

Vol. 2 Number 2 —Spring, 2020

# MAC **A r r o w**

Unitarian Universalist  
Multiracial Unity Action Council  
(UUMUAC)

“For the Unity of the  
light and dark skinned  
people of the world.”

Mailing Address: UUMUAC

1448 E. 52nd St., Box 267, Chicago, IL 60615

Editor’s email: [uusj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:uusj@sbcglobal.net)

### **The Mission Statement**

It is the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Caucus to carry out and foster anti-racist and multiracial unity activities both within and outside the Unitarian Universalist Association through education, bearing witness and other actions, and expansion of our membership both within and outside the walls of our congregations.

### **The Vision Statement**

We envision our congregations, denomination, and society as not being color blind but color appreciative; as judging and treating members of the world’s rank and file by the content of their character, not the color of their skin or their cultural heritage; and as treasuring diversity in the context of the “Beloved Community.” We call this vision Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

**To unsubscribe please send a note to [uusj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:uusj@sbcglobal.net).**

## **The UUMUAC Convocation, April 17, 2020 – A Narratological Summary by Rev. Dr. Finley C. Campbell, chair and spokesperson, UUMUAC**

**Preliminary Activities:** Sitting here in front of my laptop, waiting for 9 am, when our Zoom version of a true convocation will begin, I think that our gathering might in some small way help determine the future of the world, along with others around the world who are likewise applying their abilities toward creating The Beloved Community. After getting all the technicalities out of the way we start with a Q and A with Rev. Todd Eklof, a new member and the guest of honor, and one of the stimulus for our Convocation. Based on my recollections of the discussion, I saw several interconnected ideas which emerged from the Q and A; e.g., I felt we finally had a clear narrative about exactly what occurred at GA 19 when he and his supporters began to circulate the book. Based on my recollections, there seem to have been many circumstances which compelled him to write the book: the irrational controversy about voting against a less qualified person for a UUA position, the way that controversy ended up driving Peter Morales to resign and led to the imposition of the white supremacy dogma on our Association, led by three African American ministers, the growing concern about the use of artificially constructed restraints on preventing free discussion of issues of identity politics, restraints which were becoming more and more egregious. It seemed to me that Brother Todd was clear to emphasize that his critique was more than just about race but all forms of identity politics which would replace critical thinking with conformist dogma, what he and I both call identitarianism, which submerges our humanity into a slice and dice reality where we are only identified by our race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, physicality, etc., rather than seeing all this as aspects of a common humanity. What was also important to me was that he also shared with us the personal stress which the controversy had brought upon him and his church, especially his opponents at his church. During this section of our convocation many folks shared their praise for the book, for the ideas which emerged and stimulated their own thinking, and how much of the book's ideas about the importance of logic and reason in UU discourse was a refreshing change from the group think imposed on many of our cousins who have become infected with the virus of neo-racism in its whitesupremacyology/ multiculturalist guise.

**Plenary Session I:** This was the official kick off of the Convocation, beginning as usual with our opening words (the Seven UU Principles, read by Sister Marie Cobbs and a chalice lighting, by Brother Brian Hedges. I began by giving a special welcoming to our ministerial participants: Reverends Todd Eklof, Jack Reich, Richard Trudeau, Beverly Seese, Leland Bond-Upson, and Wesley Hromatko. Because an event like this is made up of people who participate out of commitment, since there is no salaries involved, I introduce the Board members (plus Rev. Eklof) constituting the Program Committee Members, a demonstration that a program of this magnitude could not be successful put on without dedicated help: Allan Lindrup, Marie Cobbs, Rev. Todd Eklof, Rev. Beverly Seese, and myself. This is followed by my introduction of the remaining members of the Board of Directors: Brian Hedges, Carl Wolf, Wesley Hromatko, Dick Burkhart, and Kenneth Christensen, signs of our transformation from a small caucus operation to a full fledged UU organization, even though not accepted by the UUA elites. Brother Ken introduces me for the plenary talk, giving the following biographical sketch, which unfortunately some can not hear since we had our first of many audio problems: my educational background, from aba BA from Morehouse College to a PhD from the University of Chicago, my political background in social justice work, going from Atlanta to Chicago, as a Marxist Leninist Historical Theist, and finally my religious background as an ordained Baptist minister in the UUAC. My "Brief Autobiographic – History of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council, 1994-2020," also has audio problems as I narrate our evolution from a one person dissenter to a Caucus within the UUAC organizations to an interdependent 501c3 council within the UUAC, identifying a variety of things we have accomplished (despite opposition) on the local, regional, national, and

international level. Following brief responses from some of our ministerial participants, we head into our lunch break with music by Sister Lia McCoo, an exceptional singer, and a former member of First U. Chicago, as our musical director for the rest of the Convocation.

**Plenary II:** Now we get to the heart of the matter, the issue of dissent and persecution, as one of the main issues we had wanted to deal with here at our Convocation. This session is chaired by Rev Beverly who describes the focus of the plenary on reviving the tradition of creative dissent as a vital force in the creation of a true UU Community— paying the price, a panel featuring – Three Witnesses. Then she gave a powerful, short introductory presentation/homily on the importance of dialogue and dissent in the Unitarian Universalist tradition, going back to the martyrdom of Comrade Michael Servetus. Following this she introduced the three panelists and the responder and gave their bio-sketches, except FCC's since his had been already done, I briefly summarize as follows:

1. Rev. Dr. Todd F. Eklof has been a Unitarian Universalist minister since 1999. He was ordained a Southern Baptist Minister but eventually fell away and joined the non-creedal Unitarian Universalists in 1989. After a 16-year career in TV news and corporate video production, Rev. Eklof reentered the ministry as a UU, and is presently the senior minister at UU Church of Spokane, WA.;

2. Rev. Richard Trudeau was for 17 years the minister of the UU Church of Weymouth, Mass. and for 35 years a teacher of math and the history of astronomy at Stonehill College in Easton, Mass. He is the author of two books for UUs: *Universalism 101* and *Bible Stories for Skeptics*. Now semi-retired, he is a member of the Unitarian Church in Fall River, Mass., and preaches about twenty times a year at various UU churches in eastern New England;

3. Rev. Jack Reich, respondent, is a long time UU and a member of the Unitarian Universalist Humanist Association and a member of the UU Church of DeKalb. He also has had a long history of social/racial justice activities.

