issues of cultural and social capital stem from a lack of human capital. Human capital is a particular kind of social capital that consists of parents, other relatives, neighbors, and peers in a community who are able to aid children in the acquisition of marketable skills (Anderson, 34). According to Anderson, "Segregation ties children to a disadvantaged structure of social capital, thereby perpetuating the effects of historic discrimination in human capital development, even in the presence of antidiscrimination law" (35). For example, black children whose community contacts only consist of black people who have historically been denied access to certain fields of work, will lack relationships that could potentially lead to work in those areas. This becomes perpetuated when these children have children and as adults they now lack the same contacts that their community members did, thus not being able to provide a network of people to help their children gain access into the same

fields of work that they missed out on. On a broader scale, this means that when groups of people are denied access to certain opportunities and are segregated from everyone else, these groups are unable to give future generations the tools or social relationships needed to eventually obtain access.

Unequal access to health related goods, state goods and local services. Aside from access to employment and modes of capital, residential segregation also impacts blacks' access to health related goods, state goods and local services. In general, "predominantly black communities are four times more likely to be underserved than other communities with the same average income" (Anderson, 31). The lack of access to health-related goods in segregated black neighborhoods can be attributed to the lack of nearby retail, consumer and professional services because this includes access to medical facilities, pharmacies, and super markets. Due to a lack of supermarkets, many blacks eat low quality meats and processed foods from smaller grocery stores, with little fresh produce (Anderson, 31). In consequence of segregated black neighborhoods having a lack of retail and commercial services such as banks, restaurants and retail outlets, black neighborhoods become less attractive to prospective homebuyers, thus depressing the value of local housing and the economics of the community which means professionals will be less likely to locate their practices there (Anderson, 30).

Health issues also reflect a lack of public goods on both the state and local level. Public goods such as adequate public recreational facilities and streets safe enough for residents to exercise are not available to isolated predominantly black residential areas (Anderson, 31). Local governments are responsible for providing "police protection, public order, fire protection, trash removal, streets, parks, public recreational facilities and school" but:

> Residential segregation within [metropolitan] government units impedes the formation of interracial political coalitions and enables groups in control of local government to selectively direct public resources to their own neighborhoods to the exclusion of other groups' neighborhoods (Anderson, 40).

In relatively wealthy neighborhoods, local governments provide residents with services that not only keep them safe and healthy, but also prevent the entry of the less wealthy into their borders (Anderson, 39). While the wealthy have access to these advantages, black neighborhoods are left with the police officers under-enforcing the law and racially profiling innocents and tax burdens that are characterized by high tax rates and poor services.

Essential Components to Fight Racism

When devising strategies aimed at reducing or eliminating racism, one cannot implement a plan focused either solely on solving economic inequality or solely on acknowledging and accepting racial differences. Segregation interconnects the two and "causes patterns of racial inequality that influence the ways racial groups represent one another…[which] in turn, reinforce practices of segregation and reproduce categorical inequality" (Anderson, 44). For example, racist incidents such as law enforcement officials racially profiling black individuals may stem from racial stereotyping or feelings of antipathy or inferiorization, but the structural impact on the distribution of goods and services along racial lines—police overenforcement in segregated black neighborhoods—can reinforce these beliefs. In order to deal with racism effectively, both parts of racism must be addressed appropriately, which is to say through means of recognition and redistribution. Both philosophically and politically, recognition and redistribution have typically been seen as antitheses and have been dissociated from one another (Fraser, 8).

However, just as ideological and systemic racism are interconnected, so are the concepts of redistribution and recognition.

Racism is what Nancy Fraser calls “two dimensional” because it is a social division where subordinated groups “suffer both maldistribution and misrecognition in forms where neither of these injustices is an indirect effect of the other, but where both are primary and co-original” (19). In the sphere of distribution, the economic structure divides paid jobs along racial lines in a way that results in “racialized immigrants and/or ethnic minorities suffer[ing] disproportionately high rates of unemployment and poverty and over-representation in low-paying menial work” (Fraser, 23). In the sphere of recognition, “Eurocentric patterns of cultural value privilege traits associated with ‘whiteness,’…result[ing] [in] racialized immigrants and/or ethnic minorities [being] constructed as deficient and inferior…” (Fraser, 23). Misrecognition and maldistribution are relatively equal contributors to racism and need to be dealt with under the understanding that while both dimensions intertwine, they are also distinct.

