

So What *Is* Race?



Arun Saldanha

About Insights

Insights captures the ideas and work-in-progress of the Fellows of the Institute of Advanced Study at Durham University. Up to twenty distinguished and 'fast-track' Fellows reside at the IAS in any academic year. They are world-class scholars who come to Durham to participate in a variety of events around a core inter-disciplinary theme, which changes from year to year. Each theme inspires a new series of Insights, and these are listed in the inside back cover of each issue. These short papers take the form of thought experiments, summaries of research findings, theoretical statements, original reviews, and occasionally more fully worked treatises. Every fellow who visits the IAS is asked to write for this series. The Directors of the IAS – Ash Amin, Michael O'Neill, Susan J. Smith and Colin Bain – also invite submissions from others involved in the themes, events and activities of the IAS.

About the Institute of Advanced Study

The Institute of Advanced Study, launched in October 2006 to commemorate Durham University's 175th Anniversary, is a flagship project reaffirming the value of ideas and the public role of universities. The Institute aims to cultivate new thinking on ideas that might change the world, through unconstrained dialogue between the disciplines as well as interaction between scholars, intellectuals and public figures of world standing from a variety of backgrounds and countries. The Durham IAS is one of only a handful of comparable institutions in the world that incorporates the Sciences, Social Sciences, the Arts and the Humanities.

The focal point of the IAS is a programme of work associated with, but not exclusive to, an annual research theme. At the core of this work lies a prestigious Fellowship programme. This programme gathers together scholars, intellectuals and public figures of world standing or world-promise to address topics of major academic or public interest. Their mission is to anticipate the new and re-interpret the old, communicating across and working between disciplinary boundaries.

Every year, the Institute invites as many as twenty highly creative individuals to spend up to three months in Durham. They are located in Cosin's Hall, a magnificent and spacious 18th century mansion which, together with Durham Cathedral and Durham Castle, forms part of Palace Green, dominating the World Heritage Site of Durham Peninsula. During their stay, Fellows engage with departments and colleges, deliver public lectures and seminars, and, above all, join an international community of researchers to address the theme selected for that year. Further details of the IAS and its Fellowship programme can be found at www.durham.ac.uk/ias/fellows

Copyright

The design and contents of Insights are subject to copyright. Copyright and Reproduction Rights in all submitted contributions remain with the authors, as described in the Author's Copyright Agreement. Copyright and Reproduction Rights of all other material remain with Insights.

Except under the terms of Fair Dealing (UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988), the user may not modify, copy, reproduce, retransmit or otherwise distribute the site and its contents (whether text, graphics or original research concepts), without express permission in writing from the Institute. Where the above content is directly or indirectly reproduced in an academic context under the terms of Fair Dealing, this must be acknowledged with the appropriate bibliographical citation.

The opinions stated in the Insights papers are those of their respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Institute of Advanced Study, Durham University, or the staff and students thereof.

SO WHAT IS RACE?

Over the last few decades, there has in the humanities and public discourse been some confusion about the ever-contentious category of race that needs to be cleared philosophically if anti-racist policy is to be effective. If race is sometimes put between inverted commas, does that mean that it is not real? If race is a social construction, a figment of the imagination, then how can there be racism in institutions, feelings and economic distribution? Can physical differences between human bodies be thought without boxing them into the old colonial categories? This essay will answer this last question in the affirmative, providing a realist account of some of the many mechanisms whereby differentiation happens along racial lines. It does this by carefully avoiding reducing race to genes or to anything else, while taking the biological dimension of race seriously. A critical and embodied framework for approaching race and racism is suggested that will hopefully help to start clearing the confusion.

So Why Ask?

