Linguistics of White Racism

Racist discourse strategy in US politics

Kathryn McCafferty

12/6/2011

ABSTRACT

"New Racism" is a concept that has arisen out of the purported transformation of racial prejudice and discrimination since the Civil Rights Era of the 1960s. The theories that defend the existence of a new racism distinct from pre–1960s prejudice often claim that the Civil Rights Era transformed the way US citizens think about race by legally prohibiting overt forms of racism in society, such as Jim Crow segregation. As a result, these theorists claim, overt racist language also became taboo in public forums, necessitating the creation of a brand new manner of speaking about race: a linguistic strategy that is more furtive and concealed than the racism of old. (Sears 1988; Bobo & Kleugal 1993; Bonilla-Silva 2006; McConahay 1986; Schumann 1997). It is argued that this supposedly new and surreptitious racial prejudice, covert racism, and its corresponding discourse replaced the overt racist language that was supposedly widely employed and accepted before the Civil Rights Movement.

I break with this main commonality of the new racism theories. The alleged modernity of covert racist discourse is disproved by the excerpts of political discourse reviewed for the purposes of this study. These demonstrate that covert racist discourse has been an important part of prejudiced language since far before the Civil Rights Era. Plus, similarly contrary to the theories of new racism and the supposedly new taboo status of blatant prejudice, overt racist language is also still used today, decades after the passing of the Civil Rights Act. These two points provide strong evidence that racist language has not undergone much change despite the legal banishment of some overtly racist practices in the 1960s.

Nevertheless, it is true that some smaller changes in racist language have occurred since the US's beginning. For one, it seems that the use of overt racist discourse has declined in public speech over the course of the 20th century, demonstrated through alterations in politicians'

linguistic strategies. Also, it appears that the strategy behind employing covert racism has shifted from a purpose of justifying overt racism before the Civil Rights Era, to a purpose of concealing one's prejudice. Still, these slight modifications do not prove a positive change in the way the US public views race and discrimination. Rather, racism is a persistent problem that seems nearly impossible to eradicate partially due to its possibly unconscious and subconscious nature as well as to whites' tendency to disregard all accusations of racism. The apparent lack of a much needed radical transformation in white racism after the Civil Rights Act of 1964 suggests the exigency of a new approach for effecting revolution in whites' frames for contemplating race: raising race consciousness.

446 wds.

Although many forms of overt racism such as segregation and disenfranchisement were formally illegalized in the 1960s, evidence of the persistence of racial inequalities in US society is widespread. For example, while the number of blacks in poverty increased by 1.6% between 2009 and 2010, and that of latinos[1] increased by 1.3%, the number of whites in poverty increased by only 0.5%, continuing the trend of lowest poverty rates for whites than for any other racial group in the US (Baksh 2011). Also, in 2010, while the median household income for whites was $54,620, that of blacks was $32,068 and that of latinos was $37,759 (Baksh 2011). While one in seventeen white American men may expect to spend time incarcerated, one in every six latino men may expect the same in 2011, one in every three black men are sentenced to time in prison (Mauer 2011). Not only that, but blacks and latinos are also more likely than whites to be the victims of violence in the US (Mauer 2011). According to the College Board, in 2008, 44% of white men ages 25 to 34 had an associate's degree or a higher degree. 28% of black men of the same age and 16% of latino men of the same age had obtained an associate's degree or more by that same year (Altavena 2011). These statistics unequivocally prove that racial disparities still exist in the US.

Nevertheless, much of the American public manages to convince itself that racial discrimination no longer affects the lives of people of color in US society. Instead, many of today's white US citizens describe programs such as affirmative action as discriminatory, although their purpose is to achieve racial equality (Edsall 1991). Those who use the term "racism" in this way are mistaken for two reasons: first, racism is a context-dependent concept.

---

[1] Latino is a contentious label partly because it suggests the existence of some nation or place from which the identity is taken. Instead, the label encompasses all those with origins in castellano-speaking parts of South and Central America, as well as of the Caribbean. This adds to the controversial nature of the term because many different peoples who may have different national origins and histories are lumped under one label. Still, I use latino instead of Hispanic because while Hispanic is an Anglo-American term chosen for those it labels, latino is a identity supposedly chosen by those who take on the identity as one that distinguishes them from English-speaking America (Santa Ana 2004).

As explained by Caleb Rosado (1996), racism is the combined forces of prejudice and power, meaning that only members of the race with institutional influence may be considered "racist." Secondly, as demonstrated by the statistics cited above, racism still poses serious difficulties for people of color. For these reasons, "reverse racism" does not exist. A "colorblind" stance or viewpoint, therefore, simply ignores the racial issues our society faces, as opposed to creating equal opportunity for members of all races.

These common fallacies, that racism no longer poses a problem for people of color but rather negatively impacts whites through so-called reverse discrimination, cause so much confusion partially due to the way we speak about race. Everyday prejudiced speech, designated by experts as "new" or "modern" racism, is often manifested in covert forms, as opposed to the overt racism that supposedly characterized US society before the Civil Rights Act. These expressions of racism allow speakers, whether intentionally or not, to transmit a prejudiced message in a subtle manner, thereby avoiding accusations of racism and convincing listeners that the message contains impartial reflections of reality (Bonilla-Silva 2006). The duplicitous nature of today's discriminatory language is supposedly one of the main distinctions from the no longer socially-acceptable overt racism of the pre–Civil Rights era.

However, contrary to the postulations of many sociologists, the so-called "new racism" is, in fact, not so new or modern. For centuries, white people have maintained their supremacy partially by reproducing inequalities through prejudiced rhetoric. It is evidently true that the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s legally outlawed many forms of overt racism, and also stigmatized the unequivocal vocalization of racial prejudice. This alone, however, does not indicate the evolution of a new type of racism, as well as the creation of a correspondingly new manner of speaking about race. Instead, overt and covert racist language have existed side by

side for years. Only when overt racism was met with outcry and its presence in speech declined did the use of covert racist discourse seem much more evident as an indication of persisting prejudice.

CRITIQUE

Sociologists have developed multiple theories to explain what they perceive as a change in racism since the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. According to these scholars, prejudice once manifested itself more overtly in everyday speech. Some refer to this concept of old, currently less common prejudice as Jim Crow racism, while others use the term "old-fashioned racism." When much of the overt racism that structured US society in the post–Civil Rights era was legally abolished and the US public grew more aware of prejudiced language, the act of verbalizing one's prejudice became disgraceful and even devastating to one's reputation. Students of racial prejudice have noted these changes and many agree that racism since before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has undergone some kind of fundamental transformation to become what it is today.

Dinesh D'Souza is one such scholar. According to D'Souza, racial prejudice no longer influences the socio-economic status of blacks in US society. Instead, D'Souza states that liberal policies and legislation, such as the Great Society, caused the downfall of the black family, and therefore, of all black people as a whole. While D'Souza does acknowledge that racism exists, he also states that, "it no longer has the power to thwart blacks or any other group in achieving their economic, political and social aspirations" (1995). D'Souza proposes that black people work together to pull themselves out of the lower class and states that the elimination of racism will follow naturally. The theories that D'Souza proposes in The End of Racism put the blame for racism on blacks, stating that black people are not only unhindered by racism, but that they also

have the responsibility to terminate prejudice. D'Souza's theory is problematic because it first

ignores US's history of race relations, including black slavery and the many other ways in which

whites have historically forced blacks into an inferior social position, and secondly it ignores the

statistics demonstrating the ways in which racism affects the daily lives of people of color. By

stating that racism is truly dependent on the actions of blacks, D'Souza removes any

responsibility of the racially tumultuous past for which whites must be held accountable. His

refusal to acknowledge the persistence of racism leads to a similarly problematic failure to

acknowledge the necessity of social programs that aim to smooth out the racial inequalities still

prevalent in US society. The theory that blacks are at fault for the injustices they face is itself

racist because it posits that blacks are in some way inherently different from whites. While he

presents blacks' actions as inherently bad and responsible for the persistence of their own social

standing, D'Souza implies that whites' actions are inherently good, allowing white people to

enjoy a higher status in all aspects of society. In sum, D'Souza's theory that racism no longer

poses a problem in US society is not only untrue but also allows whites to ignore the true issues

at hand. For these reasons, the linguistic transformation proposed by so many sociologists since

the Civil Rights movement must have more complex implications than the simple and utter end

to racist influence in US society.

     Many theories advanced by those intellectuals that perceive a linguistic shift since the

Civil Rights movement fortunately do not consider an alleged change in discourse strategies to

be an indication of the complete elimination of racism as a social force. David Sears (1988), for

example, theorizes that since the Civil Rights movement, public prejudice has shifted towards

"symbolic racism," which has replaced the disappearing old-fashioned racism. According to

Sears and his colleagues, symbolic racism has evolved from the intersection of anti-black

feelings and traditional American values and manifests itself in two ways: negative attitude towards blacks for causing radical changes in racial relations and white resentment towards blacks for what symbolic racists see as unfair, prioritized treatment. The main idea behind Sears's theory is that symbolic racism influences how individuals feel about certain public policies and that, despite a change since Jim Crow segregation, racism continues to play an important role.

Lawrence Bobo and James R. Kluegal (1993) propose "laissez-faire racism" as the new prejudice following economic changes of the 1950s and 60s. Unlike the tradition, Jim Crow racism of the past, which they claim was characterized by the presupposition of biological inferiority of blacks as well as the blatant expression of racism, this new ideology holds blacks accountable for their own lesser economic status compared to whites. Whites manage to place the blame on blacks for their own position through the lens of cultural inferiority, which unlike biological or natural inferiority, allows for some amount of choice. This supposed recently-emerged prejudice combines modern white stereotypes of blacks such as laziness with the denial of any white responsibility for blacks' hardships. Bobo and Kluegal propose that laissez-faire racism is group-based, meaning that whites' prejudice is born out of individuals' desire to maintain white supremacy. Like other theories of its kind, laissez-faire racism is supposedly more subtle than pre–Civil Rights prejudice.

A theory similar to that of Bobo and Kluegal is Eduardo Bonilla-Silva's theory, which he designates "color-blind racism" (2006). Supposedly born out of the Civil Rights movement and the changes of the late 60s, color-blind racism, like laissez-faire racism, allows whites to pretend that racial prejudice is no longer influential in racial relations or in the lives of people of color, aspects of this prejudice that Bonilla-Silva states are manifested in the modern language used to

talk about race. Unlike theories of new racism that he critiques, such as symbolic racism, Bonilla-Silva's theory describes prejudice not as an individual flaw but as a societal problem, and states that racism is context–dependent, meaning that the term applies solely to prejudice that the institutionally dominant group holds against members of a marginalized race.

