UCLA
UCLA Previously Published Works

Title
Special Section: Anthropology of White Supremacy

Permalink

Journal

ISSN

Authors
Jesús, Aisha M Beliso-De
Pierre, Jemima

Publication Date

DOI

Peer reviewed

INTRODUCTION

Special Section: Anthropology of White Supremacy

Aisha M. Beliso-De Jesús and **Jemima Pierre**

The world is not white. It can't be. Whiteness is just a metaphor for power.

— James Baldwin

But what on earth is whiteness that one should desire it? Then, always, somehow, some way, silently but clearly, I am given to understand that whiteness is the ownership of the earth forever and ever, Amen!

— W. E. B. Du Bois

To speak of global white supremacy is to point to the *racial* dimensions of an international power system that includes an ideology of white (broadly defined) racial superiority and its related sets of practices. However, it remains difficult to operationalize the historical reality of white supremacy within anthropological theory and practice. For even as mainstream anthropology has acknowledged the significance of race, it has yet to thoroughly engage the role of white supremacy, especially global white supremacy, as part and parcel of the baseline understanding and functioning of the modern world. In anthropological treatments of the postcolonial state, the emergence and consolidation of neoliberalism, or even in current popular trends, such as work on the "Anthropocene"[1] and the "ontological turn," an analysis of white supremacy is often missing. This is so even when there are mentions of race and racialization. How can we as anthropologists speak of neoliberalism, for example, without keeping in constant view the context of white privilege and power that structure both global capitalism and (post/neo)colonialism?

We argue that there are two main impediments to understanding global white supremacy as given in the anthropological project. First, there is a discrepancy between, on the one hand, the acknowledgment of the discursive construction of race and, on the other, the relationship of race to "the structural, material, and corporeal production of white racial hegemony" (Bonds and Inglewood 2016, 720). Second, there continues to be the fetishization of a particular kind of ethnographic localization (a trained disciplinary compulsion to focus on "the particular," the small-scale experience-based analysis) that tends to eschew broader structures of power. In this way, as the late South African anthropologist Bernard Magubane (1971, 420) pointed out, these kinds of small-scale studies persist despite the fact that "one cannot add up any aggregate of such studies to an adequate view of the national [or, in this case, global] structure of class, status, and power."

White supremacy does not work alone; it is the modality through which many social and political relationships are lived (Hall 1980). W. E. B. Du Bois (1933, 30), for example, wrote in *Black Reconstruction* of the global "color caste founded and retained by capitalism."[2] Here, we see the significance of cultural critic bell hooks's (2000, 118) formulation of "white supremacist, capitalist patriarchy" to describe the combined ways that racism, patriarchy, and capitalism differentially impact nonwhite and white peoples. For example, there can be no symmetry of race and gender subordination when white cis-gender women are differentially positioned within white supremacy than nonwhite (cis- and trans-) women and men. In other words:

> Once white supremacy is established . . . (whether as racial slavery, nonwhite expropriation, or European colonial rule), and with it racial patriarchy, gender relations are changed since one is now interacting with someone of [a different gender] *within* a particular racial structure. . . . Thus, patriarchal relations even between people . . . are necessarily going to be altered by the overarching reality in its different manifestations of white domination. (Mills 2007, 186)

The same can be said about the relationship of white domination to class, ethnicity/nationality, and sexuality, among other factors.

In 1995, anthropologist Faye Harrison wrote in the *Annual Review of Anthropology*, "Until recently, anthropology has not been as visible as some other fields in the new critical discourse on race" (47). She argued that there was an urgent need for anthropological theory and methods to be applied to race and for a racial analysis to be incorporated by anthropologists. Since this call, and along with other concerted efforts by anthropologists, significant strides have been made toward a complex and nuanced analysis of race.

But this took much effort. In 1998, for example, the executive board of the American Anthropological Association adopted an official position statement on race.[3] In September that year, *American Anthropologist* dedicated an entire section to a "Contemporary Issues Forum" on race and racism. Harrison introduced this section by celebrating the emergence, in the late 1990s, of a "racially cognizant anthropology." The section contained essays on the anthropology of race from the four major subfields, with the hope that the entire discipline would follow this "race-cognizance" and "deploy it in strategic arenas of public debate, policy formation, social action, and other loci of democratic practice" (Harrison 1998, 610). Eugenia Shanklin's (1998) contribution to this section, "The Profession of the Color Blind: Sociocultural Anthropology and Racism in the 21st Century," took the discipline to task for its inability to deal with continued racism and its effects. She argued that the discipline's early focus on proving evolutionary racial science as "bad science" left it unable to address the proliferation of a "folk" concept of race that continued to depend on the same biological notions of difference.

Only two issues earlier in *American Anthropologist*, Kamala Visweswaran's (1998) "Race and the Culture of Anthropology" had already made a similar argument: that mainstream anthropology's continued inability to address race is directly linked to the Boasian-initiated shift from race to culture, "assigning race to biology" and defining culture as "not race." In the process, anthropology did not allow room to explore not only the culturally constructed nature of racial science but also the ways that deployment of "culture" itself is often racialized. Michel-Rolph Trouillot (2003) would later carry forward this argument in his "Adieu Culture: A New Duty Arises," when he dubbed anthropology's Boasian-influenced culture concept as the "anti-concept." Using Stocking's (1968) analysis of the shift to culture among the Boasians as primarily a shift in terms, Trouillot argued that the culture concept retains its essentialist (racial) core because "the context" of its deployment did not allow room to engage with the ideological and material realities of ongoing racism. "The context" that Trouillot referred to was the fact of race and racism that had long been ignored and dismissed by the discipline. As Leith Mullings (2005, 670) would point out years later in her review article on the anthropological study of racism, "the theoretical weaknesses inherent in Boasian liberalism made it impossible to sustain a focus on racism."

Within these discussions, there is the insistence that anthropology, as the disciplinary progenitor of racial science, has an obligation to provide critical analysis not only of the race concept but also of processes of racialization, as well as the explicit and implicit practices of racism. But it is also here—on the question of the significance of racism—that there seems to be debate and even recalcitrance. Mainstream anthropology continues to steer clear of analysis that centers race and processes of racialization. Moreover, Leith Mullings (2005, 669) reminds us that, "as compared to its sister disciplines of sociology and history, anthropology's contribution to the study of racism in the last several decades has been modest." One explanation for this, we contend, may be the *trained inability* of many in the discipline to understand—and treat—race and racialization as constitutive of all modern relations. If race and racialization are not considered to be constitutive of the contemporary world, there is bound to be even less agreement on racism.