The focus of the three panelists was their persecution for their embrace of the Fourth Principle and their willingness to face this persecution for the sake of principle, in this case the Seven Principles as nourished by their sources in the Unitarian Universalist historical traditions. Rev. Reich proposed as a part of his response that members and friends of UUMUAC protest this violation of our 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> principle by withholding of our financial contributions until justice is achieved. Rev. Seese then threw the session open for general discussion which led to a lively exchange of outrage, sadness, and stories of similar persecutions in other congregations.

**Plenary III and IV:** These two sessions are interrelated since they deal with the overall theme and with the particular problems of dissent and democracy associated with them. Brother Carl Wolf is in charge of Plenary III which is an open forum on the future of the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations: Chaos or Community. This is in reference to the general future of our Association of Congregations, and our participants shared evidence of the chaos which has emerged in their own congregations caused by the commitment of the leadership of the UUA to whitesupremacyology, on the one hand, and yet denial of permitting open opposition on the other. For Carl it all came down to a matter of creating community by taking action, as related to racism reflected in the actual lives of both our congregants and the communities in which our congregations are situated. This led into Plenary Session IV with Brother Dick Burkhart as facilitator, dealing with the topic of the importance of increasing our efforts with the MAC petition drive and with the Fifth Principles Caucus' call to action for GA 2020. However, since the topic of having an 8<sup>th</sup> principle had come up, with the implication that this principle could supersede the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>, significant time was spent on pointing out its shortcomings. Unfortunately, an updated or official version of that principle was not yet available from the UUA, so

we dealt primarily with its implication that the concepts of multiculturalism and accountability were its chief problems and in the spirit of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> principles we should be ready to respond to it, the consensus being that the Seven Principles are enough.

**Plenary V: The closing, evening session:** This was led by Brian Hedges, and what I felt was that whether our participants had stayed for the whole thing, dropped in and out, or had primarily come to hear Brother Rev. Todd, they all had benefitted from our first UUMUAC Convocation. After a warm introduction, Brother Todd took over with his evening sermon, "Tomorrow's Ancestors: Why What We Do Now, Matters." He made several key points:

1. A tree without roots cannot branch. A tree with shallow roots cannot stand;
2. Unitarian Universalism is a mustard seed sized faith, but, as Jesus said, this is enough for it to grow big enough to provide rest for all kinds of birds;
- 3, But it cannot grow or stand if it becomes severed from its ancient values: reason, freedom of conscience, and, above all, uplifting our common humanity;
4. It cannot provide true sanctuary if the only birds coming together are those of one ideological feather;
5. And most of all, I felt humbled and yet proud and happy that Brother Rev. Todd identified UUMUAC as an exponent of this vision, although I disagreed with his view that there was in past years (true) communism in the Soviet Union.

Brian offered ten minutes for a Talk-Back and this is followed by Marie and I making a call for participants to join UUMUAC if they have not yet done so, with a wonderful explanation by Marie about why she is a member of UUMUAC and not a member of the Black Lives Unitarian Universalists. And when one of our participants asks what should be the take away from this day long event, she reiterated: Join UUMUAC and help it fight for our UU Principles. After thanking Lia for her music and Karyn Moriyah of MorPROStudio for videotaping, we had closing words from Brother Eklof. Then we closed with a Zoom hymn sing, the incredibly powerful "Rank on Rank We Stand," in the Grey/Blue Hymnal called SINGING THE LIVING TRADITION, led by Sister Lia McCoo:

Rank by Rank again we stand  
from the four winds gathered hither  
Loud the hallowed walls demand  
whence we come and how and whither  
From their stillness breaking clear  
Echoes wake to warn or cheer  
higher truth from saint and seer  
call to us assembled here.

And for me and all MAC members, ... that higher truth is multiracial unitarian universalism. And then we Extinguish the Chalice, but leaving Zoom active for 15 minutes for people to chat about the Convocation and to enjoy a powerful set of musical improvisation by Lia, including her version of "Keep your eyes on the prize." What a day: for me, from 1969 to now, a wonderful journey with more leagues to follow.

Note: DVD recording will be made available in the future.

## **Attempts Balance But Comes Up Short**

a review by Dick Burkhart of

### **Critical Race Theory: An Introduction**

By Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, 2017)

This short book attempts to be an introductory textbook about Critical Race Theory (CRT). As such, it is far better than the populist ideologies of race that are proliferating today, such as "white supremacy culture" and "white fragility", but the book still comes across as out-of-touch at times. On the plus side Delgado and Stefancic clearly distinguish the tension between the economic (= "realistic" / "materialistic") approach to racial oppression from analyses based on bias, whether individual or institutional. Another plus is how they present the controversies over the canonical black / white racial history versus the divergent racial histories of other minorities in US history.

But I was left wondering when they tackled the legitimate question of equality of opportunity versus equality of results, suggesting that the "human rights" approach has largely failed by focusing on the former instead of the latter. They did not even cite "entitlements" (another word for "rights") like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, which have been quite successful at producing results across racial and ethnic lines. Nor did they cite how the language of "white supremacy" has now become part of CRT via academics like Charles Mills, or the resultant inflammation of the culture wars and political polarization that has led to Trump.

Nor did Delgado and Stefancic cite damaging CRT-related controversies, such as the one at Evergreen College, which has now lost a quarter of its student body, explained as a "witch-hunt" in the "Coddling of the American Mind" by Lukianoff and Haidt. These authors also give a solid academic critique of "microaggressions". A more recent example of a CRT-derived "witch-hunt" was the Eklof controversy at the Unitarian-Universalist General Assembly in 2019 (see "A Self-Confessed White Supremacy Culture" by Anne Schneider). And despite the attempt to cover criticisms of CRT, Delgado and Stefancic made no references to well-known African-American critics like John McWhorter or Shelby Steele.

Nor were there any references to the numerous works that now document the recent oppression of much of the white working class and the long standing oppression of the white underclass, from the Angus Deaton / Anne Case studies of "deaths of despair" to Rev. Thandeka's short history ([www.revthandeka.org/twn](http://www.revthandeka.org/twn)). While Delgado and Stefancic complain that "empathy is in shorter supply than we think" (p. 34) when discussing racial stereotypes and the like, they fail to apply this to themselves. By confusing "white society" in general with the ruling classes, CRT academics may be perceived as condescending elitists themselves, especially by the multitudes who've been crushed despite their perceived "whiteness". Rabbi Michael Lerner documents this in his recent book "Revolutionary Love".

