TRUE or FALSE:
“Race should be used in research studies involving health-care delivery, etiologies of medical conditions, and health outcomes, but only as a sociopolitical category.”

❖ How do you understand, employ, and deploy the concept of race in your work as a scientist?

❖ What is your opportunity and obligation as a scientist to cease (altogether, once and for all) your use of race as a concept, construct, variable, or factor in your work?

❖ Does this question trigger cognitive dissonance and possibly objection for you?

❖ Do you agree that science should consign “race” to the dustbin of history but aren’t sure what you would replace it with?
Safe enough to be brave enough
Patience
Grace
The benefit of the doubt

BothAnd

Kindness mustn’t stifle justice
Resist the arrogance of language privilege, gays.

“Some people are born on third base and spend their lives thinking they hit a triple.”

Don’t confuse what you get with what you deserve.

It’s OK to not have known.
It’s not OK to use that as an excuse to not grow.

Please be mindful of the size and diversity of our word bubbles.

Cognitive Dissonance

Social standard, Access, Care
Opportunity, Protection ...

Delusion of Equality

Some people are positioned at the top of a social hill and believe everyone shares level ground.

* Every figure is the "same size" -- has equal worth, equal capacity, and [ought to have] equal rights
The Global **ANTI-RACIALIZATION** Campaign

Educating & Empowering People Everywhere to Understand & Resist *Racialization* in order to Overcome *Racism*
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Dyad Dialogue I
10min

Please share with your partner:

1. What you found compelling or resonant with your own bearing on race, racism, and racialization.

2. What you found unclear, uncompelling, or dissonant with your own bearing on race, racism, and racialization.

3. How your social identities and personal and professional socialization/training might factor into your response to the talk.

4. Please bear in mind your dyad conversation as we continue on with the presentation. If it might be helpful, please consider jotting down some notes to refer to during the discussion later.
The master's map will never take us beyond the master's boundaries.

Racism is stupid
What we must teach – as soon as possible – around the world

There are no races, therefore there is no legitimate basis for racism.
RACE is not something you are

We are not reducible to something that doesn’t exist

RACE is something that is done to you

We are assigned to a fictitious superior or inferior human subgroup

RACE is RACISM

Racism is to Race as flame is to fire (or syllable to sound*)

We are warmed by unearned advantage or burned by unfair disadvantage

In order to eradicate RACISM, we must end RACIALIZATION

The master’s map will never take us beyond the master’s boundaries
Race and Racism are produced by the process of RACIALIZATION

1. **Select** arbitrary superficial visible markers to distinguish some humans from other humans

2. **Sort** humans into subgroups based on the superficial markers

3. **Attribute** invisible positive or negative characteristics and qualities to the subgroups (creation of false concordances)

4. **Essentialize & Eternalize** the superiority or inferiority of the subgroups

5. **Act** on this absurd and lethal logic as justification for the interpersonal, structural, systemic, and institutional advantaging and disadvantaging of people in so-called races
RACIALIZATION

SELECT PERCEPTIBLE DISTINCTIONS

SORT PEOPLE ACCORDINGLY

ATTRIBUTE STEREOTYPES & RANK TO EACH GROUP

ESSENTIALIZE & ETERNALIZE THE DIFFERENCES & STATUSES

TREAT PEOPLE ACCORDING TO THE FALSE LOGIC

"RACENTRIC" WORLDVIEW
THE RACE COSMOLOGY
Humans often view categories as reflecting the underlying natural structure of the environment—a cognitive bias known as psychological essentialism.

In the social domain, essentialist thinking can have pernicious implications; essentialism leads people to view members of the same social group (e.g., men, women) as sharing an underlying, inherent nature that causes them to be fundamentally similar in nonobvious, immutable ways.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racialization Worksheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong> SELECT some human characteristics as meaningful signs of important differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong> SORT people into subgroups based on the characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong> ATTRIBUTE traits (e.g. temperament, capacities, talents, worth) to the different groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4:</strong> ESSENTIALIZE the differences – make them natural, fixed, unchangeable &amp; hereditary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5:</strong> ACT as if these differences justify unequal treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialization Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: <strong>SELECT</strong> some human characteristics as meaningful signs of important differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airplane Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: <strong>SORT</strong> people into subgroups based on the characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class seat holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: <strong>ATTRIBUTE</strong> traits (e.g. temperament, capacities, talents, worth) to the different groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seems to me those <strong>classies</strong> are calmer, more confident, better-looking, and just plain more appealing than the <strong>econers</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: <strong>ESSENTIALIZE</strong> the differences – make them natural, fixed, unchangeable &amp; hereditary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, it’s not about money; this is deeper than circumstance. These differences are bone-deep, ancestry-deep, heritable, and immutable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: <strong>ACT</strong> as if these differences justify unequal treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why wouldn’t I prefer classies over econers when considering relationships, employment, residence, politics, etc.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Racialization Worksheet