These three contentious theories of today's racism – symbolic, laissez-faire, and color-blind – along with multiple other new racism theories not discussed here (McConahay 1986, Schuman et. al. 1997, Sniderman et. al. 1991), all have in common the premise that racism has undergone some fundamental metamorphosis since the Civil Rights Era. Though their theories have differed in many ways, these scholars have presented the racism of old as both the belief in the natural inferiority of blacks as well as the manifestation and acceptance of more blatantly bigoted language. Though these sociologists agree more or less that racism still has a pervasive influence on US politics, US society, or both, Colin Wayne Leach (2005) makes the insightful suggestion that this focus on a supposed transformation may do more harm than good by accentuating a rupture in racism's history. Leach's point is especially pertinent because, as is demonstrated in this paper, covertly talking about race is not a new phenomenon. In fact, covert racist language has for centuries been an important part of whites' strategic repertoire for promoting their own race's supremacy. The common error inherent in almost all theories of "new" racism, that overt language ended with Jim Crow segregation, raises several important questions for new paths of research. For one, though covert racism was used both before and after the Civil Rights Era, have other changes occurred in the use of racist language? Also, what makes racism so difficult to define and diagnose that sociologists have so far been incapable of reaching a consensus on the racism of the present day?

While I do not attempt to create an entirely new theory for racial relations in the US today, I use this paper to, first of all, break with the main commonality of these new racism theories: that today's more subtle racism has arisen out of the Civil Rights movement in the 1960's and has replaced the old-fashioned more blatant racism of the Jim Crow era and earlier. I disprove this supposition by looking at how Teun A. van Dijk defines covert racist discourse and by then providing examples from US political discourse of both subtle racist language and blatant racist language from before and after the Civil Rights Era. While this section's purpose is to demonstrate the error made by many sociologists on this issue, I also find within this section that similarities in racist discourse before and after the Civil Rights Era are much more prevalent than the simple use of similar linguistic forms. From here, I go on to discuss the possible strategies behind using racist language of either type and then delve into the possibility that racist language is in fact not a strategy at all, but rather unintentional. After this, I discuss the societal problems associated with the use of racist language, including how racist language reproduces stereotypes and prejudice. Finally, I talk about possible solutions to the issue of prejudice in discourse. For the rest of this paper, I term what many theorists have labeled as new as simply "covert racism," because the subtle, or covert, nature of today's most dominant expression of racism is an important common thread in all of the theories that I have read acknowledging racism's continued existence. The more specific meaning of covert racism will be discussed in Teun A. van Dijk's terms later in this paper.

METHODOLOGY

I chose to study public political statements as opposed to discourse in private settings for multiple reasons. Politicians belong to the nation's elite. They by default have access to the media and to the press, powerful tools that non-elites do not have the means to manipulate. As a

result, politicians have the ability to speak directly to the public and, therefore, influence the public's thoughts and opinions. In this way, politicians can set the tone for discourse on race, creating metaphors and propagating stereotypes that non-elites may revert back to and use in everyday conversation (van Dijk 1997). Plus, Politicians elected in a democratic government such as that of the US are supposedly representative of public opinion. Therefore, unlike private conversations between individuals – which would demonstrate solely the prejudice or impartiality of only specific persons – public statements made by politicians should exhibit the overall prejudices or impartialities of the whole electorate. Also, as stated by Teun A. van Dijk, since politicians are constantly under public scrutiny, they must be careful about the words they choose to employ at any given time (1997). For fear of criticism – or worse – losing power, politicians attentively review public statements and speeches. One may assume, then, that political discourse usually has a distinct purpose of which the politician is likely quite aware. And finally, transcripts of political public statements are relatively easy to find, as are critiques on these statements and their prejudiced content. For these reasons, I decided to base this paper off of the racist discourse of politicians.

Finally, I attempted to collect excerpts of political discourse for the purposes of this paper from relatively early US history, from around the Civil Rights Era, and from present day. I chose speeches and statements from these periods of time because I seek to disprove those theories of new racism by showing that, after two centuries of US history, racist language has not undergone much transformation. Similar racist language from far before the Civil Rights Era, from around the time of the Civil Rights Era and from modern day should be sufficient for proving this hypothesis.

CAVEAT

Being white includes the privilege of not necessarily needing to think about race (McPhail 2002). It is through the lack of contemplation of prejudice and the choice to accept the status quo that whites maintain their own race's societal supremacy. Therefore, as a white student at an elite institution, I feel that I have the responsibility to confront my privilege. By writing about racist speech, I hope not to blame whites who use this language for all racial contention in the US, but rather I hope to further my own race consciousness and face my own prejudices, and perhaps even convince other whites to do the same.

OVERT RACISM

Examples from recent public statements provide evidence that overtly expressing one's prejudice has not been completely replaced by covert racism; overt racist discourse is still present in modern speech, sharing many similarities with the overt racist language used before the Civil Rights Era. For example, during a state House debate on April 27, 2011, Oklahoma Representative Sally Kern made several blatantly racist statements. She stated, "Is this just because they are black that they are in prison, or could it be because they didn't want to work hard in school. I taught school for 20 years and I saw a lot of people of color that didn't want to work as hard because they said the government would take care of them" (qtd. in Krehbiel 2011). Sally Kern's declaration is considered overtly racist language because her enunciation includes the unmasked labeling of all people of color with one overarching quality: laziness. From the quotation alone, it seems that Kern did not attempt to use covert language to veil her prejudice. Instead, her denunciation of blacks and people of color is quite explicit.

Similarly, a Kansas state representative, Virgil Peck, recently made a highly offensive and contested statement that may be considered overt racism. When discussing a method for

dealing with the state's large population of wild hogs, Peck declared, "If shooting these

immigrating feral hogs works, maybe we have found a [solution] to our illegal immigration

problem" (qtd. in Associated Press 2011).

Although Peck afterwards claimed that he was joking, others present at the hearing felt

that Peck truly believed his utterance and were highly offended, as were many latinos,

immigrants and their advocacy groups (Associated Press 2011). This appears to be overt racism

because Peck refers to all latino illegal immigrants as hogs and suggests treating them as such:

violently and with little recognition of their humanity. However, this example would be much

more clearly overt if Peck did explicitly say "latinos" as opposed to "illegal immigrants." Still, in

US society, these two terms "illegal immigrants" and "latinos" seem to have become synonyms.

(Santa Ana 2002).

Overt racist language was also used before the Civil Rights movement. Examples will be

helpful in drawing comparisons between linguistic racisms from both before and after the 1960s.

One politician who used overt racism in the very early years of the nation's existence was

Thomas Jefferson. Despite fame for his contribution to the Declaration of Independence, which

affirms the equality of all men, Thomas Jefferson also employed overt racist language, implying

that he viewed some people as inferior to others. In one text in the collection Notes on Virginia

published in 1782, Jefferson asserts:

> "The first difference which strikes us is that of colour […] the difference is fixed in nature, and is as real as if its seat and cause were better known to us. And is this difference of no importance? Is it not the foundation of a greater or less share of beauty in the two races? Are not the fine mixtures of red and white, the expressions of every passion by greater or less suffusions of colour in the one, preferable to that eternal monotony, which reigns in the countenances, that inmoveable veil of black, which covers all the emotions of the other race? Add to these, flowing hair, a more elegant symmetry of form, their own judgment in favour of the whites, declared by their preference of them, as uniformly as is the preference of the Oran-ootan for the black women over those of his own species.

> The circumstance of superior beauty, is thought worthy attention in the propagation of our horses, dogs, and other domestic animals; why not in that of man?" (Qtd. In Cook 1993).

In this excerpt, Jefferson affirms his belief that members of the black race are naturally inferior to those of the white race in physical beauty. He explicitly states that whites are physically superior to blacks, noting blacks', "eternal monotony, which reigns in the countenances, that immoveable veil of black, which covers all the emotions." Jefferson's purpose appears to be the explanation of blacks' inferiority to whites, which he claims is partly due to a supposed beauty of the white race that he believes blacks lack. The unequivocal manner in which he utters these statements is overt racism; it appears that Jefferson does not attempt to conceal his feelings that blacks are inferior to whites, even claiming that – because one may compare the beauty of animal breeds – one may similarly compare the beauty of members of the black and white races.

Lincoln also uttered overtly racist statements during his political career. Similar to Jefferson's overtly racist statement, Lincoln's may also seem contradictory to his reputation, which for Lincoln is the emancipation of all slaves in the US during the Civil War. In one statement, given during a debate in 1858, he explains his feelings about race:

> I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races […] I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office […] I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

Lincoln's public statement, if issued in modern US society, would be considered incredibly offensive and racist. He explicitly asserts that black people are inherently lesser than

whites and are therefore unsuited to participating in political affairs. He also states his belief that whites deserve superiority over blacks, following the presupposition that the two races are unequal. Due to its explicitly racist nature, Lincoln's language here is an example of overt racist discourse.

Theodore G. Bilbo, unlike Jefferson and Lincoln, is remembered for his unwavering anti-civil rights stance and his fervent support of continued racial segregation in the South. In 1946, during a campaign for re-election for US senator of Mississippi, Bilbo uttered the following overtly racist statement: "I call on every red-blooded white man to use any means to keep the niggers away from the polls[;] if you don't understand what that means you are just plain dumb" (qtd. in Fleegler 2006).

This type of rhetoric was apparently typical for Bilbo (Fleegler 2006). In 1938, the same year that an anti-lynching bill reached the senate floor, Bilbo – talking about head of the NAACP Walter White – again used overt racism, asserting, "When once the flat-nosed Ethiopian, like the camel, gets his proboscis under the tent, he will overthrow the established order of our Saxon civilization" (qtd. in Fleegler 2006).

