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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

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—on 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, specifically, 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 that time, each of which has transformed dominant–minority relations and required the creation of new structures and processes to maintain racial stratification and white privilege. In this chapter, we’ll explore a corollary of this theme: dominant–minority group relations change as the subsistence technology changes.
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 (see Chapter 2), 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, focusing primarily on 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. Indeed, every characteristic of American society—work, family, politics, popular culture—is being transformed as the subsistence technology continues to evolve. 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 modern institutional discrimination—to help us understand group relations in this new era. And, we will establish some important groundwork for the case studies in Part 3, in which we will consider in detail the implication of postindustrial society for America’s minority groups.

Table 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 stratification have continuously changed.

**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 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 found in societies 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 Table 4.2). Under this system, minority group members are freer to compete with dominant group members, especially those in the lower-class segments, for jobs and other valued commodities. As competition increases, the threatened members of the dominant group become more hostile, and attacks on the minority groups tend to increase.

Whereas paternalistic systems were designed to directly dominate and control the minority group (and its labor), rigid competitive systems are more defensive in nature. The threatened 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. In contrast, in rigid competitive systems, the dominant group seeks 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—to maintain black–white racial stratification—as 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 plantation system and agricultural production continued to dominate the South. 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 that was institutionalized under slavery. It was intended, also, 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 ascendance 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 Fifteenth 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* (“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 they were able to use their 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 depredations 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 tenants’ debts would be deducted from their 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. Landowners could inflate the indebtedness of sharecroppers and claim that they were 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 labor 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, and they 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 Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, which guaranteed suffrage for black men, had not yet been passed.

Such “grandfather clauses” made it easy for white men 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 men 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 (Franklin & Moss, 1994, p. 312). The bulk of this violent terrorism was racial and intended to reinforce the system of racial advantage more than to 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 white supremacist system.

COMPARATIVE FOCUS:
Jim Crow Segregation and South African Apartheid

Systems of legalized, state-sponsored racial segregation like Jim Crow can be found in many nations, but perhaps the most infamous system was apartheid, as practiced in South Africa. Here, we will note some of the many similarities apartheid shared with Jim Crow segregation.

First, and most important, both apartheid and American de jure segregation were deliberately constructed by the dominant group (whites) to control and exploit the minority group (blacks) and to keep them powerless. In both systems, segregation was comprehensive and encompassed virtually every area of life, including neighborhoods, schools, movie theaters, parks, public buildings, buses, and water fountains.

In both systems, whites benefited from a cheap, powerless labor supply in agriculture and in business. Domestically, even white families of modest means could afford servants, gardeners, and nannies.

Blacks in both systems were politically disenfranchised and closely controlled by police and other agencies of the state. Their low status was reinforced by violence and force, sometimes administered by the police, sometimes by extralegal vigilante and terrorist groups.
Elaborate rituals and customs governed interaction between the races. All were intended to overtly display and reinforce the power differential between the groups. Under both apartheid and Jim Crow segregation, blacks generally lived in abject poverty, with incomes a tiny fraction of those of the white community.

In both cases, protest movements formed in the black community and helped end the systems of racial segregation. The protests were met with extreme violence and repression from the state, and the ensuing struggles created heroes such as Martin Luther King Jr. and Nelson Mandela, among others. Also, in both cases, state-sponsored racial oppression ended only after prolonged, intense conflict. Apartheid was dismantled in the early 1990s.

Apartheid was more repressive than Jim Crow segregation and more viciously defended by the white dominant group. Why? Part of the reason is simple arithmetic. Whites in South Africa were a numerical minority (no more than 10% of the total population) and felt that their privileged status was under extreme threat from the black majority. White South Africans had a “fortress mentality” and feared that they would be swamped by the black majority if they allowed even the slightest lapse in the defense of their racial privilege.

Today, South Africa continues to deal with the legacies of racial segregation, as does the United States. In both nations, racial divisions run deep, and neither has been able to completely resolve its myriad issues of fairness, justice, and equality.

Questions for Reflection

1. Why did whites in South Africa and the American South respond so violently to black protest movements? What was at stake, as they saw it?

2. What other differences, besides the numerical one, can you identify between the two situations? For example, is it important that one system was regional and the other national? What are the implications of this difference?

