Practical Representation and the Multiracial Social Movement

Vernon D. Johnson
Western Washington University, vernon.johnson@wwu.edu

Kelsie Benslimane
Western Washington University, kelsie.benslimane@wwu.edu

Practical Representation and the Multiracial Social Movement

Vernon Damani Johnson
Kelsie Benslimane
Western Washington University

> I think most Black people, in general, are really not interested in dialogue at this point from White people ... I think most Black people think of the request of White people for dialogue as being basically analogous to stalling, stalling for time ... I think what most Black people would like from White people is some kind of action ... Now you can do it while you talk to us ... I think what most Black people, what most people in the Seneca Nation, what most people in the Mohawk Nation would like is some activity, massive amounts of it![1]

The issue of representation has been brought to attention by people in social theory, ethnic and women's studies, and literary and cultural criticism. In political science, representation arose as an issue as various social movements became concerned with their empowerment. The study of the quest for inclusion in the power structure of society has been conducted in two ways. First, political theorists and philosophers have sought to understand the efforts of social movements to define who they are and the nature of their experiences within a larger societal context. The struggle over what it means to be Black in the United States, for example, has been contested for two generations now. Black nationalists and others pressing for social justice redefined Blackness in positive terms (courageous, dignified, compassionate, humane, etc.) in contrast to the historic definitions of a society based on White supremacy (lazy, licentious, happy-go-lucky, etc.). Other races of color, women, and queer communities have engaged in similar quests for redefinition in popular culture. This struggle over representation as the power of self-definition continues unabated. Meanwhile, people studying political institutions, public policy, and constitutional law have approached representation in another way. They have focused upon the struggle for representation in the halls of government and workplace, as well as efforts to redirect public policies and restructure political institutions to redress historic injustices toward various subaltern groups.[2]

Our work is more focused on the social movement side of the study of representation. It is concerned with the social construction of group identity and movements for empowerment based upon those identities. Specifically, we are interested in the development of a multiracial American national identity, a project shared with many scholars and activists which is clearly within the purview of social movements analysis.[3] In undertaking this project, we have not only been concerned with the development of theory, but also with *the practice of multiracialism.* In terms of the academic discussion of cross-cultural communication and representation, we want not only to discern what is to be done, but to offer a blueprint for how to do it. How do Americans of different racial and cultural backgrounds who believe America should embrace multiracialism engage in action across racial lines to engender multi-racialist practices in the society at large? In doing so, how do different races of people get represented in the actual work of social and political change? Such a pursuit amounts to a *multiracial hegemonic project.* Hegemony is ideological consensus in civil society. Though consensus may exist, it is always historically contingent, and needs to be reproduced from generation to generation. This is especially true in liberal democracies where citizens exercise influence over political parties, electoral competition, and the shaping of the public policy agenda. Even when there is consensus there are usually competing hegemonic projects promoted by interest groups and social movements, some of which are unhappy with the status quo, others who seek to defend it. In the area of race relations, the United States has not witnessed ideological consensus since the late 1960s.[4] Broad hegemonic projects, however, must be undertaken in an organizational framework in social movements at a multiplicity of sites. The analysis here will be directed at the social movements in which people actually organize themselves to pursue competing visions of racial justice.

Our other concern is the way issues of race are handled in national-level political discourses in American politics. National political leaders tend to talk about race at an abstract and very

symbolic level, not in a way that concretely attends to issues facing Americans in their day-to-day lives. For that reason, we believe efforts to build a multiracial hegemony must be waged primarily at the local level where there is the potential for face to-face engagement and greater honesty, then at the abstract level of national politics.

The following analysis will begin with a review of the ideas of Stuart Hall on representation. Our arguments are based on a revised notion of Hall's ideas. Next, we posit that six social movements for racial justice exist in American politics. All six will be introduced and defined, and the desirability of the multiracial movement will be advanced. A discussion of Johnson's political work in a local human rights organization will serve as an example of the struggles that arise in organizations purporting to seek racial justice. The final section of the article will discuss the centrality of erecting a multiracial hegemony by emphasizing local politics in the context of debates about American national identity.

Representation in Practice: An Extension on the Theory of Stuart Hall

The work of the late British social theorist Stuart Hall has been very influential in the study of cultural identity. It is his theory of representation which is of concern here. Hall defines representation as "the production of meaning through language."[5] There are two systems of representation for Hall. First, there is the process by which "objects, people, and events" are linked to ideas or concepts. This is *mental representation*. It is the first step toward giving meaning to things in a way that allows us to interpret what goes on in the world. A second system of representation is language. Through language, our conceptualization of objects, people, and events, is linked by words that identify the same things to different people. This process can be termed *discursive representation*. Language allows us to share meanings. It is the key to understanding culture for Hall. He defines culture as "a set of practices [involving] the production and exchange of meanings... between the members of a society or group."[6]

In discussing the role of imagery, portrayal, and stereotyping in the analysis of representation, Hall implies a third system of representation, but does not specify it or relate it theoretically to the other two systems. In constructing his definition, Hall refers to the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary,* which defines representation as "a description or portrayal" of something.[7] The portrayal of an image or model of some future structure of race relations is of critical importance, primarily for actors in social movements, but also for cultural critics and public intellectuals seeking to make compelling observations about our social life. This third area might be defined as *practical representation.* It refers to the process whereby people engage self-consciously in certain kinds of social movement practices to model behavior they deem to be appropriate for making the larger society a better place to live. When practical representation is part of political organization it goes beyond re-conceptualizing our understandings of certain social groups, or even lobbying for the allocation of goods and services toward them. Practical representation can lead to active participation in reallocation, or ultimately, to engendering the empowerment of subaltern groups through the creation of new social institutions over which they have some ownership. Practical representation of differing racial groups is at the heart of meaningful cross-cultural communication. It is also essential to the multiracial hegemonic project, while it is marginal to the other two. The following section will elaborate upon this point.**Social Movements in Civil Society and the Struggle for Racial Justice**