A feeling is shared by many educated people in the world that race is no longer the big issue that it was in the days of European imperialism, American slavery and eugenic science. In places as different as Dubai, Singapore, Brasília, Silicon Valley or Berlin, making the term 'race' an explicit focus of investigation makes many uneasy. Though socio-economic inequalities are readily admitted to exist, the fact that they are visible across populations of physically varying *bodies* is either denied or seen as inconsequential. The reasoning is that if we would acknowledge such physical differences as consequential for the reality of inequalities, we already justify those inequalities on racist grounds, we already open the door for explaining them through unequal inherited capacities for success. This short intervention will argue that it is not only possible to study the reality of these physical differences, but it is necessary for anti-racism to do so. Race still structures the human condition like it has for centuries, and by not tackling it head-on the inequalities of the world will only deepen. The conceptual confusion surrounding race is part of its persistence.

A brief overview of race's global inequalities will be helpful. Though most humans are aware that in the last two or three generations they have become more interconnected than ever before, this process is hardly ever understood in its racializing dimensions. It is not that globalization is in itself always racist, but modern globalization has very diverse racial *effects*. One obvious global process with racializing implications is migration. Most European settlers in the Americas, Asia and Africa did their utmost to erect clear and punishable boundaries between white and native (Ballantyne and Burton, 2005). In postcolonial Europe itself, from the beginning of state-sponsored migration from formerly colonized countries, non-white immigrants have generally been at one remove from full citizenship. While there is some reason for celebrating the cosmopolitanism and hybrid cultural forms migratory movements led to, institutional racism has always had the upper hand. Immigrants' incomes, education levels and political participation still lag behind white mainstream society. Despite, and to an extent even because of, the official and commercial celebrations of 'diversity,' racist and totalitarian populism has come back with a vengeance across Europe, with the Nazi horrors still in living memory. Nationalist and regionalist movements from Russia and Austria to

Scotland and the Netherlands define the nation or region they want to preserve in the face of globalization as white, even if usually implicitly.

Hence the exaggerated 'fortress' response of the European Union to asylum seekers from Africa and Asia is ultimately based on defining Europe as full, fragile and white. Since 9/11 and the declaration of a nebulous and infinite 'war on terror,' new obsessions with security and control have colluded across the West as well as elsewhere. Surveillance has become heavily infused with xenophobia, directed especially against Muslims. Research shows that racial profiling is a logical implication of surveillance technology (Gregory and Pred, 2006). The more subtle discrimination and exploitation of Eastern European immigrants in the EU also has to be called a form of racism, insofar as it is facilitated by phenotypic difference, just like anti-Semitism is commonly understood as racism. The trafficking of third world and Eastern European girls to red light districts of Western Europe is an extreme example of the *racial division of labour* that any racist society is based on (Crankshaw, 1997). The racialization of sex work and circumstances approaching slavery is further seen in the international sex tourism of Thailand and many other places. German, American or Chinese men have the purchasing power to buy sex from economic or political refugees from rural South East Asia (Ryan and Hall, 2001). In short, the uneven distribution of access to transport and communications technologies is itself racializing, because it shows that certain bodies do the touring while others do the work.

The racial division of labour in the United States is well known. While some upward mobility of a portion of every wave of immigrants cannot be denied, illegal immigration from Latin America has become a central political issue, even while the economies on both sides of the Mexican-US border depend on the import of cheap labour. The United States is of course a country almost entirely based on modern migration. But the very way in which it was formed tells of some of the most far-reaching racism in history: the original inhabitants were either killed or forced to become semi-citizens, and Africans were imported as slaves. Today, African Americans, though having recently helped elect a mixed-race president, still bear the burden of the plantation society. To any visitor to the United States, the exclusion of Native Americans and the racial segregation in cities, media and schools is blatant. Furthermore, the exclusion and segregation are to a large extent condoned by urban policies and conservative intellectuals (Massey and Denton, 1998). It is in the United States that the battle against racism remains most urgent.

