A war sets up in our emotions: one part of our feelings tells us it is good to be in the city, that we have a chance at life here, that we need but turn a corner to become a stranger, that we need no longer bow and dodge at the sight of the Lords of the Land. Another part of our feelings tells us that, in terms of worry and strain, the cost of living in the kitchenettes is too high, that the city heaps too much responsibility on us and gives too little security in return.

The kitchenette, with its filth and foul air, with its one toilet for thirty or more tenants, kills our black babies so fast that in many cities twice as many of them die as white babies.

The kitchenette scatters death so widely among us that our death rate exceeds our birth rate, and if it were not for the trains and autos bringing us daily into the city from the plantations, we black folk who dwell in northern cities would die out entirely over the course of a few years.

The kitchenette throws desperate and unhappy people into an unbearable closeness of association, thereby increasing latent friction, giving birth to never-ending quarrels of recrimination, accusation, and vindictiveness, producing warped personalities.
The kitchenette injects pressure and tension into our individual personalities, making many of us give up the struggle, walk off and leave wives, husbands, and even children behind to shift for themselves.

The kitchenette reaches out with fingers of golden bribes to the officials of the city, persuading them to allow old firetraps to remain standing and occupied long after they should have been torn down.

The kitchenette is the funnel through which our pulverized lives flow to ruin and death on the city pavement, at a profit.

—Richard Wright (1941, pp. 105–111)*

Richard Wright (1908–1960), one of the most powerful writers of the 20th century, lived through and wrote about many of the social changes discussed in this chapter. He grew up in the South during the height of the Jim Crow system, and his passionate hatred for segregation and bigotry is expressed in his major works, Native Son (1940) and the autobiographical Black Boy (1945). In 1941, Wright helped to produce Twelve Million Black Voices, a folk history of African Americans. A combination of photos and brief essays, the work is a powerful commentary on three centuries of oppression.

The selection above is adapted from “Death on the City Pavement,” which expresses Wright’s view of the African American migration out of the South that began in the early 1900s as a reaction to Jim Crow segregation. Wright himself moved from the South to the North, a bittersweet journey that often traded harsh, rural repression for overcrowded, anonymous ghettos. Housing discrimination, both overt and covert, confined African American migrants to the least desirable, most overcrowded areas of the city—in many cases, the neighborhoods that had first housed immigrants from Europe. Unscrupulous landlords subdivided buildings into the tiniest possible apartments (“kitchenettes”), and as impoverished newcomers who could afford no better, African American migrants were forced to cope with overpriced, substandard housing as best they could.

One theme stated at the beginning of chapter 3 was that a society’s subsistence technology shapes dominant-minority group relations. A corollary of this theme, explored in this chapter, is that dominant-minority group relations change as the subsistence technology changes. We saw in chapter 3 that dominant-minority relations in the formative years of the United States were profoundly shaped by agrarian technology and the desire to control land and labor. The agrarian era ended in the 1800s, and the United States has experienced two major transformations in subsistence technology since then, each of which has transformed dominant-minority relations and required the creation of new structures and processes to maintain racial stratification and white privilege.

*From Twelve Million Back Voices by Richard Wright. Copyright © 1941 by Richard Wright. Published by Thunder’s Mouth Press, an imprint of Avalon Publishing Group Incorporated.
The first transformation, the industrial revolution, began in the early 19th century when machine-based technologies began to develop, especially in the North. In the agrarian era, work was labor-intensive, done by hand or with the aid of draft animals. During industrialization, work became capital-intensive and machines replaced people and animals.

The new industrial technology rapidly increased the productivity and efficiency of the U.S. economy and quickly began to change all other aspects of society, including the nature of work, politics, communication, transportation, family life, birth rates and death rates, the system of education, and, of course, dominant-minority relations. The groups that had become minorities during the agrarian era (African Americans, American Indians, and Mexican Americans) faced new possibilities and new dangers, but industrialization also created new minority groups, new forms of exploitation and oppression and, for some, new opportunities to rise in the social structure and succeed in America. In this chapter, we will explore this transformation and illustrate its effects on the status of African Americans, including the construction of Jim Crow segregation in the South. The impact of industrialization on other minority groups will be considered in the case studies presented in part 3.

The second transformation in subsistence technology brings us to more recent times. In the mid-20th century, the United States (and other advanced industrial societies) entered the postindustrial era, also called deindustrialization. This shift in subsistence technology was marked by (1) a decline in the manufacturing sector of the economy and a decrease in the supply of secure, well-paid, blue-collar, manual-labor jobs; and (2) an expansion in the service and information-based sectors of the economy and an increase in the relative proportion of white-collar and “high-tech” jobs. Like the 19th-century industrial revolution, these changes have profound implications for every aspect of modern society, not just for dominant-minority relations. Work, family, politics, popular culture—indeed, every characteristic of American society is being transformed as the subsistence technology continues to develop and modernize. In the latter part of this chapter, we examine this most recent transformation in general terms and point out some of its implications for minority groups. We will examine some new concepts—especially the concept of modern institutional discrimination—to help us understand group relations in this new era. We will also establish some important groundwork for the case studies in part 3, in which we will consider the implication of postindustrial society for America’s minority groups in detail.

Exhibit 4.1 summarizes the characteristics of the three major subsistence technologies considered in this text. As U.S. society has moved through these stages, group relations and the nature of racial and ethnic stratification have continuously changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 4.1 Three Subsistence Technologies and the United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postindustrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industrialization and the Shift from Paternalistic to Rigid Competitive Group Relations

As we noted in chapter 2, the Industrial Revolution began in England in the mid-1700s and spread from there to the rest of Europe, to the United States, and eventually to the rest of the world. The key innovations associated with this change in subsistence technology were the application of machine power to production and the harnessing of inanimate sources of energy, such as steam and coal, to fuel the machines. As machines replaced humans and animals, work became many times more productive, the economy grew, and the volume and variety of goods produced increased dramatically.

In an industrial economy, the close, paternalistic control of minority groups found in agrarian societies becomes irrelevant. Paternalistic relationships such as slavery are associated with labor-intensive technologies and are designed to organize and control a large, involuntary, geographically immobile labor force. An industrial economy, in contrast, requires a workforce that is geographically and socially mobile, skilled, and literate. Furthermore, with industrialization comes urbanization, and close, paternalistic controls are difficult to maintain in a city.

Thus, as industrialization progresses, agrarian paternalism tends to give way to rigid competitive group relations (see exhibit 4.6 below). Under this system, minority group members are freer to compete for jobs and other valued commodities with dominant group members, especially the lower-class segments of the dominant group. As competition increases, the threatened members of the dominant group become more hostile, and attacks on the minority groups tend to increase. While paternalistic systems were designed to directly dominate and control the minority group (and its labor), rigid competitive systems are more defensive in nature. Segments of the dominant group seek to minimize or eliminate minority group encroachment on jobs, housing, or other valuable goods or services (van den Berghe, 1967; Wilson, 1973).

Paternalistic systems such as slavery required members of the minority group to be active, if involuntary, participants. Rigid competitive systems, in contrast, seek to handicap the minority group’s ability to compete effectively or, in some cases, eliminate competition from the minority group altogether. We have already considered an example of a dominant group attempt to protect itself from a threat. As you recall, the National Origins Act was passed in the 1920s to stop the flow of cheaper labor from Europe and protect jobs and wages (see chapter 2). In this chapter, we consider dominant group attempts to keep African Americans powerless and impoverished and to maintain black–white racial stratification as the society shifted from an agricultural to an industrial base.

The Impact of Industrialization on the Racial Stratification of African Americans: From Slavery to Segregation

Industrial technology began to transform American society in the early 1800s, but its effects were not felt equally in all regions. The Northern states industrialized first, while the Southern states remained primarily agrarian. This economic diversity was
one of the underlying causes of the regional conflict that led to the Civil War. Because of its more productive technology, the North had more resources and defeated the Confederacy in a bloody war of attrition. Slavery was abolished, and black–white relations in the South entered a new era when the Civil War ended in April 1865.

The Southern system of race relations that ultimately emerged after the Civil War was designed in part to continue the control of African American labor institutionalized under slavery. It was also intended to eliminate any political or economic threat from the African American community. This rigid competitive system grew to be highly elaborate and inflexible, partly because of the high racial visibility and long history of inferior status and powerlessness of African Americans in the South and partly because of the particular needs of Southern agriculture. In this section, we look at black–white relations from the end of the Civil War through the coming of segregation in the South and the mass migration of African Americans to the cities of the industrializing North.

Reconstruction

The period of Reconstruction, from 1865 to the 1880s, was a brief respite in the long history of oppression and exploitation of African Americans. The Union Army and other agencies of the federal government, such as the Freedman’s Bureau, were used to enforce racial freedom in the defeated Confederacy. Black Southerners took advantage of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution, passed in 1870, which states that the right to vote cannot be denied on the grounds of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” They registered to vote in large numbers and turned out on Election Day, and some were elected to high political office. Schools for the former slaves were opened, and African Americans purchased land and houses and founded businesses.

The era of freedom was short, however, and Reconstruction began to end when the federal government demobilized its armies of occupation and turned its attention to other matters. By the 1880s, the federal government had withdrawn from the South, Reconstruction was over, and black Southerners began to fall rapidly into a new system of exploitation and inequality.

Reconstruction was too brief to change two of the most important legacies of slavery. First, the centuries of bondage left black Southerners impoverished, largely illiterate and uneducated, and with few power resources. When new threats of racial oppression appeared, African Americans found it difficult to defend their group interests. These developments are consistent with the Blauner hypothesis: colonized minority groups face greater difficulties in improving their disadvantaged status because they confront greater inequalities and have fewer resources at their disposal.

