

The Cost of Privilege

*Taking On the System of
White Supremacy and Racism*

Chip Smith

With

Michelle Foy, Badili Jones, Elly Leary,
Joe Navarro, and Juliet Ucelli

Art and graphic design by
Malcolm Goff

Camino



Press

Cult of domesticity

Within the dominant relations of patriarchy, a certain rough equality and mutual respect between white men and women marked the hard life of early farming families. By the beginning of the 1800s, however, this situation began to change. Owners were building factories and looking for a source of cheap labor, and they turned to young women, especially in the textile and garment industries. Long hours and hard conditions together yielded only low wages – as the mill owners, the press, and clergy promoted the view that women were not real workers. Rather, young women were said to be marking time until they could find a husband. So even as new opportunities opened up, the dominant culture stressed that women’s rightful place was in the home. This “cult of domesticity” – especially when combined with low wages – undercut any potential for women to achieve independence in their lives.

Later, at various points over the next 150 years, controlling white women’s bodies by keeping them at home remained critical to maintaining white male supremacy. For example, challenges to patriarchal relations occurred:

- *during the social turmoil after the Civil War*, as women shaped by abolitionism and the early suffrage movement made a place for themselves in the Freedmen’s schools in the South;
- *as the women’s-place-is-in-the-home system started breaking down* under the pressure of industrialization – and, in reaction, the first women’s prison, built in 1874, stressed training in household skills;⁷
- *in the mix of new immigrants, Mexicans, and free black people* that accompanied urban expansion in the late 1800s, thereby threatening white men’s exclusive access to white women; and
- *after the two world wars*, as the economy struggled to provide work for returning soldiers, including soldiers of color who felt emboldened by their military service and the respect shown them by European men and women.

Chinese domestic workers

In California, too, the cult of domesticity took hold. The mostly male society of the early years of Anglo settlement – with its cult of the Western Hero – began disappearing after the Civil War.⁸ In its place developed a dangerous (to white supremacy) mix of white women and white, Mexican, Chinese, and native men. While promoting family values for white women, the authorities also moved to effectively exclude Chinese

wives from entering the United States to join their husbands. The passage of the Page Act in 1870 required “lengthy and humiliating interrogations of [a Chinese wife’s] character prior to being issued a visa in China.”⁹ This restriction, however, did not prevent many thousands of Chinese women being purchased in China and sold into slavery in West Coast brothels in the following decades.

While popular culture pictured Chinese men as lascivious and craftily seeking to seduce helpless white women – all the more reason to keep them at home – a public world of prostitution serving white men thrived in the West Coast cities. Chinese women had no voice in the dominant culture, even though they became the target of outraged moral censure. Their voicelessness, Robert G. Lee comments, fit with the Victorian era’s overall sense of propriety and “seemed to confirm the claim to the passionless true nature of womanhood in general.”¹⁰

Lee describes how Chinese men during the 1870s and ‘80s, forced out of both manufacturing and agriculture, fell back on becoming household servants – or on occupations like running laundries that were extensions of women’s work. Chinese men then took on a new representation in popular culture as a “third sex” – which helped manage the tension of having another man in the white man’s house. In this way the lines defining sex and color became blurred. Racism and male supremacy worked together both to confine white women to the home and to subjugate men of color.

Anti-miscegenation

Despite laws barring intimacy between white people and people of color, white males were unrestrained in their violent access to black women. By the decade between 1850 and 1860, “the mulatto slave population increased by 67 percent; in contrast, the black slave population increased by only 20 percent.”¹¹

California expanded its early law against mixed marriages to include Chinese, or “Mongolians” in 1880, two years before the exclusion of all Chinese immigrant laborers from entering the country. Then in 1884, with the Page Act providing insufficient control, the state legislature prohibited wives of Chinese immigrants from joining their husbands. The goal was the prevention of a new generation of Chinese being born – thereby eliminating the “Chinese problem,” as open violence had earlier dealt with the “Indian problem.”¹²