**Step 1:** SELECT some human characteristics as meaningful signs of important differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>How it plays out for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airplane Passengers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2:** SORT people into subgroups based on the characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>How it plays out for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3:** ATTRIBUTE traits (e.g. temperament, capacities, talents, worth) to the different groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>How it plays out for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earlobe shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 4:** ESSENTIALIZE the differences – make them natural, fixed, unchangeable & hereditary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>How it plays out for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseball fans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 5:** ACT as if these differences justify unequal treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>How it plays out for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>How it plays out for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dyad Dialogue II
10min

Please share with your partner:

1. What you found compelling or resonant with your own bearing on race, racism, and racialization.

2. What you found unclear, uncompelling, or dissonant with your own bearing on race, racism, and racialization.

3. How your social identities and personal and professional socialization/training might factor into your response to the talk.

4. Please bear in mind your dyad conversation as we continue on with the presentation. If it might be helpful, please consider jotting down some notes to refer to during the discussion later.
The UN’s current efforts to combat racism are subthreshold of what’s required because they do not address the continued acceptance, even if only tacit, of the usefulness of describing human differences in terms of “race.”
The Forum sought to provide a platform for stakeholders to share and discuss cutting-edge knowledge and experience of tackling racism and discrimination, with the intention of capitalizing on this moment of unprecedented support to articulate a strong Roadmap Against Racism and Discrimination to guide UNESCO’s action in this critical area in the post-COVID era.
First Panel: Establish anti-racist policies

Second Panel: Deconstruct Racism -> anti-racist culture

Third Panel: Intersectionality (focus on gender)

Fourth Panel: Global multi-stakeholder anti-racism partnership

*Racism*: virulent, invasive, toxic weed of the mind
First Panel: Establish anti-racist policies

Second Panel: Deconstruct Racism -> anti-racist culture

Third Panel: Intersectionality (focus on gender)

First Panel: Global multi-stakeholder anti-racism partnership

THE ROOT OF THE WEED IS RACIALIZATION
Stop Conflating CORPOREALITY with CIRCUMSTANCE

When we refer to people as members of races – “black protester,” “first black Supreme Court Justice,” “black suspect,” “white police officer,” “white crime victim,” “white supremacist”... we unavoidably and counterproductively perpetuate the belief that people are indeed fundamentally, naturally different in ways that align with the lie of race.

But there is a great reluctance to take the logical and necessary step of ceasing to reify the false notion of race. As one author has said,

"The idea of race as a social construction was meant to register the fact that even if we don’t any longer believe in race as a biological entity, we still treat people as if they belonged to races. ...Treating race as a social fact amounts to nothing more that acknowledging that we were mistaken to think of it as a biological fact and then insisting that we ought to keep making the mistake. Maybe instead we ought to stop making the mistake.

- From The Trouble with Diversity: How We learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality, Walther Ben Michaels. 2006
Affirm the scientific truth that race is not a valid way to categorize human populations.

Translate the scientific clarity into transformations of sociopolitical practices.

Support people in detaching from race as a hinge on which their sense of identity, community, and security turns.
“It is incumbent on us as researchers in human genetics to advance the discussion of human diversity with rigorous attention to scientific detail and to eschew inaccurate and damaging generalizations.”


“[It is incumbent on us as scientists] to advance the discussion of human diversity with rigorous attention to scientific detail and to eschew inaccurate and damaging generalizations.”

Proponents will argue race is a placeholder—a crude marker of variation that might as well be used until better markers (genetic or environmental) for differential responses are identified and cost effective genetic screening technologies become available.

But scientifically, race is a meaningless marker of anything. Pooling people in race silos is akin to zoologists grouping raccoons, tigers and okapis on the basis that they are all stripey.

- NATURE BIOTECHNOLOGY VOLUME 23 NUMBER 8 AUGUST 2005

But the circumstances and conditions created by racialization can AND DO have biological impact.
Affirm the scientific truth that race is not a valid way to categorize human populations.