At no point in recent memory was this more apparent to the rest of the world than in the immediate and longer-term aftermath of Hurricane Katrina's devastation of New Orleans. The scenes of stranded people inexplicably left to their own devices by the authorities resembled scenes from sub-Saharan Africa or Bangladesh – except that the dark-skinned corpses and the desperate survivors in second-hand clothing lived in the richest country of the world. The lessons about systematic racism, an outrageously expensive war and the failure of the state that Katrina provided the rest of the world with will not be learnt easily in the United States itself, because it is systematic about denying its racist system. An even deeper lesson of Katrina – that in modernity, what is disastrous about a natural disaster is always 'man'-made injustice – will take longer to sink in (Braun and McCarthy, 2005).

The biggest and slowest man-made disaster is of course climate change. Global warming will cause storms like Katrina to occur more often; water levels will disturb canal and river systems everywhere; in other places there will be water shortage; disease and chemical pollutants will be more difficult to contain. What all this means for segregated cities like New Orleans and Los Angeles is that African Americans and Hispanics will suffer disproportionately from ecological transformations. Activists and academics have gathered much evidence on what

is called environmental racism: the unjust and racializing effects of the construction of highways, the dumping of toxic waste, noise pollution, and other dangerous or unhealthy environmental processes that are somehow never an issue for rich suburbs or downtown skyscrapers (Pulido, 2004). And environmental injustice occurs on a global scale too. An immense amount of electronic waste (computers, mobile phones) from the rich is dumped and recycled in poor countries like Pakistan and Ghana (Carroll, 2008). All coastline or delta populations will be more vulnerable to rising sea levels, and most of the poorer and denser ones lie outside the West. Calling these situations racializing *effects* is to leave open the question of whether the industrialists, planners, real estate agents and consumers responsible for them are individually racist or not. They may not be, and some of them are indeed non-white or non-Western. But what is beyond doubt is that the realities their actions lead to systematically harm non-white people more than they hurt white people.

The globalization that migrants, tourists, computers, waste, multinational companies and governments bring about is therefore racist in its systematic effects. Instead of binding humanity into a 'global village' through instant communication and intercultural understanding, it has disproportionately benefited European and Europe-descended populations. This is not to deny that corporate elites and huge middle classes have emerged in the Middle East, China, India, and elsewhere, who promote the same industrial and consumer capitalism that encompasses developments like climate change and sex tourism. Even if many of the planetary troubles originated with European capitalism and patriarchy, revealing injustice is not simply blaming people. What is important is first to lay bare globalization's unequal effects on populations of the world. Once these effects are known to be racist and sexist, we can say systems, not individuals, are responsible and need to be radically transformed. If it is true that particular individuals justify and protect these systems time and time again, they are well served by an ignorance of the effects of their policies. It is important to be extremely *precise* about the many ways that racism operates.

The Concept of Race

If race is now global, its concept is European. All societies have a sense of who belongs and who does not belong to it, and all large societies and states are stratified. Moreover, it is probably the case that embryonic forms of discrimination and segregation on phenotype can be found in every major 'civilization.' But what distinguishes the modern phenomenon of race is that the difference between us and them (or 'thems') is based on the cultural and political *institutionalization* of phenotypic differences between populations, and this institutionalization depends on a clear idea of what race is supposed to be. A racist society not only segregates but attempts to classify *all* human bodies into eternal types. It is this universal and rigid classification scheme that makes the concept of race quintessentially European and colonialist. Hence this is what most historians of race have focused on. The emergence of the concept of race has been extensively contextualized in the political, social and intellectual processes taking place in Europe.

Historians of Greece have often pointed out that its democracy was based on slavery and the exclusion of women and foreigners from the political arena. The ancient Greeks invented the concept of the 'barbarian' (*bárbaros*), onomatopoeically derived from what they perceived all foreigners to speak: those who speak blah-blah. There is no evidence of derogatory words for their main enemies, the Persians. It appears that Greek xenophobia and sense of superiority was a matter of language and culture, not phenotype (Hannaford, 1996). As more and more of these barbarians were brought from outside Greece, anywhere from present-day Bulgaria to

Ethiopia, however, a certain biological dimension to the category of barbarian was gradually added, with Aristotle famously stating at one point that barbarians were by nature meant for slavery.