Despite the lack of a common ground (or standard theoretical and sociohistorical models for understanding the continued cultural and political significance of race and racism), the past two decades have demonstrated that anthropological tools can indeed be deployed to contribute to critical analysis of race and racism—and their imbrications with and through other structures of power, including class, gender, religion, ethnicity, and sexuality.[4] We know that scholars of African descent, especially, have often been at the forefront of anthropological studies of race and racism since the early days of the discipline (Cobb 1936; Davis, Gardner, and Gardner 1941; Drake and Cayton 1945; Firmin 2002). But a brief review of recent ethnographies and archaeological studies demonstrates wide-ranging engagement with the hierarchies of race and power (some of which include Battle-Baptiste 2011; Brown 2005; Goett 2016; Hale 2006; Jackson 2005; Orser 2007; Page and Thomas 1994; Rana 2011; Visweswaran 2010). What we have learned from this research is that even in and through their specific local resonances, racialization processes have global reverberations. Yet, it remains difficult to link, even broadly, anthropological scholarship on globalization and on racialization. Deborah Thomas and Kamari M. Clarke (2013, 318) argue that "not only has globalization not produced the new cosmopolitanisms some scholars expected (and still desire), but contemporary assertions of being post-racial have also served only to mask the ongoing structural inequalities—now viewed in terms of abjection or ethnicity—that were put into motion by modern processes of racialization." Such views, they continue, undermine "our ability to understand how structures and institutions still undergird particular racialist meanings and orders" (318). We insist, however, on naming those *particular racialist meanings and orders* by stressing that they are organized through structures of global white supremacy.

In other words, one cannot speak of gendered racial discriminations in Brazil, for example, without acknowledging the ways that racial processes in Brazil are part of a global phenomenon of racial distinctions and gender and class inequalities that date back to European expansion and the colonization of the Americas, the enslavement of Africans in the process of dispossession of Indigenous people from their lands, and the governance, classification, and ordering of people based on epidermal difference, what sociologist Edward Telles (2014) has described as "pigmentocracies."[5] We must therefore situate the interconnected local and global histories of race and racialization in relation to global and local forms of white supremacy. As

scholars have demonstrated, it is important to examine the connections of ongoing racialized inequalities throughout the world—inequalities that render analogous the experiences of various far-flung communities (Lake and Reynolds 2008; Mills 1998; Pierre 2013; Thomas and Clarke 2013). We argue that, as anthropologists, we should make it our task to "develop theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches to advance our understanding of these new [and old] manifestations of race and racism," an understanding that includes a thoughtful consideration and attention to how white supremacy functions within these racialist orders (Mullings 2005, 667).

We consider this special section on white supremacy to be an extension of this discussion and project (See for instance, Baker 1998, 87). We intervene in this conversation through three key crucial points.

First, we argue that scholars cannot focus on race, racialization processes, or racism alone, but we must also attend to the specific power dynamics inherent in the construction of race, specifically the hierarchical categorization of "white" as racially superior. Our focus on white supremacy—instead of only race or racialization—is to *name* whiteness and its centrality to the construction of this racialized unequal world that we all inhabit. Joe Feagin and Sean Elias (2011, 939) tell us that it is just as important to stress "whites' dominant role in creating the material realities of racial oppression, inequalitarian racial hierarchies and white-framed interpretations" as the "white-imposed community norms; scientific and medical categorizations; residential, educational or occupation segregation; and the racial images and ideologies of the media, popular culture and science." In other words, race is always a description of a social, historical, cultural, and political position, and in James Baldwin's words, "whiteness is a metaphor for power" (quoted in Peck 2016). Our aim is thus to point to the presumed *power* and privilege of whiteness and to analyze how white supremacy is structured in and through our institutions, our disciplinary theories and methods, our everyday relations, and global economic and political processes.

Second, we seek to move the discussion of race and racialization through an understanding of white supremacy that extends beyond the nation-state framework toward a transnational and global perspective. We argue that an analysis of white supremacy must include the historical and current forms of transnational processes that were initiated by European expansion and that are continued through Euro-American cultural and political domination globally.

Last, we push back against the conflation of white supremacy solely with identity formations and individual and overt practices of racism. While the current political climate allows for attempts to link "white supremacy" primarily to "white nationalism," we contend that this move further hides the *systematic* deployment of white supremacy as a structuring logic that serves as the baseline for modernity and its cognates of liberalism, democracy, progress, and rationality. It is not that the study of white identity extremism and fascism is not important; in fact, we encourage this research alongside analyses of global structures of power. But, rather than regarding white supremacy as representative of extremist racist groups (as exist throughout Europe and the Americas), we understand white supremacy to be infused in all structures of global power, including liberal notions of international law and sovereignty (Grovogui 1996), the hierarchy of nation-states, Western educational systems, and so on.

WHITE SUPREMACY AS GLOBAL POWER SYSTEM

The current international power system emerged in the fifteenth century through the European expansion across the world. As Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1991, 32) identified, its concrete terms were violent "conquest, colonization and universal legitimacy of European—and racialized white—power." The impact of this power system continues to have global reverberations and is articulated in various ways and through multiple registers.[6] Thus, as Charles Mills (1998, 102) reminds us:

> An objective look at the world reveals that independent Third World nations are part of a global economy dominated by white capital and white international lending institutions, that the planet as a whole is dominated by the cultural projects of the white West, that many First World Nations have experienced a resurgence of racism, including biologically determinist ideas once thought to have been definitively discredited . . . and that in general the dark-skinned races of the world, particularly black and indigenous peoples, continue to be at or near the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder in both metropolitan and Third World polities.

Keeping in view the long history of European conquest of the world—and the establishment of white supremacy as the "central organizing logic of western modernity" (Bonds and Inglewood 2016, 720)—allows us to begin exploring race and white supremacy with the development of settler-colonial states. Settler colonialism set the conditions for the transatlantic slave trade (Lowe 2015) and the enslavement of Africans in the Americas, the full establishment of capitalism as an economic system, and, with that, the continued expansion of European power through the colonization of Africa and Asia. Lisa Lowe (2015) explains these world-historical events as the "intimacies of four continents": the *relationships among* settler colonialism, the transatlantic slave trade, the colonization of Asia, as well as the conjuncture of the abolition of slavery and the importation of Chinese and South Asian indentured servants to the Caribbean and the formal conquest of nearly the entire African continent. These are "intimacies" of colonial processes where "people from all four quarters of the globe" labored in the "'new world' to produce tobacco and sugar for European consumption," helping to give rise to the European bourgeoisie and the conceit of Western "liberal modernity" (1).