Recognition and Redistribution

The goal of recognition is to achieve “a difference-friendly world, where assimilation to majority or dominant cultural norms is no longer the price of equal respect” (Fraser, 7). To achieve this goal, recognition is often viewed as a matter of individual and self-realization, but a stronger stance is to argue that recognition is an issue of justice in terms of the social status certain individuals and groups are given (Fraser, 29). According to Fraser:

> …some individuals and groups are denied the status of full partners in social interaction simply as a consequence of institutionalized patterns of cultural value in whose construction they have not equally participated and which disparage

> their distinctive characteristics or the distinctive characteristics assigned to them. (29)

By claiming that misrecognition discriminates against certain people in a way that disrupts their ability to participate in society to the same degree that others can, one can say that the institutions that normalize these issues are "morally indefensible" (Fraser, 32). Furthermore, framing misrecognition around issues of injustice creates the foundation for integrating "claims for the redistribution of resources and wealth" into claims for recognition as both inhabit the realm of morality (Fraser, 33).

Redistribution conceives of an injustice that is "socioeconomic and rooted in the economic structure of society" and "seeks a more just distribution of resources and wealth" through economic restructuring (Fraser, 7). When integrating redistribution and recognition into one model of morality, an "overarching conception of justice" has to be established that can incorporate "defensible claims for social equality and defensible claims for the recognition of difference" (Fraser, 26). However, one cannot be subsumed under another. A just distribution of resources and rights will not prevent misrecognition, nor will "changing the cultural order" prevent maldistribution (Fraser, 34).

Participatory Parity

The core of this two-dimensional analysis of racism that incorporates both redistribution and recognition is the notion of "parity of participation" (Fraser, 36). When it comes to participatory parity, "justice requires social arrangements that permit all (adult) members of society to interact with one another as peers" (Fraser, 36). In order for this to happen, both objective and intersubjective conditions must be met. The objective condition that needs to be met is that of ensuring that economic inequality is not a barrier to a participant's "independence

and voice" (Fraser, 36). The objective condition focuses on concerns within distributive justice such as the economic structure of society. Types of economic inequalities that disrupt the opportunities an individual has for leisure time or to interact with others would be exploitation and disparities in wealth and income. The intersubjective condition inhibits "institutionalized norms that systematically depreciate some categories of people and the qualities associated with them" (Fraser, 36). These institutionalized norms include "burdening [some people] with excessive ascribed 'difference' or…failing to acknowledge their distinctiveness" (Fraser, 36).[2] The intersubjective condition focuses on "the status order of society and…culturally defined hierarchies of status" (Fraser, 36). Together, the objective and intersubjective conditions of the parity of participation bring together recognition and redistribution under a single framework of justice.

Participatory parity also has an evaluative standard that determines whether claims for recognition or redistribution are warranted (Fraser, 38). These criteria apply to both claimants of redistribution or recognition where they must show that "current arrangements prevent them from participating on a par with others in social life" and "that the social changes they seek will in fact promote parity of participation" without creating or worsening other disparities (Fraser, 38). For issues of recognition, this is regulated at the intergroup level and the intragroup level. At the intergroup level, the effects of institutionalized patterns of cultural value are assessed to determine whether the minority group is being denied participatory parity in relation to majority groups (Fraser, 40). At the intragroup level, "the internal effects of [the] minority practices" that are being claimed are assessed to determine whether the recognition they are claiming will have

[2] Excessive ascribed difference are differentiations forced upon targeted minority groups that attribute distinctions in a way that keeps them from fully integrating into society or realizing the full rights of being a member of society.

an adverse impact on certain members within the group (Fraser, 40). In order for a recognitive claim to be considered warranted, it must meet the requirements at both levels (Fraser, 41).

In order for participatory parity as an evaluative standard to be upheld, dialogue and discourse are essential. What is deemed to be oppressive to members of minority groups that are claiming distinction are not always agreed upon, whether it be because there are those who are evaluating the claims based on the values of the majority or there are in-group disagreements. Participatory parity allows for the viewpoints of all parties involved and "because interpretation and judgments are ineliminable, only the full, free participation of all the implicated parties can suffice to warrant claims for recognition" (Fraser, 43). Having an open dialogue to evaluate claims for recognition and redistribution also means that error can occur which requires the revision of determinations. The system of participatory parity is circular in that it requires the opportunity of all participants in society to have a voice in dialogue concerning claims for recognition and redistribution, while also demanding the recognition of distinct groups and redistribution of resources in order for participants to have a voice concerning these claims (Fraser, 44). The need for dialogue within participatory parity demonstrates that the standards of recognition and redistribution are intended to be created and maintained by the same individuals affected by it (Fraser, 44).