In the first quote, Bilbo uses a derogatory term to refer to black people and proceeds to endorse violence towards black voters for the purpose of preventing them from taking part in elections. He does not attempt to be subtle. Instead, he makes his statement so explicit that he even claims that those who do not understand the meaning "are just plain dumb." Bilbo's other statement is also overtly racist for multiple reasons, including when Bilbo calls White a "flat-nosed Ethiopian," although White was a US citizen. This is an example of overt racism because it is a derogatory personal attack that succeeds solely in making a statement on White's race. By also claiming that White would destroy "our Saxon civilization," Bilbo definitively affirms his

view that blacks are inhumane and incapable of participating in US politics in a civilized manner. Therefore, because Bilbo utters these declarations with no apparent shame or attempt to conceal his racism, these are examples of overt racist discourse.

A common theme of these utterances qualified as overtly racist discourse is that it seems they all seem to have been asserted with little concern for appearing unprejudiced. Of course it is possible that, despite their use of language to the contrary, these speakers would not view themselves as racist. Still, the perception of these statements remains the same; much of the US public today would be shocked and upset if any of these examples were asserted in modern US society.

The following section advances to the exploration of covert racism. First, I present the seven covert racist discourse categories proposed by Teun A. van Dijk in his article on exclusive speech in Western Parliaments. Then, I provide several examples of covert racism from before and after the Civil Rights Era to both demonstrate real use of covert racist discourse and determine the time periods in which covert racism has been used.

LINGUISTIC FORMS OF COVERT RACISM

Teun A. van Dijk (1997) provides a thorough list of types of covert racist language that synthesizes some categories from other theories and provides other, still important, but sometimes unlisted, categories. He presents his seven strategies of covert discourse as follows:

- Positive self-presentation: the characterization of oneself or of one's group as morally superior when it comes to treatment of out-group members, such as black people. As an example, van Dijk cites a statement by Tim Renton on the UK's refugee policy for the Kurds who were being persecuted in Turkey:

    I want to consider the serious subject of this adjournment debate, and I will begin by explaining the general context of the government's policy towards

> people who claim asylum. As the [honorable] member for Islington North
> reminds us, the United Kingdom was one of the earliest signatories to the 1951
> United Nations convention on refugees. We take our responsibilities very
> seriously, despite what is sometimes said by organizations like Amnesty
> International. No one who does my job can fail to be affected daily by the plight
> of people who are fleeing from persecution in their own country....
>
> If the interests of the people genuinely fleeing from persecution are to be
> safeguarded, it is vital that the system designed to protect them should not be
> exploited by people whose main motivation is economic migration (qtd. in van
> Dijk 1997: 43-44).

Corbin's statement exemplifies a way in which positive self-presentation may be used as

a covert racist discourse strategy. Before moving onto his real point, that of denying refugees

entry into asylum, Corbin discusses the ways in which the nation he represents has made great

progress for refugees' protection. Positive self-presentation may overlap with other strategies,

such as fairness or denial of racism, but the main point of this strategy is to present oneself or

one's group as morally good for the purpose of concealing a perhaps less than moral policy or

belief. While this strategy could be used with overt racist language, for example stating explicitly

that whites are morally superior to whites due to biological differences, van Dijk and I focus on

the use of this strategy as a way to prove one's goodness before making a possibly racist

statement.

- Negative other-presentation: the use of adverse language to describe members of another

  group. Often, a speaker employs negative other-presentation with positive self-

  presentation as a way of contrasting the character of his own group and members of

  another group, illustrating through language the predominance of white people in

  comparison with people of color. Van Dijk gives an example of this strategy:

  > Indeed, illegal foreigners and those who do not respect our public order
  > cause great damage to those foreigners who wish to integrate themselves
  > into the national community. . . . [Some people come here without any
  > money.] Such a pecuniary situation often leads them to clandestine work
  > or, much more seriously, to acts of delinquency (qtd. in 1997: 57).

The speaker in this example does not explicitly state that illegal foreigners are inherently or naturally bad. Instead, in a more rational and covert way, the speaker describes the negative effects that illegal foreigners have on national societies due to perhaps understandable reasons. Again, like the positive self-presentation strategy, negative other-presentation could be used for overt racist discourse. However, van Dijk is using this term to designate the more furtive description of the other as antagonistic. Van Dijk even mentions that this strategy could be viewed as racist, and to avoid this, the speaker may use the "rotten apple argument," which allows him to demonstrate impartiality and simple concern for the supposed good, who will be negatively impacted by the actions of the supposed bad.

- Denial of racism: used to make qualifications before or after a racist assertion, such as the introductory expression, "I'm not racist, but…" An example provided by van Dijk is, "We have nothing against immigrants [or minorities], but…"

- Apparent sympathy: allows the speaker to claim that an action or decision that may have negative consequences for the out-group, for example blacks, is based on protecting that group's well-being. In other words, apparent sympathy strategy allows the speaker to present a decision as concern for the other group, and conceal what may be simply concern for his own group's interests.

- Fairness: often expressed with typical keywords of liberalism, such as equality, tolerance and color-blindness. In a US context, this strategy is often used to demonstrate dedication to the constitution and to founding ideologies of the US, when really the issue discussed may result in the victimization of out-group members.

- Top-down transfer: allows the speaker to place blame for racism and its effects on other people or other communities. In the rare case that politicians do admit the existence of

racism in policy, they may place the blame on the extreme right or may explain that a racial minority is responsible for prejudice due to their behavior or the resentment they have caused in society. Accusations of reverse racism fall into this category of covert racist language; by claiming that people of color are in fact racist towards whites, or that politicians are racist because they prioritize people of color, these white people shift the blame for racism elsewhere, distancing themselves from the cause of the problem.

- Justification: the use of what appears to be rational argument to exonerate the speaker from taking responsibility for her prejudiced statements. This form is used to move the conversation away from race, to a supposedly intellectual conversation about bare facts. Van Dijk also refers to this strategy as, "the force of facts, (38)" which according to him, may include, "the international situation, agreements, financial difficulties, number of refugees, (38)" as well as any other rational excuse for policy that otherwise may seem racist.

Van Dijk proposes these seven strategies as verbal manifestations of prejudice typical in Western parliaments. His list of subtly racist rhetoric is also applicable to highly public statements made by politicians and pundits in the US, as well as in everyday conversation. This list of covertly racist linguistic forms is useful in qualifying statements as covertly racist. By using his taxonomy and searching for the existence of these forms before and after the Civil Rights Era, I will be able to determine the eras in which both types of racism have existed. This is the task I undertake in the following section.

COVERT RACIST DISCOURSE

In this section, I take a look at covert racist from before and after the Civil Rights movement. From the examples below, it does seem that the strategies described by Teun A. van

Dijk has played a role in political language for centuries; evidence of the use of covert racist

language stretches at least as far back as Thomas Jefferson's lifetime. For example, in one letter

written in 1814, Jefferson discusses his views on slavery and asserts:

> For men probably of any color, but of this color [black] we know, brought from their infancy without necessity for thought or forecast, are by their habits rendered as incapable as children of taking care of themselves, and are extinguished promptly wherever industry is necessary for raising young. In the mean time they are pests in society by their idleness, and the depredations to which this leads them. Their amalgamation with the other color produces a degradation to which no lover of his country, no lover of excellence in the human character can innocently consent […]"
>
> "But in the mean time are you right in abandoning this property [slaves], and your country with it? I think not. My opinion has ever been that, until more can be done for them, we should endeavor, with those whom fortune has thrown on our hands, to feed and clothe them well, protect them from all ill usage, require such reasonable labor only as is performed voluntarily by freemen, & be led by no repugnancies to abdicate them, and our duties to them. The laws do not permit us to turn them loose, if that were for their good: and to commute them to other property is to commit them to those whose usage of them we cannot control.

In his explanation for rejecting the immediate emancipation of slaves, Jefferson employs

several of van Dijk's types of covert racist discourse. He uses positive self-presentation with his

questioning of what is "right," his apparent charity toward black slaves, as well as discussing

whites' "duties" to blacks. These statements act to demonstrate whites' moral goodness in

dealing with and making decisions about black slaves. Jefferson also uses justification to

rationally explain blacks' inferiority to whites, stating, "Brought from their infancy without

necessity for thought or forecast, [blacks] are by their habits rendered as incapable as children of

taking care of themselves." Different from the more overt racist explanation of blacks being

biologically and naturally inferior to whites, Jefferson attempts to explain blacks as "pests in

society" due to their upbringing in society. This first paragraph acts as a justification for whites

taking a decision-making role concerning blacks, because they are presented here as unable to

act for themselves, while whites are presented as being responsible enough to care for blacks.

Apparent sympathy is the third covert racist form employed here by Jefferson. He claims that freeing black people from slavery is harmful to their very existence, as opposed to stating outright that free labor for wealthy white plantation owners, like himself, is important to maintaining whites' socio-economic superiority. Therefore, whether consciously or unconsciously, Jefferson is concealing his racist feelings about blacks' place in society with the use of furtive language.

Andrew Jackson is another politician from early US history who used covert racist discourse during his presidency. One speech riddled with examples is Jackson's 1830 message to Congress, "On Indian Removal." Addressing the perceived problem of Native Americans inhabiting land that was in demand among white settlers, Jackson states,

> [Speedy removal of the Indians] will […] free them from the power of the States; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way and under their own rude institutions; will retard the process of decay, which is lessening their numbers […]
> We now propose to acquire the countries occupied by the red men of the South and West by a fair exchange, and, at the expense of the United States, to send them to land where their existence may be prolonged […]
> How many thousands of our own people would gladly embrace the opportunity of removing to the West on such conditions! If the offers made to the Indians were extended to them, they would be hailed with gratitude and joy.
> And is it supposed that the wandering savage has a stronger attachment to his home than the settled, civilized Christian? Is it more afflicting to him to leave the graves of his fathers […]? Rightly considered, the policy of the General Government toward the red man is not only liberal, but generous. […] To save him from […] utter annihilation, the General Government kindly offers him a new home and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement.

Jackson's address to Congress features the use of strategies identified by van Dijk. For example, Jackson uses positive self-presentation; the expressions, "expense of the United States," "fair exchange," and "settled civilized Christian" all work to demonstrate the white man's good morality and superiority. "The policy […] toward the red man is not only liberal, but generous," and "the General Government kindly offers him a new home," are two more

examples of this same type of language. Jackson also uses apparent sympathy by stating that

Native Americans are lucky to receive such a deal from the US government: "How many

thousands of our own people would gladly embrace the opportunity of removing to the West on

such conditions!" He feigns concern by asserting that the US government is offering a great deal

to Native Americans, as opposed to physically forcing the Native Americans from their homes

for the profit of white US citizens.