One of the most astonishing examples of how finger-pointing ideology has triumphed common sense historical perspective in CRT is the statement (p 64): "When we are tackling a structure as deeply embedded as race, radical measures are in order – otherwise the system merely swallows up the small improvements one has made, and everything goes back to the way it was." In fact, it is precisely those "radical measures" which cause the backlashes that lead to setbacks. It is simply unrealistic to expect major societal changes, even beneficial ones, to thoroughly take hold in less than 3 to 5 generations, and often far longer, without very carefully thought-out and implemented strategies to deal with backlash and setbacks. A key parameter is simply how fast people die off, and therefore how fast old ways of thinking and doing die off.

After the Civil War, the backlash (= Jim Crow) was so bad that it took 5 generations before the next big breakthrough (= the Civil Rights Movement). The Civil Rights project of "integration", though far from complete, has still achieved an amazing amount in its first 50 years. This progress was

.speeded up by things like affirmative action and intermarriage, but slowed by escalating inequality. Also the black power movement and the violence of the late 60s eventually led to a backlash (= mass incarceration), as the moral legacy generated by MLK was dissipated by impatient blacks and guilty whites (= CRT) as much as by reactionary forces.

The Rev. William Barber is carrying forward the MLK vision into a “third reconstruction”, a renewed “Poor People’s Campaign”, not the elitist and alienating CRT. Barber’s campaign is a perfect fit for the “Green New Deal” since the latter just adds escalating climate / ecological / resource challenges to poverty and inequality. Unfortunately CRT is feeding the cultural wars that are blocking access to this common ground.

### **Commentary on the Afghan Peace Deal**

*By Fahima Gaheez, Executive Director, Afghan Women’s Fund*

This so-called peace deal with the Taliban is not a peace deal at all. In 2001 when the U.S planned to invade Afghanistan, it didn't look so difficult. Although the Taliban were in power, supported by Saudis, Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates, it took the U.S only two weeks to defeat the Taliban. 19 years later, when there is a relatively strong Afghan army and the Taliban are known as militia and an anti-government group, the U.S thinks winning the war is not possible, so let's make a “Peace Deal”?

Who are they trying to fool? The U.S with all their military might and financial power, can't defeat the medieval Taliban terrorists with little education and no understanding of technology?

If the U.S was serious and genuine about peace and the so-called “war on terror”, why not eliminate the terrorist training camps in Pakistan? There are hundreds of thousands of religious madrassas with 4.1 million students, the majority of them male students, who are taught harsh religious curriculum along with violence. The majority are recruited to be trained as foot-soldiers for Jihad. Thousands of those Madrassas were funded by the U.SA in the war against the USSR in Afghanistan, where students would come from all over the world to learn religion and anti-communism propaganda. The numbers of madrassas have multiplied many times in the past 25 years (with funds from Saudis and other Arab sheikhs) and still operate as terrorists recruiting ground. U.S. has never asked Pakistan to close them down. If the U.S was serious about “war on terror”, 1- It should have pressured Pakistan to close those madrassas, 2- All the terrorist training camps in Pakistan should have been eliminated.

Do we want Peace? Who doesn't? But not at any cost. Peace and Justice come together. The Taliban are known for their opposition to women's rights, violation of Human Rights and inhuman treatment of others. Chopping heads and public stoning were carried out less than 72 hours ago after the so-called Peace Deal agreement.

So the question is what is peace to the U.S? Whatever happens to Afghans, doesn't matter. If the U.S really wanted peace, why didn't it talk to the Taliban 19 years ago? Over 100 Thousand Afghans got killed by either the U.S or Taliban's bombing. They could have avoided all this bloodshed by making peace 19 years ago when the Taliban were in a much weaker positions and ready. From 2003 on, for several years, the Taliban contacted various Afghan political players in the government of Afghanistan to make a peace deal in exchange for immunity from prosecution and U.S attack, but the U.S and her allies, the notorious Northern Alliance warlords who were very strong in the government of President Karzai, didn't accept their offer. If accepted, the Taliban would have formed a political party in the new internationally backed regime according to Mr Jalali, the former interior minister who was contacted by the Taliban.

The current shameless “Peace Deal” is rejected by many Afghans because it surrenders Afghans and the government of President Ghani to the Taliban. According to the deal, the Taliban will “kill bad people and Al Qaida” to help the U.S., according to Mr. Trump and Mr. Pompeo.

Is the U.S going round in circles? The U.S often creates a new set of terrorists to be her allies, who will get rid of the U.S's old terrorist allies, who are now her enemies. How many years will this pattern go on? How many more lives will be lost? How many countries will be destroyed? Will this cycle go on indefinitely?

In this agreement, the U.S wants the Afghan government to release 5000 Taliban, including some 750 Pakistani Taliban who are caught red-handed with bombs or suicide vests or illegal weapons. Many have carried out attacks and committed mass murders. They are criminals, not political prisoners, but the U.S still put pressure on Ashraf Ghani's government to release those criminals unconditionally.

Another shameless issue in this deal is the use of words: Islam:19 times, Democracy: 0, Women's Right and Human Rights: 0, Terrorism: 0 , US: 43 times, Taliban :16 times, Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan: (The official Taliban Government Name), 16 times , Afghan Government 0,

In a bizarre way the agreements reads: The agreement for bringing peace to Afghanistan between the "Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, which is not recognized by the United State as a State and is known as Taliban". These words and descriptions of the Taliban as not "recognized" by the U.S as a State are mentioned in 16 articles in the agreement. Obviously, the two parties agreed to use the Taliban's preferred term along with the U.S.'s statement that it does not recognize the Taliban as a State.

Right after the agreement with the U.S, the Taliban carried out several attacks against Afghans, killed many dozen, and abducted over 55 poor people from the villages to use them for prisoners swaps. The U.S knows there will be no true peace and knows very well the Taliban can't be trusted, but this "deal" is good PR for President Trump's re-election campaign. It doesn't matter what happens to the millions of Afghans. In fact they sold the blood of Afghans, betrayed and deceived those who were told that the U.S will help in bringing democracy to Afghanistan. No wonder people around the world have lost trust in the U.S.

Unfortunately the U.S/Taliban deal is so messy that it leaves Afghans with more mess than before to clean up. It is a half-assed job by Khalilzad and Pompeo, with Trump's stamp on it. Generations suffered and more generations will live in misery, unless we change the world, starting with the U.S. government.

## **Two Paths to consider for dealing with Racism, Oppression and Social Injustice**

by Kenneth Christiansen

Please consider two very different paths for dealing with racism, oppression and social injustice. Both have a very long history.