The United States' Battle with Racism

Affirmative Action

Different models of affirmative action have certain limitations. According to Anderson, affirmative action is "any policy that aims to increase the participation of a disadvantaged social group in mainstream institutions" (135). This can be achieved through two potential paths: (1) "outreach" where individuals from a disadvantaged social group are directly

informed and given opportunities to participate, or (2) “preference” where their identification with a disadvantaged group becomes part of the criteria for their selection (Anderson, 135). Affirmative action typically has an impact in areas such as education, employment and government contracting, and can take the form of either compensatory, diversity, discrimination-blocking or integrative models. The “compensatory model” deals in the past, aiming to provide compensation for the lasting impact that historic discrimination has had (Anderson, 135). The “discrimination-blocking model” is similar to the compensatory model in that it operates in the realm of attempting to achieve justice and equity, but it works within the present systems of discrimination instead of the past (Anderson, 136). The “diversity model’s” goals cannot be encapsulated within the need for justice and racial equity, but instead is found in the desire to provide institutions with “cultural and epistemic diversity” which, according to this model, is believed to be achieved through racial diversity (Anderson, 135). The “integrative model” follows the same goals of the compensatory and discrimination blocking models in that its goals are also aligned with justice and equity. However, instead of focusing on past discrimination or working solely against current discrimination, the integrative model recognizes racial segregation and stigmatization as the roots of “unjust race-based disadvantages” (Anderson, 136). Through an analysis of the integrative model, we will find that its incorporation of both redistributive and recognizing measures makes it superior to the other models of affirmative action in its ability to fight against racism and have a lasting impact.

Integrative Affirmative Action

A model that possesses redistributive and recognitive goals. Within the integrative model, the determining factor of whether or not an institution will engage in these affirmative action practices is whether they are “capable of promoting racial integration” (Anderson, 149).

This widens the scope of all other models of affirmative action. The compensatory model is limited to only institutions that have engaged in prior racial discrimination, the discrimination-blocking model only includes institutions that are still discriminating and the diversity model is only inclusive of institutions whose missions would benefit from "a greater diversity of ideas brought by participants" (Anderson, 2010). The integrative model promotes the inclusion of all institutions to work towards the goal of integration, which is important when dealing with systems that may not have racially malicious intent now, but still have similarly harmful discriminatory results.

The integrative model views racial segregation and stigmatization as the foundation of discrimination. "Group stigmatization" is defined as the "imputation of dishonorable meanings to stereotypes of group difference—public narratives or interpretive frames for explaining perceived group differences in terms that demean the members of the stigmatized group" (Anderson, 45). Because of the lack of access that accompanies segregated poor black neighborhoods, it becomes easy to use racialized groups as indicators to assume a person's position in society and furthermore, to attach negative stereotypes that argue that it is one's "internal disposition" that causes it (Anderson, 45). This leads to "statistical discrimination" where bias is shown towards individuals that are assumed to possess certain traits that are stereotypically attributed to their group identity (Anderson, 45). All of this requires the involvement of affirmative action to reinforce justice and equity through integration, recognition and redistribution.

According to Fraser, redistribution "seeks a more just distribution of resources and wealth" (7). Goods are redistributed using the integrative model in multiple ways. One thing that is redistributed is capital; specifically, human, social, and cultural. Individuals from

disadvantaged groups that benefit from affirmative action through opportunities given to them in the workforce become sources of social capital for the network of people in their lives who have not yet gained access to the same opportunities (Anderson, 150). These same beneficiaries of affirmative action "transmit human and cultural capital (including knowledge of how to operate successfully in integrated settings)" (Anderson, 150). Access to goods and services is also redistributed. One impact of integrative affirmative action on goods and services comes from adding more individuals from disadvantaged groups into the professional industry. With more black physicians—or any other type of professional worker—coming out of professional school, segregated neighborhoods will gain access to their services. This is due to the fact that "black physicians are far more likely than white physicians to locate in underserved minority neighborhoods and serve far more black, Latino and Medicaid patients, even after controlling for location" (Anderson, 149). Public goods are also redistributed for the community as a whole. With representation of stigmatized or excluded groups in "decision-making bodies" the "accountability effect holds" which allows for decisions to be made that have increased awareness and intentional justice supporting them (Anderson, 151).

Representation of stigmatized groups affects how decisions are made because the presence of underrepresented groups brings real life experience to the issues of systemic oppression while simultaneously divorcing these individuals from the stereotypes associated with their group membership (Anderson, 151). Contributing life experiences associated with one's racialized group is very different from contributing to the diversity of ideas based on cultural difference associated with the diversity model. The latter conflates racial and cultural groups, which can perpetrate stigmatization through the attributions of black disadvantages to cultural values within the community (Anderson, 143). The opportunity to contribute life experiences, on

the other hand, are helpful in “democratic decision making, [and] are salient to members of stigmatized, segregated groups and hence likely to be practically engaged” (Anderson, 152). The contribution of life experiences demonstrates both the need for and results of recognition within the integrative model. Recognition aims for “an ideal reciprocal relation between two subjects in which each sees the other as its equal and also as separate from it” (Fraser, 10). An important advantage of the integrative model of affirmative action is that individuals who benefit from this system are chosen based on their merit. Being able to see an individual’s success in their roles when they come from a disadvantaged group helps to break down stereotypes as race becomes less applicable for making inferences about a person’s position in society (Anderson, 150).