Institutionalized White supremacy has been a defining characteristic of the American social structure since the founding of the republic. White privilege was institutionalized in differing ways in state institutions, the economy, and associational life in civil society. Until the Civil Rights Movement of 1950s and 60s brought the inhumanity of that way of life into stark relief, there was ideological hegemony among White Americans that society should be ordered in that racist fashion. For a brief period in the mid-sixties a new hegemony of racial equality usually defined as "integration" appeared

emergent with the passage of the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts in 1964 and '65 respectively. But by 1966 radical forces in the civil rights movement were rejecting integration and calling for "Black Power." And a year later cities across America were inflamed by Black racial rioting. In his 1968 presidential campaign, Richard Nixon's call for "law and order" signaled to working class Whites that concessions to Blacks had gone too far, but failed to take seriously the claims that Black militants were making. At decade's end, the consensus for integration had come undone. It was replaced by contestation amongst integrationists, Black and other minoritized nationalists, and supporters of a reconfigured White supremacy over the direction of race relations.[8]

The sphere of civil society is of crucial importance here. Civil society includes the entire network of private and voluntary social relations and institutions in a given nation-state. In civil society, "narrow interests are transformed into more universal views as ideologies are adopted or amended and alliances are formed."[9] Civil society, the state, and the economy, are the major sites at which social relations are fundamentally structured. For a straightforward definition of a site, one can do no better than the one advanced by Bowles and Gintis:

> A site is a region of social life with a coherent set of rules of the game. It is distinguished not by what is done there (appropriation of nature, politics, culture, reproduction), but by the manner in which whatever is done there is regulated by a set of social rules.[10]

The rules of operation further determine the kind of site. For example, Bowles and Gintis analyze the liberal democratic state and the capitalist economy. The rules governing social control in a liberal democratic state, and appropriation of nature in a capitalist economy, will differ from those rules in socialist states with command economies. The same can be said of civil society. Activity in civil society begins as private life relatively autonomous from state coercion. That is to say, it is the sphere in which people order personal relationships and community ties according to their own preferences and values. Under authoritarian states, the realm of autonomy in civil society is often rather restricted. Under totalitarian regimes it is practically non-existent. The United States, like most

Western countries, has a liberal civil society that sits alongside a liberal democratic state. Born as a nation that mistrusted state power, the rules of operation in American civil society allow the greatest autonomy for voluntary association and freedom of expression in the world. While civil society includes all kinds of activity, it is a crucial site for determining the political direction of liberal democracies. While politics may be played out in state institutions, politics emanates from civil society, because it is through our social interactions, civic involvement, and most critically, economic life, that attitudes and interests are aggregated into social values, ideologies, and political alliances. In liberal civil societies, the values and ideologies of the majority of the citizenry have a better chance of being reflected in state policies than is the case under more authoritarian states. But where there is no hegemonic consensus, or, in other words, no majoritarian view regarding policy direction in civil society, the state can hardly reproduce consensual public policies. In his own ruminations about race, Stuart Hall has observed:

> The effect of the struggle over Black, if it becomes strong enough, is that it stops the society reproducing itself functionally, in that old way. Social reproduction itself becomes a contested process.[11]

This is exactly where the American government has been in terms of issues of racial equality and justice since the late sixties. Although the American state passed sweeping civil rights legislation in the sixties, it became hard pressed to implement those policies in a consistent manner when different forces in civil society held divergent views about the meaning of racial equality and the appropriate ways to achieve it. Therefore, societal reproduction of stable and consensual race relations has been continuously under contestation.

In the aftermath of the collapse of the national consensus over race, Winant identified five racial hegemonic projects: the far right, the new right, neoconservatism, neoliberalism, and radical democracy.[12] These hegemonic projects are pursued by social movements in a racially-divided civil society and occupy the field upon which the struggle for racial justice is contested. Although our

discussion here parallels the concerns of Omi and Winant, the analysis is gauged closer to the ground toward the organizations in social movements. We offer six types of social movements advancing distinct models for a racially just American society. These movements also, consciously or unconsciously, suggest models for *practical representation* of different races within organizations, as well as models for social relationships between different races in civil society. We now turn to a discussion of these racial social movements.

White nationalist social movements. These movements are part of the array of groups on the far right in American politics. Historically, the most prominent White nationalist organizations have been the Ku Klu Klan and Nazis, but after the 1960s, a plethora of groups holding such views, including the Aryan Nation, the National Alliance and the Populist Party, emerged. Generally, White nationalists believe America was founded as a White republic and that it ought to return to those political origins. They believe American government has been lost to "race-traitors" willing to share power with people of color. Their vision of racial justice is a society featuring as total separation of the races as would be possible.

From the 1990s until recent times, The New Century Foundation was an important organization for White nationalism. The foundation is led by Jared Taylor. From its website, *American Renaissance*, the foundation promotes the belief that America is the home of White people and supports the preservation of it as a White-ruled nation. This is largely based on the idea that inferior races, mainly Blacks, are undermining the success and vitality of American civilization. The New Century Foundation's beliefs exemplify the ideologies of White nationalist groups:

> "…race is an important aspect of individual and group identity, that different races
> build different societies that reflect their natures, and that it is entirely normal for Whites
> (or for people of any other race) to want to be the majority race in their own homeland.
> If Whites permit themselves to become a minority population, they will lose their civiliza-
> tion, their heritage, and even their existence as a distinct people."[13]

This tendency on the White far-right is known as racial realism. More recently, a trend known as the Alternative Right has emerged as a focal point of White nationalism. The term was first used by Richard Spencer of the National Policy Institute. Now simply called, the "Alt Right," this strain includes a broad range "of far right ideologies, groups and individuals whose core belief is that 'White identity' is under attack by multicultural forces using "political correctness" and social justice" to undermine White people and their civilization"[14]. Since 2010, Spencer has been working to elaborate on Alt Right thinking on his "Alternative Right" blog.