Later waves of anti-Japanese and anti-Filipino sentiment in California resulted in further legal restrictions on interracial marriages. Country-wide the number of states with anti-miscegenation laws peaked at 38 around the time of the eugenicist-backed Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924. That year also saw passage of the Virginia Racial Integrity Act. Eugenics expert Lothrop Stoddard declared, “White race-purity is the

cornerstone of our civilization." And Walter Plecker, who was responsible for implementing Virginia's law, proudly declared in 1943, "Our own indexed birth and marriage records, showing race, reach back to 1853. Such a study has probably never been made before...Hitler's genealogical study of the Jews is not more complete."¹³

By the 1950s, almost half the states still had anti-miscegenation laws. Then under the influence of the civil rights movement, the Supreme Court ruled against Florida's harsh penalties for adultery involving mixed-race couples. Finally, in 1967's *Loving vs. Virginia*, Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote for the majority, "Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry or not marry a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed upon by the State."¹⁴

Sex and Jim Crow

The cult of domesticity, anti-miscegenation laws, and the social neutering of Chinese domestic workers helped keep white women under patriarchal control. But the unnaturalness of these arrangements both assured their eventual breakdown and, given this underlying reality, supercharged the personal dynamics across the color line – especially in the defeated Southern states bent on reasserting white patriarchal power after the Civil War.

Lynching and rape

In the decades after the violent suppression of Reconstruction, opinion leaders nurtured a simmering rage directed at African Americans' sense of entitlement to their freedom. Ida B. Wells estimated in the 1890s that 10,000 lynchings had occurred in the first 30 years after the Civil War. The great bulk of these were the result of white nightriders, Klu Klux Klan terror, and election violence in the years up to 1877. Then the killings settled into a pattern of roughly 100 people a year murdered by white vigilante violence over the next 50 years. This record translates to one person killed every three and a half days for assault, murder, and rape – as well as for "wanting a drink of water," "sassing a white lady," "being troublesome," or for "nothing."¹⁵

Despite this reign of terror, as we saw in Chapter 5, black people organized and defended themselves – refusing to accept the abuse. During the 1880s in Memphis, Tennessee, Ida B. Wells contested the tightening hold of segregation after the Supreme Court ruled Sumner's Law, the 1875 Civil Rights Bill, unconstitutional. When ordered out of a ladies' railroad car, Wells resisted the conductor's physical attempt to remove her by biting his arm. She finally was dragged from the car only with the assistance of two other men. Wells sued the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, winning a \$500 settlement in a Memphis court. The judgment was

later overturned on appeal, however, and the incident ended up costing Wells \$200 in court costs.

When Wells described her experiences in a church newsletter, the story quickly spread. Soon she was asked to write on a range of topics for the black press in Kansas City, Detroit, Indianapolis, and Louisville. Newspapers had sprung up in all the urban areas where black people lived – serving as a lifeline that nourished a shared sense of racial community. Philip Dray comments, “Newspapers and other periodicals were ubiquitous, a result of fast-growing literacy among blacks and a keen interest in the current events that affected their lives.”¹⁶ In 1889 Wells purchased a share of a newspaper and took on the roles of writer and editor for the *Free Speech and Headlight*. Typical of Wells’s stand was an editorial in 1891 in response to a lynching in Georgetown, Kentucky: “Of one thing we may be assured, so long as we permit ourselves to be trampled upon, so long we will have to endure it. Not until the Negro rises in his might and takes a hand resenting such cold-blooded murders, if he has to burn up whole towns, will a halt be called in wholesale lynching.”¹⁷