As we speak of Western liberal modernity, democracy, and morality, it is also important to stress the role of racial science in justifying the violence of colonialism. Indeed, colonial domination and expropriation was marked by

the "joint march of liberalism and white supremacy" (Bouie 2018). Anthropology's role in the development of racial science is well known, of course (Baker 1998, Blakey 1987). But we should remind ourselves of the discipline's role in helping create the racio-biological taxonomy along with the "whiteness-above-all" ideology that turned "physical difference into relations of domination" and continues to shape our modern racial worldview (Bouie 2018). The "colonial" is therefore crucial for thinking about the violent material production of the hegemony of whiteness.

The intimacies established by colonialism animate "concurrent racializations" of all populations impacted by the spread of global white supremacy (Wolfe 2016). The notion of concurrent racialization brings into clear relief the underappreciated connections between settler-colonial and non-settler-colonial societies, in particular. One of the difficulties in theorizing the nature and persistent global power of race is the distinction between settler colonialism and nonsettler colonialism—of Africa and Asia. This distinction often leads to the idea, however implicit, that nonsettler colonialism does not also have a continuing racial structure in the postcolonial era. For the African continent, more specifically, the South African (and, at times, East African) settler-colonial experience has become the exceptional case for the study of race and white supremacy. However, as Mahmood Mamdani (1996) reminds us, apartheid was indeed the norm rather than the exception in colonial Africa. It existed as a form of institutional segregation marked by racial difference. This institutional segregation was what the French called "association" and the British and Portuguese called "indirect rule" or "suzerains," a common colonial state form of white supremacist racial domination.

But how do we account for the racial legacies of colonial rule—invasion, expropriation, elimination, debilitation, hierarchical distinctions—in a context that did not depend on full settlement? When Patrick Wolfe (2016) stressed that "race is colonialism speaking," his focus was on the racial regimes of settler colonialism. But the rest of the African continent and its peoples share the common history of colonial invasion, extraction, and elimination that link it to the other communities within global structures of race and power. The framework of "concurrent racializations" of settler and nonsettler colonialism offers a way to think through the connections between indirect rule and direct rule—and, consequently, the impact of racialization even in the "postcolonial" contexts of Africa and Asia.[7] In this way, the white supremacist colonial order—both its settler and nonsettler variants—must be the ultimate frame of reference.

In the book *Terrifying Muslims* (2011), Junaid Rana (who also contributes an article to this special section), demonstrates how this white supremacist colonial order works in a contemporary postcolonial context. Through analysis of the experiences of Pakistani labor migrants in the global arena—particularly those who travel through the Middle East and the United States—he highlights the relationship between neoliberalism and empire. He argues that the "incorpora-

tion of [working-class] labor migration into the global racial system follows colonial, postcolonial, and imperial trajectories that maintain hierarchies through a racial logic" (177). He connects the long arc of British and then US imperialism in creating the conditions for South Asian labor migration and movement as well as racialized and gendered religious identity formations. The ethnographic detail and historical analysis in *Terrifying Muslims* provide us with a unique viewpoint to understand global white supremacy. In this "global racial context," Rana brings together the racialization processes of not only British empire making but also postcolonial state formations (in the context of the India-Pakistan partition) to examine the emergence of the "neoliberal political economy." Here, US militarism (through the global war on terror) and the construction of the "terrifying" racialized Muslim figure emerge as co-constructed. In so doing, and similar to many scholars of race and white supremacy, Rana does not present an understanding of racial processes as teleological; rather, he stresses that the racial processes that construct white supremacy are systemic and consist of a "vast repository of techniques, strategies, logics, and tactics" and a combination of causal and conjunctural historical events. What is perhaps Rana's most significant contribution (at least for this discussion) is the way he demonstrates the intimacies, the "pervasive logics," that connect the tropes of religion, race, and gender to capitalism and empire.[8]

A historicized understanding of global white supremacy therefore does not locate it as a relic of the past. Rather, global white supremacy points to a connected set of relations and logics that emerge at particular moments, in varying contexts, that persistently endure "through spectacular and mundane violences that reaffirm empire and the economic, social, cultural, and political power" while continuing to uphold, globally, the dominant position of whiteness (Bonds and Inglewood 2016, 721). These mundane and structuring violences are perpetuated both on a large scale (e.g., the US global war on terror, the imperial imperatives of global finance capital, cyberwarfare, etc.) and on smaller scales reflected in social institutions, practices (including disciplinary practices), epistemologies, and representations. As we discuss next, these mundane structurations of violence also include the continuing whiteness of anthropology (Harrison 2012).

ANTHROPOLOGY AS WHITE SUPREMACY

The impetus for this special section on the anthropology of white supremacy was not the election of Donald Trump to the US presidency. It came from a panel of the same title co-organized by Aisha Beliso-De Jesús and Jemima Pierre for the 2016 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in Minneapolis, MN. As anthropologists of color whose research focuses on race and racism, we have experienced the mundane cultural logics of white supremacy within the discipline, particularly during the annual meetings, and the 2016 conference was no different. Previously, for example, we noticed how panels that feature race or

racism are often given unfavorable time slots or are mostly attended by scholars of color. Indeed, we have experienced being dismissed by well-meaning white allies as not being "theoretical" enough because we "do race." For many of us, the experience of being trivialized at AAA meetings is part and parcel of being anthropologists of color. It was therefore not very surprising when our panel on the anthropology of white supremacy was scheduled for the undesirable time slot of eight o'clock in the morning on Thursday. However, to our amazement, we found that what would usually be a poorly attended panel was actually packed full of people.[9] Even more remarkable was that the audience was made up of primarily white anthropologists!

Only one week earlier, Trump had defeated the Democratic Party candidate, Hillary Clinton, whose victory seemed all but assured to those on the liberal side of the political spectrum. Many in the US electorate were shocked. The fact that Donald Trump could win the presidency created despair among political liberals, precisely because he ran an explicitly and unapologetically racist and sexist political campaign. Indeed, some white anthropologists at the conference we spoke to and who attended our panel understandably wanted to distance themselves from the electoral process, from Trump, and from his views. However, even as many underestimated the extent to which race and racism—and white supremacist thinking and practice—are deeply structured in every aspect of US society, there still remained a misrecognition that white supremacy is something that *other* (read: ignorant, poor, or uneducated) white people *do*. In this regard, our collective conference papers, which addressed white supremacy as a long-standing global system of power that benefits all white people, certainly did not satisfy this view.