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.
QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

3. How does the concept of subsistence technology clarify the shift from a paternalistic to a rigid competitive system of race relations?

4. How do the concepts of competition and differential in power in the Noel hypothesis apply to the creation of the Jim Crow system of segregation?

5. From a sociological point of view, what were the most important features of de jure segregation?

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, began out of the South. 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. In discussing the Great Migration, it has been said that African Americans voted against Southern segregation with their feet.

As Figure 4.1 shows, the black population was highly concentrated in the South as recently as 1910, a little more than a century ago. By 1990, African Americans had become much more evenly distributed across the nation, spreading to the Northeast and the upper Midwest. Since 1990, the distribution of the black population has remained roughly the same, although there has been some movement back to the South.

Figure 4.2 shows that, in addition to movement away from the South, the Great Migration was also a movement from the countryside to the city. A century ago, blacks were overwhelmingly rural, but today more than 90% are urban.

Thus, an urban black population living outside of the South is a 20th century phenomenon. The significance of this population redistribution is manifold. Most important, perhaps, was the fact that by moving out of the South and into 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 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 them. The growing Northern African American communities relished the absence of Jim Crow laws and oppressive racial etiquette, the relative freedom to
Figure 4.1: Distribution of the African American Population in the United States, 1790–1990
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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. In Chapter 5, we will explore these events and the workings of de facto segregation.

**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 1) 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 1, their hold on economic security and status was tenuous for much of the 20th century. Frequently, they 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. White ethnic groups responded by developing defensive strategies to limit the dangers presented by these migrants from the South. They

---

**Figure 4.2** Percentage of African Americans Living in Urban Areas, 1890–2010

tried to exclude African Americans from their labor unions and other associations and limit their impact on the political system. Often they successfully attempted 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 1, 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 into 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 that 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 mentioned earlier, 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 their 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 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 5, 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 emerged early in the 20th century and 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.

The Dimensions of Minority–Group Status

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 men 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 5, persist to the present day.

During the years following emancipation, 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 men in the South. Ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment in 1870 extended the vote, in principle, to African American men, but the Nineteenth Amendment enfranchising women would not be passed for another 50 years (Almquist, 1979, pp. 433–434; Evans, 1989, pp. 121–124).

QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION


7. What African American strategies for protest were developed early in the 20th century? How were these strategies shaped by the overall situation of the group?

8. Did African Americans become more or less acculturated and integrated during the Jim Crow era? Explain.

9. How was the experience of African Americans shaped by gender during this time period?

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 (computers, the Internet, cell phones) 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 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 have risen, too.

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 and indirect, but, in their way, as formidable as Jim Crow segregation.

In this section, we outline the social processes that began in the industrial era and continue to shape the postindustrial stage. We note the ways in which these processes have changed American society and examine some of the general implications for minority groups. We 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 relations. 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, 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 rejects the traditional idea that race is an important determinant of intelligence or personality traits such as dependability or competence. These conclusions are based on decades of research. These scientific findings 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 throughout much of the century. 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.

The changing nature of the workforce can be illustrated by looking at the proportional representation of three different types of jobs:

1. **Extractive (or primary) occupations** are those that produce raw materials, such as food and agricultural products, minerals, and timber. The jobs in this sector often involve unskilled manual labor, require little formal education, and are generally low paying.

2. **Manufacturing (or 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 (or 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 Figure 4.3. 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 the shift to a postindustrial subsistence technology. 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. Additionally, jobs 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, per se, 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. Immigration 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” 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 incentive 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 the relationships between group membership and wealth, prestige, and power are weaker. 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. Table 4.2 compares the characteristics of the three systems of group relations.

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.
Table 4.2  Characteristics of Three Systems of Group Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems of Group Relations</th>
<th>Paternalistic</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence technology</td>
<td>Agrarian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of labor</td>
<td>Simple. Determined by group.</td>
<td>More complex. Job largely determined by group, but some sharing of jobs by different groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact between groups</td>
<td>Common, but statuses unequal.</td>
<td>Less common, and mostly unequal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt intergroup conflict</td>
<td>Rare.</td>
<td>More common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power differential</td>
<td>Maximum. Minority groups have little ability to pursue self-interests.</td>
<td>Less. Minority groups have some ability to pursue self-interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Least. Minority groups have more ability to pursue self-interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Farley (2000, p. 109).

QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

10. Why did black–white relations shift from a rigid to a fluid competitive system? What was the role of subsistence technology in the shift?

11. What are the key changes in the shift to postindustrial subsistence technology? What are the implications of these changes for American minority groups?

Gender Inequality in a Globalizing, Postindustrial World

Deindustrialization and globalization transformed gender relations along with relations among racial and ethnic groups. Everywhere, even in the most patriarchal...
societies, women have been moving away from their traditional wife and mother roles, taking on new responsibilities, and facing new challenges. 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 education levels (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012c, p. 151), and the shift to fluid competitive group relations has weakened the barriers to gender equality, along with those to racial equality, although formidable obstacles remain. The changing role of women is also shaped by other characteristics of a modern society: smaller families, higher divorce rates, and rising numbers of single mothers who must work to support their children as well as themselves.

One of the most fundamental changes in U.S. gender relations has been the increasing participation of women in the paid labor force, a change related to both demographic trends (e.g., lower birthrates) and changing aspirations. Women are now employed at almost the same levels as men. In 2010, for example, 63% of single women (vs. about 67% of single men) and about 61% of married women (vs. about 76% of married men) had jobs outside the home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012c, p. 384). Furthermore, between 1970 and 2009, the workforce participation of married women with children increased from a little less than 40% to almost 70% (p. 385).

One reflection of changing aspirations is that U.S. women are entering a wider variety of careers. In the past, women were largely concentrated in a relatively narrow range of women-dominated jobs such as nurse and elementary school teacher. Figure 4.4 focuses on four pairs of careers and illustrates both the traditional pattern and recent changes. Each pair includes an occupation dominated by women and a comparable but higher-status, more lucrative, occupation traditionally dominated by men. While the “women’s” jobs remain largely done by women, the percentage of women in the higher-status occupations has increased dramatically (even though, except for university professor, the more lucrative careers remain disproportionately filled by men).

QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

12. Is the glass half empty or half full for women today? Consider how the comparison group we choose—women of the past versus men of the present—might influence our answer to that question.

13. Consider how race, class, sexual orientation, and religion might have affected the gender advances and restrictions described in this section. For example, are men of every class, race, and background excelling over comparable women? Are all women able to take advantage of educational and occupational opportunities, regardless of religion, sexual orientation, and other characteristics? Explain.
Jobs and Income. As is the case with many other minority groups, the economic status of women has improved over the past few decades but has stopped well short of equality. For example, as displayed in Figure 4.5, there is a persistent, although decreasing, gender gap in income. Notice the median incomes (in 2013 dollars to control for inflation) for both men and women (read from the left vertical axis) and the percentage of men’s incomes that women earn (read from the right vertical axis). Note that only full-time, year-round workers are included in the graph.

On the average, women workers today earn about 79% of what men earn, up from about 65% in 1955. The relative increase in women’s income is due to a variety of factors, including the movement of women into more lucrative careers, as reflected in Figure 4.4. Another cause of women’s rising income is that some of the occupations in

---

**Figure 4.4** Percentage of Women in Selected Occupations for Selected Years

which women are highly concentrated have benefited from deindustrialization and the shift to a service economy. For example, job opportunities in the FIRE (finance, insurance, and real estate) sector of the job market have expanded rapidly since the 1960s, and since a high percentage of the workers in this sector are women, this has tended to elevate average salaries for women in general (Farley, 1996, pp. 95–101).

A third reason for the narrowing gender income gap has more to do with men’s wages than women’s. 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 20th century, these blue-collar jobs paid well enough to subsidize a comfortable lifestyle, a house in the suburbs, and vacations, with enough left over to save for a rainy day or the kids’ college education. However, with deindustrialization, many of these desirable jobs were lost to automation and cheaper labor forces outside the United States, and were replaced, if at all, by low-paying jobs in the service sector. The result, reflected in Figure 4.5, is that while women’s wages increased steadily between the 1950s and about 2000, men’s wages have remained virtually level since the early 1970s.