There’s No Scientific Basis for Race—It’s a Made-Up Label

It's been used to define and separate people for millennia. But the concept of race is not grounded in genetics.
Modern human genetic variation does not structure into phylogenetic subspecies (geographical “races”), nor do the taxa from the most common racial subclassifications of classical anthropology qualify as “races.”
Taking race out of human genetics

Engaging a century-long debate about the role of race in science

By Michael Yudell, Dorothy Roberts, Rob DeSalle, Sarah Tishkoff

concept in biological research. Some have argued that relevant genetic information can on racism (i.e., social relations) rather than race (i.e., supposed innate biologic predi
“Human geneticists have mostly abandoned the word ‘race’ when describing populations in their papers, according to a new study of research published in a leading genetics journal. That’s in line with the current scientific understanding that race is a social construct, and a welcome departure from research that in the past has often conflated genetic variation and racial categories, says Vence Bonham, a social scientist at the National Human Genome Research Institute who led the study.

But alternative terms that have gained popularity, such as ‘ancestry’ and ‘ethnicity,’ can have ambiguous meanings or aren’t defined by genetics, suggesting researchers are still struggling to find the words to accurately describe groups delineated by their DNA, according to the study.”

“From its earliest days, the field of human genetics has had a complex, and at times troubling, connection with racist ideologies. Although the modern field of human genetics and genomics has come a long way from those earlier errors, systemic racism remains ingrained in its institutions and practices.

Although a variety of efforts are needed to excise systemic racism, we focus in this commentary on the work that must be done in scientific publishing in genetics and genomics.

We propose eight principles that are both scientifically grounded and antiracist that we hope will serve as a foundation for the development of policies by publishers and editorial boards that address the unique needs of the field of genetics and genomics.”
“Principle 1: Race should be used in research studies involving health-care delivery, etiologies of medical conditions, and health outcomes, but only as a sociopolitical category.

The inclusion of race variables is especially important in contexts where health disparities are observed. While biological race is scientifically unfounded, race as a socially constructed category plays a major role in health-care delivery and health-care outcomes.

This effect is especially apparent in the domain of health disparities, which are largely driven by factors like inequalities in the distribution and delivery of healthcare services, residential segregation, poverty, and social injustice, all of which are driven by systemic racism.

Failure to include race as a sociocultural variable in scientific studies risks obscuring these effects on health, even for studies focused primarily on genetics and genomics. Utilizing race without a scientific justification, however, risks perpetuating racial essentialism. ”


There is no scientific justification for utilizing race, no justification, no need.

Replacing use of the irredeemably problematic term, “race” with the workable term, “racialization” solves this problem.
What About African Americans and High Blood Pressure?

African Americans in the U.S. have a higher prevalence of high blood pressure (HBP) than other racial and ethnic groups. It is also often more severe in Black people and some medications are less effective in treating Black people with HBP.

High blood pressure usually has no symptoms. That’s why it’s called the “silent killer.” The only way to know if your blood pressure is high is to have your health care professional check it regularly.
How might you correct this racial worldview rendering of the concordance between high blood pressure and “race”? 

How might you emphasize the effects of racialization and counteract the insinuation of naturalized essentialized racial traits that lead to high blood pressure?

“African Americans in the U.S. have a higher prevalence of high blood pressure (HBP) than other racial and ethnic groups. It is also often more severe in Black people and some medications are less effective in treating Black people with HBP. High blood pressure usually has no symptoms. That’s why it’s called the “silent killer.” The only way to know if your blood pressure is high is to have your health care professional check it regularly.”
TRUE or FALSE:
Race should be used in research studies involving health-care delivery, etiologies of medical conditions, and health outcomes, but only as a sociopolitical category.

- How do you understand, employ and possibly deploy the concept of race in your work as a scientist?

- What is your opportunity and obligation as a scientist to cease (altogether, once and for all) your use of race as a concept, construct, variable, or factor in your work?

- Does this question trigger cognitive dissonance and possibly objection for you?

- Do you agree that science should consign “race” to the dustbin of history but aren’t sure what you would replace it with?

- Are you inclined to make the shift from race to racialization? How will you accomplish it?
What is your PRAXIS plan in light of this call to corrective action?

What will you do to de-racialize your worldview and your work so that we can truly and finally get beyond racism?

How can we work together to help the world navigate successfully beyond the master’s map?