The individual papers on the panel variously addressed how white supremacy is part of racialized land dispossession in Brazil, how whiteness is embedded in the racialization of Muslims in the United States and globally, how white supremacism underpins development language and practice in Africa, and how the performance of white aggression and toxic masculinity shapes US policing practices. The goal of the panel was to move away from an understanding of race and white supremacy as something of the past, or as tied only to explicit white racist genocidal violence (from early nineteenth-century European and American fascism to the likes of which have seen a resurgence since Trump's election). Our discussant, esteemed Black feminist anthropologist Faye Harrison, then contextualized these presentations within a long trajectory of anthropological research on race and structural racism by a group of scholars of color whose contributions are consistently ignored by the mainstream of the discipline.

However, because none of our panel's papers dealt directly with the election of Donald Trump (we had organized the panel in early 2016, long before Trump was even considered a viable Republican candidate), we did not satisfy the thirst for a post-Trump lamenting seemingly desired by

our mostly white liberal audience. We were made aware of this during the question and answer period, when the audience mostly asked us about Donald Trump's election. Few questions addressed the papers we had presented on their own terms. Some of the questions from white audience members seemed to have expected us to somehow become native informants of white supremacy. They asked for an ethno-cultural excursion into Trump voters' minds to understand how the strange white extremists—for example, people who reside in some backwoods, open carry rifles, or attend alt-right protests—*think*. But our presentations were not meant to provide analysis for this type of localized identity-based particularity of white supremacy; indeed, our objectives were explicitly antithetical to this point of view. Because our panel provided analysis of the long historical, socio-political, and economic context of global white supremacy, we expected that these analyses should have motivated, among audience members, a refusal to accept the characterization of the election of Donald Trump as exception. This characterization, in the words of Jonathan Rosa and Yarimar Bonilla (2017, 203), "effectively delinks present-day racism from colonial histories of power, disavows US settler colonialism, and silences critiques of global coloniality" and global white supremacy.

Our panel also wanted to implicate political and disciplinary liberalism as structured in and through white supremacy. As panelists and as academics of color who had been engaging with the structures of white supremacy in our work and everyday lives, we encountered at this conference the white supremacy of anthropology in its very curiosity *about* white supremacy. We responded with an analysis that instead pointed to how white supremacy is an all-encompassing, constituent, and intimate part of our social fabric, and we were left disappointed with the misrecognition both of our work and the broader role of white supremacy in the world and in anthropology. Contributors to this special section are similarly addressing these concerns. Collectively, we ask: Why is it so difficult for the discipline of anthropology to embrace a critical theory of global racial formations that includes a serious interrogation of white supremacy? By asking this, we make the case for an anthropology of white supremacy that recognizes and interrogates how the discipline of anthropology participates in practices and ideologies of white supremacy.

In this introduction and special section, we specifically want to stress how the history of anthropology depends on racialist imperial logics based on the privileging of whiteness. We assert that the social conditions of whiteness (and Otherness) continue to be embedded in the notions of "evidence" and "discovery," in whom—and how—we study anthropologically and in the perpetuation of anthropology as "white public space" (Brodkin, Morgen, and Hutchinson 2011). Indeed, as Brodkin, Morgen, and Hutchinson (2011) have shown, anthropology is a white intellectual and social space that perpetuates unequal hiring practices and labor divisions through discourses of being "not about race."

The discussion that followed our panel presentation was not satisfactory for any of us. We left with a feeling that our panel had been hijacked by the liberal fears of the US election. In addition, we were met with microaggressions that further entrenched anthropology as a white project. For example, one white woman anthropologist congratulated us for having a "more sophisticated" analysis than that of Melissa Harris-Perry, the Black feminist keynote speaker, who, the day before, had discussed how white women were responsible for the election of Donald Trump. Reinforcing what Rosa and Flores (2017) have described as the "deficit view," this type of microaggression, launched at anthropologists of color, asserts the whiteness of anthropology through racialized language that has been used to characterize communities of color as lacking theoretical acumen. Often, our analyses are described as lacking "nuance" or "sophistication." These claims are themselves constructed through the logic of white supremacy, as they are usually linked with the implication that "real theory" is about mastering and referencing a select group of white French or German poststructuralist (cisgender) male scholars (Foucault, Nietzsche, Deleuze, Derrida, and so on). It is here that the very production of anthropological scholarship—how we cite and discuss our practices, writing, and critiques of each other's work—is implicated in furthering white supremacy.

Exclusionist pedagogy is also crucial to how anthropology maintains white supremacy. The Open Syllabus Project (OSP), an online open-source platform affiliated with Columbia University that catalogs and analyzes millions of syllabi from over eighty countries across the disciplines, recently surveyed over forty-one thousand anthropology syllabi.[10] In the top one thousand texts taught in anthropology courses, only ten were authored by Black people, making up 1 percent of texts assigned across all four fields of anthropology across the world. Of those ten Black-authored texts, only two were by Black women. The first Black-authored text to appear on the list, *The Wretched of the Earth*, by Martiniquean revolutionary and psychiatrist Franz Fanon, shows up at number 185 on the list. Ironically, Fanon's *Black Skin/White Mask* is also the next Black-authored text on the list, at number 312. This list shows that the majority of Black-authored texts are from outside of the discipline (including Fanon), with *Things Fall Apart*, by Nigerian novelist Chinua Achebe, making the list at number 321. We see Black British literary scholar Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic* at number 339, followed shortly by *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* by Black British cultural studies scholar Stuart Hall at 446. The creative nonfiction book *A Small Place*, authored by Black Antiguan acclaimed female novelist Jamaica Kincaid, is at number 560. Only three of the Black-authored texts are by scholars who were trained as anthropologists, and of the three books written by Black anthropologists, only one is by a living person. None are written by a Black anthropologist researching and writing about the contemporary moment. Zora Neale Hurston's *Mules and Men* does not appear until number 486, Michel-

Rolph Trouillot's *Silencing the Past* is number 719, and Lee Baker's *From Savage to Negro* makes an appearance toward the end of the list, at number 835. What we see in this list of top anthropological texts is that the discipline does not want to teach or hear from its Black practitioners. Indeed, it seems that the white supremacy of anthropology would rather read novels and literary analysis by Black artists and scholars than ethnographic works. This list thus reveals that contemporary Black anthropologists' theories and insights are excluded from mainstream thought of the discipline. While we focus here on Black anthropologists, and the inherent anti-Blackness exemplified in the discipline, we can make similar arguments regarding the general inattention to scholarship by other anthropologists of color. This situation, we believe, is part of what anthropologist Arlene Dávila points out as a general disregard for "ethnic studies" within the discipline.[11] It is here where we can see how even as Black and other anthropologists' of color are making profound contributions to scholarship on race and racism, white epistemologies are given pedagogical merit and primacy. Social media campaigns such as #CiteBlackWomen are necessary interventions in the white supremacist disciplinary barrings that will not change until citation practices and syllabi are reshaped.