What is remarkable is that it was not until 1892 that Wells came to realize that overwhelmingly the charges of rape used to justify up to two-thirds of all lynchings had no basis in reality. Wells’s investigations undercut her earlier belief that “unreasoning anger over the terrible crime of rape...[suggested] perhaps the brute deserved to die anyhow and the mob was justified in taking his life.”¹⁸ On reflection, however, certain questions came to mind: Why had there not been an epidemic of rapes during the Civil War, when white women were left to the care of black slaves? Or especially during Reconstruction, when black people held political power and yet there were no reports of rape? When Wells drew the appropriate conclusions in a *Free Speech* editorial, her days in Memphis were numbered: “Nobody in this section believes the old threadbare lie that Negro men assault white women. If Southern white men are not careful they will over-reach themselves and a conclusion will be reached which will be very damaging to the moral reputation of their women.”¹⁹ Frederick Douglass commented during this period that until he read Wells’s articles he, too, “had begun to believe it true that there was increased lasciviousness on the part of Negroes.”²⁰

Charges of rape actually had very little to do with sexual assault – and everything to do with shoring up white supremacy in the South. Lynching was not about meting out justice, since the courts were totally controlled by white people and any legal proceeding would have yielded the desired punishment. Rather lynching – which often included sexual mutilation – aimed to terrorize a whole people into submission, to emasculate black men while defending the pinnacle of white male privilege, access to white women.

The violence of the period also had an inverted counterpart in Southern culture. The "Mammy" figure emerged as part a warm, nostalgic dream of earlier times – when black people "knew their place" and lovingly cared for white people. Philip Dray points to other conditions that compounded the white South's resentment at a new generation of audacious and independent-minded black people: "the sexual anxiety of the Victorian era," "the region's historic emphasis on protecting personal honor," "warm memories of vigilantism of the Reconstruction era," "widespread religious fundamentalism," and "economic depression." Also, Christian teachings claimed that black people – as "the children of Ham – were beings of darkness." Finally, lynching served as "a form of tribal sacrifice...a form of painful spasm a community 'needed' in order to regain a feeling of normalcy."²¹

Together, all these conditions and the brutal bloodfests they supported succeeded in creating an image in people's minds that connected the word *rape* with black men – and black men raping white women, in particular. The reality, however, was just the opposite: white men, who feared neither legal nor communal retaliation, could act on their sexual urges against women of color with impunity. The image of the black rapist justified lynch mob terror repeatedly between 1880 and 1930. It arose again in the 1930s case of the Scottsboro Boys. It lurked in the background in the killing of Emmett Till in 1955, and in the 1970 murder of Henry Marrow, described by Timothy B. Tyson in *Blood Done Sign My Name*. These dates come uncomfortably close to the present and suggest that the image still haunts us today – as does its real counterpart, white male violence in the military, in women's prisons, and at fraternity and team parties on or off campus.

Making homosexuality abnormal

As the color line became harshly defined, homosexuality for the first time came to be identified as a scientifically abnormal social category – as a particular defect in character with racial overtones.²² Two trials during the 1890s focused people's attention, first, on Oscar Wilde, charged with sodomy in England; and second, on Alice Mitchell, accused of killing her lesbian lover in the United States. During this same period, Havelock Ellis published the first textbook on sexology in which he claimed that "the question of sex – *with the racial questions that rest on it* – stands before the coming generations as the chief problem for solution."²³ This text proved to be helpful for some gay people of the era, as it helped to validate their sense of identity. At the same time, Ellis paved the way for homosexuality to be categorized as a medical pathology, a type of mental disease.

In earlier years sexual "inversion" – taking on opposite sex roles – was one thing, while committing particular criminalized sex acts was

another. "Sodomy" involved any act not connected to procreation – and ranged from masturbation all the way to bestiality. Same-sex physical love was condemned by the Hebrew Bible and considered a sin by the early Christian Church. Even so, man-boy intercourse was a staple of ancient Greek society – although not the man-man variety – and part of growing up in certain parts of Melanesia require the passing of semen from young men to boys, thereby enabling them to develop into men. In Europe the persecution of sodomy increased during the 12th and 13th centuries, including executions and imprisonment, as the church extended its hold over the common people. Later, the rising bourgeoisie associated homosexuality with decadent manor life in order to help mobilize public opinion behind their revolutionary objectives.²⁴

By the late 1800s, authorities in Europe had been conducting occasional raids for centuries on underground all-male gathering places. Women by contrast generally were not considered sexual beings in their own right – outside of a relationship with a man. Largely confined to private spaces, women experienced same-sex love in the settings where men had before the rise of the capitalist cities – in extended family networks and with and among servants in large households. As white women were brought together in factory dormitories and later in girls' schools, passionate friendships with varying degrees of physical expression were not uncommon. But these relationships largely passed unnoticed in public discourse, given women's assumed lack of sexual interest. The contrast with the earthy sensuality attributed to women of color – used to justify white men's violent attraction – highlights the society's profound confusion around race and gender.