Second, slavery left a strong tradition of racism in the white community. Anti-black prejudice and racism originated as rationalizations for slavery but had taken on lives of their own over the generations. After two centuries of slavery, the heritage of prejudice and racism was thoroughly ingrained in Southern culture. White Southerners were predisposed by this cultural legacy to see racial inequality and exploitation of
African Americans as normal and desirable. They were able to construct a social system based on the assumption of racial inferiority after Reconstruction ended and the federal government withdrew.

**De Jure Segregation**

The system of race relations that replaced slavery in the South was **de jure segregation**, sometimes referred to as the **Jim Crow system**. Under segregation, the minority group is physically and socially separated from the dominant group and consigned to an inferior position in virtually every area of social life. The term “de jure” (meaning “by law”) means that the system is sanctioned and reinforced by the legal code; the inferior status of African Americans was actually mandated or required by state and local laws. For example, Southern cities during this era had laws requiring African Americans to ride at the back of the bus. If an African American refused to comply with this seating arrangement, he or she could be arrested.

De jure segregation came to encompass all aspects of Southern social life. Neighborhoods, jobs, stores, restaurants, and parks were segregated. When new social forms, such as movie theaters, sports stadiums, and interstate buses appeared in the South, they, too, were quickly segregated.

The logic of segregation created a vicious cycle. The more African Americans were excluded from the mainstream of society, the greater their objective poverty and powerlessness became. The more inferior their status and the greater their powerlessness, the easier it was to mandate more inequality. High levels of inequality reinforced racial prejudice and made it easy to use racism to justify further separation. The system kept turning on itself, finding new social niches to segregate and reinforcing the inequality that was its starting point. For example, at the height of the Jim Crow era, the system had evolved to the point that some courtrooms maintained separate Bibles for African American witnesses to swear on. Also, in Birmingham, Alabama, it was against the law for blacks and whites to play checkers or dominoes together (Woodward, 1974, p. 118).

What were the causes of this massive separation of the races? Once again, the concepts of the Noel hypothesis prove useful. Because strong anti-black prejudice was already in existence when segregation began, we do not need to account for ethnocentrism. The post-Reconstruction competition between the racial groups was reminiscent of the origins of slavery in that black Southerners had something that white Southerners wanted: labor. In addition, a free black electorate threatened the political and economic dominance of the elite segments of the white community. Finally, after the withdrawal of federal troops and the end of Reconstruction, white Southerners had sufficient power resources to end the competition on their own terms and construct repressive systems of control for black Southerners.

**The Origins of De Jure Segregation.** Although the South lost the Civil War, its basic class structure and agrarian economy remained intact. The plantation elite remained the dominant class and was able to use its power to build a system of racial stratification to replace slavery.
Control of Black Labor. The plantation elite retained ownership of huge tracts of land, and cotton remained the primary cash crop in the South. As was the case before the Civil War, the landowners needed a workforce to farm the land. Because of the deprivations and economic disruptions of the war, the old plantation elite were short on cash and liquid capital and could not always hire workers for wages. In fact, almost as soon as the war ended, Southern legislatures attempted to force African Americans back into involuntary servitude by passing a series of laws known as the “Black Codes.” Only the beginning of Reconstruction and the active intervention of the federal government halted the implementation of this legislation (Geschwender, 1978, p. 158; Wilson, 1973, p. 99).

The plantation elite solved their manpower problem this time by developing a system of sharecropping, or tenant farming. The sharecroppers worked the land, which was actually owned by the planters, in return for payment in shares of the profit when the crop was taken to market. The landowner would supply a place to live and food and clothing on credit. After the harvest, tenant and landowner would split the profits (sometimes very unequally), and the tenant’s debts would be deducted from his share. The accounts were kept by the landowner who could cheat and take advantage of the tenants with great impunity. With few or no political and civil rights, black sharecroppers found it difficult to keep unscrupulous white landowners honest. The landowner could inflate the indebtedness of the sharecropper and claim that he was still owed money even after profits had been split. Under this system, sharecroppers had few opportunities to improve their situations and could be bound to the land until their “debts” were paid off (Geschwender, 1978, p. 163).

By 1910, more than half of all employed African Americans worked in agriculture, and more than half of the remainder (25% of the total) worked in domestic occupations, such as maid or janitor (Geschwender, 1978, p. 169). The manpower shortage in Southern agriculture was solved, and the African American community once again found itself in a subservient status.

At the same time, the white Southern working class was protected from direct job competition with African Americans. As the South began to industrialize, white workers were able to exclude black workers and reserve the better-paying jobs using a combination of whites-only labor unions and strong anti-black laws and customs. White workers took advantage of the new jobs created by industrialization, while black Southerners remained a rural peasantry, excluded from participation in the modernizing job structure.

In some sectors of the changing Southern economy, the status of African Americans actually fell lower than it had been during slavery. For example, in 1865, 83% of the artisans, or skilled craftsmen, in the South were African Americans; by 1900, this percentage had fallen to 5% (Geschwender, 1978, p. 170). The Jim Crow system confined African Americans to the agrarian and domestic sectors of the labor force, denied them the opportunity for a decent education, and excluded them from politics. The system was reinforced by still more laws and customs that drastically limited the options and life opportunities available to black Southerners.
Political and Civil Rights Under Jim Crow. A final force behind the creation of de jure segregation was political. As the 19th century drew to a close, a wave of agrarian radicalism known as populism spread across the country. This anti-elitist movement was a reaction to changes in agriculture caused by industrialization. The movement attempted to unite poor whites and blacks in the rural South against the traditional elite classes. The economic elite were frightened by the possibility of a loss of power and split the incipient coalition between whites and blacks by fanning the flames of racial hatred. The strategy of “divide and conquer” proved to be effective (as it often has both before and since this time), and the white elite classes in states throughout the South eliminated the possibility of future threats by depriving African Americans of the right to vote (Woodward, 1974).

The disenfranchisement of the black community was accomplished by measures such as literacy tests, poll taxes, and property requirements. The literacy tests were officially justified as promoting a better-informed electorate but were shamelessly rigged to favor white voters. The requirement that voters pay a tax or prove ownership of a certain amount of property could also disenfranchise poor whites, but again, the implementation of these policies was racially biased.

The policies were extremely effective, and by the early 20th century the political power of the Southern black community was virtually nonexistent. For example, as late as 1896 in Louisiana there had been more than 100,000 registered African American voters; African American voters were a majority in 26 parishes (counties). In 1898, the state adopted a new constitution containing stiff educational and property requirements for voting unless the voter’s father or grandfather had been eligible to vote as of January 1, 1867. At that time, the 14th and 15th Amendments, which guaranteed suffrage for black males, had not yet been passed. Such “grandfather clauses” made it easy for white males to register while disenfranchising blacks. By 1900, only about 5,000 African Americans were registered to vote in Louisiana, and African American voters were not a majority in any parish. A similar decline occurred in Alabama, where an electorate of more than 180,000 African American males was reduced to 3,000 by provision of a new state constitution. This story repeated itself throughout the South, and African American political powerlessness was a reality by 1905 (Franklin & Moss, 1994, p. 261).

This system of legally mandated racial privilege was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) that it was constitutional for states to require separate facilities (schools, parks, etc.) for African Americans as long as the separate facilities were fully equal. The Southern states paid close attention to “separate” but ignored “equal.”

Reinforcing the System. Under de jure segregation, as under slavery, the subordination of the African American community was reinforced and supplemented by an elaborate system of racial etiquette. Everyday interactions between blacks and whites proceeded according to highly stylized and rigidly followed codes of conduct intended to underscore the inferior status of the African American community. Whites were addressed as “mister” or “ma’am,” whereas African Americans were called by their first
names or, perhaps, by an honorific title such as “aunt,” “uncle,” or “professor.” Blacks were expected to assume a humble and deferential manner, remove their hats, cast their eyes downward, and enact the role of the subordinate in all interactions with whites. If an African American had reason to call on anyone in the white community, he or she was expected to go to the back door.

These expectations and “good manners” for black Southerners were systematically enforced. Anyone who ignored them ran the risk of reprisal, physical attacks, and even death by lynching. During the decades in which the Jim Crow system was being imposed, there were thousands of lynchings in the South. From 1884 until the end of the century, lynchings averaged almost one every other day in the South (Franklin & Moss, 1994, p. 312). The bulk of this violent terrorism was racial and intended to reinforce the system of racial advantage or punish real or imagined transgressors. Also, various secret organizations, such as the Ku Klux Klan, engaged in terrorist attacks against the African American community and anyone else who failed to conform to the dictates of the system.

**Increases in Prejudice and Racism.** As the system of racial advantage formed and solidified, levels of prejudice and racism increased (Wilson, 1973, p. 101). The new system needed justification and rationalization, just as slavery did, and anti-black sentiment, stereotypes, and ideologies of racial inferiority grew stronger. At the start of the 20th century, the United States in general—not just the South—was a very racist and intolerant society. This spirit of rejection and scorn for all out-groups coalesced with the need for justification of the Jim Crow system and created an especially negative brand of racism in the South.

**The Great Migration**

Although African Americans lacked the power resources to withstand the resurrection of Southern racism and oppression, they did have one option that had not been available under slavery: freedom of movement. African Americans were no longer legally tied to a specific master or to a certain plot of land. In the early 20th century, a massive population movement, often called the Great Migration, out of the South began. Slowly at first, African Americans began to move to other regions of the nation and from the countryside to the city. The movement increased when hard times hit Southern agriculture and slowed down during better times. It has been said that African Americans voted against Southern segregation with their feet.

As exhibits 4.2 and 4.3 show, an urban black population living outside the South is a 20th century phenomenon. A majority of African Americans continues to live in the South, but the group is more evenly distributed across the nation and much more urbanized than it was a century ago.