As the Republican presidential primaries unfolded in 2016, New York real estate developer Donald Trump emerged as a frontrunner by promising to build a wall between the U.S. and Mexico and severely restrict immigration by Muslims. White nationalists like Spencer and Taylor have traditionally condemned the Republican party for being too liberal, yet large portions of the them flocked to Trump's candidacy based upon these stances. One especially alarming development was the appointment of Stephen Bannon, Executive Chairman of the right-wing media company Breitbart News, as the Chief Executive of Trump's campaign. Under Bannon's leadership, Breitbart had become increasingly bombastic and racist in its news coverage. After his surprising victory, Trump appointed Bannon as chief White House strategist and senior counselor. As we write, everyone on the left of the political spectrum, and many on the right, are alarmed at the prospect of someone who is so blatantly racist being a close and trusted advisor to the president of an irretrievably multiracial nation.[15]

White Assimilationism. White supremacist organizations are obviously all-White, and proudly so. The model they portray of an all-White organization is not unfamiliar to many White Americans in practice. After work, when Americans have more discretion about how they use their time, they still tend to lead segregated private lives. Most White Americans would not say they consciously choose to be around White people in their free time: it just turns out that way when they do what they choose

to do. This leads to a propensity for a second type of social movement for racial justice: White assimilationism. This grouping agrees with the civil rights reforms of the 1960s, but decries the evolution of affirmative action strategies as the method of implementing civil rights policies. Viewing individual rights and liberties as the raison d'etre for the American constitution, White assimilationists frown upon any measures to correct racism beyond strict equality before the law. Any forms of group preference in hiring, contracting, and university admissions are considered anti-meritocratic and are opposed. Today, the immigration restriction movement is a prominent focus for White assimilationists. Many are concerned that the growing non-White immigrant population is threatening not to assimilate to American cultural traditions, but rather, intends to maintain its own foreign cultures, and particularly foreign languages. Other restrictionists cite the drain on our social services and the downward pressure that immigrants place on wages as their primary concerns. Scores of interest groups have gathered around the Republican Party and pounded the assimilationist drum.[16]

A very important White assimilationist interest group in the 1990s was the American Civil Rights Institute (ACRI). Initiated in California to spearhead the anti-affirmative action initiative Proposition 209, the ACRI was led by African American businessman Ward Connerly. His visibility was critical to the movement because he is Black. Most people of color in the United States believe the country has not done enough to eradicate institutional racism, and consistently support affirmative action policies. Connerly and the ACRI, however, believe affirmative action is a cause promoting minority race and gender preference which unfairly treats Whites. The ACRI has expanded its net of influence to combatting education and immigration policies that support what they consider to be unfair minority race privilege. White assimilationists support the idea of racial equality, but have had a hard time attracting people of color (POC) to their cause. In terms of cross-cultural representation, these groups have difficulty with multiculturalist sentiments because they do not recognize people as members of racial or cultural groups. The ACRI's mission, " also seeks to affect a cultural change by

challenging the "race matters" mentality embraced by many of today's so-called "civil rights leaders." ACRI's leaders and supporters believe that civil rights are individual rights and that government policies should not advocate group rights over individualrights.[17]

Thus, what is represented in such groups is *individuals* who share similar beliefs and policy orientations. To be credible, such organizations need minority membership, but they must be careful not to be seen as taking "affirmative action" to attract minorities, since that is not something they believe in. As a model for the practice of racial justice, White assimilationism suggests largely White organizations with some token POC, if they're lucky, operating upon the strict individualist-meritocratic principles that have purported to animate American society since before 1964. Because these organizations do nothing to counter White privilege or socioeconomic power, in the end, they are still a formula for continuing material inequality between Whites and people of color.

Minoritized assimilationism. People of color have also created social movements advancing their own visions of racial justice. They tend to fall into two categories. Minoritized assimilationist social movements work towards individual equality before the law, but acknowledge continuing barriers to assimilation of minorities as individuals; therefore, they still tend to support policies such as affirmative action and soft immigration reform such as amnesty for the undocumented. Minoritized assimilationist organizations are founded and led by their own racial group members and feature many of the same concerns about cultural space and dignity as the nationalist organizations that will be addressed next. But these kinds of organizations do not exclude White people from their membership.

Some of the most prominent of these groups receive a great deal of their financial support from White sources. The prototype of this kind of organization is the African American-led National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Others include the League of United Latin

American Citizens, the National Congress of American Indians and the Japanese American Citizens' League. Organizations of this kind have been responsible for some of the greatest strides the United States has made in race relations and public policy over race. They remain an important locus for training people of color for leadership, socializing White people to accept the leadership of people of color, and transferring resources from White America to communities of color. Minoritized assimilationist organizations mostly engage in mainstream interest group behavior such as lobbying policy makers and litigation in the courts. This is important work that places POCs and Whites alongside one another in the trench warfare over racial justice issues in the institutions of state and civil society. However, as far as we know, minoritized assimilationist organizations do not engage in anti-racist training of the kind we will be advancing in the conclusion of this paper.[18]

Minoritized nationalism. This is a second kind of social movement led by people of color. These organizations believe that people of color need to engender their own political space to empower their communities as part of the process of achieving racial justice. This necessitates some degree of structural separatism. Beginning with Black Power in the 1960s, people of color have sought their own organizational terrain to fight for economic and political power and cultural and psychological redemption in a society animated, consciously or unconsciously, by White supremacy. It is the ethos of particular racialized cultural groups, including their ways and modes of interacting and understanding, that govern such organizations.

Many nationalist organizations do permit the participation of Whites or members of any race, but the worldview of that minoritized group still governs the organization. For some organizations, this is a strategic way to clarify and advance the interests of the race in a given setting. The Congressional Black, Hispanic, Asian Pacific American Caucuses, and all of the minority professional organizations that abound today, are examples of this type of *inclusive nationalism.* Organizations like the Congressional Caucuses are monoracial by membership, but we define them

as mainstream because they operate within longstanding institutions identified with the

establishment, or the status quo. Conversely, organizations such as the National Conference of Black

Political Scientists, or the Association of Black Foundation Executives, have a mission centered

around the advancement of African American communities and African American advancement

within their professions, but they do not exclude non-African American membership or participation

in their activities.[19]

Other nationalist groups are monoracial because they seek to create an "in house"

conversation, a social space where they can feel free to say exactly what they wish about White

people and White institutions and advance political and cultural projects unencumbered by influence

from the larger White society. This more *exclusive nationalism* often sees the racial groups as a

nation, and continuing racial inequity as a reconfigured kind of colonialism. The Black Panthers,

Brown Berets, and American Indian Movement were examples of this more exclusive nationalism in

the 1960s and 70s. At the national level, the American Indian Movement and the Nation of Islam are

still around, and local groups promoting racial separatism can be found in many locales around the

country. In recent times, the New Black Panther Party (NBBP) has attempted to adopt the platform of

the original party. Although it pays lip service to dismantling capitalism and the pursuit of

revolution as the BPP did in the 1960s, it seems to focus on an exclusive cultural nationalism

derived from the Kawaida philosophy articulated by Maulana Karenga.[20] Highlights of the

party's platform include:

> "demands that Blacks be given a country or state of their own, within which they can make their
> own laws. They demand that all Black prisoners in the United States be released to "the lawful
> authorities of the Black Nation." They claim to be entitled to reparations for slavery from the
> United States, all European countries and "the Jews."[21]

The shooter in the police killings in Dallas in June of 2016 had been a NBBP member, but was

rejected by the party for espousing violence.[22]

We've shown that while some strains of inclusive minoritized nationalism pose a model that includes people who are not members of their racial group, exclusive nationalist organizations are monoracial. People of color have good reasons for preferring to participate in social movements organized by people of their own race, whether they be of assimilationist or nationalist persuasion. They do not have much confidence that their voices will be heard and their aspirations shared in settings where a majority of the people sitting around the table are White. This is true even when they are surrounded by White liberals. One aphorism since the sixties holds that racism is a White problem and Whites should spend time in their own communities combating racism instead of trying to work in minoritized organizations. White people do have to resolve racism within themselves, and people of color certainly cannot do it for them. But we believe we can all be empowered and enrichedif some people of color and some White people work together in *multiracial social movements.* Let us now turn to a discussion of these kinds of social movements and organizations.

Multiracial Nationalism

The problem with White nationalist, assimilationist, and minoritized nationalist movements, is that they fail to provide a model for practical representation in which different races are empowered with "equity." We purposively choose equity rather than equality. While equality means "being 'equal,' especially in status, rights, and opportunities," equity means, "fairness or justice in the way people are treated."[23] American society has historically been based upon White supremacist values and practices. The civil rights era answer to racial inequality based on White supremacy was legal racial equality before the law for individuals, or White assimilationism. After the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, policies such as affirmative action got so much push back from White America because they attempted to privilege POC in hiring, public

contracting, and university admissions practices. Proponents of affirmative action would say those practices were just and fair in order to the redress historic biases of White supremacy. Affirmative action did not treat all races equally, but it was equitable in the context of American history.[24] America is a multiracial society! This fact no one can deny. So it is necessary, especially in the struggle for "racial" justice, to provide an organizational framework for people who hold multiracialist values and wish to engage in multiracialist practices for equitable social change. We see two kinds of multiracialist organizations, the formal and substantive, which we shall now describe.

Formal multiracialism. The advance that the *formal multiracial organization* makes beyond other organizations for racial justice is that it requires that all races be at the table, while prioritizing the aspirations and interests of races of color as a way to level the playing field. These types of organizations consciously seek racial diversity in their staff and membership, and are engaged in educating their members about matters of race. They also are actively working to address racism in their programming and public policy initiatives.

Past examples of formal multiracial organizations would include the U.S. West Corporation in the 1990s, and the University of California at Berkeley until the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996. The telecommunications company U.S. West was engaged in a long-term commitment to racial and other kinds of diversity in its workforce, and fostering greater interracial understanding and harmony through internal trainings, workshops, and conferences. Until 1997, the University of California at Berkeley had an admissions policy that sought to make the undergraduate student body reflect the racial makeup of the state in the first decade of the twenty-first century. After several years of practicing that policy, White students were a minority of the undergraduate population, and Latinos, while not a majority, outnumbered all other races. Proposition 209 eliminated affirmative

action in university admissions throughout the University of California system, and Berkeley changed its admissions policies for the fall of 1997. Although both U.S. West and UC Berkeley did increase the diversity of their respective organizations, in neither case were they transformed into substantive multiracial organizations. At Berkeley, struggles ensued over curricular and personnel matters. While some strides were made in both areas, the university remained a place where power and resources were predominantly held by Whites until the day Prop 209 passed. In the case of US West, workshops and debates were ongoing, and people of color had gained structural power through their own caucuses and other mechanisms. In 1999, U.S. West was acquired by Qwest Communications in a hostile takeover. It is unclear as of this writing what happened to all of the cutting-edge diversity work the U.S. was doing after that. After further corporate consolidation in the new century, the current parent company Century Link has a high-profile statement on corporate social responsibility. However, at this time, we have not discerned how robust those policies are in practice.[25] In all likelihood, the ever more monopolisitic corporate world may not permit the time for the heavy lifting required to consciously attempt to transfer resources and power to employees of color.

Substantive Multiracial Organization. Neither universities nor corporations are social movements built to pursue racial justice. The most progressive framework for attacking racial inequity is the *substantive multiracial organization.* This type of organization helps Whites learn the following:

- to work together and challenge other Whites around issues of racism
- to share power with people of color
- to take leadership from people of color
- to be accountable to people of color.

The same organization helps people of color become more empowered in the following ways:

- taking leadership

- sharing power in the organization
- transforming the organizational culture by challenging Whites and other people of color
- healing the remnants of oppression through collective wellness.

Some of the strategies employed might include;

- forming White and people of color caucuses
- training on White privilege and power
- setting clear standards for inclusion of people of color at every level of the group, and reviewing the mission ... policies, procedures, board agreements, etc. to make sure that anti-racism is a constant theme.[26]

In the 1990s, (coauthor) Johnson was involved in the Whatcom Human Rights Task Force. The Task Force began in the fall of 1994 following a cross-burning outside the residences of Latino migrant farm workers. A group of community organizations, religious groups, and other local citizens mobilized to monitor, respond to, and prevent further acts of malicious harassment. The Task Force also sought to undertake community education around tolerance and honoring diversity. In 1995, in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing, the breadth and depth of anti-government militia activity, much of it White supremacist-based, was revealed. Rural and small-town Washington became a hotbed of such activity. Our organization was born in the struggle for racial justice, but also took on anti-Semitism and homophobia as issues. Local Latinos had been at the forefront of the initial organizing, but over the months, as debates over organizational strategy and process unfolded and the drudgery of writing mission statements and by-laws set in, the Latinos left the table. As far as I can tell, they left, mostly, to return their energies to their own community organizations in a context where those organizations are always in want of participation. They left because they came out of traditions of working in their own communities in minority nationalist or minority assimilationist organizations where people like them clearly had ownership. In an interracial organization, the racial character of ownership was contingent. Rather than spend time contesting for control over this new organization, with no certainty of the outcome, they elected to return to the

more secure terrain of groups controlled by people of their own race. As an African American with a multiracialist vision, Johnson found these developments particularly distressing.