Abraham Lincoln also used covert racist discourse. In his speech at Peoria, Illinois in

1854, Lincoln explained his feelings about slavery:

> I can not but hate [the declared indifference for slavery's spread]. I hate it
> because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself […]
> If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do, as to the
> existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all slaves, and send them to
> Liberia, -- to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince
> me, that whatever of high hope, (as I think there is) there may be in this, in the
> long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were landed there in a day,
> they would all perish in the next ten days […]
> What next? Free them and make them politically and socially, our equals?
> My own feelings will not admit of this; […].

In his public statement, Lincoln unequivocally states that he morally disagrees with the

existence of slavery in the US. However, his repugnance for slavery as an institution is

apparently insufficient to necessitate the emancipation of slaves and the termination of slavery

itself. Lincoln's affirmation that sending black slaves to Liberia is not a solution to the slavery

problem is an example of covert racist language. Lincoln seems to be feigning care for blacks'

well-being, while providing reason for blacks to remain in captivity and to be exploited as whites

see fit. This use of covert racist discourse is an example of apparent sympathy. In this except,

Lincoln also may also be using denial of racism. When he claims that he would "free all slaves"

if given the power to do so, he may be using a similar structure to, "I'm not racist, but…"

Perhaps Lincoln is prefacing his opinion that slavery must continue with this statement as a way

of excusing himself and leading others to believe that his opinion is not a racist one. If this is the

case, then this part of the speech is also an example of covert racist discourse.

Van Dijk's strategies were also used in the decision of the 1896 trial of Plessy v.

Ferguson. In this trial, a "colored" man, Homer Plessy, challenged the constitutionality of the

legislation providing for separate but equal facilities by sitting in a train car reserved for whites

only and refusing to move to the colored persons' car. The trial of Plessy v. Ferguson followed

his arrest and upheld the doctrine legitimizing racial segregation. Justice Henry Billings Brown

delivered the statement of the court's opinion on the case:

> It would be running the slavery question into the ground to make it apply to every act of discrimination which a person may see fit to make as to the guests he will entertain […] or deal with in other matters of intercourse or business […]
> A statute which implies merely a legal distinction between the white and colored races […] has no tendency to destroy the legal equality of the two races […]
> The object of the [14th] amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but, in the nature of things, it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either […]
> In determining the question of reasonableness, it is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people, and with a view to the promotion of their comfort, and the preservation of the public peace and good order […]
> We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it. The argument necessarily assumes that if, as has been more than once the case, and is not unlikely to be so again, the colored race should become the dominant power in the state legislature, and should enact a law in precisely similar terms, it would thereby relegate the white race to an inferior position […]
> The argument also assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation, and that equal rights cannot be secured to the negro except by an enforced commingling of the two races. We cannot accept this proposition. If the two races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities […]

At the very beginning of his assertion, Brown uses the covertly racist strategy of justification to lead the conversation away from race: "It would be running the slavery question into the ground to make it apply to every act of discrimination which a person may see fit." By stating that there is no reason to take the history of slavery into account, he is implying that racial discrimination is not a factor and should not affect the decision at hand. Also, when Brown states, "A statute which implies merely a legal distinction between the white and colored races […] has no tendency to destroy the legal equality of the two races," he again attempts to demonstrate that the issue discussed has nothing to do with racial inequality. His point is that, by supporting the separate but equal legislation, he is making a decision based not on race, but on multiple other factors that seem more rational, such as the comfort of all US citizens. This argument leads to the strategy of fairness, which also makes an appearance in Brown's assertion when he states that the fourteenth amendment, "is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people, and with a view to the promotion of their comfort, and the preservation of the public peace and good order." By making this statement, Brown ignores the act's purpose of achieving equal treatment of all races and explains that the legislation should be enacted in a way that allows white people to feel comfortable with any changes; Brown would be hesitant to allow for some alteration to the constitution that would make white people feel unjustly treated so he uses this as an excuse to allow for the continued unjust treatment of blacks.

Covert racist language continued to make public appearances right up to the eve of the passing of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill. Mississippi Senator James Eastland, viewed by some as "The Voice of the White South," was interviewed by Mike Wallace on several racial relations issues, including segregation, voting rights and the Ku Klux Klan. This interview took place

during an era when the first Civil Rights Act was being debated in the US government.

Eastland's statements present evidence of the existence of this type of racist discourse at the time

this interview was performed, in 1957.

> […] This doctrine of the separation of the races has been involved over many years by both races. It's not something that one race has imposed on another race. It's not a badge of inferiority, or superiority […]
>
> It's found, throughout the years, you have more harmony and the races can make more progress under a system of separate [facilities] […]
>
> I'm suggesting that the vast majority of Negroes want their own schools, their own hospitals, their own churches, their own restaurants […]
>
> The races segregate themselves on buses. […]
>
> Well, Mike, I am against any organization which indulges, which promotes racial and religious prejudice, hatred and bigotry […]
>
> Well, what we are fighting for is a great principle and that is for each state to handle its own domestic affairs. If the North wants segregation, integration, it's their affair […] we just want the right to handle it in our state for the best interest of all concerned […]

In these statements, James Eastland uses van Dijk's strategy of justification, as in the

phrase, "[separation of the races is] not something that one race has imposed on another race. It's

not a badge of inferiority, or superiority." After this claim that racial segregation has no racist

goals, Eastland goes on to explain that segregation simply functions better socially. This is an

example of justification because Eastland is either consciously or unconsciously averting the race

issue at hand to make his views seem rational, as opposed to racist. Eastland also uses top-down

transfer when he states, "The races segregate themselves on buses," which is an attempt to

demonstrate that racial segregation is not solely a product of whites' actions, but is also hoped

for and supported by blacks. This may be Eastland's way of placing the blame of racial

segregation on black prejudice towards whites, also called reverse discrimination. In addition,

Eastland employs apparent sympathy when he declares, "the vast majority of Negroes want their

own schools, their own hospitals, their own churches, their own restaurants," and "You have

more harmony and the races can make more progress under a system of separate [facilities]."

With these assertions, Eastland may claim to truly care about the needs of black people,

including their supposed desire for racially segregated spaces as well as a higher standard of

living: "harmony," when really this statement acts solely as a justification for the maintenance of

racial segregation, which in turn perpetuates white supremacy. Plus, Eastland makes use of

denial of racism: "I am against any organization which indulges, which promotes racial and

religious prejudice, hatred and bigotry." By stating that he opposes racist organizations, Eastland

is implying that he is impartial to race and, therefore, his statements are not prejudiced and

certainly not uttered for the purpose of promoting white superiority.

Opponents of the Civil Rights Bill used much covert racist language during the 1957

Congressional Hearings. For example, James P. Coleman, governor of the state of Mississippi

stated,

> If [lynching] is nonexistent and if we do not propose to lynch anybody,
> which we do not, why should we care about it being passed and enacted into law?
> It would not mean anything. Well, it would be an unnecessary invasion of the
> rights of the States to convict and punish for the crime of murder […]
> In other words, it would be saying, "While you have been inactive for
> many years, we hereby brand you in the archives of the Nation and before the
> eyes of the world as a bunch of unreformed, congenital lynchers who are only
> looking for another opportunity to start it again […]
> I do not think the white people should be condemned because a few of
> their number have gone out and violated the law against the wishes and the will of
> the great overwhelming majority of the people" (Coleman 1957).

In his statement, Coleman uses a few types of covert racist language, one of which is

justification. In the statement, "Well, it would be an unnecessary invasion of the rights of the

States […]," Coleman attempts to transform the conversation about race into a conversation

about states' rights, making his racist comment into a seemingly more rational argument that is

harder to dismiss as prejudiced. Coleman additionally uses top-down transfer: "I do not think the

white people should be condemned because a few of their number have gone out and violated the law […]." Coleman's assertion appears to be an attempt to place the blame of discrimination elsewhere, which in this case, is on the federal government. According to Coleman, southern whites are the true victims of unfair prejudice, since the government is discriminating against all white people for the behavior of a few white criminals.

The above political discourse fragments from before the 1960s corroborate my hypothesis that covert racist language was employed long before the Civil Rights Movement. Examples of covert racist discourse following the Civil Rights Act will be helpful in elucidating how covert racist discourse has evolved since the US's early years as a nation. The following section fulfills that purpose.

Rand Paul, as candidate for senator from the state of Kentucky, has made various statements that fall into van Dijk's categories of covert racist discourse. In an interview to a local newspaper in 2010, Rand Paul voiced his reasons for objecting the Civil Rights Act of 1964 if he had been in the Senate at that time. Though he claimed he does not disagree with the entire piece of legislation, Paul did state the following:

> What about freedom of speech? Should we limit speech from people we find abhorrent? Should we limit racists from speaking? I don't want to be associated with those people, but I also don't want to limit their speech in any way in the sense that we tolerate boorish and uncivilized behavior because that's one of the things that freedom requires is that we allow people to be boorish and uncivilized, but that doesn't mean we approve of it.
> Well what it gets into then is if you decide that restaurants are publicly owned and not privately owned, then do you say that you should have the right to bring your gun into a restaurant even though the owner of the restaurant says, 'Well no, we don't want to have guns in here' […] Does the owner of the restaurant own his restaurant? Or the does government own his restaurant? (qtd. in Wingfield 2010).

In this quotation, Paul uses fairness as a covert racist strategy. He makes a critique of the new Civil Rights bill on the grounds that illegalizing discrimination violates freedoms of speech

and of private property, which are founding principles of the constitution. He does not even speak about the implied race issue, except to question "Should we limit racists from speaking?" In this example, as in other instances of this type of covert racist discourse, the speaker refuses or fails to acknowledge that providing whites with a simple "right," such as choosing their clientele based on any characteristic, may have detrimental effects on the rights of other, more vulnerable people, such as blacks.

Other recent legislation has similarly prompted debates characterized by the occasional use of covert racist discourse. Representatives in the state of Alabama have recently been employing covert racist language to endorse Alabama's new and incredibly strict law on immigration. This law, the constitutionality of which is currently being challenged, is reminiscent of some of anti-integration laws in the years before the Civil Rights Act was passed. Supporters of Alabama's law, on the other hand, claim that it has nothing to do with race.