The significance of this population redistribution is manifold. Most important, perhaps, was the fact that by moving out of the South and from rural to urban areas, African Americans moved from areas of great resistance to racial change to areas of lower resistance. In the Northern cities, for example, it was far easier to register and
Exhibit 4.2  Regional Distribution of African American Population, 1890–2010


Exhibit 4.3  Percentage of African American Population Living in Urban Areas, 1890–2000

vote. Black political power began to grow and eventually provided many of the crucial resources that fueled the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.

**Life in the North**

What did African American migrants find when they got to the industrializing cities of the North? There is no doubt that life in the North was better for the vast majority of African American migrants. The growing Northern African American communities relished the absence of Jim Crow laws and oppressive racial etiquette, the relative freedom to pursue jobs, and the greater opportunities to educate their children. Inevitably, however, life in the North fell far short of utopia. Many aspects of African American culture—literature, poetry, music—flourished in the heady new atmosphere of freedom, but on other fronts Northern African American communities faced massive discrimination in housing, schools, and the job market. Along with freedom and such cultural flowerings as the Harlem Renaissance came black ghettos and new forms of oppression and exploitation. We will explore these events and the workings of what has been called **de facto segregation** in chapter 5.

**Competition with White Ethnic Groups**

It is useful to see the movement of African Americans out of the South in terms of their resultant relationships with other groups. Southern blacks began to move to the North at about the same time as the New Immigration from Europe (see chapter 2) began to end. By the time substantial numbers of black Southerners began arriving in the North, European immigrants and their descendants had had years, decades, and even generations to establish themselves in the job markets, political systems, labor unions, and neighborhoods of the North. Many of the European ethnic groups had also been the victims of discrimination and rejection, and, as we discussed in chapter 2, their hold on economic security and status was tenuous for much of the 20th century. They often saw the newly arriving black migrants as a threat to their status, a perception that was reinforced by the fact that industrialists and factory owners often used African Americans as strikebreakers and scabs during strikes. The white ethnic groups responded by developing defensive strategies to limit the dangers presented by these migrants from the South. They tried to exclude African Americans from their labor unions and other associations and limit their impact on the political system. They also attempted, often successfully, to maintain segregated neighborhoods and schools (although the legal system outside the South did not sanction overt **de jure** segregation).

This competition led to hostile relations between black Southern migrants and white ethnic groups, especially the lower- and working-class segments of those groups. Ironically, however, in another chapter of the ethnic succession discussed in chapter 2, the newly arriving African Americans actually helped white ethnic groups become upwardly mobile. Dominant group whites became less contemptuous of white ethnic groups as their alarm over the presence of African Americans increased. The greater antipathy of the white community toward African Americans made the immigrants
more desirable and thus hastened their admission to the institutions of the larger society. For many white ethnic groups, the increased tolerance of the larger society coincided happily with the coming of age of the more educated and skilled descendants of the original immigrants, further abetting the rise of these groups in the U.S. social class structure (Lieberson, 1980).

For more than a century, each new European immigrant group had helped to push previous groups up the ladder of socioeconomic success and out of the old, ghettoized neighborhoods. Black Southerners got to the cities after immigration from Europe had been curtailed, and no newly arrived immigrants appeared to continue the pattern of succession for Northern African Americans. Instead, American cities developed concentrations of low-income blacks who were economically vulnerable and politically weak and whose position was further solidified by anti-black prejudice and discrimination (Wilson, 1987, p. 34).

The Origins of Black Protest

As I pointed out in chapter 3, African Americans have always resisted their oppression and protested their situation. Under slavery, however, the inequalities they faced were so great and their resources so meager that the protest was ineffective. With the increased freedom that followed slavery, a national African American leadership developed and spoke out against oppression and founded organizations that eventually helped to lead the fight for freedom and equality. Even at its birth, the black protest movement was diverse and incorporated a variety of viewpoints and leaders.

Booker T. Washington was the most prominent African American leader prior to World War I. Washington had been born in slavery and was the founder and president of Tuskegee Institute, a college in Alabama dedicated to educating African Americans. His public advice to African Americans in the South was to be patient, to accommodate to the Jim Crow system for the time being, to raise their levels of education and job skills, and to take full advantage of whatever opportunities became available. This nonconfrontational stance earned Washington praise and support from the white community and widespread popularity in the nation. Privately, he worked behind the scenes to end discrimination and implement full racial integration and equality (Franklin & Moss, 1994, pp. 272–274; Hawkins, 1962; Washington, 1965).

Washington's most vocal opponent was W. E. B. Du Bois, an intellectual and activist who was born in the North and educated at some of the leading universities of the day. Among his many other accomplishments, Du Bois was part of a coalition of blacks and white liberals who founded the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1909. Du Bois rejected Washington's accommodationist stance and advocated immediate pursuit of racial equality and a direct assault on de jure segregation. Almost from the beginning of its existence, the NAACP filed lawsuits that challenged the legal foundations of Jim Crow segregation (Du Bois, 1961). As we shall see in chapter 6, this legal strategy was eventually successful and led to the demise of the Jim Crow system.
Washington and Du Bois may have differed on matters of strategy and tactics, but they agreed that the only acceptable goal for African Americans was an integrated, racially equal United States. A third leader who emerged early in the 20th century called for a very different approach to the problems of U.S. race relations. Marcus Garvey was born in Jamaica and immigrated to the United States during World War I. He argued that the white-dominated U.S. society was hopelessly racist and would never truly support integration and racial equality. He advocated separatist goals, including a return to Africa. Garvey founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association in 1914 in his native Jamaica and founded the first U.S. branch in 1916. Garvey’s organization was very popular for a time in African American communities outside the South, and he helped to establish some of the themes and ideas of black nationalism and pride in African heritage that would become prominent again in the pluralistic 1960s (Essien-Udom, 1962; Garvey, 1969, 1977; Vincent, 1976).

These early leaders and organizations established some of the foundations for later protest movements, but prior to the mid-20th century they made few actual improvements in the situation of African Americans in the North or South. Jim Crow was a formidable opponent, and the African American community lacked the resources to successfully challenge the status quo until the century was well along and some basic structural features of American society had changed.

**Applying Concepts**

**Acculturation and Integration**

During this era of Southern segregation and migration to the North, assimilation was not a major factor in the African American experience. Rather, the black–white relations of the time are better described as a system of structural pluralism combined with great inequality. Excluded from the mainstream but freed from the limitations of slavery, African Americans constructed a separate subsociety and subculture. In all regions of the nation, African Americans developed their own institutions and organizations, including separate neighborhoods, churches, businesses, and schools. Like immigrants from Europe in the same era, they organized their communities to cater to their own needs and problems and pursue their agenda as a group.

During segregation, a small African American middle class emerged based on leadership roles in the church, education, and business. A network of black colleges and universities was constructed to educate the children of the growing middle class, as well as other classes. Through this infrastructure, African Americans began to develop the resources and leadership that in the decades ahead would attack, head on, the structures of racial inequality.

**Gender and Race**

For African American men and women, the changes wrought by industrialization and the population movement to the North created new possibilities and new roles. However, as African Americans continued to be the victims of exploitation and exclusion
in both the North and the South, African American women continued to be among the most vulnerable groups in society.

Following Emancipation, there was a flurry of marriages and weddings among African Americans, as they were finally able to legitimate their family relationships (Staples, 1988, p. 306). African American women continued to have primary responsibility for home and children. Historian Herbert Gutman (1976) reports that it was common for married women to drop out of the labor force and attend solely to household and family duties, because a working wife was too reminiscent of a slave role. This pattern became so widespread that it created serious labor shortages in many areas (Gutman, 1976; see also Staples, 1988, p. 307).

The former slaves were hardly affluent, however, and as sharecropping and segregation began to shape race relations in the South women often had to return to the fields or to domestic work for the family to survive. One former slave woman noted that women “do double duty, a man’s share in the field and a woman’s part at home” (Evans, 1989, p. 121). During the bleak decades following the end of Reconstruction, Southern black families and black women in particular lived “close to the bone” (Evans, 1989, p. 121).

In the cities and in the growing African American neighborhoods in the North, African American women played a role that in some ways paralleled the role of immigrant women from Europe. The men often moved north first and sent for the women after they had attained some level of financial stability or after the pain of separation became too great (Almquist, 1979, p. 434). In other cases, African American women by the thousands left the South to work as domestic servants; they often replaced European immigrant women, who had moved up in the job structure (Amott & Matthaei, 1991, p. 168).

In the North, discrimination and racism created constant problems of unemployment for the men, and families often relied on the income supplied by the women to make ends meet. It was comparatively easy for women to find employment, but only in the low-paying, less-desirable areas, such as domestic work. In both the South and the North, African American women worked outside the home in larger proportions than did white women. For example, in 1900 41% of African American women were employed, compared with only 16% of white women (Staples, 1988, p. 307).

In 1890, more than a generation after the end of slavery, 85% of all African American men and 96% of African American women were employed in just two occupational categories: agriculture and domestic or personal service. By 1930, 90% of employed African American women were still in these same two categories, whereas the corresponding percentage for employed African American males had dropped to 54% (although nearly all of the remaining 46% were unskilled workers) (Steinberg, 1981, pp. 206–207). Since the inception of segregation, African American women have had consistently higher unemployment rates and lower incomes than African American men and white women (Almquist, 1979, p. 437). These gaps, as we shall see in chapter 6, persist to the present day.

During the years following the Civil War some issues did split men and women, within both the African American community and the larger society. Prominent among these was suffrage, or the right to vote, which was still limited to men only. The abolitionist movement, which had been so instrumental in ending slavery, also supported universal suffrage. Efforts to enfranchise women, though, were abandoned by the
Republican Party and large parts of the abolitionist movement to concentrate on efforts to secure the vote for African American males in the South. Ratification of the 15th Amendment in 1870 extended the vote, in principle, to African American men, but the 19th Amendment enfranchising women would not be passed for another 50 years (Almquist, 1979, pp. 433–434; Evans, 1989, pp. 121–124).