Participatory Parity within the Integrative Model

The integrative model follows the standards of participatory parity in its recognitive and redistributive efforts. The objective condition is met in that through affirmative action, economic inequality due to past and present racial discrimination is not a barrier to an individual’s participation in institutions following this model. Individuals are chosen with the goal of creating “a critical mass of workers from underrepresented groups” because integration “reduces the salience of social group membership, enables others to view them as individuals, facilitates meritocratic evaluation and undermines the stereotype incumbency effect” (Anderson, 151). With this goal in mind, individuals who have suffered economic inequality are provided opportunities within institutions where they have a voice and independence.

Of these individuals who have suffered economic inequality, “…affirmative action programs tend to select from within the disadvantaged racial group those who are likely to be better skilled and more highly educated, who have suffered less from the racial caste system than their peers” (Anderson, 151). By choosing these particular individuals, institutions are able to do

away with stereotypes of incompetence and uphold its meritocracy. Furthermore, the contribution of lived experiences by individuals that are typically underrepresented will aid in coming up with practical solutions to those still facing adversity. Having these lived experiences is a key component in discourse concerning justice within participatory parity because by the standards of participatory parity, "justice is not an externally imposed requirement, determined over the heads of those whom it obligates. Rather is binds only insofar as its addressees can also rightly regard themselves as its authors" (Fraser, 44). In other words, it is imperative that those who are able to participate in the decision making process are people that are impacted.

The intersubjective condition is also met because individuals that are selected by affirmative action programs are skilled individuals forging integrated relationships and "as the contact hypothesis holds, institutionally supported cooperative interaction with members of stigmatized groups on terms of equality reduces stigmatization and discrimination" (Anderson, 151). Therefore, not only are pragmatic solutions to issues of inequality being proposed, but with stigmatized and excluded groups as equals in the decision-making process, there will be increased levels of accountability, as well as discussion and responsible decision making (Anderson, 151). Discourse involving diverse perspectives is reinforced by the integrative model of affirmative action and with equal participation, it is possible to not only develop a method for securing fair access to existing social goods, but the question of whether or not the "right goods" are being talked about can be brought into question (Fraser, 44). The integrative model of affirmative access grants access to the decision-making process to those who can dispel stereotypes and introduce the needs of underrepresented individuals through lived experience.

France's Battle with Race

French Suburbs

According to Tyler Stovall, “the Paris suburbs […] have […] become a central symbol of immigration and racial conflict in France” (351). This was a difficult transition for France to grapple with as historically, Parisian suburbs have been associated with a “large working class [and a] politically radical population (Stovall, 351). Furthermore, the narrative of these suburbs has been presented in a way that “[oversimplifies] the Paris suburbs and the realities of both race and class in twentieth century France” (Stovall, 357). One way in which the shift has been understood is in the context of France undergoing decolonization and experiencing an influx of immigrants from its former colonial dependencies (Stovall, 356). Framed this way, “the racial split formerly represented by a separate metropole [continental France] and empire [France and its colonies] has now been replicated on the territory of the metropole itself, overshadowing previous class distinctions” (Stovall, 356). This portrays these French suburbs as still representing the traditional working class. Race and traditional French life are separated, while the racial conflict that dominates he suburbs is attributed to immigrants coming from former French dependencies. Another way that the transition in the suburbs is portrayed is that France was taking on “American multiculturalism” (Stovall, 357). This suggests again that “race is not a factor in French life” and that any conflict that has arisen is coming from an external source (Stovall, 357). In order to understand the dynamics of race and class, we will consider “new perspectives on the history of contemporary France” (Stovall, 357).

Historians have established that “the Paris suburbs in the early twentieth century [were] a zone of working-class marginality,” but in recognizing this, we must also acknowledge that race played a role in how the Parisian suburbs were and are perceived (Stovall, 357). Conceptions of race in France have origins that started out vastly different from the modern racialized groups that exist today and the way that modern racialized groups in France are seen today is different

from the United States. According to Pierre Boulle, “the term [race] was first associated simply with lineage, rather than fixed, physically defined differentiations between broad human groups” (12). This term of social status, quickly evolved into “natural—what we would now call biological—differences and placed great value on the possession of inherited character traits” (Boulle, 12). In contrast to modern conceptions of race, in this “natural” conception of race, “qualities were not seen as fixed or inevitable” but instead were just as much a matter of “familial training as [of] natural inheritance” (12). However, François Bernier, a medical doctor and a traveler, introduced the modern concept of race in 1684 when he wrote the article *A New Division of the Earth, according to the Different Species or Races of Men Who Inhabit It,* where he used the terms race and species interchangeably, began to focus on combinations of fixed physical features and skin color and stressed the importance of inheritance over environmental and cultural factors (Boulle, 15). The distinctions he makes between races form a “hierarchy” of sorts that “places a huge distance between Europeans and others” as he describes European peoples as a part of the first race which possesses only “the absence in [themselves] of the features defining the other three races” (Boulle, 14). This placed Europeans in the norm and other races as divergent (Boulle, 14).