During the Jim Crow era, this confusion took on a more defined character – as homosexual relationships came to be associated with interracial ones, and both received the label "abnormal." This linked assessment continued in psychiatry into the 1970s. Only with the rise of the gay and lesbian movement after the Stonewall Rebellion* in 1969 did mental health experts take homosexuality out of the category of mental illness (1973) – six years after state anti-miscegenation laws had been ruled unconstitutional.

The uneasiness with sexual roles in the early 1900s showed up in the popularity of cross-dressing in Vaudeville acts, and in the gender-bending farce *A Florida Enchantment* that both toyed with lesbian love

* In the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, gay and transgender men and lesbians for the first time stood up and defended themselves, instead of meekly, and even shamefully, accepting harassment from the police and criminal underworld. The Stonewall Inn, a mafia-controlled gay bar on Christopher St. in Greenwich Village, became the site of several evenings of street fighting by patrons and community supporters in response to a police raid. This rebellion marked the start of the gay – later to become the lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender/questioning (LGBTQ) – liberation movement. (*Martin Duberman, Stonewall*)

while projecting the starkest racist stereotypes. In Archibald Gunter's original novel published in 1891, the main character Lillian, who experiences being transformed into a man, ends up marrying her woman friend – with whom she had flirted while still dressed as a woman. By the time the 1915 movie version came out, however, this ending proved too risky, so everything was short-circuited by the heroine's "waking up" from her suggestive dream.

Siobhan Somerville reports that attitudes toward women's passionate relationships with other women were mixed at the turn of the 20th Century, as these relationships had not yet been pathologized. Popular fiction of the time – including the stories of African American writer Pauline Hopkins – reflects this ambiguity. Overlapping themes center on light-skinned characters "passing," on cross-dressing, and on romantic relationships between women – while often couched as tragedies or safely isolated in a stage world separate from heterosexual culture.

The Jim Crow era drew a sharp line between white people on the one side and people of color on the other. On the basic human level, the unnaturalness of this division led writers to focus on the margins – where one color blends into another, or where either-or sexual identities break down. In the larger social context of the period, as discussed in Chapter 6, the United States was emerging as a new and energetic imperialist power. The virile white male and the purity of his line represented imperial power and civilization in an increasingly multi-colored world.^{*} Meanwhile, European immigrants, pressured into dropping their old-world identities and class-consciousness, gained factory employment. But along with it came harsh working conditions, crowded tenements, immigrant bashing, and deportation – as well as battlefield death and injury in the inter-imperialist rivalry of World War I. In this process of acculturation to the realities of white privilege, clearing up ambiguities required pathologizing any deviance from the heterosexual, white norm.

Political uses of patriarchy

Jacksonian Democracy

In the 1830s Andrew Jackson extended the vote to all white males as part of his effort to preserve the slave system and crush remaining indigenous resistance. Jackson solidified his base in the Democratic Party; strengthened grassroots allegiance to white supremacy and the slave system; and mobilized a base for the expulsion from the South of the "Five Civilized Tribes" – the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole.²⁵

^{*} Harvard trained lawyer and eugenicist Lothrop Stoddard's *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy* (1920) clearly represents this outlook.