In response to doubts about the law, Alabama Governor Robert Bentley asked, "Why are we getting all the publicity? I think it has to do with Alabama's past and the perception that people have of Alabama over the years that don't live in our state and really don't recognize the amount of progress we've made in Alabama over the last 50 to 60 years" (qtd. in Fox News Latino 2011). Bentley's statement, thought only a few sentences in duration, includes multiple types of covert racist discourse, one of which is positive self-presentation. He aims his description of Alabama's race relations at creating an image of the state as one that has greatly improved in terms of its racial relations. Accordingly, Bentley seems to imply that Alabama should be praised as opposed to criticized. Bentley's use of positive self-presentation may overlap with the strategy denial of racism. He seems to state that, since Alabama has ameliorated its stance on race, "over the last 50 to 60 years," this proves an absence of racism and therefore

proves that the state's new immigration law is similarly impartial. Bentley additionally employs top-down transfer. His question, "Why are we getting all the publicity?" makes the claim that Alabama is being unjustly criticized for being racist. In other words, Bentley seems to imply that, contrary to the arguments of the new law's adversaries, Alabama is not the prejudiced party, and that those who criticize Alabama unfairly for its past are the ones truly guilty of discrimination. Lastly, justification may also play a role in Bentley's statements. His use of the fact that Alabama has progressed racially seems to move away from the true issue at hand: that racism still poses a problem.

Another politician supporting Alabama's new law, Senator Scott Beason, also made covertly racist comments. He asserted, "There are people who try to make racism a cottage industry and profit off it, but I would put the harmony in Alabama up against any place in the country" (qtd. in Fox News Latino 2011). In this one sentence there are at least two types of covert racist discourse. Beason uses top-down transfer to illustrate that others may be racist, or use racism to their advantage, but Beason is simply not one of these people. Evidently, this is also an example of denial of racism, which is rendered even stronger when Beason condemns others' prejudice. Towards the end of his utterance, Beason also employs positive self-presentation. He states that Alabama actually has better race relations than any other location nationwide: "I would put the harmony in Alabama up against any place in the country." Beason's point is to paint himself and Alabama as morally good and therefore undeserving of criticism when it comes to racial relations in the state.

The political discourse cited in these sections on overt and covert racist language contradicts the claim of sociologists discussed and critiqued early on in this paper that covert racist discourse is a new phenomenon that has replaced the overt racist language of old. These

public statements corroborate my hypothesis that both covert and overt racist language has been

evident in public discourse since before the Civil Rights Era. Further, the examples show that

these two types of racist discourse have been used since at least the early 1800's, implying that

there has been a continuity of linguistic strategies for talking about race not only since before the

Civil Rights era, but possibly since the formal creation of the United States.

DISCUSSION

The uniformity of racist language since long before the 1960s indicates a correspondence

even more evident than that of consistent types of covert racism. In some of these examples,

politicians from more than a century ago even employed the same words when communicating a

message. Produced below are two representations of comparable racist language usage from the

examples used above.

For one, Bilbo's statement demanding that all southern whites keep blacks from voting is

similar to Peck's statement on undocumented immigrants. Bilbo, in 1946, stated, "I call on every

red-blooded white man to use any means to keep the niggers away from the polls[;] if you don't

understand what that means you are just plain dumb" (qtd. in Fleegler 2006), while Peck, in

2011, declared, "If shooting these immigrating feral hogs works, maybe we have found a

[solution] to our illegal immigration problem" (qtd. in Associated Press 2011). These two

statements incite violence towards people of color for the purpose of excluding them: blacks

from the polls, and latinos from the US.

By the same token, resemblances between eras come up in the language used by Judge

Brown before the Civil Rights movement and used by Rand Paul in the 21st century. In his

statement to the court during the 1896 trial of Plessy v. Ferguson, Brown stated:

> "The object of the [14th] amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the
> absolute equality of the two races before the law, but, in the nature of things, it

could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either.

In determining the question of reasonableness, it is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people, and with a view to the promotion of their comfort, and the preservation of the public peace and good order.

Then, over a century later, in 2010, Rand Paul declared:

Well what it gets into then is if you decide that restaurants are publicly owned and not privately owned, then do you say that you should have the right to bring your gun into a restaurant even though the owner of the restaurant says, 'Well no, we don't want to have guns in here' […] Does the owner of the restaurant own his restaurant? Or the does government own his restaurant?
(qtd. in Wingfield 2010).

Both Brown and Paul, seem to be discussing the same legislation: the 14th amendment's requirement that all people, regardless of race, sex, or religion, be treated the same. Although these two political figures made these statements in two different periods in history, they both claim that this obligation actually hinders whites' rights. Both declarations make the point that discrimination based on race is acceptable if it allows the people to feel comfortable and preserves public order.

Nevertheless, nearly identical rhetoric does not prove that racism has remained static over a time span of at least two centuries. Although the politicians who enunciated these examples used similar discourse techniques to talk about race, it is quite possible that they did so with different goals in mind. Accepting that speakers for the past couple of centuries have had a choice between two repertoires of racist discourse strategies – overt and covert – there must be some sort of strategy behind choosing one type of racist language over the other.

COVERT VS. OVERT LINGUISTIC STRATEGY

Searching for the motive behind using a racist discourse strategy presupposes the intentionality of prejudice in language. Some sociologists do make this claim that racist language

can be consciously exploited for various purposes (Coates 2008; Graham 1996; Van Dijk 2006,

Winter 2008). As a contentious issue in US politics, race has powerful potential to gain support

or cause damage to political adversaries. Politicians have evidently noticed that race-related

policy and speech awakens passionate feelings among the US electorate, suggesting that these

politicians may use racist discourse as a tool for public manipulation (Edsall 1991; Myers 2005;

Santa Ana 2002). This section on discourse strategy demonstrates through several examples that

racist language may be exploited for political gain.

OVERT STRATEGY

Before the Civil Rights Era, some politicians did use overt racist discourse as a tactic to

gain public support. George Wallace was one of many Southern politicians who noticed the

potential gain as a result of overtly racist statements. Explaining his experiences with overt racist

language, Wallace stated in 1963, "I tried to talk about good roads and good schools and all these

things that have been a part of my career, and nobody listened. And then I began talking about

niggers, and they stomped the floor" (qtd. in Stekler 2000). Although they perhaps did not so

explicitly explain their intended goal in using racist language, it seems that other politicians in

the pre–Civil Rights Era similarly employed overt racist discourse with a purpose, especially in

the southern states.

Early in the 20th century, the heavy majority of the electorate in the Deep South

supported the Democratic Party, which had traditionally been the party of white southerners

(Zwiers 2007). In this political atmosphere, candidates of the Democratic Party had to find a way

to draw attention to themselves as the better representatives of the white South for the purpose of

winning Democratic primaries and elected state positions. One way a politician could fulfill this goal is by modifying his or her use of language on race.

The use of overt racist discourse by James Eastland, senator of Mississippi, apparently had the effect of gaining extra political support. During Eastland's political career, the large majority of Mississippi residents supported the Jim Crow Laws and racial segregation but rich plantation owners and the politicians representing them, such as Eastland, typically stayed away from the overtly racist language of populists from counties of mainly poor whites (Zwiers 2007). When Eastland began his political career in the early 1940's, his main support came from the wealthy elite in the state. In order to beat his opponents, often politicians who represented the lower classes of Mississippi, Eastland had to appeal to poor whites from the hills, who had acquired political clout in the early 1900's (Zwiers 2007). During his campaigns for Senate, Eastland made overtly racist comments such stating that the National Democrats and National Republicans were both, "[…] trying to force an interracial society upon our people. Their aim is integration and racial mongrelization" (Zwiers 2007). Stepping outside of the typical linguistic strategy on race for politicians of his kind, Eastland likely won votes through his use of overt racist discourse. Whether or not his conscious intention was to mobilize white resentment towards blacks and demonstrate his focus on the needs of working class whites over blacks in the state, Eastland's overt racist strategy helped his political campaigns (2007).

Racist discourse also played an important role in the presidential election of 1948. Strom Thurmond ran for US president on the ticket for the new States' Rights Party, also known as the Dixiecrats, a party created in response to the Democratic Party's announcement in 1948 that it would take a pro-civil rights stance. Strom Thurmond needed to take a large number of the Democratic Party's votes in order to win the election. Therefore, Thurmond may have used overt

racist language for the purpose of distancing himself from the Democratic presidential candidate, Harry S. Truman. During his campaign, Thurmond gave speeches playing on the racism of southern whites fearful of impending integration occasionally using overt racist discourse: "I wanna tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that there's not enough troops in the army to force the Southern people to break down segregation and admit the nigger race into our theaters, into our swimming pools, into our homes and into our churches" (Noah 2002). Although he lost the election to Truman, Strom Thurmond and the States' Rights Party won four states central to the Deep South, demonstrating the political potential the issue of race has as a galvanizing point (Edsall 1991).

Comparably, overt racist language was an important part of Theodore Bilbo's career as Senator of Mississippi. As the examples provided show, Bilbo was know for his use of overt racist discourse. According to Robert L. Fleegler (2006), it was this type of language that, in the late 1930s, aided Bilbo in his campaigns for support in Mississippi, and in the mid 1940s caused the downfall of Bilbo's career. From his article, it seems that the senator's adversaries were mostly members of the white elite: other senators, politicians, and the media. However, until the end of his career, Bilbo was still supported by his main electorate: working class whites, and not excluding those outside of the south. At least for Bilbo, overtly racist language had already become detrimental to one's political career in the early and late 1940s. Nevertheless, despite whatever political damage was caused by Bilbo's blatant racism, his base support remained the same, demonstrating that although other politicians and the media can manipulate an adversary's racist language to tarnish his career, racist language still may be used as a tool for gaining support among white voters.

One possible benefit of covert racist discourse, as opposed to overt, is that its use may not include the negative aspects of mobilizing white resentment: revealing oneself to public criticism. If Bilbo had realized this, perhaps he would have stopped using overt racist language and would have replaced all his blatant prejudiced speech with more subtly racist utterances. It is likely for mainly these reasons, fear of public criticism and subsequent loss of support, that overt racist language seems to have declined since over the course of the 20th century (Leach 2005; Schumann 1997; Bobo 1993)

COVERT STRATEGY

As the 1960s approached, the black vote gained political clout and the US public's awareness of the need for change in race relations grew (Nichols 2011). Politicians needed to change their racist language strategies if they hoped to capture the vote of blacks and pro-civil rights whites. At this point, when users of overt racist discourse began to be publicly denounced, politicians (especially at the national level) needed a strategy that could subtly win votes from whites resentful against blacks in the both the north and south, as well as win votes from the younger, more progressive electorate.