French universalism

In the 18th century, Henri-Baptiste Grégoire, a priest and French revolutionary, strongly advocated for the beliefs that led to what is now called French universalism. As these ideas were beginning to form, Grégoire had a vision of “both cultural and biological” homogenization, with his opposition to racial prejudice “rooted in his larger goal of bringing all of mankind into the Catholic Church” (Sepinwall, 29). He believed that this could be achieved “once [oppressed

groups] had escaped their oppression, [they] would abandon their cultural—and even racial particularity" (Sepinwall, 33).

Grégoire formed his beliefs and operated under the assumption that blacks, Jews and Indians did have cultural *and* biological differences, but that they were not permanent. In regard to biological differences, he saw necessity in ameliorating other races by "race-crossing through intermarriage" (Sepinwall, 35). Although this idea could breed racial acceptance and negate segregation, the assumption that this is necessary in order to improve "physical deficiency" is an issue. It perpetuates an attitude that races that are not European or not within the "first race" are lacking certain biological traits that need to be supplied by another race. Similarly, with culture, while Grégoire "denounced forced conversion," he saw importance in everyone adopting Christianity and European culture. Grégoire did not feel that black slaves understood the "rights and duties" that came with being a citizen and that it would be "dangerous" to incorporate them in democracy until they converted to Christianity (Sepinwall, 30). The assumption was that Christianity would give black slaves the essential tools to teach them how to conduct themselves as free members of society (Sepinwall, 30).

Modern Multiculturalism

Republicanism and state nationalism in France have their roots in French universalism and the French revolution, making these essential components of what it means to "French". The revolution of 1789 has marked France as "a birthplace of political liberalism" while republicanism maintains the "national pride, and feed[s] into a shared sense of destiny..." (Morena, 2019). Furthermore, "Because of its universalism, progressives and leftists have long been drawn toward the concept of the Republic: the promise of a nation that bestows upon all of its members an equal opportunity for liberty, equality and fraternity" (Morena, 2019). In the late

19th century, a shift occurred within republicanism. It was believed that the survival of the Republic depended on the support of rural France, which led to the framing of republicanism in light of the peasantry, celebrating small farmers, local folklore and traditions and the movement away from the urban working class and socialist ideals (Morena, 2019).

However, in 21st century France, although it was still perceived as an assimilationist country, French republicanism has been incorporated into liberalism and multiculturalism. Structurally, there are clear instances in which the mistrust of multiculturalism is shown, such as laws limiting religious symbols in public spaces and the "reluctance to take ethnic factors into account in designing policy" (May, 1337). Nevertheless, France has shown an "increased willingness to fight discrimination on behalf of the French Republican ideal" (May, 1337). Organizations that support and advocate for cultural and religious minorities have been created at the national level and researchers at the local level have worked to expose issues that are related to ethnic minorities (May, 1337).

In order to demonstrate the shift from assimilation to multiculturalism, political philosopher Paul May conducted a study of four French national newspapers--*Le Figaro, L'Humanité, Libération and Le Monde*—to look at how multiculturalism is implemented in France, rather than analyzing legislation and institutions. The study began by identifying that there are three definitions for multiculturalism:

> The first…refers to the ethnic, cultural and religious diversity resulting from post-colonial immigration in Western countries. The second…refers to valuing diversity and the moral imperative of recognising different cultures from a social justice perspective [and] the third definition refers to…political authorities

> playing an active role in ensuring fair recognition of different cultures by giving individuals the means to maintain and transmit their cultural differences (1334).

These three definitions demonstrate the different understandings the public has about multiculturalism and gives insight into their conception of "ethnicity, cultural diversity and citizenship" (May, 1335). The results of the study showed that out of the four national newspapers analyzed, 40.3% of 866 articles portrayed multiculturalism as positive and when only taking into account *L'Humanité, Libération and Le Monde—Le Figaro* being widely known as a conservative newspaper—56.96% of the articles were positive and only 10.23% were negative (May, 1339). By contrast, in those same three newspapers, whenever assimilation was mentioned, it was "described as failing to provide a solution to the institutional discrimination that some parts of the immigrant population are facing" (May, 1339).'