One path asks you 1) to identify specific actions or patterns of injustice, discrimination and/or oppression encountered in specific times and places; 2) identify solutions, changes that need to be made, to accomplish greater justice; 3) communicate accurately about what is wrong and what needs to be changed to make it right; 4) mobilize everybody you can from any background who can understand the problem(s) and potential solution(s); and 5) work together in what Rev. William Barber calls a "Fusion Coalition" to accomplish your goal(s) and achieve greater social justice.

A second path for achieving greater justice in our society that has become prominent since the late 1960s is to ask every white person to own all the racist or oppressive actions committed by white people in any time or place; confess their involvement in the wrongs done by way of the benefits they have received by being born white; and affirm what is expressed by Robin DiAngelo on page 149 of *White Fragility*, "... a positive white identity is an impossible goal. White identity is inherently racist; white people do not exist outside the system of white supremacy."

## Points to discuss:

- ☛ Which approach do you think will lead to the best outcomes? Why?
- ✳ To what extent has the Unitarian Universalist Association affirmed and actively supported each of these approaches?
- 👤 To what extent have other groups or organizations in your life affirmed and actively supported each of these approaches?
- 🎯 What do you want to do with your life energy?

## **Castaway Americans: A View From the Heart**

a review by Dick Burkhardt of

### **Dignity:**

### **Seeking Respect in Back Row America**

By Chris Arnade (2019)

The author goes directly to the source: the streets themselves over 5 years, and places like McDonald's, where street people often hang out. We hear it all: the drugs, prostitution, guns, deaths, begging, homelessness, family traumas, welcoming churches, and more. The theme is how "community" builds itself even in the worst circumstances. People need respect, to feel accepted and at home. Instead, "Much of back row America, both black and white, is humiliated" (p 232)

Readers who've studied anthropology know that the key to survival for primitive villages and tribal groupings is sharing, or "mutual reciprocity". I was amazed to read that when someone in the street community of Hunt's Point in New York City came into a financial windfall, it was shared, not hoarded. Likewise, when a squatter shot a deer near Selma, Alabama, the meat was shared. No need to go to the Amazon or New Guinea – it's right under our noses.

Racism is also addressed, but in all its complexities, not according to current ideologies. Arnade laments that his home town continues to have white, black, and Latino neighborhoods. Yet in Bakersfield, California, the street people (an even mixture of black, white, and Latino) ignore racial differences. Instead they are united by poverty and poor education. And Somalis moved from Atlanta, Georgia, to Lewiston, Maine, to escape prejudice from African Americans, finding the northern, rural white population much more welcoming. Things are the worst in deteriorating northern ghettos, as in Milwaukee and Gary, where the good jobs have fled to Mexico, China, or unwelcoming suburbs.

The many close-up photos in this book convey a sense of dignity, despite the hard lines in the faces, the tattoos, and the destitute circumstances. As one man says "When you don't have anything, respect is all you have" (p 240). Arnade's solution is simple: "We need everyone – those in the back row, those in the front row – to listen to one another and to understand one another and understand what they value and be less judgmental" (p 282). Amen.

## **Quote of the Day**

By Brian Hedges

"To Judge people, assign them roles and tell them what rooms they may and may not enter based solely on the color of their skin is the essence of racism and no matter what form it takes targets everyone, persons of color as well as whites. And to condemn the use of logic and reasoning is to stand on the side of hate and ignorance."

**White Fragility by Robin DiAngelo, a book written purposefully for white people, by a white person, about the defensiveness of white people in regards to racism. This text successfully erases any class analysis of racism and builds on the cynical ruling class idea that White and Black workers cannot unite against racism: In 2011, DiAngelo coined the term "white fragility" to describe the disbelieving defensiveness that white people exhibit when their ideas about race and racism are challenged...She argues that our largely segregated society is set up to insulate whites from racial discomfort, so that they fall to pieces at the first application of stress (The New Yorker, 7/23/2018).**

**DiAngelo is popular among neoracists. She is an academic who has worked as a diversity trainer for businesses. Her theory of white fragility is based on the idea that white privilege insulates white people from racial stress and any discussion of race and racism makes them defensive. It also pushes the idea that white people are solely responsible for both creating and dismantling racism in the United States. While DiAngelo states that race was a social construct created by the white ruling class to justify slavery and keep poor White workers separate from enslaved Blacks and indigenous workers, she gives little to no examples of ways for White workers to fight back against it.**

**Her book is deliberately more descriptive than solution oriented. All she suggests is for white people to acknowledge their white privilege, and join all-White anti-racist organizations like SURJ (Showing Up for Racial Justice) [or Allies for Racial Equity – FCC] who will support Black Lives Matter, listen, reflect, and be more racially aware toward nonwhite people. We cannot fight racism by using the very tools the bourgeoisie use to keep us divided.**

### **On the class question of racism**

**In Black Reconstruction in America, communist fighter and thinker W.E.B. Du Bois writes,**

*[T]he white group of laborers, while they receive a low wage, were compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological wage. They were given public deference and titles of courtesy because they were white. They were admitted freely with all classes of white people to public functions, public parks, and the best schools.*

**White privilege theorists love to co-opt Du Bois's words out of context. This psychological wage is the ideological division used to prevent White and Black workers from uniting as one class. Du Bois continues:**

*The result of this was that the wages of both classes could be kept low, the whites fearing to be supplanted by Negro labor, the Negroes always being threatened by the substitution of white labor.*

Without that crucial analysis, we fall into the trap of blaming each other for a systematic problem that hurts us all, albeit to different degrees. White privilege theory, and all identity politics, is based on a politics of difference, which deliberately seeks to undermine and break any potential for working-class unity.