The progressive challenge to Jackson during this period came from opponents of the slave system, reflected in David Walker's Appeal (1829), Nat Turner's Rebellion (1831), and the abolitionist movement beginning in the early 1830s. Women began to speak out publicly, gaining experience that later carried over to the early women's suffrage movement. Maria W. Stewart, a free black woman, gave talks in Boston between 1831 and 1833.²⁶ And two white women from a former slaveholding family in South Carolina, Angelina and Sarah Grimké, toured the Northeast lecturing against the slave system.²⁷ All three women faced criticism for stepping outside the bounds of what was then considered women's proper role.

Jackson's reactionary policy of white male enfranchisement succeeded, however. And as the Southeastern native peoples struggled to survive the forced march west over the Trail of Tears – or fled to form isolated settlements in the Appalachian Mountains – white settlers moved in to take over the dispossessed nations' land in Georgia, Alabama, and the Carolinas. "The Democracy," as the Jacksonian movement came to be called, distributed white male privileges in the form of political power and land in order to consolidate the Southern patriarchs' hold on federal power for another generation and more.

The Wilmington Riot

Some sixty years later, the Democratic Party moved to reassert its power in North Carolina, using a variation on the same methods. In the run-up to the 1898 elections, the Democrats consciously linked "black rule," as they called the racially mixed state and local fusion governments, with rape.²⁸ Campaigners went about North Carolina rallying white farmers who had voted for the Populist Party to rise up in defense of white women. Not only were the Democrats able to undercut the class solidarity of the Populists with this racist appeal, they also dealt a blow to women's aspirations for the vote. In place of suffrage, the racists offered protection. Some white women took advantage of this backward movement to enter the public arena, baiting white men to stand up and show their manhood. Others stood next to their husbands on the campaign circuit, representing the pure and passive ideal at stake in the struggle.

In Wilmington Alfred Moore Waddell transformed himself from an old, poor, ex-Confederate colonel into the leader of the white supremacist mob that seized power from the city's elected authority. Waddell's family, Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore reports, "could scarcely believe the manly vigor that now gripped the old colonel...For Alfred Waddell, the hypermasculine trappings of the white supremacy campaign provided an opportunity to act out his redemption upon a public stage."²⁹

On Election Day Democrats won all across the state. The Republicans hardly put up a fight – and in Wilmington the Republican governor had withdrawn all the Republican candidates from the contest. Nonetheless, the day after the election the Democrats called a mass meeting and drew up a “white declaration of independence.” They demanded the resignation of the police chief and the mayor, who had a year left on his term of office. They called on employers to fire their black employees. And they ordered Alexander Manly, the outspoken editor of Wilmington’s black newspaper, the *Daily Record*, to get out of town.

The next morning Waddell led a mob in hunting down black leaders and property owners – shooting people and chasing them out of town. As reported in the press, the number of people killed that day was about a dozen. Folk accounts, however, ranged into the hundreds, with images of carts passing through town loaded with bodies. Waddell took over the mayor’s office. And in the wake of the riot, some 1,400 African Americans fled Wilmington – while white people once again moved in to take over their property. The governor and Republican President William McKinley refused to intervene. And the next state convention of the Republican Party – the Party of Lincoln – was a “whites only” gathering.

Restriction, upsurge, and counter-“Reconstruction”

A third example of patriarchy’s political usefulness is the counter-attack on the “Second Reconstruction” of the 1960s and ‘70s. Wini Breines, in her study of the 1950s, shows that white women’s restricted horizons during this decade clashed with the real opportunities that were opening to them in society.³⁰ As a result of this contradiction, the repressive ‘50s actually laid the groundwork for the women’s liberation movement of the 1960s. As described by Micaela Di Leonardo and Roger Lancaster, this broad upsurge in consciousness and organization, which later came to be identified as feminism’s “Second Wave,”³¹ achieved a number of lasting gains:

- *making a distinction between sex* – the biological configuration people are born with – *and gender* – the patterns of behavior, trained capacities, and roles society constructs for women vs. men;
- *affirming that “the personal is political”* – particularly in relation to women controlling their own lives in the areas of reproduction, household tasks, child rearing, and sexual fulfillment;
- *pulling away the ideological veil* that hides women’s true potential behind a fixation on body type and particular images of beauty,

³¹ The First Wave extended from the pre-Civil War women’s movement – often identified with the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848 – to August 26, 1920, when the 19th Amendment giving women the right to vote became law.