Within all of these articles, multiculturalism has been viewed as positive at some point. For *L'Humanité, Libération* and *Le Monde* this positivity is the source of associations of multiculturalism with hospitality, acceptance and openness towards the future (May, 1342). This is supported with "discourse…[taking] the form of valuing ethnocultural diversity and celebrating a mixing of cultures" (May, 1342). For *Le Figaro*, the source of positivity was in appreciation of how multiculturalism benefited business in a globalized economy (May, 1343). Although this "positive connotation of multiculturalism" may not be in reference to a "politics of recognition, or even as a positive conception of cultural diversity" it shows tolerance to an ever-changing society in regard to its ethnographic makeup (May, 1343).

At the same time, there are instances where multiculturalism has negative connotations and for *Le Figaro,* this is quite frequent and unique. It is specifically "when multiculturalism is associated with post-colonial immigration, [that] it has negative connotations," and from 1995 to

2013 there has been a related "hardening of stances" (May, 1344). One reason that the opinions represented in *Le Figaro* are negative is that multiculturalism is blamed for the struggle to integrate immigrants and is seen as fostering division (May, 1345). In contrast, assimilation is seen as "an essential ingredient in the permanence and unity of the national community" (May, 1344). In addition, the negative opinions in *Le Figaro* stem from the belief that the rhetoric of multiculturalism "denigrates the national heritage" (May, 1345). When past events such as the French revolution—which evokes feelings of national unity and pride—are conflated with events such as colonialism—which evokes feelings of oppression—in public discourse, it is believed that the history of colonialism overshadows the French revolution in a way that generally portrays France as a country with a terrible history. Furthermore, it is viewed as a source of discouragement for immigrants to integrate into society which consequently, would further contribute to the divide (May, 1345).

What all four newspapers have in common is their negative association of multiculturalism with minority cultures—specifically Muslims—taking advantage of the need to respect other cultures in a way that oppresses other groups. The more left-leaning newspapers such as *L'Humanité* and *Libération*, are concerned with how affording different minority groups different rights will impact subgroups within the larger community. In these cases:

> Multiculturalism is associated with a form of differentialism that is opposed to universal rights. Multiculturalism is even sometimes compared to a 'form of racism' and a kind of indifference to the fate of immigrant women. Equality between men and women and emancipation of gay[s] and lesbians […] are perceived as being opposed to political compromises and differentiated groups rights associated with multiculturalism. (May, 1347)

The opinions in these articles are concerned with the rights of women and LGBTQ+ individuals being ignored as a consequence of also trying to maintain the rights of different cultures to be recognized (May, 1347). Within *Le Figaro,* the concerns are slightly different. The negative associations are similar to before in that there is a concern that national unity will be trampled "in the name of respect for differences and out of fear of being accused of racism" if radical Muslims are given too many exceptions (May, 1348). This is how the 2005 London bombing was interpreted because "more inclusive form[s] of secularism [are] interpreted as making concessions to Muslim extremists…" (May, 1348).

With both the positive and negative opinions of multiculturalism observed, it is clear that while assimilation is still seen to have advantages, it does not all stem from Grégoire's initiative to improve what he perceives to be inferior races and multiculturalism has become a significant part of the picture. In fact, political scientist Murat Akan attempts to contextualize multiculturalism to get a better understanding of how it can be contrasted with reluctance to adopt policies that account for ethnic differences in France. He identifies that the common argument of multiculturalists is that difference-blind liberalism falls short in issues of injustice because it does not "grant special rights to certain identity or culture-based groups" (Akan, 59). He proceeds to argue that it is not an issue of difference-blind liberalism, but rather republican nationalist interpretations of liberal laws that lead to injustice (Akan, 59).

Akan provides the examples of three Muslim school girls who were expelled from school in September of 1989 for wearing headscarves in the classroom on the basis of "the formal separation of the state from religious institutions" (66). The discourse that proceeded from this was about "the integration of immigrants into French society and related citizenship laws" (Akan, 66). For multiculturalists such as Iris Young, the conclusion was quickly drawn from that this was an

instance where the laws put in place did not grant ethnic minorities the same rights as others (Akan, 66). For feminists such as Susan Okin, who opposes multiculturalism, the belief was that this was a case of "cultural group rights [perpetuating] the subordination of women…" (Akan, 66). For Okin, this was not an issue of group rights prevailing over feminist rights, this was an issue of individual rights. For Young, applying individual rights would be the request of an exemption from *laïcité*—a law that prohibits religious proselytism and is deeply tied to radical republicanism—but Muslim women were not asking for an exemption under this law (Akan, 67). In fact, the State Council ruled that wearing the scarf did not infringe upon this law; it was the Minister of Education who reinterpreted this law five years later to take any "'ostentatious' signs of religious belief as proselytism" which resulted in seventy-nine students being dismissed from class (Akan, 67).