The Roman Empire continued the Greek institution of slavery and also used the word *barbarus* profusely, now for Germanic and other tribes of the north. It was quite prevalent for slaves in the Empire to buy themselves free, as well as that non-Romans worked themselves up the political and military ladder. Hence to speak of racism in antiquity would be inaccurate. Nonetheless, it is also indisputable that some of the legal, economic and imperial mechanisms of the later colonial racism of Western Europe first appeared with Greek and Roman civilization. If modern racism is intimately entwined with modern liberal democracy, it cannot but at least faintly echo discriminations of the times when European literature, politics and law were invented.

The next consolidation of the idea of race spanned the time from the crumbling of the Roman Empire to the beginnings of urban networks. Steeped in feudalism, agriculture and the medieval organization of land ownership by marriage, the rich started delineating themselves from the rest of society more through biology than manner. Descent gradually became the central defining feature of someone's worth in society. The mutual presupposition of 'blood' and aristocracy was the direct predecessor of the category of race. It is far from arbitrary that in the mammal species closest to humans, dogs, similar preoccupation with pedigree developed over the same time. While dogs were bred for purity, their masters were doing something similar with their own families, only with much more pomp (cf. Haraway, 2008).

Christianity in the Mediterranean world had for centuries lived comparatively peacefully alongside Islam and Judaism. The 'Moors' (interestingly affiliated with Spanish *moreno*, brown) had first conquered Spain between 711 and 718. Islamic rule over Spain, as elsewhere and later, was tolerant of Christians, Jews and others, and luckily for humanity, developed art, philosophy and science as no other society did – for some five centuries (Lewis, 2008). In 1095 Pope Urban II decided abruptly that a Christian attack on the Muslim occupancy of Jerusalem was the only righteous way to reconsolidate papal authority in a fragmented Europe. With the ensuing Crusades, Christianity not only militarized its newly found intolerance against other religions, but it became identified with a territory: France, Italy, the Low Countries, England and Germany (Asbridge, 2004).

Much of the early history of the Western idea of race took place in the Iberian Peninsula, since this is where the conflict over European identity became the most intense once the Crusades had inaugurated an almost cosmic struggle between Christianity and Islam. In the so-called *Reconquista* the Spanish gradually expelled the Muslims, and anti-Muslim sentiment accompanied the Iberians in all colonizing efforts. Simultaneously anti-Semitism increased, as could be felt in all sorts of legal measures against Jewish urbanites in Spanish cities. Most Jews gradually converted to Christianity, and were forced to do so at the end of the fifteenth century. Important for the emergence of European racism, the Jews were immediately brandished as 'New Christians' and *marranos* (pigs). European anti-Semitism culminated in the expulsion of all Jews from Spain in 1492, the same year the last Muslim stronghold was conquered and Columbus landed in Cuba. Anti-Semitism and intolerance against increasing numbers of heretics reached new heights with the notorious Inquisition, again exported to the colonies. It was in this paranoia and murky expansion of horizons that *purity* became a legal matter, measured by the alleged amount of foreign or sinful blood contaminating a body.

The Iberian aristocracy and monarchy, like the rest of feudal Europe, had long been materially and symbolically invested in descent. Obsessions about bloodlines obtained racial overtones, especially with the Portuguese notion of *pureza do sangue* (purity of blood). The notion shaped the geopolitically important colonies of Portugal in the Indian Ocean and Brazil, even if miscegenation was officially promoted (Boxer, 1963). In short, anti-Semitism, aristocratic elitism and extreme Christian ethnocentrism have to be seen as the immediate precursors to modern racism. In fact, most etymologies trace *race* to the Spanish *raza*, possibly derived from Arab and Hebrew words for variety or class.