“mother-blaming” as the source of people’s psychological problems, and women’s “sexual passivity,” “frigidity,” and “neuroses”;

- *working to rebalance the sexual revolution* of the 1960s to counter its bias toward men;
- *revealing and taking steps to correct* the medical profession’s orientation to men and male diseases by stimulating “better research on breast cancer, contraceptive methods, the physiology of menopause, and the elimination of unnecessary hysterectomies, Cesarean sections, and radical mastectomies”; and
- *broadening the understanding of work* and women’s (and men’s) relationship to it – by validating women’s efforts in the reproduction of labor power in the home, as well as by demanding equal pay for equal work in all sectors of the economy, and especially in those traditionally identified with women.

In the next three chapters we will broaden this assessment by discussing some of the shortcomings of Second Wave feminism. Here, however, we want to emphasize the movement’s lasting impact on people’s thinking and social practices – as part of the popular upheaval of the 1960s that many call the “Second Reconstruction.”

Sheila Collins provides a measure of the broad challenge to the U.S. social system at the end of the 1960s:

- “Between 1958 and 1972...the percentage of those who thought that government was run for the benefit of a ‘few big interests’ rose from 17.6 percent to 53.3 percent.
- “In 1960, 18 percent of the people polled thought the government was spending too much on defense. By 1969 that figure had climbed to 52 percent, and
- “By 1970, 58 percent in a Harris poll thought that defense spending should be cut.”³²

Collins goes on to show sharply dropping confidence in the president, in Congress, business leaders, educators, and the military. At the same time, by the early 1970s people were open to considering a real shift in national priorities:

- “44% favored direct public ownership of natural resources.
- “Ninety percent...favored a federal program to give jobs to the unemployed,
- “83 percent favored more federal funds for pollution control, and
- “76 percent favored more federal funds for education.”³³

Collins then shows how the conservative counterattack took as its initial target the weak link in white progressive thinking – namely, the black woman. Liberal sociologist Daniel Moynihan in his *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* focused on what he called the “pathology” of the black family. Collins notes that in the 1965 Moynihan Report “the black matriarchal family is made the scapegoat for the ills of the black lower class.”³⁴

Then in the early 1970s the media began beating the drums of the “white backlash” – taking advantage, in particular, of the progressive movement’s failure to recognize and struggle through with white workers their sense of deteriorating privileges. Emblematic of this effort was the TV program *All in the Family* (1971-1979), whose liberal-oriented goal was to expose and defuse class, race, and gender tensions. While ridiculing embattled dockworker Archie Bunker for his racist and anti-woman attitudes, the program at the same time indelibly imprinted on millions of minds an image of backward white workers.

The real-life efforts of revolutionary activists of the period to move into white communities and organize among white workers came too late. Then the closing of union plants in the North undercut the social base of the oppressed nationality movements – as in Detroit with its League of Revolutionary Black Workers and huge NAACP. Patriarchal practices of male leaders undermined internal solidarity in the movement. And the government moved violently against Black Panthers, American Indian Movement activists, and Puerto Rican and Chicano nationalists.

Together with the media offensive, deindustrialization, and counter-insurgency measures, the offensive against the Second Reconstruction also had its more subtle side. Cooptation of leading movement forces operated in two directions to preserve, even if in modified form, the white male dominated social structure. On one side, some individuals in the national movements found their way to a middle class life-style – professionals, academics, and a few at the margins of corporate management. Political power brokers from these sectors also gained a role in overseeing the cities for regional ruling elites – and from these positions helped chill out grassroots dissent. On a second front, affirmative action resulting from the 1964 Civil Rights Act tended to benefit white women disproportionately – since better-off women had access to resources that allowed personal advancement through education. As a result the leading sector of the white women’s movement largely separated off from its potential base among the masses of working class women of all nationalities.