**COMPARATIVE FOCUS:**
South African Apartheid

Legally sanctioned racial segregation can be found in many nations, but perhaps the

Exhibit 4.4  Map of Africa Showing South Africa
most infamous system was constructed in South Africa (see exhibit 4.4). As in the Southern United States, South African segregation was intended to control the labor of the black population and eliminate all political and economic threats from the group. The white dominant group enjoyed a level of race-based privilege rarely equaled in the history of the world. Today, although enormous problems of inequality and racism remain, South Africa has officially dismantled the machinery of racial oppression, has enfranchised non-whites, and has elected three black presidents as of this writing.

South Africa has a long and bloody history of racial oppression but the system known as apartheid dates only from the late 1940s. The word “apartheid” means “separate” or “apart” in Afrikaans, one of the two languages of white South Africans (the other language is English). The logic of the system was to separate whites and blacks in every area of life: schools, neighborhoods, jobs, buses, churches, and so forth. Apartheid resembled the Jim Crow system of segregation in the United States except it was even more repressive, elaborate, and unequal. By keeping blacks poor and powerless, white South Africans created a pool of cheap, highly controlled labor. Of the dominant-minority situations considered in this text, perhaps only American slavery rivals apartheid for its naked, unabashed subjugation of one group for the benefit of another.

Note that the coming of apartheid reverses the relationship between modernization and control of minority groups in the Southern United States. As the United States industrialized and modernized, group relations evolved from paternalistic (slavery) to the looser rigid competitive form (de jure segregation). In South Africa, the structures of minority group control became stronger and more oppressive. Why the difference?

One reason for the increasing repression was that South African blacks in the late 1940s were extremely powerless. Protest organizations existed, but they were illegal and had to operate underground or from exile and under conditions of extreme repression. In the United States, in contrast, blacks living outside the South were able to organize and pool their resources to assist in the campaign against Jim Crow, and these activities were protected (more or less) by the national commitment to civil liberties and political freedom.

Perhaps more important than the power differential was the extreme sense of threat felt by white South Africans. Blacks were the great majority of the population in the society and whites feared that they would be "swamped" unless black powerlessness was perpetuated. This strong sense of threat helped to create a "fortress" mentality among white South Africans: the feeling that they were defending a small (but luxurious) outpost surrounded and besieged by savage hordes who threatened their immediate and total destruction.

Apartheid lasted about 40 years. Through the 1970s and 1980s, changes within South Africa and in the world in general built up pressure against the system. Internally, protests against apartheid by blacks began in the 1960s and continued to build in
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intensity, in spite of the brutal, violent repression of the South African government. Internationally, other nations established trade embargoes and organized boycotts of South African goods. Many of these efforts were more symbolic than real and had only minor impact on everyday social life, but they sustained an outcast status for South Africa and helped create an atmosphere of uncertainty among its economic and political elite.

By the late 1980s, these various pressures made it impossible to ignore the need for reform. In 1990, President F. W. de Klerk began a series of changes that eventually ended apartheid. He lifted the ban on many outlawed black African protest organizations, and released Nelson Mandela from prison. Mandela was the leader of the African National Congress (ANC), one of the oldest and most important black organizations, and he had served a 27-year prison term for actively protesting apartheid. Together, de Klerk and Mandela helped to ease South Africa through a period of rapid racial change that saw the franchise being extended to blacks, the first open election in South African history, and, in 1994, Mandela’s election to a 5-year term as president. Mandela has been succeeded by two other black South Africans: Thabo M. Mbeki, first elected in 1999, and Jacob Zuma, who became president in 2009.

The future of South Africa remains unclear. Although the majority black population now has political power, deep racial divisions remain and much of the black population lives in apartheid-era townships—pockets of deep, grinding poverty with no running water, poor or nonexistent medical care, and grossly overcrowded and understaffed schools. To illustrate, the average annual income (in U.S. dollars) for white households in 2006 was about $38,000 whereas black households averaged about $5,000 (Statistics South Africa, 2008, p. 9)

The problems of racial and class inequality facing South Africa are enormous and this experiment in racial reform might still fail. However, should it succeed in meeting these challenges, the dramatic transition away from massive racism and institutionalized discrimination could still provide a model of change for other racially divided societies.

**Industrialization, the Shift to Postindustrial Society, and Dominant-Minority Group Relations: General Trends**

The processes of industrialization that began in the 19th century continued to shape the larger society and dominant-minority relations throughout the 20th century. Today, the United States bears little resemblance to the society it was a century ago. The population has more than tripled in size and has urbanized even more rapidly than it has grown. New organizational forms (bureaucracies, corporations, multinational businesses) and new technologies (nuclear power, computers) dominate everyday life. Levels of education have risen, and the public schools have
produced one of the most literate populations and best-trained workforces in the history of the world.

Minority groups also grew in size during this period, and most became even more urbanized than the general population. Minority group members have come to participate in an increasing array of occupations, and their average levels of education also have risen. Despite these real improvements, however, virtually all U.S. minority groups continue to face racism, poverty, discrimination, and exclusion. As industrialization proceeded, the mechanisms for maintaining racial stratification also evolved, morphing into forms that are subtle, indirect, but, in their way, as formidable as Jim Crow segregation.

In this section, I outline the social processes that began in the industrial era and continue to shape the postindustrial stage. I note the ways in which these processes have changed American society and examine some of the general implications for minority groups. I then summarize these changes in terms of a transition from the rigid competitive Jim Crow era to a new stage of group relations called fluid competitive system. The treatment here is broad and intended to establish a general framework for the examination of the impacts of industrialization and deindustrialization on group relations in the case studies that make up part 3 of this text.

**Urbanization**

We have already noted that urbanization made close, paternalistic controls of minority groups irrelevant. For example, the racial etiquette required by Southern de jure segregation, such as African Americans deferring to whites on crowded sidewalks, tended to disappear in the chaos of an urban rush hour.

Besides weakening dominant group controls, urbanization also created the potential for minority groups to mobilize and organize large numbers of people. As stated in chapter 1, the sheer size of a group is a source of power. Without the freedom to organize, however, size means little, and urbanization increased both the concentration of populations and the freedom to organize.

**Occupational Specialization**

One of the first and most important results of industrialization, even in its earliest days, was an increase in occupational specialization and the variety of jobs available in the workforce. The growing needs of an urbanizing population increased the number of jobs available in the production, transport, and sale of goods and services. Occupational specialization was also stimulated by the very nature of industrial production. Complex manufacturing processes could be performed more efficiently if they were broken down into the narrower component tasks. It was easier and more efficient to train the workforce in the simpler, specialized jobs. Assembly lines were invented, work was subdivided, the division of labor became increasingly complex, and the number of different occupations continued to grow.

The sheer complexity of the industrial job structure made it difficult to maintain rigid, caste-like divisions of labor between dominant and minority groups. Rigid
competitive forms of group relations, such as Jim Crow segregation, became less viable as the job market became more diversified and changeable. Simple, clear rules about which groups could do which jobs disappeared. As the more repressive systems of control weakened, job opportunities for minority group members sometimes increased. However, conflict between groups also increased as the relationships between group memberships and positions in the job market became more blurred. For example, as we have noted, African Americans moving from the South often found themselves in competition for jobs with members of white ethnic groups, labor unions, and other elements of the dominant group.

**Bureaucracy and Rationality**

As industrialization continued, privately owned corporations and businesses came to have workforces numbering in the hundreds of thousands. Gigantic factories employing thousands of workers became common. To coordinate the efforts of these huge workforces, bureaucracy became the dominant form of organization in the economy and, indeed, throughout the society.

Bureaucracies are large-scale, impersonal, formal organizations that run “by the book.” They are governed by rules and regulations (i.e., “red tape”) and are “rational” in that they attempt to find the most efficient ways to accomplish their tasks. Although they typically fail to attain the ideal of fully rational efficiency, bureaucracies tend to recruit, reward, and promote employees on the basis of competence and performance (Gerth & Mills, 1946).

The stress on rationality and objectivity can counteract the more blatant forms of racism and increase the array of opportunities available to members of minority groups. Although they are often nullified by other forces (see Blumer, 1965), these antiprejudicial tendencies do not exist at all or are much weaker in preindustrial economies.

The history of the concept of race illustrates the impact of rationality and scientific ways of thinking. Today, virtually the entire scientific community regards race as a biological triviality, a conclusion based on decades of research. This scientific finding undermined and contributed to the destruction of the formal systems of privilege based solely on race (e.g., segregated school systems) and traditional prejudice, which is based on the assumption that race is a crucial personal characteristic.

**Growth of White-Collar Jobs and the Service Sector**

Industrialization changed the composition of the labor force. As work became more complex and specialized, the need to coordinate and regulate the production process increased, and as a result bureaucracies and other organizations grew larger still. Within these organizations, white-collar occupations—those that coordinate, manage, and deal with the flow of paperwork—continued to expand. As industrialization progressed, mechanization and automation reduced the number of manual or blue-collar workers, and white-collar occupations became the dominant sector of the job market in the United States.
1. **Extractive (primary) occupations** are those that produce raw materials, such as food and agricultural products, minerals, and lumber. The jobs in this sector often involve unskilled manual labor, require little formal education, and are generally low paying.

2. **Manufacturing (secondary) occupations** transform raw materials into finished products ready for sale in the marketplace. Like jobs in the extractive sector, these blue-collar jobs involve manual labor, but they tend to require higher levels of skill and are more highly rewarded. Examples of occupations in this sector include the assembly line jobs that transform steel, rubber, plastic, and other materials into finished automobiles.

3. **Service (tertiary) occupations** do not produce “things”; rather, they provide services. As urbanization increased and self-sufficiency decreased, opportunities for work in this sector grew. Examples of tertiary occupations include police officer, clerk, waiter, teacher, nurse, doctor, and cabdriver.