Figure 4.5 Median Income for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers by Gender, 1955–2013

These large-scale, macrolevel forces have tended to raise the status of women and narrow the income gap, but they have not equalized gender relations. Far from it! For example, although women and men are now equal in terms of education, women tend to get lower returns on their investment in human capital. Figure 4.6 compares men and women full-time workers in 2013. Notice the wage gap at every level of education. Wages rise as education rises for both genders but the wage gap persists.
Figure 4.6  Mean Annual Income for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers Ages 25–64 by Gender and Educational Attainment, 2013


COMPARATIVE FOCUS:  
Women’s Status in Global Perspective

On October 9, 2012, in the Swat region of Pakistan, an armed assailant attacked 15-year-old Malala Yousafzai while she was riding a bus to school. Her attacker sought her out and even asked for her by name. He shot at her three times, one bullet passing through her left eye and out her shoulder.

The reason for the attack? Malala wanted an education and was an outspoken advocate for schooling for girls. The gunman was sent by the Taliban to punish Malala because she flaunted, publicly and repeatedly, the organization’s ideas regarding the proper place of women.

Malala survived the attack and was transported to the United Kingdom, where she underwent a lengthy and painful recovery. Far from being intimidated, she resumed her advocacy for education and was frequently featured by the mass media in Western (Continued)
Europe, the United States, and around the globe. In recognition of her courage, eloquence, and passion, she was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2013, becoming the youngest person to be so recognized.

Why was Malala willing to risk her life? How oppressed are women in Pakistan? How does the status of Pakistani women compare to that of women in other nations?

In Pakistan and around the globe, women are moving out of their traditional and often highly controlled and repressed status. According to United Nations (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2013) statistics, rates of early marriage and childbirth are falling, and education levels and participation in the paid labor force are rising. Today, almost 50% of all women worldwide are in the paid labor force (vs. 72% of all men), although they still tend to be concentrated in lower-status, less-lucrative, and more-insecure jobs everywhere (pp. 8, 20–22).

The women of Pakistan are not as repressed as women in many other nations, including Saudi Arabia, where women are not allowed to drive and won the right to vote only in 2015. Some simple statistics will illustrate the range of possibilities. Table 4.3 provides information on women’s status in four nations representing various levels of development, locations, and religious backgrounds.

As we have noted, the status of women is partly a function of subsistence technology. Mali is the most agricultural of these four nations (with 80% of its workforce in farming), and the women there have more children, earlier in life, and are far more likely to die in childbirth. They are also much less educated than the women of other nations and the men of their own nation.

Pakistan is less agricultural than Mali, and the status of women is relatively higher, although they are indeed much less likely than men to be educated. Note, also, that the statistics suggest that Pakistani women are still largely focused on producing and maintaining large families.

Women’s status generally rises as industrialization and urbanization proceed, as indicated by the profiles of Chile and Sweden. Sweden is more industrialized than Chile, and Swedish women have fewer children, later in life, and are just as educated as men in their nation.

Why does the status of women generally improve as societies move away from agricultural subsistence technology? One reason, no doubt, is the changing economies of childbearing: Large families are useful in the labor-intensive economies of agrarian nations, but children become increasingly expensive in modern urban-industrial economies. Also, consistent with Malala’s point, more-educated women tend to make different choices about career and family and about their own life goals.
Modern Institutional Discrimination

In general, 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 a lack of willpower or motivation to get ahead on the part of minority
group members. In the remaining chapters of this text, however, we 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 white women may have fewer years of experience than dominant group workers and men, and may be the first to go when layoffs are necessary. The adage “last hired, first fired” describes the situation of minority group and woman 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 the moving target of racial stratification. Today, about 72% of non-Hispanic whites own their own homes, and
these houses have a median value of $179,000. In contrast, only 44% of non-Hispanic blacks are homeowners, and the median value of their homes is $125,900 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013a). Homeownership is an important source of family wealth because home equity can be used to establish credit, to finance businesses and other purchases and investments, and to 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; 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 that 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 another 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 (see, e.g., Figure 4.7), 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) individuals 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 (see Pager & Shepherd, 2008, for a review).

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 (e.g., 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 (2000, p. 4) has even demonstrated racially biased treatment based on the use of “Black English” in telephone contacts.

Audit studies have also documented racial discrimination in the job market (e.g., 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 on this trend), 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 present as in the past—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

Modern institutional discrimination is difficult to identify, measure, and eliminate, and 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? A 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. That is, 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 2009, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the white and Hispanic plaintiffs in a five to four ruling.