As Nahum Chandler (2013, 140) rightly argues, there is a pervasive operative presumption that theory only exists in whiteness. He gives the example of how W. E. B. Du Bois's profound theories of race are often passed over by the ethnological disciplines in favor of less critical conceptualizations of race. Specifically, he discusses an "essentialist privilege in theory" within the disciplines of history, sociology, and anthropology that often overlooks Black scholars of race to instead read race through white philosophers, such as Foucault. We saw this occur after the election of Donald Trump, when a top anthropology journal hosted a Twitter read-in on Foucault to discuss contemporary race in the United States. This was in place of groundbreaking scholarship by Black anthropologists, other scholars of color, or critical race theorists who have contributed greatly to understanding racial oppression and racialization in the United States and beyond (Harrison et al. 2018; Harrison and Harrison 1998; Jobson and Allen 2016). Chandler (2013) describes how this "essentialist privilege," this "paradoxical structure," must be remarked upon because it is fundamentally about the presumed whiteness of theory.

Many anthropologists of color experience the discipline through microaggressions and dismissals that have become part and parcel of its white supremacy. Our theoretical credibility and analytical skills are questioned in ways that are reminiscent of old debates about objectivity and neutrality. Even if we are not so-called native ethnographers, we are often perceived as such and/or treated as token interlocutors who cannot provide *real* theory or analysis because we are considered "too close" to our subject matter. This "closeness" is often simply epidermal—our racial and ethnic backgrounds seem to color the reception

of our work. Normative considerations of "empirical," "ethnographic," and presumed "real" research thus lends to the invisible workings of white supremacy.

This racialized reception becomes especially apparent when discussions about what constitutes white supremacy itself is brought up during intellectual conversations, conferences, or even the peer-review process. For example, during the peer-review of one of the articles in this special section addressing how a white anthropologist had inadvertently reproduced white supremacist discourses about Africa, one of the reviewers commented that they personally knew that scholar and that "[they] are not racist." But one does not have to *be* explicitly racist to reproduce white supremacy or its discursive formations. Rather than engage with the argument itself, the theoretical discussion was perceived as a personal attack and then dismissed. In other instances, the very idea that white supremacy mattered was itself questioned. "Why is this not about the security state or governance [instead of white supremacy]?" a reviewer asked. Our assertion is that white supremacy is part of the security state and governance, and that this misrecognition—where we have to choose an either/or—is how white supremacy is naturalized.

The whiteness of anthropology is also reinforced in the everyday policies, hiring practices, searches, and labor divisions of our discipline. For example, most anthropologists of color are not hired in anthropology departments, and "racialized minority faculty are more likely to be in ethnic or gender studies departments, and in departments without anthropology in their title."[12] When they are found in anthropology departments, they are cross- or joint-appointed in other departments and programs.[13] Coming into anthropology through "the back door," scholars of color are split between multiple departments (usually ethnic or cultural studies) to satisfy "diversity" hires, are often excluded from true decision making within the discipline, and are heaped with extra, invisible labor (Brodkin, Morgen, and Hutchinson 2011, 545; Dávila 2006, 39; Harrison 2012, 53).[14] Last, topics and areas of focus have also been laden with colonialist dynamics that are tied to white supremacist classificatory structures. As scholars have noted, although these colonialist ethnographic gazes have been heavily critiqued, they still are used in job searches, where we continue to search for "Africanists," "Caribbeanists," or people who study "Asia" or the "Middle East." This tendency to privilege geographies of difference (and the not-so-subtle relationship between anthropological "local" sites and "area studies") in the discipline not only reinforces the outsider perspective of anthropological research but also marginalizes US-based anthropology. Scholars who study race and racism in the United States are read more widely by other fields and disciplines, such as sociology or ethnic studies, and have a harder time being considered "true" anthropologists. This ultimately impacts hires, funding, resource distribution, and disciplinary reproduction. We contend that any anthropology of white supremacy must therefore address the white supremacy *of* anthropology.

TOWARD AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF WHITE SUPREMACY

As we have laid out its theoretical and historical contours, we submit an understanding of white supremacy through the words of philosopher Frances Lee Ansley:

> A political, economic, and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement are widespread, and relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad array of institutions and social settings. (quoted in Mills 2003, 37)

How might we operationalize an anthropology of white supremacy? First, we must recognize that white supremacy is structural and pervasive. This means that it informs institutions, habits, laws, policies, representations, pleasures, desires, and so on. It is only in understanding the persistent investment, privilege, and power of whiteness as central to the world as we know it that we can examine the structural process of racialized supremacy. Second, white supremacy must be traced globally. We must situate a transnational analysis that links global anti-Blackness, xenophobia, and Islamophobia, among other structures of inequality, in order to unravel the intricacies of violence and power that maintain white supremacy (Perry 2009, 2013; Pierre 2006, 2013; Rana 2007; Smith 2015, 2016). For us, the inability of anthropology to deal with white supremacy also has to do with the nature of anthropological reticence to deal with race, on the one hand, and to explore the structures of race in white supremacy as a global issue, on the other hand. Third, as the discipline that gave us racial science, anthropology has a specific responsibility to address the consequences of this history, both in terms of white supremacy's practical realities in global hierarchical relations (including the sites we study) and in terms of acknowledging the ways that racial processes and white supremacy remain sedimented in the discipline's theoretical models, research practices, and institutional existence.

An anthropology of white supremacy must therefore develop new strategies for writing, research, and data collection. We call for an expansive re-rendering of ethnography and archaeology that can draw on a myriad of social texts and data formations. Rather than police the boundaries of our discipline and ethnography from the perceived encroachment from cultural and media studies, women's, gender and sexuality studies, critical race theory, or ethnic studies, we suggest drawing on the well-developed tools in these areas.