### **Who benefits from racism?**

*White Fragility* touched on institutional racism in the context of white people (as a monolithic group) running the institutions and not on capitalism needing racism to keep the [rank and file] divided and super exploiting Black, Latin, Asian, and immigrant workers while exploiting White workers. What DiAngelo conveniently fails to do is show how, under the threat of rebellion, the U.S. constructed race and racism off the tears, blood, flesh of Black, Indigenous, and White workers. Lerone Bennett's masterpiece essay "The Road Not Taken" in *The Shaping of Black America* illustrates this:

*The race problem in America was a deliberate invention of men who systematically separated blacks and whites in order to make money...Curiously unconcerned about their color, these people worked together and relaxed together. They had essentially the same interests, the same aspirations, and the same grievances. They conspired together and waged a common struggle against their common enemy – the big planter apparatus and a social system that legalized terror against black and white bondsmen.*

*[The separation of our class] was done by the creation of a total system of domination, a system that penetrated every corner of Colonial life and made use of every Colonial institution. Nothing was left to chance. The assemblies, the courts, the churches, and the press were thrown into the breach.*

*The whole system of separation and subordination rested on official state terror. The exigencies of the situation required men to kill some white people to keep them white and to kill many blacks to keep them black. In the North and South, men and women were maimed, tortured, and murdered in a comprehensive campaign of mass conditioning. The severed heads of black and white rebels were impaled on poles along the road as warnings to black people and white people, and opponents of the status quo were starved to death in chains and roasted slowly over open fires. Some rebels were branded; others were castrated. This exemplary cruelty, which was carried out as a deliberate process of mass education, was an inherent part of the new system.*

**Clearly, if the ruling class ran a state terror campaign to create race and racism, it cannot be for the benefit of any worker. White privilege is a ruling-class idea. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels said it plainly, "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class."**

## Segregation continues today

**Race and racism has been maintained. Lerone Bennett's essay continues:**

*As the seventeenth century ended and the eighteenth century began, white arrogance increased, and a yawning chasm opened up between blacks and whites.... Responding to this situation, blacks began to define themselves in opposition to whites, who were viewed as enemies and oppressors.*

**The bourgeoisie and its agents over the two hundred years of conditioning and institutional racism have succeeded in separating the natural unity between Black and White workers.**

**And yet the dynamics of multiracial unity remained alive, thanks to a variety of political movements of which Unitarian and Universalists were a vital part: in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Rights of Man Movement; in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Abolitionist Movement and its successor the Reconstruction Period; in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the anti-white supremacist movement leading to smashing apartheid in the US and South Africa, and racist colonialism in the Third World.**

**Institutions like schools have been made, at the level of appearance, more segregated today by neo-racists in the federal government than they were in the 1960s (The Atlantic, 6/11/12) and yet the commitment to desegregation still exists. Despite the deliberate creation of segregated neighborhoods through global cities and gentrification policies of the ruling class, the majority of US Americans prefer multi-racial interactions, as seen in Atlanta, Detroit, Birmingham, Chicago, and even here in Spokane Washington.**

**What do they fear the most?**

**An oppressor's greatest fear in a racist society is multiracial unity. When Black workers can organize hand in hand with their White counterparts, we are subverting 200 years of racist conditioning which is never as deep as we have been led to believe, as witness how the KKK failed to mobilize a general strike of white workers against the implementation of the 1964 and 1965 Civil Rights Bills in the South. It is our belief that workers, students, and professionals of all races want to learn about the real nature of racism and how to combat it. We will continue to struggle with those who are open to the ideas of multiracial unity and actively fighting racism.**

**[And I would add: if you are a white member of the UUAC, you can join UUMUAC with all your so-called fragility. Never forget that at Gettysburg 1863, this fragility turned out to be made of a powerful moral density, when white Abolitionist Union soldiers killed white supremacist Confederate soldiers so that white and black folks in the South could finally be free from a system which was oppressing them both. FCC ]**

## UU Resource Links

The UUA has had an antiracist agenda since 1997. The agenda got kicked into high gear in 2017. Important items in **bold**. The easy URL for this page is <http://bit.ly/UUradical>.

1997 GA	Delegates endorse Journey to Wholeness antiracism program.	<a href="https://www.uua.org/uuagovernance/committees/jtwtc">https://www.uua.org/uuagovernance/committees/jtwtc</a>		
<b>1999 GA</b>	Thandeka's Meadville-Lombard lecture predicts that the <b>UUA's antiracism program will fail</b> because it doesn't match our values or describe the reality of racism.	<a href="https://www.meadville.edu/files/resources/thandeka-why-anti-racism-will-fail-447.pdf">https://www.meadville.edu/files/resources/thandeka-why-anti-racism-will-fail-447.pdf</a>		
2001	Kenneth Jones and Tema Okun formalize a list of characteristics of "white supremacy culture", later adopted by the UUA as its theoretical framework.	<a href="https://www.showingupforracialjustice.org/white-supremacy-culture-characteristics.html">https://www.showingupforracialjustice.org/white-supremacy-culture-characteristics.html</a>		
2012	<a href="#">Rev Frederic Muir</a> identifies UUs' "allergy to authority" as an error to be corrected. Lay UUs are to set aside our individualism and embrace our leaders' authority like lay people in other traditions do.	<a href="https://www.uuma.org/mpage/BSE2012">https://www.uuma.org/mpage/BSE2012</a>		
2013	Beloved Conversations program begins.	<a href="https://www.meadville.edu/fahs-collaborative/fahs-curriculum-catalogue/beloved-conversations/">https://www.meadville.edu/fahs-collaborative/fahs-curriculum-catalogue/beloved-conversations/</a>		
2015 February	<a href="#">Leslie Mac</a> calls on UU churches to hang Black Lives Matter banners, and the UUA website tracks which congregations do so.	<a href="https://www.uua.org/racial-justice/black-lives-matter/banners">https://www.uua.org/racial-justice/black-lives-matter/banners</a>		
2017 March 23	UUA President Peter Morales called out first in person and then online in white-supremacy controversy.	Rarely discussed, but hinted at in this timeline. <a href="https://www.uua.org/sites/live-new.uua.org/files/findings-related-to-the-southern-regional-lead-hiring-april-2017-person_20180409.pdf">https://www.uua.org/sites/live-new.uua.org/files/findings-related-to-the-southern-regional-lead-hiring-april-2017-person_20180409.pdf</a>		
<b>2017 March 27</b>	Morales releases a letter that makes everything worse, leading to <b>his resignation and resignations of other leaders</b> who had also come under fire. Don Southworth resigns from the UU Ministers' Association.	<a href="https://www.uuworld.org/sites/live-new.uuworld.org/files/morales_staff_diversity_controversy_20170327.pdf">https://www.uuworld.org/sites/live-new.uuworld.org/files/morales_staff_diversity_controversy_20170327.pdf</a>		
2017 April	UU World summary of blog posts re Morales controversy.	<a href="https://www.uuworld.org/articles/blog-roundup-2017-04-21">https://www.uuworld.org/articles/blog-roundup-2017-04-21</a>		
2017 April 30, May 7	White supremacy teach-in, where the controversy over Morales was left out.	<a href="https://www.uua.org/pressroom/stories/uua-supports-uwhitesupremacyteachin">https://www.uua.org/pressroom/stories/uua-supports-uwhitesupremacyteachin</a>		