What can be gathered from this situation is that "the universal application of the law meant allowing the Muslim girls to wear their headscarves" and it was interpretations of the law that intended to repress representation of certain groups—Jews being allowed to wear yarmulkes and Catholics being allowed to wear crucifixes—that was the source of the problem (Akan, 67). This continues to be an issue as new laws come forward such as the Burqa Bans that are intentionally created to restrict anything that is not deemed to correspond with French identity. Multiculturalism is a useful tool for fighting against laws that have already been put in place or new laws that disproportionately impact disadvantaged ethnic groups in France because it attempts to give greater accessibility by changing laws, but it does not create issues of exemption. Multiculturalism is simply helpful for making and revising laws.

Multiculturalism also has its own drawbacks. While difference-blind laws are often critiqued as operating under the assumption of a homogenized population, multiculturalism within

France can homogenize members of a particular cultural group and ignore the within-group differences (Akan, 62). Concerns that were raised in liberal newspapers and concerns raised by Susan Okin are not unfounded. "Internal restrictions…[are] the right to restrict individual choice in the name of cultural 'tradition' or cultural 'integrity,'" which would allow for immigrant women to be oppressed within the greater context of minority group rights (Akan, 63). Even if we take away internal restriction and only allow for "external protections…which are claimed by a minority group against the larger society in order to reduce its vulnerability to the economic or political power of the larger society" we find that these protections will not always be equally distributed within the group (Akan, 63). When claiming one group identity, other parts of each individual have to be ignored which allows issues such as gender inequalities and economic class—which can cross boundaries of cultural and ethnic identity—to continue to marginalize people (Akan, 63).

Participatory Parity Within French Multiculturalism

Participatory parity's justificatory standard for whether claims for redistribution or recognition molds itself well within French multiculturalism. As detailed above, within French institutions, the issue often arises as to whether the French Muslim community needs to be protected from institutions that uphold majority culture norms that disrupt the minority community's traditions and cultures or if the subgroups within the French Muslim community need to be protected from the larger group's traditions or practices. In the case of the three Muslim school girls who were expelled from school, they were claiming recognition insofar as needing to be seen the same in the eyes of the law as other religious groups were. In order to claim this recognition, it needed to be shown that "the institutionalization of majority cultural norms denies them participatory parity and […] that the practices whose recognition they seek do

not themselves deny participatory parity—to some group members as well as nonmembers" (Fraser, 41). Both of these can be justified.

In regard to the impact of the institutionalization of majority cultural norms, the educational institution was denying them participatory parity by claiming that the headscarves of these Muslim girls took away from the ability for students to learn, while other religious groups were able to display their own religious symbols. The issue was not that there was religious symbolism in the educational realm, it was that the cultural symbol being represented did not align with the majority culture's values. In terms of the girls being a subgroup within the French Muslim community, the wearing of the headscarves was not necessarily denying participatory them parity through female subordination:

> …some French republicans have argued that the *foulard* is itself a marker of [female] subordination and must therefore be denied recognition…however, some multiculturalists have rejoined that the scarf's meaning is highly contested in French Muslim communities today…thus…the state should treat the foulard as a symbol of Muslim identity in transition, one whose meaning is contested, as is French identity itself… (Fraser, 41).

As the world becomes ever more connected through globalization and transcultural interactions, gender relations in general are starting to be questioned and discuss and Muslim communities are no exception. While some view the headscarf as "univocally patriarchal, which effectively accords to male supremacists the sole authority to interpret Islam," it is also viewed as a symbol of religious and ethnic identity. Therefore, it cannot be solely interpreted as subordination of a subgroup's participatory parity within a minority ethnic group.

Acknowledging the controversy around the headscarf and understanding that there is more than one way to interpret its symbolism within the Muslim community demonstrates the importance of public dialogue and discourse as well the inclusion of communities being effected. With such a controversial issue like the Muslim headscarf, it is important that when decisions are being made space is made for revision as cultures evolve and transition. Furthermore, it is vital that the decisions being made take into consideration the viewpoints of French Muslims to escape the oppressive force of majority culture interpretations that may not be understanding of minority traditions or know what is best for the subgroups of those communities.

However, Akan points outs out that this was not simply an issue of recognition; it was an issue of legal interpretation. In fact, “All of the public debates tended to revolve around a single axis: the integration of immigrants into French society and related citizenship laws” (Akan, 66). The laws that were already put in place did not institutionalize majority cultural norms in a way that denied participation and the first ruling by the State Council allowed for the Muslim girls to wear their headscarves. What participatory parity would prevent against is the ability to justify the modification of laws that intentionally institutionalize majority cultural values in the way that the French Minister of Education did in 1994. The deputy of the Union for French Democracy argued that “the French have the right to protect their particular cultural identity from being watered down by other foreign elements…[and] in order to substantiate the unassimability of immigrants, the nationalist groups pointed to…the headscarves incident” (Akan, 68).[3] The claim to French protection of foreigners would not be justified under participatory parity because it attempts to deny societal rights to citizenships with immigrant backgrounds. Based on the

[3] The claim to French protection was used to justify the nationalist attack on *jus soli* which ruled that citizenship of a child is determined by the place of that child’s birth.

incident regarding the Muslim school-girls' incident and French nationalism claims, the standards of participatory parity have demonstrated its ability to inhibit oppressive laws and substantiate claims for recognition in France.