Similarly, the overreliance on theoretical knowledge produced from the United States and Europe is what Faye Harrison (2016, 161) has described as "epistemological apartheid." This "theory-forming landscape" restricts knowledge production to imperialist racial and national spaces. Even when scholars of color produce that scholarship, they too are situated in global centers of power. The Global South becomes a place of extraction, used as a site of raw data, and is not seen as a site from which theory is *made.* Harrison

shows that this form of "imperial globality," grounded in "modernity, development practices, and white supremacy," is integral to the logics of academia dominated by the Global North (172). Part of the work of undoing white supremacy must therefore "desediment" this epistemological apartheid (Chandler 2013). We must read, teach, cite, and engage with the vast cannon of global scholarship produced outside of North American and European power centers. Recognizing the various marginalized anthropologies that currently exist can help us begin to unravel concentric sites of oppression.

Ultimately, an anthropology of white supremacy should: (1) take the history of European expansion and the political, intellectual, cultural, and ideological sedimentation of presumed white superiority as given; (2) understand that, whether or not it is acknowledged, this history informs the social practices of all the communities within which we work; (3) shift from an overreliance on the deployment of white supremacy as identity (i.e., the "white supremacist") to deal with the structural embeddedness of white supremacy in the world; (4) situate the intersectional layers that understand white supremacy as constituent of patriarchy, heteronormativity, settler colonialism, mass incarceration, police violence, and other global and imperial violences in and between societies structured in racial dominance; and (5) have a commitment to dismantling global structures of race and whiteness, structures within which the discipline of anthropology remains deeply implicated (Magubane and Faris 1985).

We offer this special section of *American Anthropologist* as a beginning to this conversation. In these articles, we focus not simply on race but also on the processes, epistemologies, ontologies, and structural relations of white supremacy globally. We are fully aware that our contributions are not exhaustive. We feature a series of theoretical and methodological interventions along with ethnographic techniques that demonstrate the usefulness of different anthropological tools to understand and dismantle white supremacy. In this vein, several of our pieces shift away from a traditional ethnographic approach to explore the historical and discursive sites that inform anthropology of white supremacy both inside and outside of the discipline (Perry, Pierre, Ralph, Rana). Ethnographically, we tackle how people's experiences with white supremacist governance create persisting and unfolding violences in everyday life (Beliso-De Jesús, Perry, Speed). We examine the philosophical and ontological issues that arise as we practice anthropology and examine those structures of power in advertising, university institutions, and the very discipline of anthropology itself (Rana, Rosa and Diaz, and Shankar).

Moving away from an area-based ethnographic or theoretical lens that would territorialize our respective "sites" into certain "places" in the world, we instead examine the global and transnational connections of white supremacy, power, and violence. This spans from the ways white supremacy persists in "settler capitalism," as Shannon Speed identifies, with the experiences of Indigenous women as they migrate from Central America to the United States. In her article, "On the Persistence of White Supremacy: Indigenous Migrant Experience and the Structures of Settler Capitalism," Speed argues against the presumption of racial progress and diminishing racial violence and domination after colonialism. She demonstrates that the neoliberal moment, with its accompanying discourses of tolerance and rights that allowed for such notions as "postracial society," has reached its limits. Describing the shift from "neoliberal multiculturalism" to "neoliberal multicriminalism," Speed discusses the resurgence of explicit white supremacy and misogyny in public discourse and actions as a direct response to the changing needs of settler-capitalist power.

In "The Racial Vernaculars of Development: A View from West Africa," Jemima Pierre demonstrates how both the prominent Western-derived development apparatus in postcolonial Africa and anthropological theorizing of this apparatus are embedded in a "hermeneutics of race." Pierre demonstrates this through a discussion of the language of development and argues it is a "racial vernacular" that sustains racial thought, indexes racial meanings, and prescribes social practices. She links the long white supremacist history of development to current practices and argues that "though notions of racial difference may be submerged," they are reflected in a racial vernacular that normalizes the whiteness of discourses and representations of technology and liberal acts of charity as well as the "Blackness" of poverty and primitivism.

Junaid Rana's article, "Anthropology and the Riddle of White Supremacy," examines the famous exchange on race between white anthropologist Margaret Mead and Black writer and intellectual James Baldwin, showing how their ideas around religion, morality, and theology are integral to racism, white supremacy, and the critique of racial liberalism. Rana makes two interventions. He argues that while racism and white supremacy are often thought of as conceptually related, it is important to clarify their theoretical differences. He then draws on Baldwin and Mead's conversation to theorize the "global and the theological" and to demonstrate how the "racialization of religion and the theological components of white supremacy" are relevant to the construction of anti-Muslim racism.

The articles further expand the theoretical discussion of global white supremacy by delving into institutions, ontologies, and practices. In "Nothing Sells like Whiteness: Race, Ontology, and American Advertising," Shalini Shankar explores how multiculturalist diversity advertising actually reinforces the fiction of a white mainstream, highlighting racial and ethnic differences. She shows how ontology, or "the study of the nature of being," matters to the construction of white supremacist worlds through advertising practices aimed at diversity.

Similarly, Jonathan Rosa and Vanessa Diaz use anthropological analyses of institutional racism to explore the ontological issues of race and white supremacy in their article,

"Raciontologies: Rethinking Anthropological Accounts of Institutional Racism and Enactments of White Supremacy in the United States." They examine how institutions and apparatuses, such as the criminal justice system and gentrification processes, join to reproduce white supremacy. By viewing institutions as actors rather than simply sites or vehicles for the reproduction of white supremacy, they shift the representational location of ethnography in what they describe as a *raciontological* perspective. Raciolontologies, they argue, powerfully shape how institutional entities are endowed with the capacity to engage in particular acts while also conditioning perceptions, experiences, and material groundings of white supremacist reality.

In "The Resurgent Far Right and the Black Feminist Struggle for Social Democracy in Brazil," Keisha-Khan Perry discusses the recent upsurge in hatred and violence in Brazil resulting from the 2016 election of right-wing politician Jair Bolsonaro to the presidency, as well as the suspicious murder (assassination) of Black queer feminist politician Marielle Franco in 2017. Through her discussion of Black women's activism, Perry argues that white supremacy and white supremacist violence is foundational to Brazil, beginning with slavery and continuing on to the present moment.