The course of industrialization is traced in the changing structure of the labor market depicted in exhibit 4.5. In 1840, when industrialization was just beginning in the United States, most of the workforce (70%) was in the extractive sector, with...
agriculture being the dominant occupation. As industrialization progressed, the manufacturing, or secondary, sector grew, reaching a peak after World War II. Today, in the postindustrial era, the large majority of U.S. jobs are in the service, or tertiary, sector.

This shift away from blue-collar jobs and manufacturing since the 1960s is sometimes referred to as deindustrialization or discussed in terms of the emergence of postindustrial society. The U.S. economy has lost millions of unionized, high-paying factory jobs since the 1960s, and the downward trend continues. The industrial jobs that sustained so many generations of American workers have moved to other nations where wages are considerably lower than in the United States, or have been eliminated by robots or other automated manufacturing processes (see Rifkin, 1996).

The changing structure of the job market helps to clarify the nature of intergroup competition and the sources of wealth and power in society. Job growth in the United States today is largely in the service sector, and these occupations are highly variable. At one end are low-paying jobs with few, if any, benefits or chances for advancement (e.g., washing dishes in a restaurant). At the other end are high-prestige, lucrative positions, such as Supreme Court justice, scientist, and financial analyst. The new service sector jobs are either highly desirable technical, professional, or administrative jobs with demanding entry requirements (e.g., physician or nurse) or low-paying, low-skilled jobs with few benefits and little security (e.g., receptionist, nurse’s aide). For the past half century, job growth in the United States has been either in areas in which educationally deprived minority group members find it difficult to compete or in areas that offer little compensation, upward mobility, or security. As we will see in part 3, the economic situation of contemporary minority groups reflects these fundamental trends.

The Growing Importance of Education

Education has been an increasingly important prerequisite for employability in the United States and in other advanced industrial societies. A high school or, increasingly, a college degree has become the minimum entry-level requirement for employment. However, opportunities for high-quality education are not distributed equally across the population. Some minority groups, especially those created by colonization, have been systematically excluded from the schools of the dominant society, and today they are less likely to have the educational backgrounds needed to compete for better jobs.

Access to education is a key issue for all U.S. minority groups, and the average educational levels of these groups have been rising since World War II. Still, minority children continue to be much more likely to attend segregated, underfunded, deteriorated schools and to receive inferior educations (see Orfield & Lee, 2007).

A Dual Labor Market

The changing composition of the labor force and increasing importance of educational credentials has split the U.S. labor market into two segments or types of jobs. The primary labor market includes jobs usually located in large, bureaucratic organizations. These positions offer higher pay, more security, better opportunities for advancement, health and retirement benefits, and other amenities. Entry requirements include college degrees, even when people with fewer years of schooling could competently perform the work.
The secondary labor market, sometimes called the competitive market, includes low-paying, low-skilled, insecure jobs. Many of these jobs are in the service sector. They do not represent a career and offer little opportunity for promotion or upward mobility. Very often, they do not offer health or retirement benefits, have high rates of turnover, and are part-time, seasonal, or temporary.

Many American minority groups are concentrated in the secondary job market. Their exclusion from better jobs is perpetuated not so much by direct or overt discrimination as by their lack of access to the educational and other credentials required to enter the primary sector. The differential distribution of educational opportunities, in the past as well as in the present, effectively protects workers in the primary sector from competition from minority groups.

Globalization

Over the past century, the United States became an economic, political, and military world power with interests around the globe. These worldwide ties have created new minority groups through population movement and have changed the status of others. Migration to this country has been considerable for the past three decades. The American economy is one of the most productive in the world, and jobs, even those in the low-paying secondary sector, are the primary goals for millions of newcomers. For other immigrants, this country continues to play its historic role as a refuge from political and religious persecution.

Many of the wars, conflicts, and other disputes in which the United States has been involved have had consequences for American minority groups. For example, both Puerto Ricans and Cuban Americans became U.S. minority groups as the result of processes set in motion during the Spanish-American War of 1898. Both World War I and World War II created new job opportunities for many minority groups, including African Americans and Mexican Americans. After the Korean War in the early 1950s, international ties were forged between the United States and South Korea, and this led to an increase in immigration from that nation. In the 1960s and 1970s, the military involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia led to the arrival of Vietnamese, Cambodians, Hmong, and other immigrant and refugee groups. The most recent war in Iraq has also produced new communities of immigrants and refugees.

Dominant-minority relations in the United States have been increasingly played out on an international stage as the world has effectively “shrunk” in size and become more interconnected by international organizations, such as the United Nations; by ties of trade and commerce; and by modern means of transportation and communication. In a world in which two thirds of the population is non-white and many important nations (such as China, India, and Nigeria) are composed of peoples of color, the treatment of racial minorities by the U.S. dominant group has come under increased scrutiny. It is difficult to preach principles of fairness, equality, and justice—which the United States claims as its own—when domestic realities suggest an embarrassing failure to fully implement these standards. Part of the pressure for the United States to end blatant systems of discrimination such as de jure segregation came from the desire to maintain a leading position in the world.
Postindustrial Society and the Shift from Rigid to Fluid Competitive Relationships

The coming of postindustrial society brought changes so fundamental and profound that they are often described in terms of a revolution: from an industrial society, based on manufacturing, to a postindustrial society, based on information processing and computer-related or other new technologies. As the subsistence technology evolved, so did American dominant-minority relations. The rigid competitive systems (such as Jim Crow) associated with earlier phases of industrialization gave way to fluid competitive systems of group relations. In fluid competitive relations, formal or legal barriers to competition—such as Jim Crow laws or South African apartheid—no longer exist. Both geographic and social mobility are greater in the newer system, and the limitations imposed by minority group status are less restrictive and burdensome. Rigid caste systems of stratification (in which group membership determines opportunities, adult statuses, and jobs) are replaced by more open class systems, in which there are weaker relationships between group membership and wealth, prestige, and power. Because fluid competitive systems are more open and the position of the minority group is less fixed, the fear of competition from minority groups becomes more widespread for the dominant group, and intergroup conflict increases. Exhibit 4.6 compares the characteristics of the three systems of group relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 4.6</th>
<th>Characteristics of Three Systems of Group Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems of Group Relations</strong></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsistence Technology</strong></td>
<td>Agrarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division of labor</strong></td>
<td>Simple. Determined by group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact between groups</strong></td>
<td>Common, but statuses unequal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power differential</strong></td>
<td>Maximum. Minority groups have little ability to pursue self-interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with previous systems, the fluid competitive system is closer to the American ideal of an open, fair system of stratification in which effort and competence are rewarded and race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and other “birthmarks” are irrelevant. However, as we will see in chapters to come, race and ethnicity continue to affect life chances and limit opportunities for minority group members even in fluid competitive systems. As suggested by the Noel hypothesis, people continue to identify themselves with particular groups (ethnocentrism), and competition for resources continues to play out along group lines. Consistent with the Blauner hypothesis, the minority groups that were formed by colonization remain at a disadvantage in the pursuit of opportunities, education, prestige, and other resources.

**Gender Inequality in a Globalizing, Postindustrial World**

Deindustrialization and globalization are transforming gender relations along with relations between racial and ethnic groups. Everywhere, even in the most patriarchal, male-dominated societies, women are moving away from their traditional role as wives and mothers, taking on new responsibilities, and facing new challenges. Some women are also encountering new dangers and new forms of exploitation that perpetuate their lower status and extend it into new areas.

**Trends in the United States**

In the United States, the transition to a postindustrial society has changed gender relations and the status of women on a number of levels. Women and men are now equal in terms of levels of education (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012b, p. 151) and the shift to fluid competitive group relations has weakened the barriers to gender equality along with the barriers to racial equality, although formidable obstacles remain. The changing role of women is also shaped by other characteristics of a modern society: smaller families, high divorce rates, and rising numbers of single mothers who must work to support their children as well as themselves. Here, we will look at the ways in which the shift to a postindustrial subsistence technology has raised the status of women relative to men and then examine some of the barriers and challenges that remain.

Many of these trends have coalesced to motivate women to enter the paid labor force in unprecedented numbers over the past half century. Women are now employed at almost the same levels as men. In the year 2010, for example, 63% of single women (versus about 67% of single men) and about 61% of married women (versus about 76% of married men) had jobs outside the home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012a, p. 384). Furthermore, between 1970 and 2009 the participation of married women with children in the workforce increased from a little less than 40% to almost 70% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012a, p. 385).

These “new” women workers are entering a wider variety of careers. In the past, women were largely concentrated in a relatively narrow range of female-dominated jobs such as nurse and elementary school teacher. Exhibit 4.7 focuses on four pairs of careers and illustrates both traditional patterns and recent changes. Each pair includes
PART 2  THE EVOLUTION OF DOMINANT-MINORITY RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Some women enter the paid labor force to compensate for the declining earning power of men. Before deindustrialization began to transform U.S. society, men monopolized the more desirable, higher-paid, unionized jobs in the manufacturing sector. For much of the last century, these blue-collar jobs paid well enough to subsidize a comfortable lifestyle, a house in the suburbs, and vacations, with enough money left over to save for a rainy day or for college for the kids.

However, when deindustrialization began, many of these desirable jobs were lost to automation and to cheaper labor forces outside the United States and were replaced, if at all, by lower-paying jobs in the service sector. Thus, deindustrialization tended to drive men's wages down, and many women took jobs outside the home to supplement

---

**Exhibit 4.7** Percentage Female in Selected Occupations for Selected Years

the family income. Women have taken jobs in sectors of the economy that tended to be relatively unaffected by the shift to an information society (such as elementary school teacher) or in areas that actually benefitted from this shift (finance, insurance, and real estate—the “FIRE” sector).