Our human rights task force worked in the community for three years as a largely White organization working for racial justice, with myself as the "token" minority chairing the board and lending some credibility. Finally, we learned of a workshop offered by the Communities Against Hate of Lane County in Eugene Oregon, entitled, "Unlearning Racism." We invited them to conduct the workshop for our membership only in January of 1998. It was there that we were exposed to the principles of multiracial political work that were presented above. We knew we were committed to racial justice, but the idea that we needed to put our organizational resources conclusively at the disposal of communities of color was a revelation. For many of us it became a mantra that we could focus on as the standard for our work. It meant that we simply could not accept a board with one active person of color out of eleven members, no matter how progressive our work was. It mandated that more POC be at that table so that we could sensibly direct those well-intentioned resources. POC were needed so we could, in fact, engage concretely in struggle over real issues, but also over competing worldviews. Lastly, at the level of the image portrayed to the public, people of all races needed to be seen representing the organization in its community programming, before the news media, and at social functions.

Whatcom County, Washington, is situated ninety miles north of Seattle. It has two Native American reservations and a significant Latino migrant farm-working population. By the end of the 90s, the Whatcom County Council of seven had two proponents of Wise Use, a movement of anti-government property rights advocates. It also had a member virulently opposed to Native American treaty rights. The issue of jurisdiction over water rights on the Lummi Nation Reservation was a hot button issue at the time. Because of nineteenth century federal policies allowing reservation land to be sold to non-natives, somewhere between a quarter and a third of the land on the Lummi

reservation is owned by non-tribal members (almost all White). Much of it is pristine beachfront along the Hale Passage (part of the Salish Sea). White landowners had gotten into a fight with the Lummi over who had the right to provide water to their homes. They wanted to drill their own wells to get water. They did not understand that on reservations, federally recognized tribes are governments that hold a nation-state-like sovereignty. Therefore, tribal governments have jurisdiction over utilities and other public services. This region had witnessed the "fishing wars" of the 1960s and 70s. The treaties from the 1850s with the Salish Sea tribes had given the Natives half of the catch of salmon, steelhead, and shell fish. The federal courts upheld those treaties in the Boldt Decision in 1974.[27] During the battles of the period, the slogan "Indian Rights are Special Rights," meaning rights beyond the individual rights extended by the US Constitution, could be heard. Those cries were once again heard in the 1990s over the water rights issue. Members of our task force began to educate themselves about the issue, and we began to publicly support the Lummi in their struggle with non-natives on their land. We attended public meetings, made statements, and filed letters of support to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on behalf of the Lummi Nation. We also attended functions on the reservation and began to hold one of our quarterly public meetings there. Through these efforts, we were able to encourage Lummis to join our board of directors. We also did a better job of recruiting other POC to our board as we took on racism in the public schools. We did a second Unlearning Racism workshop, which was opened up to the community, and we developed the capacity to offer those workshops ourselves in our community.

By the beginning of the new millennium, we had made significant progress toward approximating the Anti-Racist Organization model by becoming accountable to communities of color, sharing power with POC in the organization, placing resources at the disposal of communities of color, and taking leadership from POC. When all races of people in the community begin to see all races of people working together for racial justice in a way that extends some ownership to minoritized races, they may begin to see a model for what a multiracial America looks like. This is

what we mean by a *system of practical representation.* It imparts the meaning of multiracialism through multiracial practice.

The Whatcom Human Rights Task Force was part of a regional network of organizations under the umbrella of the Northwest Coalition Against Malicious Harassment (NWCAMH), the Coalition for Human Dignity (CHD) and the Western States Center (WSC). The Pacific Northwest had been identified as the last bastion of the White race in an increasingly browning America in the Northwest Imperative. Beginning in the 1970s, White nationalists around Richard Butler began flocking to the region to live out their ideals. Butler's Aryan Nation compound in Hayden Lake, Idaho, became ground zero for a whole range of racial and anti-government extremists.[28] The NWCAMH was committed to visible opposition to White nationalism via community organizing and would send staff to locales around the region to assist them on what to do "when hate comes to town." The CHD focused on research on the far right, going as far as infiltrating those groups and having plants write in details about their internal workings under pseudonyms. WSC's work centered on training progressives for both social movement work and electoral politics in an effort to "mainstream" progressivism in the way that the far right seeped into the mainstream of the Republican Party in the 1990s. [29] That work was not only multiracial. It was geared to support not only racial minorities, but sexual minorities and religious minorities also, as the far right assaulted each of those identity groups.

In 2000, NWCAMH and CHD merged into the Northwest Coalition for Human Dignity (NWCHD). However, multi-issue identity politics work is hard to do, and melding different organizational cultures was difficult, even when we shared the same values. The NWCHD did not survive the merger and closed its doors in 2003. The WSC did survive those tumultuous times and continues to thrive today. Its mission *"*is to connect and build the power of community organizations to challenge and transform individuals, organizations and systems to achieve

racial, gender and economic justice."[30] The WSC agenda continues to be multi-issue, multi-identity kinds of work, but it's staff is majority POC, and anti-racism remains central to its mission. WSC has added research and upped its profile around training organizers and supporting the actual organizing itself. Still, the death of the NWCHD is a cautionary tale for those advancing multiracial practices because it demonstrates how hard it is to do that kind of work. The WSC represents one type of multiracial work. It is certainly pursuing an anti-racist organizing model with its multiracial staff and by directing its resources toward POC issues. Another example of a multiracial organizing model is offered by Race Forward. Founded as the Applied Research Center in 1981, Race Forward's "mission is to build awareness, solutions, and leadership for racial justice by generating transformative ideas, information and experiences."[31] Unlike WSC, its focus is entirely on race, but its staff does include a couple of White people. Thus, it is a multiracial organization.

The Western States Center and Race Forward represent the successful institutionalization of the multiracial site, or, what we would like to call *multiracial nationalism*. They do research on racial justice, hold annual conferences where activist can gather and learn from each other and network, and train activist in community organizing. Two contemporary social movements for racial justice which are actively creating models for multiracial nationalism are the Black Lives Matter Movement (BLM) and the Treaty Rights Environmental Justice Movement. BLM appeared as hashtag following the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the murder of African American Florida teenager Trayvon Martin in 2013. Founded by three African American women, Alicia Garza, Patrice Cullors and Opal Tometi, BLM mushroomed after the killing of Michael Brown by a White policeman in Ferguson Missouri in August of 2014.