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 rather 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 in the past were so long allocated on the basis of race? 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 (GPAs) 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 more recent cases involving affirmative action in higher education, the Supreme Court further narrowed the ability of universities to consider race in admissions decisions. One case, decided in June 2013, was _Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin_. The University of Texas (UT) had been using a unique admissions system according to which the top 10% of the student body in each high school in Texas were automatically admitted. 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
Chapter 4 Industrialization and Dominant–Minority Relations

of criteria, including race and ethnicity. It is common for selective institutions such as UT to use many criteria—not just test scores—to diversify their student body.

The case was brought by Amy Fisher, a white student who was not admitted to UT. She argued that some of the admitted minority students had lower GPAs and test scores than she did. The university argued that the educational benefit of a diverse student body justifies its partial and limited use of race as one admission criterion among many.

The Supreme Court sent the case back to the federal appeals court with instructions to apply a strict standard: Race could be used as an admission criterion only if there were no workable race-neutral alternatives that would result in a diverse student body. The decision was not a death blow to affirmative action, but it appeared to continue the trend of limiting the circumstances under which affirmative action policies could be applied.

In a second recent decision (Schuette v. BAMN), decided in April 2014, the Supreme Court upheld an amendment to the state constitution of Michigan that banned the use of race as a factor in admissions and hiring decisions in all state agencies. This decision effectively ended affirmative action, in any form, in Michigan and in several other states with similar laws. Combined with the 2013 Fisher decision, it seems that the role of affirmative action in higher education has been severely curtailed.

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 for minority groups in jobs or university admissions. For example, in 2012, a representative sample of Americans was asked in a survey if they supported “preferential hiring and promotion of blacks.” Only 15% of white respondents expressed support. Somewhat surprisingly, less than half (43%) of black respondents supported preferential hiring (National Opinion Research Council, 1972–2012).

On the other hand, although white (and many minority group) Americans object to fixed quotas, people support 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.

Many businesses and universities are committed to the broad principles of affirmative action and see the need to address past injustices and the usefulness and desirability of creating diversity in workplaces and colleges. Thus, 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 limited form into the foreseeable future.
QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

16. What is modern institutional discrimination, and how does it differ from traditional or blatant institutional discrimination? What are some of the common forms of modern institutional discrimination?

17. What is affirmative action, and what are some of the ways it has been used to combat modern institutional discrimination?

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—such as the seven murders committed in 2015 by Dylann Roof in a black church in Charleston, South Carolina—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. Figure 4.8 reports the breakdown of hate crimes in 2013 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, 2013).

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 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 (Potok, 2013).

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 Figure 4.9). 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 frustration and fear. Some white Americans believe that
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Figure 4.9: Active Hate Groups in the United States, 2012
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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 men 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 since 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.

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.

Note

1. From Twelve Million Black Voices by Richard Wright. Copyright 1941 by Richard Wright. Published by Thunder's Mouth Press, an imprint of Avalon Publishing Group Incorporated.

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 intended to control the labor of African Americans and eliminate their political power.
- Black Southerners responded to segregation, in part, by moving to urban areas outside the South, particularly in the Northeast and Midwest. The African American population enjoyed greater freedom and developed some political and economic resources away from the South, but a large concentration of low-income, relatively powerless African Americans developed in ghetto neighborhoods. The resources and relative freedom of blacks living outside the South became an important foundation for the various movements that dramatically changed American race relations, starting in the middle of the 20th century.
- 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. Combining work with family roles, African American women were employed mostly in agriculture and domestic service during the era of segregation and were one of the most exploited groups.
- Urbanization, specialization, bureaucratization, the changing structure of the occupational sector, the growing importance of education, and other trends have changed the shape of race relations. The shifts in subsistence technology created more opportunity and freedom for all minority groups but also increased the intensity of struggle and conflict.
- Paternalistic systems are associated with an agrarian subsistence technology and the desire to control a large, powerless labor force. Under industrialization, group relationships feature more competition for jobs and status, and lower levels of contact between groups. As a postindustrial society began to emerge, group relations in the United States shifted from rigid to fluid competitive. The postindustrial subsistence technology is associated with the highest levels of openness and opportunity for minorities, along with continuing power differentials between groups.
Modern institutional discrimination consists of subtle, indirect, difficult-to-document forms of discrimination that are built into society’s daily operation, including past-in-present discrimination and other policies, such as the use of racially biased school aptitude tests and drug laws, that are more punitive for minority groups. Affirmative action policies are intended, in part, to combat these forms of discrimination.