Conclusion

Racism is a highly complex issue in terms of ideology and systemic impact. As humans we are naturally inclined to assign meanings to other human bodies based on the information we receive and the inferences that we make. However, what distinguishes the racist and non-racist race-thinking that is involved is whether or not we attribute these qualities directly to the person based on biological or cultural inferiority or evaluate likelihoods and understand the social explanations involved in a person's position in society. These ideas become complicated further when we look at how we should define racism to the external world, whether it be as unethical disregard or based strictly in antipathy and inferiorization. The former reinforces the idea that any differential treatment of people based on race goes against our moral beliefs. The latter focuses in on the need to morally condemn and disapprove a racially discriminatory act. By identifying two schools of thought on how racism should be defined, we can eventually come to a common understanding of what it means to be racist and move forward is discussions regarding racism.

If we are able to come to an agreement on how racism should be defined, we will be able to better converse and understand one another when discussing how the negative repercussions of racialized groups should be handled. Through looking at the system of segregation and the way it impacts access to socioeconomic goods and services we are able to determine the importance of integration in remedying these issues. The need for integration is supported even more by the standards of participatory parity. The necessity of ensuring that all members of

society are able to participate involves integrating all members in the societal framework regardless of majority and minority ethnic and cultural diversity or economic position in society. The goal is that through recognition and redistribution, all participants in society will have a voice in decision making processes.

We are able to see how participatory parity can conform to different cultural contexts and issues when looking at France and the United States. Both of these countries have their own complex histories and relationships to race. In France, transcultural contact has taken the country from a place of assimilation and a singular French identity, to a multiculturalist society battling between liberal and republican interpretations of the law. In the United States, a history of outright racially discriminatory housing policies that continue to fuel segregation and the socioeconomic inequalities that result. In the context of the United States, participatory parity outlines the need for an integrative model of affirmative action because it touches upon the need for redistributive goods that will provide opportunity and decrease gaps in socioeconomic inequality, while recognizing the differences that have been created due to a racialized history. In the context of France, participatory parity has the ability to quell fears induced by potential weaknesses in multiculturalism and hold accountable liberal laws that are supposed to provide universal rights to all of its citizens. In both the United States and France, participatory parity fosters relationships and understanding people from diverse backgrounds, while simultaneously implementing an environment that forges accountability in systems that have the ability to create change.

Bibliography

Akan, Murat. “Contextualizing Multiculturalism.” Studies in Comparative International Development 38, no. 2 (2003): 57–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02686268.

Anderson, Elizabeth. *The Imperative of Integration*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Beirich, Heidi, Susy Buchanan, and Max-o-Matic. “2017: The Year in Hate and Extremism.” *Southern Poverty Law Center*, February 11, 2019. https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2018/2017-year-hate-and-extremism.

Blum, Lawrence. *"I'm Not a Racist, But...": The Moral Quandary of Race*. 1st ed. Cornell University Press, 2002.

Brown, Anna. “Key Findings on Americans' Views of Race in 2019.” *Pew Research Center.* Pew Research Center, April 9, 2019. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/09/key-findings-on-americans-views-of-race-in-2019/.

Fraser, Nancy, and Axel Honneth. *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso, 2018.

Kishi, Katayoun. “Muslims, Jews Faced Social Hostilities in Seven-in-Ten European Countries in 2015.” *Pew Research Center.* Pew Research Center, April 12, 2017. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/12/muslims-jews-faced-social-hostilities-in-seven-in-ten-european-countries-in-2015/.

May, Paul. “French Cultural Wars: Public Discourses on Multiculturalism in France (1995–2013).” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42, no. 8 (2015): 1334–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2015.1093412.

Morena, Edouard. “French Republicanism - RLS Brüssel.” (Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Büro Brüssel), October 24, 2019. https://www.rosalux.eu/en/article/1498.french-republicanism.html.

Peabody, Sue, and Tyler Edward. Stovall. *The Color of Liberty Histories of Race in France*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Taylor, Paul C. *Race: A Philosophical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2013.

The House We Live In: Race—The Power of an Illusion. 2003. Accessed November 8, 2020. https://digital.films.com/PortalPlaylists.aspx?wID=106248&xtid=49736.

Wise, Tim. “Preface.” In *Between Barack and a Hard Place: Racism and White Denial in the Age of Obama*, 7–16. San Francisco, CA: City lights Books, 2009.