James Eastland's rhetoric greatly changed after the Civil Rights movement, likely due to a shift in public opinion on the issue of race relations, as well as increasing numbers of enfranchised blacks (Zwiers 2007). During his campaign for election Mississippi senator in 1972, Eastland seemed to avoid making overtly racist statements. According Zwiers (2007), this change in rhetoric was intended to appeal to all of the state's electorate, as opposed to appealing to solely white resentment. Differences in Eastland's use of language during this campaign included dropping his formerly blatant and unmoving stance for racial segregation, thanking rich, poor, white, black, red and yellow for their support after winning Mississippi primaries, and

focused his discourse on the state's young people and the hope in store for the future. Eastland did win the election, but by a narrow margin compared to past elections.

By the time of the 1968 presidential election, the National Republican Party had regrouped and had learned important lessons from the last election of 1964, in which Republican candidate Goldwater lost the presidency to Lyndon Johnson: appealing to white resentment through more subtle language could capture Goldwater's votes and also attract white moderates from the Democratic Party (Mayer 2001). Nixon's tactical mobilization of Goldwater's support in the south – known as his southern strategy – focused on race covertly with an anti-civil rights and anti-integration stance (Mayer 2001). Nixon purposefully manipulated racial relations to cause a rift in the traditional Democratic Party electorate: working class whites and blacks (Graham1996). H. R. Haldeman, a Nixon advisor, wrote diary entries during Nixon's presidency. On April 28, 1969, Haldeman wrote Nixon's views of welfare stating, "[Nixon] emphasized that you have to face the fact that the *whole* problem really is the blacks. The key is to devise a system that recognizes this while not appearing to. Problem with overall welfare plan is that it forces poor whites into same position as blacks." Later in the entry, Haldeman writes Nixon's opinion that "there has never in history been an adequate black nation, and they are the only race of which this is true" (Graham 1996). These entries, although not direct quotations, imply Nixon's use of overt racist language in private conversation. However, when it comes to public discourse, Nixon was careful to keep his racism discreet. For example, in 1968, in response to the Brown v. Board of Education decision, Nixon stated that he supported the decision, but,

> […] while that decision dealt with segregation and said that we would not have segregation, when you go beyond that and say it is the responsibility of the federal government, and the federal courts, to, in effect, act as local school districts in determining how we carry that out, and then to use the power of the federal treasury to withhold funds or give funds in order to carry it out, then I think we are going too far […] (qtd. in Edsall 1991).

Nixon's use of covert racism allowed him to exploit white resentment against blacks for his own

political gain, while also maintaining his public image as impartial to race.

The Southern strategy in national US politics continued to be an important part of

subsequent presidential elections. At this point in US history, employing explicit racism could

mean the end of one's political career (Edsall 1991). President Ronald Reagan, however, found

other more subtle and perhaps more successful ways of appealing to white resentment to

galvanize support for his 1980 and 1984 presidential elections and during his presidency. Reagan

acquired verbal techniques by further refining the racist rhetoric of previous conservative

politicians, such as Richard Nixon (Edsall 1991). One of Reagan's perfected tactics was racial

code or metaphor, which Coates describes as, "subtle words typically […] used to describe

crime, welfare payments, drug abuse, or out of wedlock births" (2008). These code words often

completely avoid any verbal acknowledgement of the issue of race, but still manage to awaken

resentment among whites, turning white voters to the speaker's favor. For these reasons, coded

racism, or racist metaphor, should fall into the category of covert racist language even though

Teun A. van Dijk does not mention metaphor in his article. For example, Reagan is well-known

for his use of the coded racist term, "welfare queen." According to a Washington Monthly article

from 2003, "Reagan told the story of the 'Chicago welfare queen' who had 80 names, 30

addresses, 12 Social Security cards, and collected benefits for 'four nonexisting deceased

husbands,'" (qtd. in Coates 2008). Coates (2008), among others, argues that the use of this term

is in fact an appeal to racism in an attempt to gain white support for minimizing government

programs and, subsequently, support for re-election (Reese 2005; Winter 2008). Another of

Reagan's covert racist metaphors is the use of the term "special interests" or "groups" to

designate all minority groups as the primary focus of the Democratic Party, as in his 1984 speech

to the Republican convention: "Is there any doubt that [the democrats] will raise our taxes? […] We're here to see that government continues to serve the people and not the other way around. Yes, government should do all that is necessary, but only that which is necessary. We don't lump people by groups or special interests" (qtd. in Edsall 1991). This argument was powerful due to its historical context: economic recession and high unemployment. Working class whites were angered by the possibility that people of color could be given more help than they in finding a job through affirmative action legislation. Therefore, to these whites, "special interests" signified reverse discrimination in the favor of minorities, causing many whites to vote Republican in the 1984 election (Edsall 1991).

According to Nicholas J. G. Winter (2008), the potency of such racist metaphors lies in their exploitation of black stereotypes from slavery, which have been ingrained into the human brain through a socialization process that will be discussed in a following section. The effectiveness of such metaphors lies in their ability to tap into the white voter's subconscious, perhaps by-passing any conscious realization that race is a factor in an utterance, resulting in a tool with incredible political potential. The manipulation of the public's subconscious through racist metaphor allowed Reagan to create a new electorate: the Reagan Democrats (Winter 2008). This white constituency of Reagan support were traditionally Democrats who supported government spending for social programs and help for the working class, but were convinced through control of their resentment towards blacks, to vote Republican, and therefore against benefits and their own economic and political interests. In this way, Reagan very effectively used covert racist language to galvanize voter support for his campaign and is now known as one of the most popular presidents in US history (Edsall 1991).

BOTH OVERT AND COVERT STRATEGY

Although it may seem that overt examples or covert examples of a politician's speech implies that he, as a rule, always uses that type of discourse for his purposes, this is not necessarily the case. Politicians and other public figures that use overt racist language may also use covert racist language, as is demonstrated earlier in some of the examples of racist speech. The fact that politicians have often made assertions in which they use both covert and overt racist discourse suggests that the strategies associated with the two types are not necessarily separate, but interrelated.

Jefferson's statement in 1814 on slavery is one example in which the two types of racist discourse appear together. He does employ apparent sympathy to claim that blacks should be slaves for their own good, but not until after he states that, "[blacks] are by their habits rendered as incapable as children of taking care of themselves […] they are pests in society by their idleness, and the depredations to which this leads them. Their amalgamation with the other color produces a degradation to which no lover of his country […] can innocently consent." This overtly racist comment preceding Jefferson's use of covert racism, demonstrates that the two types may be working together for the same strategic purpose.

Covert racism takes on the same role in Jackson's statement "On Indian Removal." While it is true that, as has already been explained, Jackson uses much covert racist language to justify his forced removal of Native Americans from their land, there are also clear examples of overt racism in this same address. At one point, Jackson qualifies Native Americans as "wandering savage[s]." Today this label would be considered a racial slur and Jackson almost certainly would be publicly denounced as racist. Jackson's example therefore demonstrates once again that overt and covert racist language can each play a role in the same utterance.

The same type of interaction between covert and overt racist discourse occurs yet again in Lincoln's 1854 speech at Peoria, Illinois. Although Lincoln explains that he views slavery as unjust and that, given the opportunity, he would choose to free all the slaves, he then asks and answers this rhetorical question, "What next? Free them and make them politically and socially, our equals? My own feelings will not admit to this; [...]". This example, like those of Jefferson and Jackson, corroborates the postulation that these two forms of racist discourse are not exact opposites, but must also at least occasionally work together.

The overlap of covert and overt racist discourse proposes that both may be used for some strategic purpose. In these statements, which – within my research – all take place before the Civil Rights Era, covert racist language appears to take on the role of justifying overt racist language or overt racist action, such as slavery or segregation. This would mean that, when public overt racist discourse was widely accepted, covert racist language was also employed as an argument for an overtly racist cause. For example, one could state that slavery is morally acceptable not only because blacks are naturally inferior to whites (overt racism), but also because slavery allows blacks to be well-fed (apparent sympathy). However, as overt racism grew increasingly taboo in public discourse, the strategy behind covert racist language use also may have changed. All of the examples of post–Civil Rights Era covert racist discourse above lack overt racist language. Therefore it seems from at least these fragments that politicians stopped using covert racist language as a justification for overt racist language once overt racism became less socially acceptable. As a result, covert racist discourse after the Civil Rights Movement appears to have gained a role independent of overt racism; now, as opposed to justifying overt racism, covert racist language may be employed with a racist means, but with an attempt to conceal one's prejudice enough to avoid confrontation. In other words, the role of

covert racist language after the Civil Rights Era may have transformed from justification of overt racism to the conveyance of a subtly racist message without accountability.

These demonstrations of the use of racist discourse in US politics indicate the great power that racist language has as a galvanizing tactic. The issue of race caused many changes within the US political parties, as well as their supporting constituencies. During some presidential campaigns, it even seems that the race issue alone is contentious enough to decide the election's outcome (Edsall 1991). From employing overt racism to differentiate oneself from other racially conservative candidates, to using covert racism to conceal overtly racist beliefs, to creating emblematic metaphors that send a subliminal message to whites, candidates have enhanced their skill in employing racism as a tactic for political power. While the racist metaphors discussed in this section are not included in Teun A. van Dijk's list of covert racist language, they still act as covert racism. Manipulating the public by activating subconscious white resentment towards blacks, politicians have gotten better at using racist metaphor while also effectively evading public criticism (Winter 2008).

In this section, all the possible strategies discussed were assumed to be premeditated usages of racist language. However, intentionality is an incredibly difficult phenomenon to test for and to prove. The inability to confirm one's intentions is even more complicated by the fact that almost all people accused of racism deny culpability, even many of the politicians from long before the Civil Rights Era that we consider overtly racist today (Newby 1965). While this information does not corroborate the existence or inexistence of strategy behind racist language, it does present a question for study: could racist language simply be a product of the unconscious or subconscious mind? The next section delves into this issue.