2017 June	<a href="#">Ashley Horan</a> , Meg Riley, et al. Video podcast on radicalism (pro), liberalism (con), call-out culture (pro), and pushing out dissenters (pro). Please click here to see my separate page covering this conversation.  <a href="#">YUU #185</a>	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VdVzGNb5SmE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VdVzGNb5SmE</a>
2018	Lull. UU professionals of color report more trouble from congregants after the teach-in than before.	
2018 June	Beacon Press publishes <i>White Fragility</i> by Robin DiAngelo.	<a href="http://www.beacon.org/White-Fragility-PI346.aspx">http://www.beacon.org/White-Fragility-PI346.aspx</a> a review: <a href="https://www.popmatters.com/white-fragility-robin-diangelo-2613164973.html">https://www.popmatters.com/white-fragility-robin-diangelo-2613164973.html</a>
2019 January	UU World publishes idiot's guide to critical race theory	<a href="https://www.uuworld.org/articles/idiots-guide-critical-race-theory">https://www.uuworld.org/articles/idiots-guide-critical-race-theory</a>
2019 March	Commission on Institutional Change says that <b>most UUs have views that are the opposite</b> of what the leadership is teaching.	<a href="https://www.uua.org/uuagovernance/committees/cic/blogrel-tapestry/adults/commitment/statement">https://www.uua.org/uuagovernance/committees/cic/blogrel-tapestry/adults/commitment/statement</a>
2019 GA	Todd Eklof self-publishes <i>The Gadfly Papers</i> , comprising three iconoclastic essays critical of the UUA's social-justice leadership.	<a href="https://www.amazon.com/Gadfly-Papers-Inconvenient-Essays-Minister-ebook/dp/B07S9TB7JY">https://www.amazon.com/Gadfly-Papers-Inconvenient-Essays-Minister-ebook/dp/B07S9TB7JY</a>
2019 also GA	UU social justice groups condemn Gadfly. Hundreds of white ministers sign a letter condemning it and slighting UUs who might agree with it.	white ministers' letter <a href="https://www.muusja.org/reprint-an-open-letter-from-white-uu-ministers/">https://www.muusja.org/reprint-an-open-letter-from-white-uu-ministers/</a>
2019 August	UU Ministers' Association, no longer led by Southworth, formally censures Eklof. They state that they will not comment publicly on their decision.	<a href="https://www.uuma.org/news/466020/UUMA-Board-and-Executive-Team-Issues-Public-Letter-of-Censure.htm">https://www.uuma.org/news/466020/UUMA-Board-and-Executive-Team-Issues-Public-Letter-of-Censure.htm</a>
2019 summer? fall?	UUA establishes Conversations for Liberation "to address conflicts arising ... around the call to dismantle white supremacy in our faith movement".	<a href="https://www.uua.org/conversations">https://www.uua.org/conversations</a>
2019 September	Anne Schneider publishes <i>Self-Professed White Supremacy Culture</i> describing recent UU controversies.	<a href="https://www.amazon.com/dp/1692310283">https://www.amazon.com/dp/1692310283</a>
2019 ?	Ministers' letter to UUMA requesting that they engage with Eklof.	<a href="http://www.topiccentral.com/tgp/UUMA_concerns.pdf">http://www.topiccentral.com/tgp/UUMA_concerns.pdf</a>
2020 February	UU Multiracial Unity Action Council (UUMUAC) launches a lay petition requesting dialog about the future of the association. I joined UUMUAC, and you can, too.	petition: <a href="https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/dialogue-on-the-direction-of-the-UUA">https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/dialogue-on-the-direction-of-the-UUA</a> UUMUAC: <a href="https://www.uumuac.org">https://www.uumuac.org</a>
2020 March	UU Congregation of Salem issues a public letter calling for an end to the white-supremacy theory and teaching in the UUA.	<a href="https://uusalem.org/2020/01/27/congregation-meeting-march-1-to-consider-statement-to-uua-and-uuma/">https://uusalem.org/2020/01/27/congregation-meeting-march-1-to-consider-statement-to-uua-and-uuma/</a>

Easy URL for this page: <http://bit.ly/UUradical>

The **YUU #185**: Leaders talk frankly about their plans for lay UUs. <http://bit.ly/YUU185>

**Leadership and Lay UUs**: UU leaders have a dim view of the lay population. <http://bit.ly/layUUs>

**UU plurality (public)**: An open letter calling for mutual acceptance. <http://bit.ly/UUplurality>

## Letter suggested for use by Jonathan Tweet, Seattle, WA

[Welcome: This letter is meant to be signed by those Unitarian Universalists who might disagree with each other in terms of how best to address oppression but who accept each other anyway. We don't have to think alike to love alike. Some UUs will refuse to sign, and we, the undersigned, accept them, too.]

"We, the undersigned Unitarian Universalists, affirm that as a covenanted people of liberal faith who choose to be together in association, we are stronger and more effective together in our diverse work on issues as weighty as racism and oppression. We see a spectrum of views on these topics among Unitarian Universalists. We accept that everyone is biased, ourselves included.

"We understand that some Unitarian Universalists consider the language and teachings around white supremacy, white privilege, white fragility, and critical race theory to be at times counterproductive to our fight against racism and questionable due to perceived issues including objectivity, evidence, tone-policing, democratic process and accountability. We also understand that some UUs consider this way of opposing racism and oppression as helpful or even vital in countering power imbalances and living out our principles and sources. Other Unitarian Universalists have views somewhere in between or elsewhere.

"We, the undersigned Unitarian Universalists affirm, that we are an intentional community with a plurality of views on the many weighty matters of human wellbeing and flourishing. We wish to extend our support to all Unitarian Universalists, including those with whom we disagree over the best strategies and tactics for achieving justice. We invite all people of goodwill in our chosen faith to embody our covenanted seven principles and six sources in navigating our disagreements and divisions.

"Signed..."

## On Multiracial Unity

By Finley C. Campbell, UUMUAC Chair/Spokesman

Why is multiracial unity the only way to combat neo-racism it...and win? There are three reasons why this is so. First of all, multiracial unity brings people together who have been divided historically and artificially by racial categories, themselves ideological constructs whose definitions shift. For example, at one time Jews were considered only as a religious group; today, they are considered a race. Secondly, unlike desegregational unity which exists in a mechanical way between the so-called races, multiracial unity is organic and is shaped by interracial interrelationships at the personal, existential, and political levels. Lastly, multiracial unity builds upon interracial unity but takes it to a higher level with new racial categories that builds upon but goes beyond the historical black-white binary which has shaped progressive struggles since the invention of racism.