Colonialism was essential to the final solidification of the intellectual and legal concept of race. The encounter between Europeans and the 'savages' of the Americas was singular in making Europeans question their inherited knowledge of the world. But this self-questioning was short-lived. The central position of Europeans in world affairs was supposedly demonstrated by their very 'discovery,' conquest and cultivation of this New World (Todorov, 1984). By the early seventeenth century, visual and quasi-biblical distinctions between 'we' the civilized and 'they' the primitive and bizarre had become legion across Europe. As mentioned, the most important developments that needed to be justified or obscured by incipient racist thinking were the importation into the Americas of millions of African slaves and the obliteration of the indigenous populations. On a global scale, the 'natives,' though sometimes considered more splendid or innocent than fellow Christians by white settlers, were clearly segregated in all sectors of colonial society. Important European scholarship emerged in the nineteenth century regarding other civilizations, but on the whole this interest only served to underline the distinction between an enlightened and honest West and an eternally despotic and irrational East (Said, 1978). No wonder that after independence, the formerly colonized would be kept in subordinate position in global capitalism, then experience racism when attempting to partake in the wealth of the West.

This history of racism, and the idea of race, is buttressed by a wide literature, but does not itself *disprove* racist justifications of colonialism and slavery. When intellectuals of imperial regimes argued that 'races' were intrinsically unequal in mental and physical capacities, and the white race was biologically predisposed to rule the globe, there is in the preceding brief history as such no rhetorical weapon to counter the racist argument on its own quasi-scientific grounds.

Race and Biology

Human biodiversity is the quintessential place where science is inextricably mingled with politics. The more nuanced and critically minded of anthropologists have from the early twentieth century argued that whatever it is, race cannot be a cause of economic and cultural disparities amongst human societies. They were a minority arguing against a firmly entrenched way of thinking amongst scientists, historians, and some politicians, which postulated that human populations had over hundreds of thousands of years adapted differently to the different climates they settled down in, to evolve differing capacities to think, work and appreciate art. By the middle of the nineteenth century it could no longer be seriously argued, against overwhelming evidence of fertile mixed-race offspring, that there was more than one human species (polygenism). Nevertheless the desire to demonstrate that there exist significant differences between human 'races' owing to isolated evolution – not surprisingly, especially between sub-Saharan Africans and northern Europeans – continues to live on. What has changed is that the majority of physical anthropologists today emphasize genetic and behavioural interconnectivity of human population, while a combative

minority perseveres in the conviction that regionally evolved subspecies are demonstrable morphologically, genetically and sociologically. However careful to distinguish itself from earlier polygenism, multiregionalist theory clearly finds it as frightening as nineteenth-century racists to accept constant gene flow between all humans and hominids (Wolpoff and Caspari, 2007). Today's racist scientists feel besieged by an allegedly 'politically correct' majority. They nonetheless thoroughly enjoy kicking up dust, claiming it is data not ideology that drives them, but are incapable of acknowledging they meanwhile reinforce the oldest and silliest of white anxieties (Sarich and Miele, 2005). Data do not appear by themselves. The refusal to examine where exactly one's own scientific interests and choices come from speaks simply of immature science.

There are fortunately more nuanced, more scientific ways of producing and interpreting biological data. We have to posit forcefully that genetic, morphological and even physiological variation is real and can only be studied as a highly volatile system. Regardless of how much science may try, human variation will never allow for any strict and timeless classification as has been attempted in vain for some 250 years. Borrowing from natural history, especially the famous system of Linnaeus, racist science fundamentally seeks to determine a fixed number of 'races' within the human species. Taxonomy in biology cannot avoid a fairly strong version of essentialism: each species, genus, etc. has an unchanging essence which can be found to varying degrees in individual organisms. Darwin already knew well that this taxonomic desire to place organisms into boxes only works if one forgets the many intermediate stages between species on the evolutionary 'tree'; the many hybrids; the fundamental sexual differences within a species; the role environments play in introducing variations, even during lifetimes; and the many cases where it is unclear whether a population is a variation, a separate species, or something else entirely. In other words, classification can exist only if we bracket all that is interesting about life in the first place (Mayr, 2007).