* See Chap. 19, pp. 289-292, for a discussion of the New Communist Movement of the 1970s.

Then as the economic crisis of the early 1970s took hold – the devaluation of the dollar, rising gas prices, the decline in average wages (which continued for 20+ years), and stagflation – industry moved south and men of color in the rust belt lost out overall. In subsequent decades, with the increase in service industries, women of color were able to make some gains, but the trend toward more equal treatment in the workplace also had much to do with men's deteriorating situation. Meanwhile white male union workers, who had largely ridden out the 1960s in their privileged and apparently secure economic positions, came under attack as well. By 1981 the popular movements were in retreat, and Ronald Reagan turned on the white male workforce. His mass firing of the air traffic controllers sent a signal that the period of privileged accommodation with organized labor was over. Reagan counterbalanced his real attack on white workers with an appeal to patriarchy and white supremacy: He opposed the Equal Rights Amendment; used Clarence Thomas to dismantle the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; filled his administration with anti-abortion advocates, including Chief of Staff, Patrick Buchanan; and bonded with his supporters by labeling poor women on welfare "welfare queens."³⁵

The Second Reconstruction, as with the first, fell to a combination of attacks on people of color and privileges distributed to white people – this time, to white women as well as men. After the Civil War, women were denied inclusion under the 14th and subsequent amendments that assured black men the right to vote. It took another 50 years to achieve this goal. In the 1960s, by contrast, patriarchy bent to allow better-off women into the educated elite, while continuing to restrain advancement with glass ceilings and old-boy networks. At the same time, certain oppressed nationality individuals were able to achieve a measure of economic and political power. Effectively split off from their social bases, both these social elites still maintained sufficient standing to confuse people and hold out hope for individual advancement. The majority of working class people, however, found themselves no better off – and white patriarchal capitalism successfully reconstituted itself after this most recent revolutionary challenge.

IV. Patriarchy and Privilege

Chapter 12: Roots of Patriarchy

- ¹ Zúñi and Plains Indians examples from Howard Zinn, *People's History of the United States*
- ² Lauren Wells Hasten, "In Search of the 'Berdache'"
- ³ Carol Devens, "Countering Colonization"
- ⁴ Cheryl I. Harris, "Whiteness as Property"
- ⁵ Zinn, op. cit., p. 108
- ⁶ Angela Davis, "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves"
- ⁷ Angela Davis, "Public Imprisonment and Private Violence"
- ⁸ This discussion draws on Robert G. Lee, "Orientals"
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 89
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 91
- ¹¹ Bárbara C. Cruz and Michael J. Berson, "The American Melting Pot?"
- ¹² Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters*
- ¹³ Both Plecker and Stoddard quoted in "Eugenics in America," *Facing History and Ourselves*
- ¹⁴ Cruz and Berson, op. cit.
- ¹⁵ Philip Dray, *At the Hands of Persons Unknown*, p. x-xi
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 57
- ¹⁷ Quoted in Dray, op. cit., p. 59-60
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 63
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 64
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 67
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-79
- ²² This discussion follows Siobhan B. Somerville, *Queering the Color Line*
- ²³ Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 15, italics in original
- ²⁴ Micaela Di Leonardo and Roger Lancaster, "Gender, Sexuality, Political Economy"
- ²⁵ Alexander Saxton, *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic*
- ²⁶ Lerone Bennett, Jr., 1993. *Before the Mayflower*
- ²⁷ Zinn, op. cit.
- ²⁸ Patriarchy in the Wilmington riot draws on Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow*
- ²⁹ Gilmore, op. cit., p. 110
- ³⁰ Wini Breines, *Young, White, and Miserable*
- ³¹ List of topics and quote drawn from Di Leonardo and Lancaster, op. cit., pp. 47-48
- ³² Sheila Collins, *The Jackson Campaign and the Future of U.S. Politics*, p. 54
- ³³ *Ibid.*, p. 55
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63
- ³⁵ Pam Chamberlain and Jean Hardisty, "Reproducing Patriarchy"