For example, as developed by the InterNational Committee Against Racism, racial categories are described as a mix of continental and national racial designations; i.e., Asian (referring to the vast eastern section of Eurasia, east of the Urals), Latin (referring only to folks in the area of the Americas designated as Spanish speakers), Black (referring to all people formerly identified by racist anthropology as Negroid, regardless of color), Red (either referring to US American Indigenous people, both mixed and non-mixed, or to those folks in the Americas), White (referring to all people globally formerly identified by racist anthropology as Caucasoid or Caucasian).

When these variants of the human race are united, despite their racial identification and socio-ethnic conditioning, it creates the kind of socio-psychic energy which is generated when the unity of opposites occurs among human beings. And on the basis of this energy, this unity, all forms of historical changes can occur, moving humanity from a lower level to a higher one. Marxist-Leninist-Historical Theists argue that this unity is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of God's design for recreating the lost paradise of Eden here on earth aka the Beloved Community or The Classless Society.

The question is this: can predominantly white groups be committed to multiracial unity? The answer is yes if they or their members embrace the doctrine of multiracial unitarian universalism.

### **Intersectionality: A Marxist Critique**

**Originally published as Multiracial Unity by Barbara Foley (September 26, 2018)**

**This is a slightly revised version of an article with this title  
that appeared in *Science & Society* 82, 2 (April 2018): 269-75.**

Intersectionality, a way of thinking about the nature and causes of social inequality, proposes that the effects of multiple forms of oppression are cumulative and, as the term suggests, interwoven. Not only do racism, sexism, homophobia, disablism, religious bigotry, and so-called "classism" wreak pain and harm in the lives of many people, but any two or more of these types of oppression can be experienced simultaneously in the lives of given individuals or demographic sectors. According to the intersectional model, it is only by taking into account the complex experiences of many people who are pressed to the margins of mainstream society that matters of social justice can be effectively addressed. In order to assess the usefulness of intersectionality as an analytical model and practical program, however—and, indeed, to decide whether or not it can actually be said to be a "theory," as a number of its proponents insist—we need to ask not only what kinds of questions it encourages and remedies, but also what kinds of questions it discourages and what kinds of remedies it forecloses.

It is standard procedure in discussions of intersectionality to cite important forebears—from Sojourner Truth to Anna Julia Cooper, from Alexandra Kollontai to Claudia Jones to the Combahee River Collective—but then to zero in on the work of the legal theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw, who first coined and explicated the term in the late 1980s. Concerned with overcoming the discriminatory situation faced by African American women workers at General Motors, Crenshaw demonstrated the inadequacy of existing categories denoting gender and race as grounds for legal action, since these could not be mobilized simultaneously in the case of a given individual: you had to be either a woman or nonwhite, but not both at the same time. Crenshaw famously developed the metaphor of a crossroads of two avenues, one denoting race, the other gender, to make the point that accidents occurring at the intersection could not be attributed to solely one cause; it took motion along two crossing roads to make an accident happen (Crenshaw, 1989).

While Crenshaw's model ably describes the workings of what the African American feminist writer Patricia Hill Collins has termed a "matrix of oppressions," the model's spatial two-dimensionality points to its inadequacy as an explanation of why this "matrix" exists in the first place (Collins, 1990). Who created these avenues? Why would certain people be traveling down them? Where were they constructed, and when? The spatial model discourages questions like these. The fact that the black women in question are workers who earn at best modest wages, but make the bosses of General Motors (GM) very rich, is simply taken as a given.

That is, to return to the metaphor of intersecting roads, the ground on which the roads have been built is a given, not even called into question. While Crenshaw succeeded in demonstrating that the GM workers had been subjected to double discrimination—no doubt a legal outcome of considerable value to the women she represented—her model for analysis and compensation was confined to the limits of the law. As the Marxist-feminist theorist Delia Aguilar has ironically noted, class was not even an “actionable” category for the workers in question (Aguilar, 2015, 209).

Although intersectionality can usefully describe the effects of multiple oppressions, I propose, it does not offer an adequate explanatory framework for addressing the root causes of social inequality in the capitalist socioeconomic system. In fact, intersectionality can pose a barrier when one begins to ask other kinds of questions about the reasons for inequality—that is, when one moves past the discourse of “rights” and institutional policy, which presuppose the existence of social relations based upon the private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of labor.

Gender, race and class:—the “contemporary holy trinity,” as Terry Eagleton once called them (Eagleton, 1986, 82), or the “trilogy,” in Martha Gimenez’s phrase (Gimenez, 2001)—how do these categories correlate with one another? If gender, race and class are analytical categories, are they commensurable (that is, similar in kind), or distinct? Can their causal roles be situated in some kind of hierarchy, or are they, by virtue of their “interlocked” and simultaneous operations, of necessity basically equivalent to one another as causal “factors”?

When I ask these questions, I am not asserting that a black female auto worker is black on Monday and Wednesday, female on Tuesday and Thursday, a proletarian on Friday, and—for good measure—a Muslim on Saturday. (We’ll leave Sunday for another selfhood of her choosing.) (For a version of this rather clever formulation I am indebted to Kathryn Russell [Russell, 2007].) But I am proposing that some kinds of causes take priority over others—and, moreover, that, while gender, race and class can be viewed as comparable identities, they in fact require quite different analytical approaches. Here is where the Marxist claim for the explanatory superiority of a class analysis comes into the mix, and the distinction between oppression and exploitation becomes crucially important. Oppression, as Gregory Meyerson puts it, is indeed multiple and intersecting, producing experiences of various kinds; but its causes are not multiple but singular (Meyerson, 2000). That is, “race” does not cause racism; gender does not cause sexism. But the ways in which “race” and gender—as modes of oppression—have historically been shaped by the division of labor can and should be understood within the explanatory framework supplied by class analysis, which foregrounds the issue of exploitation, that is, of the profits gained from the extraction of what Marx called “surplus value” from the labor of those who produce the things that society needs. (In considering the historical division of labor offline along lines of gender, we need to go back to the origins of monogamous marriage, as Friedrich Engels argued in *On the Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. The historical division of labor along lines of “race” is largely traceable to the age of colonialism, imperialism, and modern chattel slavery [Fields and Fields; Baptist].) If class analysis is ignored, as Eve Mitchell points out, categories for defining types of identity that are themselves the product of exploited labor end up being taken for granted and, in the process, legitimated (Mitchell, 2013).