Physical variation between human bodies is inseparable from what *cultural* practices do to them. Barring a handful of hereditary diseases, health and well-being are determined by access to medication, safe food and clean water, hence ultimately one's position in global capitalism. The extent to which disabilities or mental instabilities impinge on social interaction depends greatly on cultural understandings and a country's healthcare policy. On the physiological level itself, therefore, human variation can only be explained by bringing economics and politics into the equation. Put more strongly, social injustice is ingrained biologically into the human population.

Bodies furthermore develop and experience themselves very differently over their lifetime. They are trained, surgically altered, enhanced with bypasses and spectacles, tattooed, clothed, decorated, painted, erotically disrobed, and subjected to all sorts of media-fed pressures (as in anorexia). In a basic sense humans eat, have sex and die just like all mammals, including the many combinations entirely useless for survival. In a more exacting sense, however, the variation in prohibitions, transgressions, kinship and ceremony are what really matters for our daily lives. This variation is called *cultural* because it is learnt not inherited, but it still engages human physiology. When we look at bodily variation carefully it becomes not just practically but theoretically impossible to say where 'biology' ends and where 'culture' begins. The human species is always – in essence, if you wish – experimental. Human culture does not escape human biology, but necessarily uses 'it' as raw material out of which unprecedented forms are continually invented (Lingis, 2006).

Hence human biological variation is real, unclassifiable and intrinsically cultural. What does this mean for our understanding of race? It makes race something more than an idea: a

fleshy reality of mass and movement. Some bodily features just listed cohere into identities which are racial. For example, obesity rates may vary significantly between white, black and Hispanic populations, or certain ways of talking or singing are recognized and marketed as black or Asian British. The important point for anti-racist science is neither to shy away from talking about physiological differences nor to become biologically or genetically determinist about them. An example: many researchers and African American doctors (as well as, of course, pharmaceutical companies) are keen for treatment to become racially sensitive. With a more complex and critical understanding of human biology it becomes possible to call the new field of pharmacogenetics not just ideological or commercially driven, but scientifically inadequate. Risk of heart disease, for example, is directly caused by lifestyle, not by genes or skin hue. Race is an effect of health inequalities spread over differently coloured bodies, not a cause. Besides, there is no dependable way of telling genetically who would be the target group for these 'ethnic drugs' (Kahn, 2007).

A biological perspective on the human species has to be resolutely multidimensional and include culture, history and economic globalization. Biologists are themselves gradually understanding that nothing about life's complexity can be reduced to the quasi-metaphysical notion of 'natural selection,' with 'selfish genes' directing material processes from their little hideouts, unperturbed by what goes on at smaller and larger levels of physical organization (Jablonka and Lamb, 2005). Intraspecies phenotypic variations are obviously a key topic for biology and there are ways to take them seriously that undermine racist science. In the human species, their study is of profound political importance.

Getting Real About Race

By focusing on the *idea* of race, and assuming that the reality of racism followed from it, the answer to the question 'what is race?' has in the recent humanities tended towards philosophical idealism: race *is* an idea. More precisely, like other sociological phenomena from science to the state and menstruation, race is metaphorically called a 'social construction.' What is race then constructed *from*? The social, presumably, but what is the social? Meanings, we might say, but who produces and circulates these meanings? People, probably. But are those people not bodies, with certain shapes, colours, desires, illnesses? Is it not precisely those material features that are swept up in the social constructions of race, gender, health? How can they be simultaneously the material and the objective of the constructing? Unpacking the term 'social construction' leads to complicated but age-old philosophical discussions about the nature of reality and the language to describe it (Hacking, 2000). Why was it so important from the 1970s to the 1990s to assert the constructedness of everything in the first place?