The pieces also explicitly engage white supremacist practices and their reproduction through policing and militarization. In "The Jungle Academy: Molding White Supremacy in American Police Recruits," Aisha Beliso-De Jesús examines how white supremacy is molded, crafted, and trained into the bodies of police academy cadets. Through an ethnography of a composite police academy in the United States, she demonstrates how training practices produce adjacent white sameness in the molding of police bodies where the physicality involved in "becoming blue" is actually a racialized site of Aryan-inspired body politics. With ethnographic detail, Beliso-De Jesús discusses the active physical, emotional, and mental reshaping of police recruits, and explains how white supremacy is ordered, maintained, infused, and embodied in US policing.

In "The Making of Richard Zuley: The Ignored Linkages between the US Criminal In/Justice System and the International Security State," Laurence Ralph reveals the operations of white supremacy by tracing US military and police torture techniques and practices from Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, to Chicago, Illinois. Focusing on the torture of Mohamedou Ould Slahi, a Muslim victim of the so-called war on terror, Ralph examines how the roots of white supremacy are obscured and white ignorance is cultivated. As a major component of the schema of racism that informs state-sanctioned violence, Ralph uncovers how white supremacy continues to be naturalized and thus remains unexamined in prevailing scholarship on governance and security.

While this special section examines white supremacy through analyses of historical structures of oppression, we also encourage research that examines explicit acts of hate and racism—but that does not delink the present from the past. We follow anthropologist Faye Harrison, who points

us toward a horizon of an anthropology that does not simply interrogate white supremacy but that actively works to dismantle this system of dominance. To us, a clear path forward is to work toward eliminating the conditions that make possible the brutal persistence of white supremacist capitalist patriarchy—within anthropology and beyond.

Aisha M. Beliso-De Jesús *American Studies Program, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA; beliso.dejesus@princeton.edu*
Jemima Pierre *Department of African American Studies and Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095 USA; pierrej@ucla.edu*

NOTES

1. A team of geographers at University College London recently found that European colonization, specifically the genocide of over fifty-six million Indigenous peoples in the Americas, led to global climate change (Koch et al. 2019). A period called the "Great Dying" occurred because abandoned farmland from the murdered Indigenous peoples, in addition to pathogens introduced by Europeans, brought about a global cooling known as the "Little Ice Age" of the sixteenth century.

2. The idea of "racial capitalism"—which has recently taken hold among a broad spectrum of social scientists—points to the relationship of racism and capitalism, but we must make it clear that the focus should not just be on how capitalism is racialized but how it is specifically about structuring white economic control.

3. http://www.americananthro.org/ConnectWithAAA/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2583.

4. This is not to say, of course, that studies of race and inequality did not continue occur within anthropology previously.

5. Christen Smith's *Afro-Paradise: Blackness, Violence and Performance in Brazil* (2016) also provides a much-needed lens onto the global genocidal violence against Black people through anti-Black state violence in Brazil. Exposing the brutal realities of how police death squads terrorize communities in order to create the semblance of an "Afro-paradise," a location of consumable Black culture for an international market that desires non-threatening Black people in exotic locales, Smith shows how Black trauma and anti-Black violence have always been constitutive of white racial democracies.

6. Along with others, anthropologist Roger Sanjek (1994, 1) reminded us decades ago that, "for worse, not better, today we all live in a racialized world." Sociologist Howard Winant (2002), in his *The World Is a Ghetto*, was even more specific in historically

grounding the emergence of the race-concept and the establishment of white supremacy. Following the lead of Caribbean scholars such as Walter Rodney and Sylvia Wynter, he reprises the argument that "imperialism's creation of modern nation-states, capitalism's construction of an international economy, and the Enlightenment's articulation of a unified world culture . . . were all deeply racialized processes" (Winant 2002, 19).

7. For the African continent, the British indirect rule in West Africa and the colonial practice of "making the native" were in fact a processes of racialization. These racialization processes established a structure of differentiation that was sedimented through practices and carries through to the postcolonial moment (Pierre 2013).

8. According to Rana (2011, 27), "Gender and sexuality are also key components in understanding the place of the Muslim in this historical logic of racialization. The process of queering and feminizing are simultaneous to the racializing of Islam and Muslims through a historical precedent that imagines religious groups as enemies."

9. There were a handful of people of color, but the room was mostly filled with white people.

10. See Laurence Ralph's August 15, 2019, Twitter thread where he and Aisha Beliso-De Jesús first analyzed the Open Source Anthropology syllabi. Twitter-8/15/19. 10:24pm @Laurence_Ralph. For the Open Source Syllabi see, https://blog.opensyllabus.org/about-the-open-syllabus-project/.

11. Twitter – 8/15/19. 12:21 pm @arlenedavila1

12. This quotation comes from an interview with Karen Brodkin, one of the co-authors of the article, "Anthropology as White Public Space." https://savageminds.org/2014/11/15/anthropology-still-white-public-space-brodkin/.

13. Arlene Dávila and Shalini Shankar made this key point during a discussion at the 2016 AAA panel titled "Ethnic Studies Matters."

14. In anthropology, the invisibility of white supremacy is especially keen in the very white-oriented body politic of anthropology's identity as a discipline where non-"x" peoples study people different from them and then report back to the non-"x" people. Known more broadly as "ethnography," we cannot deny the implicit racialization of the "ethnos" portion of who we write about, and for whom.

REFERENCES CITED

Baker, Lee D. 1998. *From savage to Negro: Anthropology and the construction of race, 1896-1954*. Berkeley: Univ of California Press.

Battle-Baptiste, Whitney. 2011. *Black Feminist Archaeology*. New York: Routledge.

Blakey, Michael L. 1987. "Intrinsic Social and Political Bias in the History of American Physical Anthropology: With Special Reference to the Work of Aleš Hrdlička." *Critique of Anthropology* 7 (2): 7–35.

Bonds, Anne, and Joshua Inwood. 2016. "Beyond White Privilege: Geographies of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism." *Progress in Human Geography* 40 (6): 715–33.

Bouie, Jamelle. 2018. "The Enlightenment's Dark Side: How the Enlightenment Created Modern Race Thinking, and Why We Should Confront It." *Slate*, June 5. https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2018/06/taking-the-enlightenment-seriously-requires-talking-about-race.html.

Brodkin, Karen, Sandra Morgen, and Janis Hutchinson. 2011. "Anthropology as White Public Space?" *American Anthropologist* 113 (4): 545–56.