The movement began with concerns over police brutality and institutional racism in the criminal justice system. The people in Ferguson occupied the streets for weeks, horrified by the official insensitivity to the way Brown's body was left on the street for hours and the ways in which

the police sought to characterize him as a criminal. Over that time, it gathered national attention as a constant stream of similar cases took place and were aired in the media. As spokespersons and educated observers discussed the conditions causing the police killings, the movement began to connect the dots between police brutality, racial segregation, poor schooling, and lack of economic opportunity. In its street protests and meetings, the movement presented itself as Black nationalist, but it permitted the participation of other POC and Whites as long as those others accepted Black leadership. While sometimes appearing radical in its approach, as in the episode in which activists in Seattle shouted Bernie Sanders from the state in 2015, the movement appeared to have embraced the necessity for engaging the institutions of the state via pressure politics.[32] In August of 2016, BLM declared its support for the immigrant rights movement, seeing mass deportations as another instance of law enforcement injustice against a people of color. In September, BLM came out in solidarity with the Standing Rock Sioux in their battle to protect their ancestral lands against the Dakota Access petroleum pipeline.[33]

The movement of the Standing Rock Sioux water protectors is another example of work that is centered on the concerns of the minoritized group but embraces interracial solidarity. The victory that occurred in November of 2015 in the several year struggle against the Keystone XL oil pipeline proposed from Alberta, Canada to Texas witnessed unprecedented coalitions between indigenous nations, farmers, other property owners, and environmentalists. During the course of the campaign, the largely White environmental movement began to recognize that Native treaty rights were the most effective pressure point in the battle against corporate capital. The same thing happened in early 2016, when the Army Corps of Engineers rejected the Gateway Pacific coal port due to its placement on Lummi Nation fishing grounds.[34] This Indigenous Environmental Justice Movement (IEJM) has emerged again in the battle to prevent the oil pipeline under the Missouri River and adjoining Standing Rock Sioux ancestral lands in North Dakota as we write. Along with the solidarity declared

by the BLM movement, dozens of other Native American nations are represented in the protests, as well as Latino activists who recognize their indigenous roots.[35]

Contemporary movements, such as Black Lives Matter and the Indigenous Environmental Justice Movement, as well as organizations like the Western States Center and Race Forward, are engaging in anti-racist organizational practices. BLM and IEJM are movements which are the successors of the Black and Native American nationalists of the 1960s. They represent a mix of the minoritized nationalisms of the 1960s which sought racial pride and empowerment. But their permission of involvement by other POC and Whites is also a model for evolving multiracial social movements that are essential for a progressive American nationalism in the twenty-first century.[36] Race Forward and the Western States Center offer slightly different models. Like BLM and IEJM, Race Forward originates in a minoritized nationalism seeking pride and empowerment, but in this case, for all races of color. It represents a kind of "pan-people of color" alliance against institutionalized racism where some Whites committed to such an agenda are on the staff. The way that White staffers and supporters get treated is a good example of equity in for all races in the movement. Just as we can see with the BLM and IEJM, Whites are welcome to contribute to the work, as long they can accept the leadership of people of color.

As we mentioned above, Western States Center's origins are in the movement to protect racial, religious, and sexual minorities against White nationalist attempts to make the Pacific Northwest the homeland of the White race in North America. That work began around Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in the early 1980s. WSC and its sister organization, the Northwest Coalition against Malicious Harassment, were founded in 1987. As we noted earlier, WSC continues that multi-issue work, but with a strong emphasis on racial justice. This is a model for empowering people who are not White, straight, or Christian. People who have those "mainstream" identities

can participate at all levels of the organization if they accept that vision. The project here is one of multiracialism as a central component of the broader American progressivism to which we alluded earlier. In all of the organizations treated here, White people are not given equal status or opportunities in movement work. However, White people are welcome to participate, if they can accept the organizational models. The races are not "equal," but they are treated with equity in multiracial social movements.

Conclusion

Over the last two generations, conservatives mounted a hegemonic project from the grassroots that called for a return to American tradition. In matters of race, that meant assimilation to White ways and understandings of the world. White assimilationists made political headway slowly by doing their homework in the myriad of institutions in civil society. By the 1990s, they had seized the high ground in national politics. But, as Johnson argued;

> ... we must not belittle the political, and indeed cultural work in the realm of reinterpreting American history that the right undertook, which paved the way to electoral victories. Progressives must do the same kind of political and cultural work. We should expect it to take years, perhaps a generation or more, to achieve results at the national level in the way conservatives have in the 1980s and 90s.[37]

Since national-level elected officials are too concerned with short-term electoral strategies to seriously undertake this kind of politics, multiracial social movements bear a heavy responsibility over the next generation. Movements like BLM and the Indigenous Environmental Justice Movement, and organizations like Race Forward and the Western States Center, are taking on the same kind of historical project marshalled by the right since the time of Reagan. They are forging the ideological foundations and the organizing tools to represent multiracialism in practice. In doing so, they are potent examples of a new way of being in this world.

Endnotes

[1] The Fire This Time, *Basslines and Ballistics,* compact disc. Victoria Australia: Extreme Recordings, 1991.

[2] For a study encompassing political representation along lines of race, gender and sexual orientation, see Rebekah Herrick, *Minorities and Representation in American Politics*. CO Press, 2017.

[3]We use the term multiracialism to highlight the centrality of race in cultural difference. However, in the literature multiracialism most often refers to people of mixed-race heritage. Scholars committed to the vision we are advancing use the term multiculturalism. They include James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGhee Banks, *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives.* 7th edition; Francisco Rios and Susan Markus, "Multicultural Education as a Human Right: Framing Multicultural Education for Citizenship in a Global Age," *Multicultural Education Review*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2011, pp. 1-36. Conversely, in the social movement world activist organizations promoting the same view more explicitly use race to frame their hegemonic vision. They include *Race Forward*, based in New York and Oakland, California and *The Western States Center* based in Portland, Oregon.

[4] The foregoing, including a discussion of Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony, follows the analysis of Michael Omi and Howard Winant in *Racial Formation in the United States.* Second edition. London: Routledge Publishers, 1994.

[5] Stuart Hall, editor, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* p. 16.

[6] ibid., p. 2.

[7] ibid., p. 16

[8]Classic examples of Black and Mexican American racial nationalism are Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America.* New York, Vintage Books, 1967; and Rodolfo Gonzales, Alturista, *El Plan Espiritual de Atzlan*. Denver, Colorado, 1969, http://www.colorado.edu/StudentGroups/MEChA/MEXAplana.html; For a view on the white nationalist backlash to minoritized nationalists examine the 1968 presidential campaign of George Wallace, see *The American Experience.* http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wallace/peopleevents/pande07.html.