For feminism and anti-racism, social construction was from the start a politically salient decision. If social reality is shown to be far from 'natural,' constructed specifically by those who benefit from calling it natural, then it can be changed. For a just society, race and sex are the quintessential constructions that should be exposed as fallacious. If you would suppose that there really exists some indisputable bedrock of material heterogeneity – phenotypic difference – on which race and sex are founded, you already succumb to how dominant groups want you to accept that some states of affairs are inevitable (Butler, 1993). The strong social-constructionist political view is to deny the relevance of any knowledge of physical bodies for politics, since it is based on the (realist) supposition that bodies *can* be known. But realism does not have to be 'naïve' and suppose that bodies are transparent to knowledge. Bodies beckon knowledge onwards forever into their ever-receding depths, requiring from knowledge

constant invention. Instead of hitting a bedrock (*this is race*), science and politics are ongoing explorations through the body rather like the science-fiction movie *Fantastic Voyage*.

Hence race is not constructed merely from ideas or meanings and not even just by people, but it is constructed by and in reality itself. There are realities of trade, migration, conquest and slavery, and *then* racist ideas of inevitable superiority and inferiority emerge to make sense of and maintain those realities. Since Marx, but also in some Eastern spiritual traditions, realists have been committed to change by understanding ideas to be secondary in relation to the material circumstances in which they participate (Bhaskar, 2002). This is not to say that a realist cannot study a reality – say, the genocide of the Jews, or of the Vietnamese minority and Cambodian dissidents under the Khmer Rouge – as at least partially triggered by ideas. But ideas have to negotiate their way through an immense thicket of heterogeneous processes in order to take effect. Indeed, as we see with Katrina's destruction of New Orleans and anthropogenic climate change, there are racist realities triggered not by clearly identifiable ideas at all, but by forces of so-called 'nature.' Human-biophysical systems of unequal distributions of power are what matter first. Race is mostly constituted of racializing *effects* of processes that far exceed people and meanings.

Getting real about race means understanding race perhaps above all as *irreducible*. Race is always more than mental categories, genotype, phenotype, or socio-economic inequality, though some racial phenomena may be better explained through one particular component. There are no essential 'races,' no differently evolved human subspecies as racist typologists still try to argue, although genetic, physical and cultural variation in the species and beyond can and should be studied using non-essentialist and non-reductionist methods. A last note on politics: anti-racism becomes more precise and vigorous as we address the biological components of race and racism. Not only can racist scientists be defeated on their own turf, but the wide, sub- and suprahuman scope of institutional racism becomes evident. Darwin himself provides complex conceptions of human life in some ways more radically open to the future than is available in the humanities (Grosz, 2004). Instead of the conventional religious or liberal-humanist positions that humans are fundamentally equal because they are so in the eyes of God, the law or the market, however, anti-racism now is derived from a more volatile situation which does not allow for such a priori principles. Dismantling racism is still necessary in science and media discourse, but sadly also in many other sites, like the environment and housing. In fact, without changing the mechanisms behind the racializing effects – chiefly capitalism and patriarchy – it is utopian to think racism will disappear. Racism is not simply prejudice. If only it were!



Reference List

- Ballantyne, A. and Burton, A. (eds.) (2005) *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Encounters in World History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhaskar, R. (2002) *From Science to Emancipation: Alienation and the Actuality of Enlightenment*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Boxer, C. R. (1963) *Race Relations in the Portuguese Empire, 1415–1825*. London: Clarendon.
- Braun, B. and McCarthy, J. (2005) Hurricane Katrina and abandoned being. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23(6): 802–9.
- Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. New York: Routledge.
- Carroll, C. (2008) High-tech trash. *National Geographic* (January). <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2008/01/high-tech-trash/carroll-text/1>
- Crankshaw, O. (1997) *Race, Class, and the Changing Division of Labour under Apartheid*. London: Routledge.
- Gregory, D. and Pred, A. (eds.) (2006) *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Grosz, E. (2004) *The Nick of Time: Politics, Evolution, and the Untimely*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hacking, I. (2000) *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hannaford, I. (1996) *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Haraway, D. (2008) *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jablonka, E. and Lamb, M. J. (2005) *Evolution in Four Dimensions: Genetic, Epigenetic, Behavioral, and Symbolic Variation in the History of Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kahn, J. (2007) Race in a bottle. *Scientific American* (July). <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=race-in-a-bottle>
- LaDuke, W. and Stein, R. (eds.) (2004) *New Perspectives on Environmental Justice: Gender, Sexuality, and Activism*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lewis, D. L. (2008) *God's Crucible: Islam and the Making of Europe, 570–1215*. New York: Norton.
- Lingis, A. (2006) *Body Transformations: Evolutions and Atavisms in Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1998) *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mayr, E. (2007) *One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and the Genesis of Evolutionary Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pulido, L. (1996) *Environmentalism and Economic Justice: Two Chicano Struggles in the Southwest*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Ryan, C. and Hall, C. M. (2001) *Sex Tourism: Marginal People and Liminalities*. London: Routledge.