**APPLYING CONCEPTS**

How have the trends discussed in this section affected you and your family? If the United States had not industrialized, where would your family live? What kind of career would your parents and grandparents have had? Would you have had the opportunity for a college education?

You can get some insight on the answers to these questions by researching your family history over the past several generations and completing the table below. You may not have all the information requested, but that might be a good reason to give your parents or grandparents a call! If you know nothing at all about your family history and have no way to get the information, ask a roommate or friend for information about his or her family history instead.

To complete the table, pick one ancestor from each generation, perhaps the one about which you know the most. To get you started and provide a comparison, one of the authors has completed the table. When you get to the bottom row of the right-hand side of the table, fill in the blanks in terms of your desires or plans. Would you rather live in the city, suburbs, or country? What is your ideal job or the career for which you are preparing? What degree are you pursuing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great-grandparent</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Coal miner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Eighth grade (?)</td>
<td>Clerk, bar owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>High school, some college</td>
<td>Agent for the Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healey</td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>College professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TURN TO THE END OF THIS SECTION TO FIND OUR OBSERVATIONS ABOUT TRENDS IN ANSWERS TO APPLYING CONCEPTS.
Review Questions

1. The opening paragraph of this chapter offers a corollary to two themes from Chapter 3: dominant–minority group relations change as the subsistence technology changes. How does the material in this chapter illustrate the usefulness of that idea?

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 efforts been?

Internet Activities

1. Watch this 2-minute video of Billie Holiday singing her iconic song “Strange Fruit”: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h4ZyuULy9zs. It has inspired books, an opera, a documentary, and more. Why do you think this song resonates with so many people? What “strange fruit” did she sing about? What's your reaction to this song? How do the lyrics illustrate ideas from the chapter? To find out more about protest music, including music about slavery, visit http://www.pbs.org/independentlens/strangefruit/protest.html.

2. Go to the Jim Crow Stories link http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories.html. Listen to at least three of the narratives. What do these oral histories teach you that you didn't know before? How do they relate to the textbook?

3. Check out Jacob Lawrence’s famous Great Migration series at http://www.moma.org/interactives/exhibitions/2015/oneyewticket/. You may wish to read a review of the exhibit first, such as this article in the New Yorker: http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/04/20/telling-the-whole-story. Read the text for Panel 1, which includes information about key Northern cities, including Harlem in New York City. Read through “One-Way Ticket” and “Bound No’th Blues” (1926) by poet Langston Hughes. (If you click on his name, you'll find a list of key figures to learn more about.) Listen to Maggie Jones singing “Northbound Blues,” an early song about the Great Migration (1925). What are the key themes in these poems and song? How do they illustrate ideas from the chapter? Click on two more panels of your choosing. You may wish to look at those relating to the book (e.g., panels 10–11 on poverty, panels 14–16 and 22 on violence). What relevant or new ideas do you learn there? How do they relate to what you’ve learned so far? For an article that links Lawrence’s work to modern racialized violence, see...
“Black Bodies in Motion and in Pain” at http://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/black-bodies-in-motion-and-in-pain. What do you think of the connections the author makes?


Group Discussion

With some classmates, discuss what you learned from this chapter and from the websites you visited for the Internet Activities. Before you start the discussion, write a brief reaction to both the chapter and the online content. Consider the following questions in your essay and during the discussion:

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 macro-level changes in subsistence technology made segregation untenable? Why?

ANSWERS TO APPLYING CONCEPTS

Based on the trends discussed in this chapter, and as partially illustrated by Healey’s family history, it is likely that you will see these trends in your family history:

1. Movement from rural to urban residence

2. Decrease in jobs in the primary sector (extractive jobs such as farmer or coal miner) and secondary sector (manufacturing jobs)

3. Increase in service-sector jobs

4. Increase in education

Of course, each family is unique, and it is entirely possible that your history will not follow any of these trends. Nonetheless, given the pressures created by these macro-level changes, the bulk of families should conform to most of these tendencies. Did your family follow or buck the trends?
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