[9] Enrico Augelli and Craig Murphy, *America's Quest for Supremacy and the Third World.* London: Pinter Publishers, 1988, p. 130.

[10] Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Democracy and Capitalism.* New York: Basic Books, 1987, p. 98.

[11] Stuart Hall, "Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* June, 1985, p. 113.

[12] Actually Winant presents four racial hegemonic projects in "Postmodem Racial Politics," *Socialist Review,* 1990. In the second edition of *Racial Formation* Omi and Winant discuss a fifth project: neoliberalism, pp. 147-57. In my own analysis I would add a tendency: the minority far right, while folding the new right and neoconservatism into one.

[13] "Our Issues," *American Renaissance.* http://www.amren.com/about/issues/. Accessed, December 14, 2016.

[14] "Alternative Right, " *SPLC: Southern Poverty Law Center.* https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/ideology/alternative-right. Accessed, October 30, 2016

[15] For Bannon's history, see Joshua Green, "This Man Is the Most Dangerous Political Operative in America," *Bloomberg Politics*. October 8, 2015. https://www.bloomberg.com/politics/graphics/2015. For a conservative perspective critical of Bannon, see Kathleen Parker, "Is Steve Bannon Really as Bad as All That?" *Washington Post,* November 15, 2016. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/is-steve-bannon-really-as-bad-as-all-that/2016/11/15/3c74af12-ab81-11e6-8b45-f8e493f06fcd_story.html?utm_term=.fe3239a2b51d. Accessed, December 14, 2016.

[16]See for instance, Mark Perry of the American Enterprise Institute on affirmative action, *AEI Ideas.* https://www.aei.org/publication/the-downside-of-affirmative-action-academic-mismatch/. Accessed November 1, 2016. https://www.aei.org/publication/the-downside-of-affirmative-action-academic-mismatch/. Accessed November 1, 2016. On the Latino failure to assimilate, see Daniel Griswold, "Mexican, Migration, legalization and Assimilation," *Cato Institute.* https://www.cato.org/publications/speeches/mexican-migration-legalization-assimilation. Accessed December 14, 2016.

[17]*About ACRI* http://acri.org/about-acri/. Accessed, November 1

---

[18] In our conversations with the national office of the NAACP no one could offer an example of anti-racist training. The Northwest regional office of the NAACP, League of United Latin American Citizens and the Association of Black Foundation Executives did not respond to our inquiries.

[19] National Conference of Black Political Scientists. http://www.ncobps.org/. Association of Black Foundation Executives, http://www.abfe.org/. Accessed November 3, 2016.

[20] Scot Brown, *Fighting for US: Maulana Karenga, The US Organization, and Black Cultural Nationalism* ((New York: New York University Press, 2003.

[21]"The New Black Panthers," *Southern Poverty Law Center.* https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/new-black-panther-party. Accessed November 3, 2016.

[22]Melissa Jacobs, "Dallas Police Sniper was Shunned by New Black Panthers, Says Group Leader," *FoxNews.com.* http://www.foxnews.com/us/2016/07/12/dallas-police-sniper-was-shunned-by-new-black-panthers-says-groups-leader.html. Accessed November 3, 2016.

[23] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/

[24] Deborah A. Stone provides useful discussion of the difference between equality and equity in *The Art of Political Decision Making*. Revised edition. .New York: W.W. Norton Company, 2012, chapter 2.

[25]For Century Link social responsibility statement, see http://www.centurylink.com/aboutus/community/environment/

[26]From "Exchange Project Peace Development Fund" (CAHLC), P. 44.

[27] Walt Crowley and David Wilma," Federal Judge George Boldt issues historic ruling affirming Native American treaty treaty fishing rights on February 12, 1974." Federal Judge George Boldt issues historic ruling affirming Native American treaty fishing rights on February 12, 1974. *HistoryLink.org*. http://www.historylink.org/File/5282 Accessed November 6, 2016.

[28] "The Butler Plan: The Homeland," *Northwest Front.* http://northwestfront.org/about/the-butler-plan/the-butler-plan-the-homeland/

[29] *Not In Our Town. https://www.niot.org/category/action-kit/when-hate-comes-your-town*.

[30] *Western States Center*. http://www.westernstatescenter.org/about. Accessed November 8, 2016.

[31] *Race Forward: The Center for Racial Justice Innovation.* https://www.raceforward.org/about. Accessed November 8, 2016

[32] https://www.facebook.com/pg/BlackLivesMatter/about/?ref=page_internal.

[33] http://fusion.net/story/333395/black-lives-matter-fighting-deportations/. And http://blacklivesmatter.com/solidarity-with-standing-rock/.

[34] For the Keystone pipeline, see Coral Davenport, "Citing Climate Change, Obama Rejects Construction of Keystone XL Oil Pipeline," *New York Times,* November 6, 2015. On the Gateway Pacific terminal ,see Ashley Ahearn and Eric Whitney, "Pacific Northwest Coal Terminal Nixed," *Inside Energy.* http://insideenergy.org/2016/05/10/pacific-nw-coal-terminal-nixed/.

[35] Brian Ward, "Natives are Fighting a New but Familiar Battle at Standing Rock," *The Nation,* September 22, 2016.

[36] For an extended discussion of progressive and traditional American nationalisms, see Vernon D. Johnson and Elizabeth Frombgen, "Racial contestation and the emergence of populist nationalism in the United States," *Social Identities*, September, 2009, pp. 652-54.

[37] Vernon D. Johnson, "A Response to Religion and the Construction of Contemporary White American Nationalism," in Eric Ward, ed. *American Armageddon: Religion, Revolution and the Right.* Seattle:Peanut Butter Publishers, 1998, p. 101.

APPENDIX.

MULTIRACIAL NATIONALISM
and
ANTI-RACIST ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This article has been about the continuum of social movements working for competing visions of racial justice and how those views of racial justice are put into practice. Various organizations and institutions have been used as examples of those differing racial practices. The authors have devised Table 1 a visual depiction of the typology offered in the narrative of the article. Table 2 offers a more in-depth description of racial practices. It was originally developed by Bailey Jackson and Rita Hardiman and adapted by the Exchange Project of the Peace Development Fund, Grassroots Leadership's Barriers and Bridges program. The version of the typology offered here was further developed by Kenneth Jackson and Tema Okun for the Change Work training group. It is presently included in the Western States Center's *Dismantling Racism: A Resource Book*. Portland, Oregon: 2003, pp. 60-63.