Said, E. W. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Knopf.

Sarich, V. and Miele, F. (2005) *Race: The Reality of Human Difference*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Todorov, T. (1984) *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Translated by Howard, R. New York: Harper & Row.

Wolpoff, M. and Caspari, R. (2007) *Race and Human Evolution: A Fatal Attraction*. Second edition. New York: Simon & Schuster.

*Backlist of Papers Published in Insights***2008 Volume 1**

No.	Author	Title	Series
1	Boris Wiseman	Lévi-Strauss, Caduveo Body Painting and the Readymade: Thinking Borderlines	General
2	John Hedley Brooke	Can Scientific Discovery be a Religious Experience?	Darwin's Legacy
3	Bryan R. Cullen	Rapid and Ongoing Darwinian Selection of the Human Genome	Darwin's Legacy
4	Penelope Deutscher	Women, Animality, Immunity – and the Slave of the Slave	Darwin's Legacy
5	Martin Harwit	The Growth of Astrophysical Understanding	Modelling
6	Donald MacKenzie	Making Things the Same: Gases, Emission Rights and the Politics of Carbon Markets	Modelling
7	Lorraine Code	Thinking Ecologically about Biology	Darwin's Legacy
8	Eric Winsberg	A Function for Fictions: Expanding the Scope of Science	Modelling
9	Willard Bohn	Visual Poetry in France after Apollinaire	Modelling
10	Robert A. Skipper Jr	R. A. Fisher and the Origins of Random Drift	Darwin's Legacy
11	Nancy Cartwright	Models: Parables v Fables	Modelling
12	Atholl Anderson	Problems of the 'Traditionalist' Model of Long-Distance Polynesian Voyaging	Modelling

2009 Volume 2

1	Robert A. Walker	Where Species Begin: Structure, Organization and Stability in Biological Membranes and Model Membrane Systems	Darwin's Legacy
2	Michael Pryke	'What is Going On?' Seeking Visual Cues Amongst the Flows of Global Finance	Modelling
3	Ronaldo I. Borja	Landslides and Debris Flow Induced by Rainfall	Modelling
4	Roland Fletcher	Low-Density, Agrarian-Based Urbanism: A Comparative View	Modelling
5	Paul Ormerod	21st Century Economics	Modelling

No.	Author	Title	Series
6	Peter C. Matthews	Guiding the Engineering Process: Path of Least Resistance versus Creative Fiction	Modelling
7	Bernd Goebel	Anselm's Theory of Universals Reconsidered	Modelling
8	Roger Smith	Locating History in the Human Sciences	Being Human
9	Sonia Kruks	Why Do We Humans Seek Revenge and Should We?	Being Human
10	Mark Turner	Thinking With Feeling	Being Human
11	Christa Davis Acampora	Agonistic Politics and the War on Terror	Being Human

Insights

Insights is edited by Susan J. Smith, IAS Director and Professor of Geography. Correspondence should be directed to Audrey Bowron (a.e.bowron@durham.ac.uk).