Cheap labor: An effective critique of the limitations of intersectionality hinges upon the formulation of a more robust and materialist understanding of social class than is usually allowed: not class as an identity or an experiential category, but class analysis as a mode of structural explanation. In the writings of Karl Marx, "class" figures in several ways. At times, as in the chapter on "The Working Day" in Volume I of *Capital*, it is an empirical category, one inhabited by children who inhale factory dust, men who lose fingers in power-looms, women who drag barges, and slaves who pick cotton in the blazing sun (Marx, 1990, 340-416). All these people are oppressed as well as exploited. But most of the time, for Marx, class is a relationship, a social relation of production; that is why, in the opening chapter of *Capital*, he can talk about the commodity, with its odd identity as a conjunction of use value and exchange value, as an embodiment of irreconcilable class antagonisms.

To assert the priority of a class analysis is not to claim that a worker is more important than a homemaker, or even that the worker primarily thinks of herself as a worker; indeed, based on her personal experience with spousal abuse or police brutality, she may well think of herself more as a woman, or a black person. It is to propose, however, that the ways in which productive human activity is organized—and, in class-based society, compels the mass of the population to be divided up into various categories in order to insure that the many will be divided from one another and will labor for the benefit of the few—this class-based organization constitutes the principal issue requiring investigation if we wish to understand the roots of social inequality. To say this is not to "reduce" gender or "race" to class as modes of oppression. It is, rather, to insist that the distinction between exploitation and oppression makes possible an understanding of the material (that is, socially grounded) roots of oppressions of various kinds. It is also to posit that "classism," a frequently heard term, is a deeply flawed concept. For this term often views class to a set of prejudiced attitudes, equivalent to ideologies of racism and sexism. As a Marxist, I say that we need more, not less, class-based antipathy.

In closing, I suggest that intersectionality is less valuable as an explanatory framework than as an ideological reflection of the times in which it has moved into prominence (see Wallis, 2015). These times—extending back several decades now—have been marked by several interrelated developments. One is the world-historical (if in the long run temporary) defeat of movements to set up and consolidate worker-run egalitarian societies, primarily in China and the USSR. Another—hardly independent of the first—is the neoliberal assault upon the standard of living of the world's workers, as well as upon those unions that have historically supplied a ground for a class-based and class-conscious resistance to capital. The growing regime of what has been called "flexible accumulation" (Harvey, 1990, 141-72), which fragments the workforce into gig and precarious economies of various kinds, has accompanied and consolidated this capitalist assault on the working class, not just in the U.S. but around the world. For some decades now, a political manifestation of these altered economic circumstances has been the emergence of "New Social Movements" positing the need for pluralist coalitions around a range of non-class-based reform movements rather than resistance to capitalism. Central to all these developments has been the "retreat from class," a phrase originated by Ellen Meiksins Wood (Wood, 1986); in academic circles, this has been displayed in attacks on Marxism as a class-reductionist "master narrative" in need of supplementation by a range of alternative methodologies (Laclau and Mouffe).

capitalism: socialism --These and related phenomena have for some time now constituted the ideological air that we breathe; intersectionality is in many ways a reflection of, and reaction to, these economic and political developments. Those of us who look to intersectionality for a comprehension of the causes of the social inequalities that grow more intense every day, here in the U.S. and around the world, would do much better to seek analysis and remedy in an antiracist, antisexist, and internationalist revolutionary Marxism: a Marxism that envisions the communist transformation of society in the not too distant future.

## Works Cited

- Aguilar, Delia. 2015. "Intersectionality." In *Mojab*, 203-220.
- Baptist, Edward E. *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books. 2014.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Practice." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 89:139-67.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1986. *Against the Grain: Selected Essays 1975-1985*. London: Verso.
- Engels, Friedrich. *On the Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. New York: International Publishers. 1972.
- Fields, Karen E., and Barbara J. Fields. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. London: Verso. 2014.
- Gimenez, Martha. 2001. "Marxism and Class, Gender and Race: Rethinking the Trilogy." *Race, Gender & Class* 8, 2: 22-33.
- Harvey, David. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. 2nd ed. London: Verso. 2001.
- Marx, Karl. 1990. *Capital*. Vol. I. Trans. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- Meyerson, Gregory. 2000. "Rethinking Black Marxism: Reflections on Cedric Robinson and Others." *Cultural Logic* 3(2). [clogic.eserver.org/3-182/meyerson.html](http://clogic.eserver.org/3-182/meyerson.html). Accessed 18 May 2016.
- Mitchell, Eve. 2013. "I Am a Woman and a Human: A Marxist Feminist Critique of Intersectionality Theory." <http://gatheringforces.org/2013/09/12/i-am-a-woman-and-a-human-amarxist-feminist-critique-of-intersectionality-theory/>.
- Mojab, Shahrzad. 2015. *Marxism and Feminism*. London: ZED Books.
- Russell, Kathryn. 2007. "Feminist Dialectics and Marxist Theory." *Radical Philosophy Review* 10, 1: 33-54.
- Smith, Sharon. n.d. "Black Feminism and Intersectionality." *International Socialist Review* #91. <http://isreview.org/issue/91/black-feminism-and-intersectionality>.
- Wallis, Victor. 2015. "Intersectionality's Binding Agent: The Political Primacy of Class." *New Political Science* 37, 4: 604-619.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 1986. *The Retreat from Class: A New "True" Socialism*. London: Verso.

## Who is Dr. Barbara Foley?

Here are some expository fragments which describe Prof. Foley's activism in the arena of Social Justice:

Member of InCAR [the InterNational Committee Against Racism (1975 - 1993);

Member, Radical Caucus of the Modern Language Association, 1993-2019; President, 1998-2017;

Chair, NOW-NJ Task Force on Combating Racism, 1995-present; Member and Co-Founder, Essex County Women of Color and Allies chapter of NOW-NJ, 1995-present; Member, People's Organization for Progress, Newark NJ 2010-present; Member, AAUP, 1998-present; Executive Committee of Rutgers University -Newark Chapter, 2018-19

In addition, she is an author of several books on the radical tradition in US American literature, including a work on *Invisible Man* by Ralph Ellison, one of my old co-academics back in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Presently, she is a tenured professor at the Rutgers University - Newark campus.

And on a personal note: Dr Foley, I am proud to say, was one of my nurturees and mentees back in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and while we are not always in agreement on many issues related to social justice, we are in agreement on the need for social justice throughout the world.

Finley C. Campbell