UNCONSCIOUS RACISM

Some sociologists who study racism neglect the issue of intent. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, for one, simply states, "The intentions of individual actors are largely irrelevant to the explanation of social outcomes" (2006: 54). By avoiding this topic, theorists of racism disregard an aspect of racist language that has powerful potential in fostering a clearer understanding of prejudice in the human mind. The issue of whether prejudiced language is intentional or not also raises other important points deserving of reflection, such as the question of possible legal sanctions for those who purposely use racist language and the issue of removing racism as a pillar in US society if racist discourse is an accidental manifestation of subconscious prejudice. On the other hand, some theorists do explore strategic purpose in their work. For example, by stating that politicians must carefully prepare all planned public statements, Teun A. van Dijk implies that racist political discourse is a strategic, conscious attempt to appeal to the electorate's prejudice (1997).

Racist discourse may moreover be the manifestation of subconscious or unconscious prejudice. In other words, racist language may not be a tool at all, but rather, completely unintentional. Although racist language is quite a common phenomenon, the vast majority of people claim that they are impartial to race (Haskell 2009). This contradiction suggests that perhaps covert racist language speakers are not purposely concealing their racist agendas, but are in fact inadvertently exposing prejudices of which they are unaware. According to Lawrence, as members of society, we are all racist (1987). Starting at a very young age, we are bombarded with parents' speech, media, and all forms of discourse to which a child has access. From these messages, humans learn their social realities, which, because they are so ingrained in our culture and taught to us so early in our lives, are not remembered as lessons and are instead taken for granted as truth (Cook 1993). Through this process of socially acquiring prejudice, individuals

and whole societies then use the models they've absorbed to reproduce racist discourse in their own speech. As a result, racist messages have become part of a teaching and learning closed feedback loop, into which all individuals are born and then unintentionally reproduce (van Dijk 1997).

The occurrence of racist gaffes, or supposedly thoughtless verbalizations of racial slurs, further supports the claim that unintentional racist language is an existing phenomenon. These blatant manifestations of overt racism are often, if not always, assumed or claimed to be mistakes and unrelated to the speaker's true feelings on race (Hill 2008). A racist gaffe uttered in public could ruin one's career, as it did for pundit Don Imus in 2007, when he used the term "nappy-headed hoes" on his talk show to refer to black female basketball players and as it did for politician George Allen, who publicly denounced the employee of a political opponent as a "macaca" in 2006 (qtd. in Hill 2008). The large incentive to avoid racist slurs in the public sphere strongly suggests that gaffes are accidents, as opposed to carefully calculated strategies. The inadvertent verbalization of subconscious or unconscious prejudice is not always so blatantly overt; covert racist language may also be unintentional. Like some overt racist discourse, covert racist language also may function outside of the conscious knowledge of the speaker (Coates 2008). Because of the process of racist socialization, even an individual who does not view himself as prejudiced has built his realities on the base of racist messages and is therefore susceptible to using racist language of either the overt or covert variety. A main difference between unintentional covert racist language and gaffes or slurs is that the racism in a covertly racist statement is more likely to bypass the consciousness of the listeners as well the consciousness of the speaker (Coates 2008).

Politicians and other members of the elite who control the US media have realized the potential of racism to circumvent whites' consciousness and play on stereotypes and prejudices of which they are not even aware. Through the exploitation of racist stereotypes, politicians may be able to manipulate the white public into making decisions based on prejudice without white voters realizing that their racial schemas are being activated or that race is even influencing their thought processes (Winter 2008). Conservative think tanks, for example, concoct racist language strategy that will be effective in galvanizing public support for politicians and their policies. These think tanks exploit subconscious levels of white resentment to convince the public that government regulations, including those regarding civil rights and affirmative action, are unnecessary and even harmful to the public's needs (Wilson 1996). In this way, the nation's elite including politicians and corporations, manipulate the public into making decisions according to their subconscious prejudice as opposed to basing political support on their own needs and wants.

Politicians' tactic of using racism to manipulate public opinion is detrimental to the goal of ridding society of prejudice. Racist language has so much social power, that according to Mark Lawrence McPhail, the use of an analytical approach to racist language and its relationship to the perpetuation of racism in society is, "the most important development in contemporary race relations" (2002). The use of racist discourse manipulates not only the thoughts of the listener, but also alters the speaker's level of impartiality, to the point that any attempts at destroying racial stereotypes and building an impartial society seem futile (McPhail 2002). Plus, political language that manipulates white resentment is often repeated by those unaware of its racist message. Through this process, then, of politicians exploiting racist language to manipulate public opinion, racist discourse is repeated and reproduced, in turn further ingraining prejudice

into the minds of both those who use this language and those who hear it (McPhail 2002; Myers 2005).

THE SEARCH FOR A SOLUTION

The outlook for terminating racism and racist language in our society seems quite bleak. One solution could include punishing those who purposely exploit public racism for their own ends. However, as noted by Lawrence, intentionality is difficult, if not impossible, to test for (1987). Nevertheless, racist language that is used accidentally or inadvertently is not necessarily any less harmful than racist language that is used purposefully (Lawrence 1987; Coates 2007; Cook 1993). On one hand, since white US citizens have undergone similar processes of race socialization and therefore must have very similar unconscious and subconscious schemas regarding race, they may be unable to detect the racism in a message. People of color, on the other hand, often recognize the inadvertent racist comments that whites fail to notice. The victims of such statements are regardless of intent or rare apology by the speaker still receives the same racist message (Lawrence 1987). Therefore, the subconscious or unconscious nature of racist speech does not excuse its use and certainly does not lessen the effects on its victims.

Also because the socialization process is different for whites and for people of color, members of minority groups face complications when attempting to confront speakers of covert racist discourse. While people of color are likely to recognize a prejudiced statement as racist, whites usually do not consciously notice the racial slights in the same utterance, implying that people of color are more likely to make an accusation, and in turn, be disregarded by the white speaker and his white listeners (Hardisty 1999; Lawrence 1987). The responsibility of proof falls to the victim and, since testing for intentionality is difficult or impossible, the accuser is often simply brushed aside as overly sensitive or as playing the race card as a ploy for attention

(Lawrence 1987). Whites have become truly adept at fending off racist accusations, having worked at perfecting their counter-argument tactics for decades. One such strategy was performed by Donald Trump in 2010 when denying accusations of racism: "I am the least racist person there is […] and I think most people who know me would tell you that. I am the least racist. I've had great relationships […]" (qtd. in Huffington Post 2011). Another way to evade an accusation of racism is by way of personal attack. In a 2008 CNN interview with Lou Dobbs, Janet Murguia, President of the National Council of La Raza, accused Dobbs of racism. Dobbs responded by changing the course of the conversation with the attack: "No, you're trying to stifle speech" (qtd. in Chiang 2010). These methods of denying racism employed by Trump and Dobbs allow for the perpetrator of racist language to turn the conversation around and play the victim by personally attacking the accuser as immoral or overly sensitive. The many perfected tactics employed to defend oneself from racist accusations render public admonishment of racist language ineffective and sometimes even counter-productive, reproducing the ideas behind white racism (Hill 2008).

The solution to racist language and its pervasive power in politics and society as whole has been elusive. One postulated solution is that whites should become "race traitors" (Bonilla-Silva 2006). In this way, whites can render covert racism as much a social taboo as overt racist. As a result, whites will supposedly feel pressured to end their own use of racist language for fear of public embarrassment and other possible negative effects. However, there are multiple reasons why blatantly reproving one for his linguistic prejudice is counter-productive. One of these reasons, as explained above, is that whites have become so skilled at using tactics as counter-arguments that public reprimands are futile. Secondly, labeling whites as racists gives the accusing whites a higher moral ground that allows them to claim impartiality. This reverts

back to the issue of viewing racial discrimination as an individual issue and a moral abnormality, as opposed to a widespread societal problem by which at least all whites have been socialized. If a solution to racism exists, it must take society's culpability and the participation of all white people into account, as opposed to putting the blame on other individuals. Lastly, as demonstrated by Jane Hill (2008), even public reproach of overtly racist slurs and gaffes may not produce desired effects. Rarely met with a sincere apology, these accusations are often simply brushed aside. In short, denouncing a speaker's prejudice often does not do what it must if there is hope for change: encourage whites to self-reflect on their own racism – whether conscious or subconscious – and take steps towards ridding racism from their words, actions, and thoughts (Goodman 2010).

Instead of disparaging others for being racist, it may be more effective for whites to learn to talk about race in a more contemplative manner. According to McPhail, the sole possibility for terminating prejudice is attacking the problem at its source of reproduction: discourse. He states, "The social, economic, and political conflicts which continue to define racial interaction suggest that we need to address the underlying issues which circumscribe race relations in terms of the relationship between race and rhetoric, and in the light of the possibility of constructing alternative social realities through language" (2002). In other words, a solution to racism must work to change the realities we verbally reproduce by transforming our discourse and the way we talk about race. As opposed to prompting accusatory, uncomfortable and defensive dialogue, discussions on race could instead guide whites to thoughtfully come to terms with their own racism and support their fellow community members experience the same process. This process needs to begin in the early stages of life, which would include parents discussing race and racism with their children, as well as textbooks and teachers acknowledging the role that white privilege

has played in US history, and continue through adulthood in the form of thoughtful dialogue, questions, and mutual respect. It is especially important that white elites, such as politicians, pundits and other who have access to the media, participate in and contribute to a new kind of racial socialization, for they have the opportunity to make change at an institutional level. Those in power may do this by changing the culture of public accusations, blaming, defensiveness, and excuses into one of listening for real understanding and apology (Hill 2008). As white individuals develop race consciousness, they may begin to notice and take responsibility for the racial injustices inherent to our society. They may even start to notice covert racist discourse as problematic and begin fruitful discussions and thought processes. In this way, hopefully race consciousness may take hold and disseminate, as white individuals contemplate their prejudice, listen, ask, apologize, and take responsibility for their own racist discourse.

CONCLUSION

Many of those who have studied and written about racist language recognize that the existence of covert racism today disproves those theorists such as D'Souza, who claim that the US has seen an end to institutional racism. Considering the effect that that this popular fallacy has on public policy and programs that provide aid to victims of discrimination, the question of whether or not prejudice still poses a problem is an important point of contention. The examples of racist public speech in this paper provide evidence that racism has not experienced much transformation in the past couple of centuries. However, the few changes that have occurred are of interest: while overt racist discourse has decreased over the course the 20th century, the role of covert racist discourse has been slightly modified. While before the Civil Rights Era, covert racist language was often used as a justification for overt racist language or overt racist policy, it now appears often as a way of concealing the speaker's prejudice. Still, in spite of the changes,

both overt and covert racist language were employed in the pre–Civil Rights Era, and continue to be used today.