The rising aspirations of women and their movement into more lucrative and higher status careers have resulted in much greater gender equality in earning power. Exhibit 4.8 shows median income for male and female full-time, year-round workers. Note that the comparison is limited to full-time workers: this eliminates any difference in income caused by the fact that women tend to be less involved in the paid labor force. Also, income is expressed in 2010 dollars and this eliminates the effects of inflation on wages.

The graph reflects the impact of deindustrialization on men: their average wages have been stagnant or actually declining since the early 1970s. Women’s wages, in contrast, have been steadily rising. In 1955, women’s income was less than two thirds of men’s income. By 2007, the percentage had risen to 78% but then declined slightly to 77% in 2010.

The large-scale, macrolevel forces associated with deindustrialization have tended to raise the status of women and narrow the income gap but they have not equalized gender relations. Far from it! Even though women and men are now equal in terms of
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**Exhibit 4.8** Median Incomes for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers by Gender, 1955–2010 (2010 dollars)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2012c).
education, women tend to get lower returns for their investment in human capital. Exhibit 4.9 compares men and women who were full-time workers in 2010 and shows a wage gap at every level of education. Wages rise as education rises for both sexes but the wage gap tends to increase as education increases. The least-educated women earned 71% of what the least-educated men earned, and women with a high-school education earned 73% of what comparably educated men earned. Women college graduates ("BA degree only") earned only 70% of what the men college graduates earned. Among people with a college degree or more ("BA degree or more"), women earned only 68% of what men earned. The wage gap is greatest (60%) for people with professional degrees (doctors, lawyers, etc.)

**Exhibit 4.9** Mean Income for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers by Gender and Level of Education, 2010

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2012d).
Furthermore, the gender wage gap persists across occupational areas. Exhibit 4.10 compares men and women in 10 types of occupations in 2010 and, like exhibit 4.9, shows a substantial wage gap. The gender wage gap is smallest for nurses and social workers—two traditionally female-dominated jobs—and largest for the most prestigious and lucrative jobs (management and the professions).

The continuing gender income gap is related to the continuing concentration of women in less-well-paid occupations illustrated in exhibit 4.7, which, in turn, is partly a result of outright occupational discrimination and a pervasive pressure to funnel young women into “appropriate” jobs. This pattern is also a result of the choices women make to balance the demands of their jobs with their family obligations. Whereas men are expected to make a total commitment to their jobs and careers,
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**Exhibit 4.10** Median Earnings for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers by Gender, for Selected Occupational Categories, 2009

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2012e).
women have been expected to find ways to continue to fulfill their domestic roles even while working full-time, and many “female” jobs offer some flexibility in this area. For example, some women become elementary school teachers because the job offers long summer breaks, which can help women meet their childcare and other family responsibilities. This pattern of gender occupational segregation testifies to the persistence of minority status for women and the choices they make to reconcile the demands of career and family.

Women, along with minority groups in general, are also limited by the glass ceiling, or the discriminatory practices that limit opportunities to rise to higher levels in their careers, qualify for promotions, and earn higher salaries. These practices, today, are usually subtle, unspoken, and unwritten, but effective in maintaining gender inequality, including income inequality. Decisions about promotions or raises will not overtly mention gender but the glass ceiling is maintained, for example, by giving women less access to key mentors or sponsors and fewer opportunities for training and other experiences needed to qualify for higher-level jobs (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995, p. 8; Ridgeway, 2011, pp. 109–117).

One recent cross-national study demonstrated the reality of gender discrimination in business. The researchers followed a group of men and women who held MBAs from prestigious universities and found that the women in the sample started in lower positions, earned less over the course of their careers, and were far less likely to rise to the top of their companies (Carter & Silva, 2010). Another recent study of the Fortune 500 largest corporations found that women were woefully underrepresented among top business leaders and absent from the executive suites and board rooms. Women made up almost half of the total workforce in these companies but were only about 15% of executive officers and board members and fewer than 8% of top earners (Soares, Combopiano, Regis, Shut, & Wong, 2010).

Global Trends

How have deindustrialization and globalization affected women around the world? In part, these trends parallel those in the United States. According to the United Nations (2010), indicators such as rising education levels for women and lower rates of early marriage and childbirth show that women around the world are moving out of their traditional (and often highly controlled and repressed) status. Levels of education for women are rising worldwide and women are approaching educational parity with men, although progress has been slowed by the recent global economic crisis. They are entering the labor force in unprecedented numbers virtually everywhere, and women now make up about 40% of the paid global workforce. Still, women are concentrated in lower-status, less-lucrative, and more-insecure jobs everywhere (United Nations, 2010, pp. 20–23).

Although the status of women is generally rising, the movement away from traditional gender roles also brings exposure to new forms of exploitation. Around the globe, women have become a source of cheap labor, often in jobs that have recently been exported from the U.S. economy. For example, many manufacturing jobs
formerly held by men in the United States have migrated just south of the border to Mexico, where they are held by women. Maquiladoras are assembly plants built by corporations (often headquartered in the United States) to take advantage of the plentiful supply of working-class females who will work for low wages and in conditions that workers in the United States would not tolerate.

The weakening of traditional gender roles has increased women’s vulnerability in other areas, as well. A global sex trade in prostitution and pornography is flourishing and accounts for a significant portion of the economy of the Philippines, Thailand, and other nations. This international industry depends on impoverished women (and children) pushed out of the subsistence rural economy by industrialization and globalization and made vulnerable for exploitation by their lack of resources and power (Poulan, 2003; see also Ehrenreich & Hochschild, 2004; and Kristof & WuDunn, 2010).

Across all these changes and around the globe, women commonly face the challenge of reconciling their new work demands with their traditional family responsibilities. Also, women face challenges and issues such as sexual harassment and domestic violence, which clearly differentiate their status from that of men. In this context, minority group women face a double disadvantage because the issues they face as women are complicated by the barriers created by racial and ethnic prejudice and discrimination. As we will see in part 3, minority group and immigrant women often form the poorest, most vulnerable, and most exploited groups in U.S. society and around the globe.

**Modern Institutional Discrimination**

Virtually all American minority groups continue to lag behind national averages in income, employment, and other measures of equality, despite the greater fluidity of group relations, the end of legal barriers such as Jim Crow laws, the dramatic declines in overt prejudice, and the introduction of numerous laws designed to ensure that all people are treated without regard to race, gender, or ethnicity. After all this change, shouldn’t there be less minority group inequality and racial stratification?

As we will discuss in chapter 5, many Americans attribute the persisting patterns of inequality to the minority groups’ lack of willpower or motivation to get ahead. In the remaining chapters of this text, however, I argue that the major barriers facing minority groups in postindustrial, post–Jim Crow America are pervasive, subtle, but still powerful forms of discrimination that together can be called modern institutional discrimination.

As you read in chapter 1, institutional discrimination is built into the everyday operation of the social structure of society. The routine procedures and policies of institutions and organizations are arranged so that minority group members are automatically put at a disadvantage. In the Jim Crow era in the South, for example, African Americans were deprived of the right to vote by overt institutional discrimination and could acquire little in the way of political power.

The forms of institutional discrimination that persist in the present are more subtle and difficult to document than the blatant, overt customs and laws of the Jim
Crow system. In fact, they are sometimes unintentional or unconscious and are manifested more in the results for minority groups than in the intentions or prejudices of dominant group members. Modern institutional discrimination is not necessarily linked to prejudice, and the decision makers who implement it may sincerely think of themselves as behaving rationally and in the best interests of their organizations.

The Continuing Power of the Past

Many forces conspire to maintain racial stratification in the present. Some are the legacies of past discriminatory practices. Consider, for example, past-in-present institutional discrimination, which involves practices in the present that have discriminatory consequences because of some pattern of discrimination or exclusion in the past (Feagin & Feagin, 1986, p. 32). One form of this discrimination is found in workforces organized around the principle of seniority. In these systems, which are quite common, workers who have been on the job longer have higher incomes, more privileges, and other benefits, such as longer vacations. The “old-timers” often have more job security and are designated in official, written policy as the last to be fired or laid off in the event of hard times. Workers and employers alike may think of the privileges of seniority as just rewards for long years of service, familiarity with the job, and so forth.

Personnel policies based on seniority may seem perfectly reasonable, neutral, and fair. However, they can have discriminatory results in the present because in the past members of minority groups and women were excluded from specific occupations by racist or sexist labor unions, discriminatory employers, or both. As a result, minority group workers and women may have fewer years of experience than dominant group workers and may be the first to go when layoffs are necessary. The adage “last hired, first fired” describes the situation of minority group and female employees who are more vulnerable not because of some overtly racist or sexist policy in the present, but because of the routine operation of the seemingly neutral principle of seniority.

Racial differences in home ownership provide a second example of the myriad ways in which the past shapes the present and maintains racial stratification. Today, about 70% of whites own their own home, and these houses have a median value of $182,000. In contrast, only 44% of blacks are homeowners and the median value of their homes is $134,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012b). Home ownership is an important source of family wealth because home equity can be used to establish credit; finance businesses, other purchases, and investments; and fund education and other sources of human capital for the next generation. What is the origin of these huge differences in family wealth?

Part of answer lies in events that date back 80 years. As you know, President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s administration responded to the Great Depression of the 1930s, in part, by instituting the New Deal—a variety of programs that provided assistance to distressed Americans. What is not as widely known is that these programs were racially discriminatory and provided few or no benefits to African Americans (Massey, 2007, p. 60; see also Katznelson, 2005; and Lieberson, 1998). One of the New Deal programs was administered by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA): the
agency offered low-interest mortgages and made home ownership possible for millions of families. However, the FHA sanctioned racially restrictive covenants, which forbade whites to sell to blacks, and helped to institutionalize the practice of “redlining” black neighborhoods, which prevented banks from making home loans in these areas. Together, these and other discriminatory practices effectively excluded black Americans from home ownership (Massey, 2007, pp. 60–61; Massey & Denton, 1993, pp 53–54) Thus, another racial divide was created that, over the generations, has helped countless white families develop wealth and credit but made it impossible for black families to qualify for home ownership, the “great engine of wealth creation” (Massey, 2007, p. 61).