DISCUSSION
Slides that follow will be used only if needed
Translate the scientific clarity into transformations of sociopolitical practices

Even in a sample where one-third of the students interviewed were anthropology majors, and thus among those most likely to be exposed to the academic idea of race as a social construct, less than one-fifth of the respondents defined race that way. -Morning, 2011

...people often think about race as if it is deterministically rooted in biology. The beliefs that racial categories reflect real distinctions found in nature, and that race is an inherently meaningful part of identity, are widespread.

These beliefs reflect psychological *essentialism*—a set of cognitive biases that lead people to view members of a category as sharing a deep, underlying essence that causes them to be fundamentally similar to one another in both obvious and nonobvious ways.
“the racial categories included in the census questionnaire generally reflect a social definition of race recognized in this country and not an attempt to define race biologically, anthropologically, or genetically.”
- The United States Census Bureau

...racial enumeration itself creates and advances concepts of race, bringing into being the racial reality that census officials presume is already there, waiting to be counted.
- Nobles, 2000

... the categorical model need not and should not remain the paradigm for recognizing racial discrimination to the exclusion of other paradigms. Rather, we should aspire to a more fluid understanding of race, one that acknowledges animus directed against a person’s perceived race without an attendant need to define that person’s “objective” racial identity or to place that person in a category. – Leong, 2009
But what about the *whatabouts*?

**Whatabout monitoring race-based injustice?**

If we relinquish race won’t racists be enabled to dismiss charges of race-based injustice by simply saying the complainers are playing *the false construct card*?

**What about racial pride?**

Rightly or wrongly, particularly for those who identify as black or African American, race is not merely the basis on which discrimination and oppression occur, it is also a powerful source of pride, solidarity, and mobilization. Would relinquishing race require denying the validity of race as a reclaimed ("I’m black and I’m proud!") identity, as a *culture-community*? If we try to see race as a culture and not a biological category, then shouldn’t anyone be able to claim and partake in the culture? If we restrict who can be part of the culture-community to those with racial bona fides, aren’t we back to the essentialized, naturalized, biologized and utterly false way of defining it?

**Whatabout affirmative action?**

We should affirm the need to take into account the ways that racialization differentially affect people in society, advantaging some and disadvantaging others, and we should (1) take action to level unlevel playing fields created by racialization, and (2) recognize and act on the truth that people who have to contend with the adverse effects of racialization can contribute a unique perspective to environments (schools, jobs, communities) that value diversity of experience and perspective, and admire the qualities of courage, perseverance, and resilience required to overcome such adversity.
Support people in detaching from race as a hinge on which their sense of identity, community, and security turns

“It's easier to fool people than to convince them that they have been fooled.” — Author uncertain

“I see no reason why I should be consciously wrong today because I was unconsciously wrong yesterday.” – Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, 1948

“The point is that we are all capable of believing things which we know to be untrue, and then, when we are finally proved wrong, impudently twisting the facts so as to show that we were right. Intellectually, it is possible to carry on this process for an indefinite time: the only check on it is that sooner or later a false belief bumps up against solid reality, usually on a battlefield.” – George Orwell, 1946
By “racial worldview” I simply mean believing and acting in accordance with the social convention that people can and should be regarded as members of one (or more) of a handful of nebulous, restrictive, contradictory, and conflicting subspecies, called races. - Smedley, 2016

The essence of racism is to interact with others on the basis of racial assignment - Muir, 1993

Racism resembles a gun. While mean racists use it to coerce or kill, kind racists help keep it loaded by supporting the underlying racial concepts. - Muir, 1993

The master’s map will never take us beyond the master’s boundaries. – Hoyt, 2021

“My journey has taken me past constructions of race, past constructions of mixed race, and into an understanding of human difference that does not include race as a meaningful category.” - Spencer, 2002
SCIENCE DEFINES YOU BY YOUR DNA.
SOCIETY DEFINES YOU BY THE COLOR OF YOUR SKIN.
The Social Identity Prism

Our brains tend to sort, simplify, and rank everything, including personhood.

This or that, good or bad, us or them. It’s hard for us to hold the multiple, intersecting aspects of personhood at once in our minds. Instead, like a prism, we often refract our complex whole selves into narrow categories.

Recognizing the full spectrum of social identity and resisting the tendency to reduce people to one or another restrictive category enables us to think critically and inclusively, engage empathically, reduce social bias, and thrive in an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

Whoever you are, however you are, YOU ARE SAFE HERE