Several other implications stem from the question: why have so many experts, while creating their lists of covert racist strategies and categorizing tactics into frames used to propagate color blind racist ideas, failed to notice that covert racism is not a new phenomenon? One reason could be that prejudice in language is incredibly difficult to detect, and it seems to be growing even sneakier. Metaphors, for example, are sly strategies by which politicians are able to mobilize whites' prejudiced resentment without them even noticing that their racial schema is being provoked. Therefore, it is possible that even students of racist language occasionally overlook covert racism. Also, the distinction between the two types of linguistic strategies is not as explicit as it first seems. Many utterances that scholars such as Bonilla-Silva or Jane H. Hill may label as overtly racist could be asserted by a speaker who views him or herself as completely impartial. (Newby 1965). While intentionality is not a defining aspect of overt racism, the denial of racism does make the issue more complicated as well as more difficult to identify as racist. It seems nearly impossible to know if the speaker is purposely hiding his or her prejudice, if the listener is overly sensitive, or if the speaker is accidentally expressing subconscious feelings about race. More likely the reason why sociologists have failed to notice that both covert and overt racist discourse have played an important role in political speech for centuries is the fact that white racism allows for the persistent reproduction of white racism, undetected by those who engage in and sustain it.

The difficulty that sociologists and linguists experience in determining what racism is and how racist language manifests itself demonstrates the simple fact that those who study racism are, like all other members of society, also subject to its curse (Lawrence 1987). Therefore, these

theorists, similar to many white US citizens, fail to seriously contemplate the role racism plays in their thoughts, decisions and daily lives. This presents a serious pitfall to any solution for curing our communities of prejudice, proving further the need to break the closed feedback cycle of racist socialization and move away from accusations of prejudice towards listening and learning about race.

References

Altavena, Lily. 2011, June 20. "College Board Finds Minority Men Continue to Lag

      Academically." The New York Times. Retrieved from:

http://thechoice.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/20/college-board-findings-on-minority-men/

Associated Press. 2011, March 25. "Kansas Rep: Illegal Immigrants Should Be 'Shot Like

Hogs.'" News One. Retrieved from: http://newsone.com/nation/associatedpress2/virgil-

peck-resignation-petition-illegal-immigrants-shoot-like-

hogs/#TB_inline?height=514&width=455&inlineId=customer-feedback&modal=true.

Baksh, Stokely, and Jamilah King. 2011, September 16. "Poverty Rate Hits New High as Racial

Inequality Deepens." Colorlines. Retrieved from:

http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/09/more_americans_living_in_poverty_as_rate_clim

bs.html

Bobo, Lawrence, and James R. Kluegel. 1993. "Opposition to Race-Targeting: Self-Interest,

Stratification Ideology, or Racial Attitudes?" *American Sociological Review*. 58:443-64.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence

of Racial Inequality in the United States. 2nd Ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Publishers, Inc.

Brown, Henry Billings. 1896, May 18. Plessy v. Ferguson, Judgement. Records of the Supreme

Court of the United States. Record Group 267; *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163, #15248. National

Archives. Retrieved from: http://ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=52

Chiang, Shiao-Yun. 2010. 'Well, I'm a lot of thing, but I'm sure not a bigot': Positive self-

presentation in confrontational discourse on racism. *Discourse & Society*. 21(3),

pp 273-294.

Coates, Rodney D. 2008. "Covert Racism in the USA and Globally." *Sociology Compass*. Vol.

2, No. 1, pp 208-231.

Coleman, James P. 1957. *Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the*

Judiciary, House of Representatives. 85th Cong. 725.

Cook, Anthony. 1993. "Cultural Racism and the Limits of Rationality in the Saga of Rodney
King." 70 Den. U. L. 297.

Cook, Eugene. 1957. *Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the
Judiciary, House of Representatives*. 85th Cong. 725.

D'Souza, Dinesh. 1995. <u>The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society</u>. New York,
NY: The Free Press.

Eastland, James. 1957, July 28. "The Mike Wallace Interview." Transcript. Collections. Harry
Ransom Center: The University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from:
http://www.hrc.utexas.edu/multimedia/video/2008/wallace/eastland_james_t.html

Edsall, Thomas Byrne, and Mary D. Edsall. 1991. <u>Chain Reaction : The Impact of Race, Rights,
and Taxes on American Politics</u>. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Fleegler, Robert L. 2006. "Theodore G. Bilbo and the Decline of Public Racism, 1938 – 1947."
Journal of Mississippi History 68, no. 1: 1 – 28.

Fox News Latino. 2011, October 29. "Alabama Immigration Battle Mirrors Civil Rights Era."

Goodman, Simon; Shani Burke. 2010. "'Oh you don't want asylum seekers, oh you're just
racist': A discursive analysis of discussions about whether it's racist to oppose asylum
seeking." *Discourse & Society*. 21(3). Pp 325-340.

Graham, Hugh Davis. 1996. "Richard Nixon and Civil Rights: Explaining an Enigma."
Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 26(1): pp 93-106.

Haskell, Robert E. 2009. "Unconscious linguistic referents to race: analysis and methodological
frameworks." *Discourse & Society*. Vol. 20(1): pp 59-84.

Hill, Jane H. 2008. <u>The Everyday Language of White Racism</u>. Wiley & Blackwell : Malden,

MA.

Huffington Press. 2011, May 9. "Donald Trump Responds to Charges of Racism (VIDEO)."

> Retrieved from: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/09/donald-trump-responds-to-
>
> _n_859392.html?view=screen

Jackson, Andrew. 1830, December 6. "On Indian Removal." Message to Congress. Records of

> the United States Senate, 1789-1990; National Archives. Retrieved from:
>
> http://ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=25

Jefferson, Thomas. 1814, August 25. "Emancipation and the Younger Generation." Electronic

> Text Center, University of Virginia Library. Retrieved from:
>
> http://etext.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccernew2?id=JefLett.sgm&images=images/modeng&dat
>
> a=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=230&division=div1

Krehbiel, Randy. 2011, April 27. "State House sends affirmative action ban to voters."

> Tulsa World. Retrieved from:
>
> http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/article.aspx?subjectid=11&articleid=20110427_11_0_
>
> TheOkl298226&rss_lnk=11

Lawrence III, Charles R. 1987. "The Id, the Ego, and Equal Protection: Reckoning with

> Unconscious Racism." *Stanford Law Review*. Vol. 39(2): pp 317-388.

Leach, Colin Wayne. 2005. "Against the Notion of a 'New Racism.'" *Journal of Community &*

> *Applied Social Psychology*. 15: 432-445.

Lincoln, Abraham. 1854, October 16. "Speech at Peoria, Illinois." Retrieved from:

> http://www.nps.gov/liho/historyculture/peoriaspeech.htm

Lincoln, Abraham. 1858, September 18. Fourth Debate: Charleston, Illinois. Lincoln Home

National Historic Site. National Park Service: US Department of the Interior. Retrieved

from: http://www.nps.gov/liho/historyculture/debate4.htm

Mauer, Mark. 2011. "Addressing Racial Disparities in Incarceration." The Prison Journal

Supplement to 91(3). Sage Publications. Retrieved from:

http://sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/Prison%20Journal%20-

%20racial%20disparity.pdf

Mayer, Jeremy D. 2001. "LBJ Fights the White Backlash: The Racial Politics of the 1964

Presidential Campaign." *Prologue Magazine.* Vol. 33, No. 1. Retrieved from

http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2001/spring/lbj-and-white-backlash-

1.html

Myers, Kristen. 2005. Racetalk: Racism Hiding in Plain Sight. Lanham, MD: Rowman &

Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). "Modern Racism, Ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale." In S.

L. Gaertner, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.). *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*. New York,

NY: Academic.

McPhail, Mark Lawrence. 2002. The Rhetoric of Racism Revisited: Reparations or Separations?

Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Newby, I. A. 1965. Jim Crow's Defense: Anti-Negro Thought in America, 1900-1930. Baton

Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Nichols, David A. 2011. Eisenhower 1956: The President's Year of Crisis: Suez and the Brink of

War. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Noah, Timothy. 2002, December 16. "The Legend of Strom's Remorse: A Washington lie is laid

to rest." Slate. Retrieved from:

http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/chatterbox/2002/12/the_legend_of_stroms_remorse.html

Rosado, Caleb. 1996. "The Undergirding Factor is POWER: Toward an Understanding of Prejudice and Racism." Retrieved from:

http://www.rosado.net/pdf/Under_factor_Power_article.pdf

Santa Ana, Otto. 2002. <u>Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse</u>. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Santa Ana, Otto. 2004. "Is There Such a Thing as Latino Identity?" PBS. Retrieved from:

http://www.pbs.org/americanfamily/latino2.html

Schumann, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., and Krysan. (1997). *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University.

Sears, David O. 1988. "Symbolic Racism." In Katz, P.A., and Taylor, D.A. (Eds.). <u>Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy</u>. Pp 53-814. New York: Plenum Press.

Sniderman, Paul M., Thomas Piazza, Philip E. Tetlock, and Ann Kendrick. 1991. "The New Racism." *American Journal of Political Science* 35:423-47.

Stekler, Paul; Daniel McCabe (producers and directors). 2000. Program Transcript: *George Wallace: Settin' the Woods on Fire, Part 1* [Motion Picture]. PBS. Retrieved from:

http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wallace/filmmore/transcript/index.html

Van Dijk, Teun A. 1997. *Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments*. In: <u>The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse</u>. (1997). Stephen Harold Riggens (Ed.). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2006. "Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*. 17(3). Pp 359-383.

Wilson, Carter A. 1996. <u>Racism: From Slavery to Advanced Capitalism</u>. Thousand Oaks,

London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2010, May 22. "Rand Paul Exposes Dangers of Colorblind Thinking."

Racism Review. Retrieved from http://www.racismreview.com/blog/2010/05/22/rand-

paul-exposes-dangers-of-colorblind-thinking/

Winter, Nicholas J. G. 2008. <u>Dangerous Frames: How Ideas about Race & Gender Shape Public</u>

<u>Opinion</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zwiers, Maarten. 2007. *The Paradox of Power: James Eastland and the Democratic Party*. MA

Thesis. University of Mississippi.