Brown, Jacqueline Nassy. 2005. *Dropping Anchor, Setting Sail: Geographies of Race in Black Liverpool*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chandler, Nahum. 2013. *X-The Problem of the Negro as a Problem for Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cobb, Montague. 1936. "Race and Runners." *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 7 (1): 3–56.

Davila, Arlene. 2006. "The Disciplined Boundary: Anthropology, Ethnic Studies, and the 'Minority' Practitioner." *Transforming Anthropology* 14 (1): 35–43.

Davis, Allison, Burleigh Gardner, and Mary R. Gardner. 1941. *Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Drake, St. Clair, and Horace R. Cayton. 1945. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1933. *Black Reconstruction*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Feagin, Joe, and Sean Elias. 2011. "Rethinking Racial Formation Theory: A Systemic Racism Critique." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (6): 931–60.

Firmin, Antenor. 2002. *The Equality of the Human Races*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Goett, Jennifer. 2016. *Black Autonomy: Race, Gender, and Afro-Nicaraguan Activism*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Grovogui, Siba N. 1996. *Sovereigns, Quasi Sovereigns, and Africa: Race and Self-Determination in International Law*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hale, Charles R. 2006. *Mas Que Un Indio (More Than an Indian): Racial Ambivalence and the Paradox of Neoliberal Multiculturalism*. New Mexico: School for Advance Research Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance." In *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*, edited by UNESCO, 16–60. Paris: UNESCO.

Harrison, Faye. 1995. "The Persistent Power of 'Race' in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:47–74.

Harrison, Faye. 1998. "Introduction: Expanding the Discourse on Race." *American Anthropologist* 100 (3): 609–31.

Harrison, Faye. 2012. "Racism in the Academy: Toward a Multi-Methodological Agenda for Anthropological Engagement." In *Racism in the Academy: The New Millennium*, edited by Audrey Smedley and Janice Hutchinson, 13–32. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.

Harrison, Faye. 2016. "Theorizing in Ex-Centric Sites." *Anthropological Theory* 16 (2–3): 160–76.

Harrison, Faye, and Ira Harrison. 1998. *African American Pioneers in Anthropology*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Harrison, Ira, Deborah Johnson-Simon, and Erica Williams. 2018. *The Second Generation of African American Pioneers in Anthropology*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

hooks, bell. 2000. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Second edition. London: Pluto Press.

Koch, Alexander, Chris Brierley, Mark M. Maslin, and Simon L. Lewis. 2019. "Earth System Impacts of the European Arrival and Great Dying in the Americas After 1492." *Quaternary Science Reviews* 207:13–36.

Jackson, John L. 2005. *Real Black: Adventures in Racial Sincerity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jobson, Ryan, and Jafari Allen. 2016. "The Decolonizing Generation: (Race and) Theory in Anthropology since the Eighties." *Current Anthropology* 57 (2): 129–48.

Lake, Marilyn, and Henry Reynolds. 2008. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowe, Lisa. 2015. *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Magubane, Bernard. 1971. "A Critical Look at Indices Used in the Study of Social Change in Colonial Africa." *Current Anthropology* 12 (4/5): 419–45.

Magubane, Bernard, and James C. Faris. 1985. "On the Political Relevance of Anthropology." *Dialectical Anthropology* 9 (1): 91–104.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mills, Charles W. 1998. *Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Mills, Charles W. 2003. *From Class to Race: Essays in White Marxism and Black Radicalism*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mills, Charles W. 2007. "Racial Liberalism." *PMLA* 123 (5): 1380–97.

Mullings, Leith. 2005. "Interrogating Racism: Toward an Antiracist Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:667–93.

Orser, Charles E. 2007. *The Archaeology of Race and Racialization in Historic America*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Page, Helán, and R. Brooke Thomas. 1994. "White Public Space and the Construction of White Privilege in U.S. Health Care: Fresh Concepts and a New Model of Analysis." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 8 (1): 109–16.

Peck, Raoul, dir. 2016. *I Am Not Your Negro*. Strasburg: Arte France.

Perry, Keisha-Khan. 2009. "The Groundings with My Sisters: Toward a Diasporic Feminist Agenda in the Americas." *The Scholar and Feminist Online* 7: n.p.

Perry, Keisha-Khan. 2013. *Black Women against the Land Grab: The Fight for Racial Justice in Brazil*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Pierre, Jemima. 2006. "Anthropology and the Race for/of Africa." In *The Study of Africa. Volume I: Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Encounters*, edited by Paul T. Zeleza, 39–61. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Pierre, Jemima. 2013. *The Predicament of Blackness: Postcolonial Ghana and the Politics of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rana, Junaid. 2007. "The History of Islamophobia." *Souls* 9 (2): 148–61.

Rana, Junaid. 2011. *Terrifying Muslims: Race and Labor in the South Asian Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rosa, Jonathan, and Yarimar Bonilla. 2017. "Deprovincializing Trump, Decolonizing Diversity, and Unsettling Anthropology." *American Ethnologist* 44 (2): 201–208.

Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. 2017. "Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective." *Language in Society* 46 (5): 621–47.

Sanjek, Roger. 1994. "The Enduring Inequalities of Race." In *Race*, edited by Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, 1–17. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Shanklin, Eugenia. 1998. "The Profession of the Color Blind: Socio-cultural Anthropology and Racism in the 21st Century." *American Anthropologist* 100 (3): 669–79.

Smith, Christen. 2015. "Blackness, Citizenship, and the Transnational Vertigo of Violence in the Americas." *American Anthropologist* 117 (2): 384–87.

Smith, Christen. 2016. *Afro-Paradise: Blackness, Violence, and Performance in Brazil*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Stocking, George. 1968. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Telles, Edward. 2014. *Pigmentocracies: Ethnicity, Race, and Color in Latin America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Thomas, Deborah, and Kamari Clarke. 2013. "Globalization and Race: Structures of Inequality, New Sovereignties, and Citizenship in a Neoliberal Era." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42:305–25.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1991. "Anthropology and the Savage Slot: The Poetics and Politics of Otherness." In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, edited by Richard G. Fox, 17–44. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2003. *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modernn World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Visweswaran, Kamala. 1998. "Race and the Culture of Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 100 (1): 70–83.

Visweswaran, Kamala. 2010. *Un/Common Cultures: Racism and the Rearticulation of Cultural Difference*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Winant, Howard. 2002. *The World Is a Ghetto*. New York: Basic Books.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2016. *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race*. London: Verso Books.