More broadly, racial residential segregation—which is arguably the key factor in preserving racial stratification in the present—provides a third illustration of modern institutional discrimination. The overt, Jim Crow-era laws and customs that created racially segregated neighborhoods and towns in the past were abolished decades ago, and racial discrimination in selling and renting houses has been illegal since the passage of the Fair Housing Act in 1968. However, blacks continue to be concentrated in all- or mostly black neighborhoods, many of which are also characterized by inadequate services and high levels of poverty and crime. How is racial residential segregation maintained in an era of fair housing laws?

Some of the practices that preserve racial residential segregation have been documented by audit studies. In this technique, black and white (and sometimes Latino and Asian) customers are prepared with carefully matched background credentials (education, employment and credit histories, and finances) and sent to test the market for racial fairness. Characteristically, the black customer is steered away from white neighborhoods, required to furnish larger down payments or deposits, charged higher interest rates, or otherwise discouraged from a successful sale or rental. Sometimes, the black customer may be told that a unit is already sold or rented, or otherwise given false or misleading information.

The result is that blacks are discouraged from breaking the housing color line, but not directly, blatantly, or in ways that clearly violate the fair housing laws. The gatekeepers (real estate agents, landlords, mortgage bankers) base their behavior not on race per se but on characteristics associated with race—accent, dialect, home address, and so forth—to make decisions about what levels of service and responsiveness to provide to customers. Sociologist Douglas Massey has even demonstrated racially biased treatment based on the use of “black English” in telephone contacts (Massey, 2000, p.4).

Audit studies have also documented racial discrimination in the job market (for example, see Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004). Other forms of modern institutional discrimination include the use of racially and culturally biased standardized tests in school systems, the pattern of drug arrests that sends disproportionate numbers of black teenage boys and young men to jail and prison (see chapter 5 for more), and decisions by businesspeople to move their operations away from center-city neighborhoods. Part of what makes modern institutional discrimination so challenging to document is that race, ethnicity, or gender may not be a conscious or overt part of these decision-making processes. Still, the results are that blacks and other
minorities—in the past as in the present—are filtered away from opportunities and resources and racial stratification is maintained, even in the new age of a supposedly color-blind society.

Modern institutional discrimination routinely places black Americans in less desirable statuses in education, residence and home ownership, jobs, the criminal justice system—indeed, across the entire expanse of the socioeconomic system. The result is racial stratification maintained not by monolithic Jim Crow segregation or slavery, but by a subtle and indirect system that is the “new configuration of inequality” (Katz & Stern, 2008, p. 100). We will apply the concept of modern institutional discrimination throughout the case study chapters in part 3 of this text.

**Affirmative Action**

By its nature, modern institutional discrimination is more difficult to identify, measure, and eliminate. Some of the most heated disputes in recent group relations have concerned public policy and law in this area. Among the most controversial issues is **affirmative action**, a group of programs that attempt to reduce the effects of past discrimination or increase diversity in the workplace or in schools. In the 1970s and 1980s, the Supreme Court found that programs designed to favor minority employees as a strategy for overcoming past discrimination were constitutional (e.g., *Firefighters Local Union No. 1784 v. Stotts*, 1984; *Sheet Metal Workers v. EEOC*, 1986; *United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC v. Weber*, 1979). Virtually all these early decisions concerned blatant policies of discrimination, which are becoming increasingly rare as we move farther away from the days of Jim Crow. Even so, the decisions were based on narrow margins (votes of five to four) and featured acrimonious and bitter debates. More recently, the Supreme Court narrowed the grounds on which such past grievances could be redressed (e.g., *Adarand Constructors Inc. v. Peña*, 1995).

**A Case of Discrimination?** The most recent case involving affirmative action programs in the workplace is *Ricci v. DeStefano*, 2009, involving firefighters in New Haven, Connecticut. In 2003, the city administered a test for promotion in the city's fire department. More than 100 people took the test but no African American scored high enough to qualify for promotion. The city decided to throw out the test results on the grounds that its dramatically unequal racial results strongly suggested that it was biased against African Americans. This decision is consistent with the legal concept of “disparate impact”: if a practice has unequal results, federal policy and court precedents tend to assume that the practice is racially biased. The city feared that using these possibly “tainted” test scores might result in lawsuits by black and other minority firefighters. Instead, a lawsuit was filed by several white and Hispanic firefighters who had qualified for promotion, claiming that invalidating the test results amounted to reverse racial discrimination. In yet another five to four ruling, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the white and Hispanic plaintiffs in 2009. This case illustrates some of the difficult issues that accompany attempts to address modern institutional discrimination.
The issue in *Ricci v. Stefano* is not overt Jim Crow discrimination, but a test that might be discriminatory in its results, although not in its intent. New Haven was attempting to avoid racial discrimination: How far do employers need to go to ensure racial fairness? Should policies and procedures be judged by the outcomes or their intents? What does “fairness” and “equal treatment” mean in a society in which minority groups have only recently won formal equality and still have lower access to quality schooling and jobs in the mainstream economy? Did the city of New Haven go too far in its attempt to avoid discrimination? (Five of the Supreme Court Justices thought so.) Can there be a truly fair, race-neutral policy for employment and promotion in the present when opportunities and resources have been allocated on the basis of race for so long in the past? If the problem is color-coded, can the solution be color-neutral?

**Higher Education and Affirmative Action.** Colleges and universities have been another prominent battleground for affirmative action programs. Since the 1960s, many institutions of higher education have implemented programs to increase the number of minority students on campus at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, sometimes admitting minority students who had lower grade point averages or test scores than dominant group students who were turned away. In general, advocates of these programs have justified them in terms of redressing the discriminatory practices of the past or increasing diversity on campus and making the student body a more accurate representation of the surrounding society. To say the least, these programs have been highly controversial and the targets of frequent lawsuits, some of which have found their way to the highest courts in the land.

Recent decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court have limited the application of affirmative action to colleges and universities. In two lawsuits involving the University of Michigan in 2003 (*Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*), the Supreme Court held that the university’s law school could use race as one criterion in deciding admissions but that undergraduate admissions could not award an automatic advantage to minority applicants. In other words, universities could take account of an applicant’s race but only in a limited way, as one factor among many.

In February 2012, the Supreme Court agreed to hear a case that challenges the partial use of minority status in determining college admissions (Liptak, 2012a). The case (*Fisher v University of Texas at Austin*) involves the University of Texas (UT), which uses a unique admissions system: the top 10% of the student body in each high school in Texas is automatically admitted to the university. Because of the residential segregation in towns and cities across the state, the student body at many high schools is disproportionately black, white, or Hispanic and the 10% rule guarantees substantial diversity in the UT student body. Some 80% of the students are selected by this method. The remaining 20% are selected using a variety of criteria, including race and ethnicity.

The case was brought by a white student who was not admitted to UT. She argues that some of the admitted minority students had lower grade point averages and test scores than hers. The university argues that the educational benefit of a diverse student body justifies its partial and limited use of race as an admission criterion. Like many
other select universities, UT uses many criteria—not just test scores—to diversify the student body. The Supreme Court will hear arguments in the fall of 2012 and decide if such programs remain constitutional, probably by a narrow margin and in a split decision.

**The Future of Affirmative Action.** What lies ahead for affirmative action? On the one hand, there is a clear trend in court decisions to narrow the scope and applicability of these programs. Also, there is very little public support for affirmative action, especially for programs that are perceived as providing specific numerical quotas in jobs or university admissions for minority groups. For example, a representative sample of Americans was asked in a 2010 survey if they supported “preferential hiring and promotion of blacks.” Only 12% of white respondents expressed support. More surprising, perhaps, preferences were supported by less than a majority of black respondents (44%) and only 18% of female respondents (National Opinion Research Council, 1972–2010).

On the other hand, although white (and many minority group) Americans object to fixed quotas or preferences, there is support for programs that expand the opportunities available to minority groups, including enhanced job training, education, and recruitment in minority communities (Wilson, 2009, p. 139). Programs of this sort are more consistent with traditional ideologies and value systems that stress individual initiative, personal responsibility, and equality of opportunity. Also, many businesses and universities are committed to the broad principles of affirmative action—the need to address past injustices and the importance of providing diversity in the workplace and classroom—and they are likely to sustain their programs (to the extent allowed by court decisions and legislation) into the future. By and large, it seems that affirmative action programs, especially those that stress equality of opportunity, will continue in some form, perhaps quite limited, into the foreseeable future.

### Social Change and Minority Group Activism

This chapter has focused on the continuing Industrial Revolution and its impact on minority groups in general and black–white relations in particular. For the most part, changes in group relations have been presented as the results of the fundamental transformation of the U.S. economy from agrarian to industrial to postindustrial. However, the changes in the situation of African Americans and other minority groups did not “just happen” as society modernized. Although the opportunity to pursue favorable change was the result of broad structural changes in American society, the realization of these opportunities came from the efforts of the many who gave their time, their voices, their resources, and sometimes their lives in pursuit of racial justice in America. Since World War II, African Americans have often been in the vanguard of protest activity, and we focus on the contemporary situation of this group in the next chapter.
FOCUS ON CONTEMPORARY ISSUES:
Hate Crimes

Hate crimes are attacks or other acts of intimidation motivated by the group membership of the victim or victims. Victims can be chosen randomly and are often strangers to their assailants. They are chosen because they are taken as representatives of a group, not because of who they are as individuals. These crimes are expressions of hatred or disdain, strong prejudice, and blatant racism, and are not committed for profit or gain. In recent years, they have included homicides and assaults, arson against black churches, vandalism of Jewish synagogues, cross burnings, nooses prominently tied to office doors of black university professors, and other acts of intimidation and harassment. Furthermore, a number of violent, openly racist extremist groups—skinheads, the Ku Klux Klan (KKK), White Aryan Resistance (WAR), the Minutemen, and Aryan Nations—have achieved widespread notoriety and have a prominent presence not only in some local communities, but also on the Internet.