The reader will notice the use of different rubrics to classify types of organizations from the ones we have used to describe social movments in the text of the article. Rather than reorganize what we think is a clear and discrete presentation, we have chosen to leave it intact; but we offer a guide in Table 1, which links our categories to those offered below. Also, White nationalist organizations have been included in our addendum as a type of all White clubs, because they obviously are. But they have no place in the adapted typology, because they would not normally employ POC. So the internal issues and tensions raised by the presence of a White power structure do not come into play for White nationalists.

Table 1.

RACE IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Social Movements	Organization Type
White Nationalism	All White Club
White Assimilationism	All White Club
White Assimilationism	Affirmative Action
Minoritized Assimilationism	Multicultural
Minoritized Nationalism (Mainstream)	Anti-Racist
Minoritized Nationalism (Separatism)	Anti-Racist
Multiracial Nationalism	Anti-Racist

Vernon D. Johnson and Kelsie Benslimane.

Table 2.

RACE AND INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICES

	All White Club	Token or Affirmative Action Organization	Multi-Cultural Organization	Anti-Racist Organization
Decision Making	• Made by White people (often men) • Made in private in ways that people can't see or really know	• Made by White people • Decisions made in private and often in unclear ways	• Made by diverse group of board and staff • Token attempts to involve those targeted by mission in decision-making	• Made by diverse group • People of color are in significant leadership positions • Everyone in the organization understand how power is distributed and how decisions are made
Budget	• Developed, controlled, and understood by (one or two) White people (often men)	• Developed, controlled, and understood by (one or two) White people	• Developed, controlled, and understood by (one or two) White people	• Developed, controlled, and understood by people of color and White people at all levels of the organization
Money From	• Select foundations • Wealthy or middle-class college-educated White donors • Often a small number of very large donors	• Foundations • Wealthy or middle-class college-educated donors	• Foundations • Wealthy or middle-class college-educated donors • Some donations from people of color and lower-income people	• Comes from the community most affected by the problem(s) being addressed • Supplemented by foundation grants and donations from allies (those concerned but not directly affected)
Accountable to	• Funders • A few White people on board or staff	• Funders • Board • Staff	• Funders • Board and staff • Token attempts to report to those targeted by mission	• Communities targeted in mission
Power and Pay	• White people in decision-making positions, paid very well • People of color (and/or women) in administrative or service positions paying low wages • Few if any benefits, and little job security • People at the bottom have very little power	• White people in decision-making positions, paid relatively well • People of color (and/or women) in administrative or service positions that pay less well • Few, if any benefits for anyone • Sometimes 1 or 2 people of color in token positions of power, with high turnover or low levels of real authority • People at the bottom have very little power	• White people in decision-making positions, paid relatively well • People of color in administrative or service positions that pay less well • 1 or 2 people in positions of power, particularly in their work style emulates those of White people in power • Training to upgrade skills is offered • People of color may not be at equal levels of power with White people, but a lot of respect is present	• People of color in decision-making positions that pay a decent way comparable to the wages of White people in the organization • Administrative and service positions perceived as stepping stone to positions of more power (if desired) and those positions reflect some decision-making power and authority • Training and other mentoring help provided

	All White Club	Token or Affirmative Action Organization	Multi-Cultural Organization	Anti-Racist Organization
Located	• In White community • Decorations reflect a predominantly White culture	• In White community • Decorations reflect some cultural diversity	• Physically accessible to people of color • Decorations reflect a commitment to multi-culturalism	• Physically accessible to community served • Decorations reflect a commitment to multi-culturalism and power sharing
Members	• White people, with token number of people of color (if any) • Members have no real decision-making power	• White people and people of color, with only a token ability to participate in decision-making • People of color are only aware of the organization because it is providing a direct service	• From diverse communities • Token encouragement to participate in decision-making	• From range of communities targeted by mission • Encouraged to participate in decision-making • Provided training to enhance skills and abilities to be successful in the organization and their communities
Culture	• Top down, paternalistic • Often secretive • Success measured by how much is accomplished • Little if any attention paid to process, or how work gets done • Little if any leadership or staff development • No discussion of power analysis or oppression issues • Conflict is avoided at all costs • People who raise issues that make people uncomfortable are considered troublemakers or hard to work with • Leaders assume "we are all the same"	• Still top down although inclusivity is stressed • Those in power assume their standards and ways of doing things are neutral, most desirable and form the basis for what is considered "qualified" • People expected to be highly motivated self-starters requiring little supervision • Some training may be provided • No power analysis • Conflict avoided • Emphasis on people getting along • Discussion of race limited to prejudice reduction	• Organization looks inclusive with a visibly diverse board and staff • Actively celebrated diversity • Focuses on reducing prejudice but is uncomfortable naming racism • Continues to assume dominant culture ways of doing things most desirable • Assume a level playing field • Emphasize belief in equality but still no power analysis • Workaholism desired and rewarded • Still uncomfortable with conflict	• Organization actively recruits and mentors people of color • Celebrates diversity • Has a power analysis about racism and other oppression issues • A diversity of work styles encouraged with active reflection about balancing what gets done and how it gets done • A willingness to name racism and address conflict • Resources devoted to developing shared goals, teamwork, and sharing skills and knowledge (mentoring)

	All White Club	**Token or Affirmative Action Organization**	**Multi-Cultural Organization**	**Anti-Racist Organization**
Programs	• Not about building power for communities of color • Designed to help people who have little or no participation in decision-making • Emphasis is on serving of "helping" those in need	• Intent is to be inclusive • Little analysis about root causes of issues/problems • People in programs appreciate until they speak out or organize for power • Designed to help low-income people who have little or no participation in the decision-making	• Designed to build power until people speak up and out • Some attempt to understand issue/problem in relation to big picture • Some participation by those served in program planning • Constituency may have only token representation in the organization	• Designed to build and share power • Designed to help people analyze and address root causes • People most affected by issues/problems centrally involved in program planning • Opportunities for constituents to move into leadership roles in the organization

Adapted from: *Western States Center,*
http://www.westernstatescenter.org/tools-and-resources/Tools/Dismantling%20Racism