As we will see in chapters to come, racial violence, hate crimes, and extremist racist groups are hardly new to the United States. Violence between whites and non-whites began in the earliest days of this society (e.g., conflicts with American Indians, the kidnapping and enslavement of Africans) and has continued, in one form or another, to the present. Contemporary racist attacks and hate crimes, in all their manifestations, have deep roots in the American past.

Are hate crimes increasing or decreasing? It's difficult to answer this question, though the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) has been collecting and compiling information on hate crimes since 1996. Not all localities report these incidents or classify them in the same way, and perhaps more important, not all hate crimes are reported. Thus, the actual volume of hate crimes may be many times greater than the "official" rate compiled by the FBI. (For a recent analysis, see Fears, 2007.)

Keeping these sharp limitations in mind, here is some of what is known. Exhibit 4.1 reports the breakdown of hate crimes in 2010 and shows that most incidents were motivated by race. In the great majority (70%) of these racial cases, the victims were black Americans. Most of the religious incidents (67%) involved Jewish victims, and most of the anti-ethnic attacks were against Hispanics (67%). The majority (57%) of the attacks motivated by the sexual orientation of the victims were directed against male homosexuals (FBI, 2012).

Exhibit 4.12 shows the number of hate crimes by the group membership of victims since the mid-1990s. For all categories, there has been a slight upward trend over the past several years. However, because our information on these crimes is so partial and untrustworthy, it is best not to make any hard-and-fast conclusions about trends.

Hate crimes and hate groups are not limited to a particular region. The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) tracks hate groups and hate crimes around the nation and
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estimates that there were 1,002 hate groups (defined as groups that “have beliefs or practices that attack or malign an entire class of people, typically for their immutable characteristics”) active in the United States in 2010 (SPLC, 2012). These groups include the KKK, various skinhead and white power groups, and black groups such as the Nation of Islam. The SPLC maintains a map at its website showing the locations of the known hate groups (see exhibit 4.13). The map shows that although the greatest concentration is in the Southeast, Texas, and California, hate groups are spread across the nation and can be found in all states.

What causes hate crimes? One possible explanation for at least some hate crimes is that they are fueled by perceived frustration and fear. Some white Americans believe
that minority groups are threatening their position in society and making unfair progress at their expense. They feel threatened by what they perceive to be an undeserved rise in the status of minority groups and fear that they may lose their jobs, incomes, neighborhoods, and schools to what they see as “inferior” groups.

Given the nature of American history, it is logical to suppose that the white Americans who feel most threatened and angriest are those toward the bottom of the stratification system: lower-class and working-class whites. There is evidence that males from these classes commit the bulk of hate crimes and are the primary sources of membership for the extremist racist groups (Schafer & Navarro, 2004). In the eyes of the perpetrators, attacks on minorities may represent attempts to preserve status and privilege.
The connection between social class and hate crimes might also reflect some broad structural changes in the economy, especially the shift from an industrial, manufacturing economy to a postindustrial, information-processing economy. This change has meant a decline in the supply of secure, well-paying, blue-collar jobs. Many manufacturing jobs have been lost to other nations with cheaper workforces; others have been lost to automation and mechanization. The tensions resulting from the decline in desirable employment opportunities for people with lower levels of education have been exacerbated by industry downsizing, increasing inequality in the class structure, and rising costs of living. These economic forces have squeezed the middle and lower ranges of the dominant group’s class system, creating considerable pressure and frustration, some of which may be directed at immigrants and minority groups.

Several studies support these ideas. One study found that at the state level, the rate of hate crimes increased as unemployment rose and as the percentage of the population between 15 and 19 years old increased. Also, the rate fell as average wages rose (Medoff, 1999, p. 970; see also Jacobs & Wood, 1999). Another study, based on county-level data gathered in South Carolina, found a correlation between white-on-black hate crimes and economic competition (D’Alessio, Stolzenberg, & Eitle, 2002). Finally, Arab Americans have been victimized by a rash of violent attacks after September 11, 2001 (Ibish, 2003). These patterns are exactly what one would expect if the perpetrators of hate crimes tended to be young men motivated by a sense of threat and economic distress.

Exhibit 4.13 Distribution of Hate Groups, 2010

Source: SPLC (2012).
Main Points

- Group relations change as the subsistence technology and the level of development of the larger society change. As nations industrialize and urbanize, dominant-minority relations change from paternalistic to rigid competitive forms.
- In the South, slavery was replaced by de jure segregation, a system that combined racial separation with great inequality. The Jim Crow system was motivated by a need to control labor and was reinforced by coercion and intense racism and prejudice.
- Black Southerners responded to segregation in part by moving to Northern urban areas. The Northern African American population enjoyed greater freedom and developed some political and economic resources, but a large concentration of low-income, relatively powerless African Americans developed in ghetto neighborhoods.
- In response to segregation, the African American community developed a separate institutional life centered on family, church, and community. An African American middle class emerged, as well as a protest movement.
- African American women remain one of the most exploited groups. Combining work with family roles, African American females were employed mostly in agriculture and domestic service during the era of segregation.
- Industrialization continued throughout the 20th century and has profoundly affected dominant-minority relations. Urbanization, specialization, bureaucratization, and other trends have changed the shape of race relations, as have the changing structure of the occupational sector and the growing importance of education. Group relations have shifted from rigid to fluid competitive. Modern institutional discrimination is one of the major challenges facing minority groups.

Study Site on the Web

Don’t forget the interactive quizzes and other resources and learning aids at www.sagepub.com/healeyds4e.

For Further Reading


*The classic analysis of the shift from a manufacturing to a service-based, information society.*


*Two comprehensive and provocative looks at modern institutional discrimination.*


*Three outstanding analyses of black–white relations in the United States, with a major focus on the historical periods covered in this chapter.*

*A compact, masterful review of the myths and realities surrounding affirmative action.*

### Questions For Review and Study

1. A corollary to two themes from chapter 3 is presented at the beginning of chapter 4. How exactly does the material in this chapter illustrate the usefulness of this corollary?

2. Explain paternalistic and rigid competitive relations and link them to industrialization. How does the shift from slavery to de jure segregation illustrate the dynamics of these two systems?

3. What was the Great Migration to the North? How did it change American race relations?

4. Explain the transition from rigid competitive to fluid competitive relations and explain how this transition is related to the coming of postindustrial society. Explain the roles of urbanization, bureaucracy, the service sector of the job market, and education in this transition.

5. What is modern institutional discrimination? How does it differ from “traditional” institutional discrimination? Explain the role of affirmative action in combating each.

6. Explain the impact of industrialization and globalization on gender relations. Compare and contrast these changes with the changes that occurred for racial and ethnic minority groups.

7. What efforts have been made on your campus to combat modern institutional discrimination? How effective have these programs been?

### Internet Research Project

In this project, you will extend the treatment of de jure segregation in this chapter by visiting a website entitled “The Rise and Fall of Jim Crow” at http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/index.html. The website is related to a documentary series, which can be ordered from the website and is well worth viewing. The website has five subsections; you should explore each and take the “Jim Crow quiz” under the “Tools and Activities” link. As you browse the site, find answers to each of the questions below *(Note: Your instructor may have different or additional questions.)*

### Questions

1. What “strange fruit” did Billie Holiday sing about?

2. In what year did Louisiana ban marriages between “White persons and persons of color?”
3. What state, in 1876, provided that schools could be segregated if there were 15 or more “colored” children?

4. In Florida in 1909, what was the fine for “occupying” a train car other than the one designated for one’s race?

5. In what year was Wilberforce University in Ohio founded? Who was Wilberforce? What was the mission of this institution?

6. What were the following people best known for? Where did they live and what were their dates of birth and death?
   a. Sidney Bechet
   b. Madam C. J. Walker
   c. Ida B. Wells
   d. Walter White
   e. Ned Cobb

7. What was the Brownsville Affair of 1906? How does this incident illustrate the dynamics of the Jim Crow era?

8. Why is the Plessy v. Ferguson 1896 Supreme Court decision important? What was its relationship to the Jim Crow system? What events led to this decision?

9. What happened during the Red Summer of 1919? How do these events illustrate the dynamics of the Jim Crow system and American race relations in general?

10. What was the relevance of the following organizations for Jim Crow?
    a. The Democratic Party
    b. The Populist Party
    c. The National Urban League
    d. The Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters

Reactions

Using the information and insights you gathered from the website, along with the material in this chapter, write an essay in which you explain the legal, political, economic, and social dimensions of Jim Crow segregation, citing specific examples. How did the system control blacks, institutionalize racial stratification, and sustain the privilege of whites? (Note: Your instructor may have more-specific or different instructions.)

Optional Group Discussion

Discuss what you learned from the website and this chapter with a group of your classmates. Use your reaction essay to help guide your thoughts and focus the discussion. You might organize the discussion around questions such as these:

1. Why did de jure segregation happen? What was at stake? Who gained and who lost? Be sure to discuss class and gender differences in connection with these issues.
2. How was the Jim Crow system sustained across time? What was the role of prejudice and racism? Subsistence technology? Law and custom? How was violence used to enforce the system? What organizations were involved in the creation and persistence of segregation?

3. What does it mean to call this system “rigid competitive”? How did it differ from the paternalistic system of slavery?

4. How did the black community react to segregation? What means of resistance and escape were available? Were they effective? Why or why not?

5. Why did de jure segregation end? What macrolevel changes in subsistence technology made segregation untenable? Why?

(Note: Your instructor may have more-specific or different instructions.)