

Race and Capital

Implications for Planning

Vithulan Vivekanandan

Supervisor: Stefan Kipfer

August 28, 2014

A Major Paper submitted to the Faculty of Environmental Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master in Environmental Studies

York University

Ontario, Canada

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Foreword.....	3
Introduction	4
American Labour History	12
The Social Control Strata.....	12
The Working Man.....	25
Marxist Thought after Emancipation	31
White as Management.....	36
Caribbean Slavery	47
Sugar and Capitalism.....	47
Slavery and the World Economy	60
Conclusion.....	67
Bibliography	73

Abstract

The increasing ‘racial’ and ‘ethnic’ diversity of cities in a neoliberal terrain calls for planning scholars to revisit the notions of race and ethnicity in relation to capital. Theorists of Canadian multiculturalism have often used culturalist notions of race that are divorced from the inseparable links between racialization and capitalist processes. In light of this quandary, this paper is an attempt at a renewed conceptual and historical interpretation of race and capitalism by using a selection of Marxist scholars. The research takes two specific avenues in exploring race and capitalism: an analysis of the production of race in the labour history of the United States, and Caribbean slavery in the development of global capitalism. Furthermore, the paper concludes with a reflection on the implications of its content for planning. The construction of race is inextricably tied to the development of capitalism. The historical relationship of race to issues of labour, slavery, and colonial-imperial processes demonstrates the shared conceptual roots of race, class and capital.

Foreword

My plan of study revolves around my aspiration to better understand the various socio-economic structures that impede the progression towards social justice and equality. Such passions stem from my experience with pockets of poverty in multicultural Toronto coupled with concepts I've grasped in my experience at York University. In attempting to understand the intricacies of what is increasingly referred to as multicultural planning, I became aware of both the problematic notion of 'race' in planning scholarship and its relationship to issues associated with neoliberal capitalism. Here, one can locate the role of this Major Paper in my plan of study. In addition to understanding broader ideas of planning as a profession, my objectives call for a Marxist political economy approach to grasp the specific processes that continue to shape ideas of both planning and 'race.'

I wish to extend my gratitude to my family who have supported me throughout my academic career in this faculty despite hardships. I am grateful for the careful advice of my Advisor Anders Sandberg in pertaining to both the Plan of Study and my life, and the intellectual inspiration and meticulous guidance of my Supervisor Stefan Kipfer. Thank you all.

Introduction

Neither the city-designated priority-investment status of the neighbourhood of L'Amoreaux-Steeles in North Eastern Toronto, nor the self-identification of 80% of its residents as visible minorities was lost on me as I witnessed the downward spiral of disenfranchised immigrant youth from relative docility to violence and crime. Such a phenomenon solicits central questions about the intricacies of oppressive structures and processes operating in increasingly diverse capitalist societies. The prominence of capitalist processes as constitutive of a hegemonic system, and the increasing neoliberal trend in the current political and economic landscape requires a critical engagement with race and class from a Marxist framework. Leela Viswanathan (2010) situates racialization as an integral process in the formation of the neoliberal city. Socially constructed hierarchies along lines of 'race' and ethnicity often become entrenched in the institutions of neoliberal cities, and strengthen policies that discriminate against some while privileging others; such policies are concurrent with the process of racialization where race is given specific social and economic significance.

Although its historical progression in the political sphere has been complex, cultural pluralism has long been held as a defining characteristic of Canadian identity. Patricia Wood and Liette Gilbert (2005) contend that deep political motives are present in the construction of contemporary multicultural Canada; multiculturalism was not "a goal or a vision in and of itself," but was a "politically necessary addition to a national bilingual policy introduced to recognize Francophones and Quebec" (p.682). Multiculturalism was a tactical construction used to quell issues associated with Canada's bilingualism, where Quebec and French Canadians can be consigned to an "equal" status with other non Anglo-Canadians. Whether a specific set of state policies on political pluralism, a social structure in a diverse society, or an ideology that

upholds diversity, multiculturalism itself connotes a variety of meanings (Kallen, 1982; Angus, 1997). For Wood and Gilbert, multiculturalism is both recognition by the wider society of a pluralistic society, and the assertion by cultural groups in legitimizing their contributions to the national identity. Wood and Gilbert also present a variety of thinkers who have criticized the official multicultural policy of Canada for producing a socio-political landscape that is poorly equipped for dealing with social injustice. Kobayashi (1994) contends that multiculturalism is “formulated against conflict,” where the need to reconcile First Nations groups, French Canadians and various other cultural groups has resulted in a policy that is poorly equipped to deal with inequality and social injustice. With political opportunism located at the root of multicultural policies in Canada, cultures become caricatured for political reasons; in this process, the cultures that are to be ideologically embraced become reified in practice (Wood and Gilbert, 2005). Wood and Gilbert also link multiculturalism to the social, political and physical spaces of the city, and tie political ideology to space. Here, Multiculturalism is not merely about coexistence, but also includes spaces of resistance that promote the negotiation of rights and social needs.

The implications of the increasingly neoliberal form of capitalism for the already turbulent conceptions of race and ethnicity in planning become urgent spheres of research. Brenner, Peck and Theodore (2010) have referred to neoliberalism as a “key word for understanding the regulatory transformations of our time” (p.327) Although the term itself has varied in usage, its resurgence in the 1980’s has been associated with *laissez-faire* capitalist initiatives such as privatization, free trade and deregulation (Boas and Gans-Morse, 2009). Economic issues faced by cities are often remedied by the state with the “agenda of contemporary spatial planning through the seemingly necessary production of market-friendly

places.” As a result, “the city as a right, as entitlement, is slowly being replaced with the city as possibility and opportunity” (Baeten, 2012, p.206). In 1967, Lefebvre wrote the *Right to the City* as a powerful critique of pre-neoliberal urbanist capitalism. Katiya and Reid (2012) demonstrate that *Right to the City* movements such as the Right to the City Alliance have gained some momentum in responding to the current neoliberal logic. Based in New York City, the Right to the City Alliance is a collaboration of multiple social justice organizations addressing citizens’ increasing lack of power in controlling the production of their own spaces (Katiya and Reid, 2012).

Using the works of Rose (1999) and Larner (2000), Baeten has questioned the very concept of freedom under a neoliberal agenda; “freedom under this new neoliberal subjectivity means freedom from bureaucracy and state patronage, rather than freedom from want or from the need for transport, shelter or safety. In this neoliberal understanding, urban subjects in the first instance carry self-responsibility for education, retraining, well-being, and risk management through prudence, rather than having a set of rights they can claim from the city or the government” (Baeten, 2012, p.207). In the neoliberal city, citizens are forced to maximize their own well-being in a city that does not owe them anything, and the salient question of the role of the state in its responsibilities to the citizen becomes a contested topic. In *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2005), David Harvey also poses the question of freedom in the increasingly neoliberal world. Harvey (2005) cautions that there is evidence that market oriented policies (which trumpet individual liberties) reduce individuality and freedom. According to Riches (1997), hunger, poverty, and underemployment in the United States have risen significantly in the last few decades, and yet garner very little attention from state actors. Starting with Esping-Anderson’s (1990) work on residual welfare in pre-neoliberal states, Riches argues that the

Anglo-Saxon states in particular currently “comprise residual welfare states lacking any commitment to full employment and seeking to maintain a state/market dualism in which the state defers to the market” (Riches, 1997, p.04). Under neoliberalism, this emphasis on residual welfare continues to be magnified. In this context, it becomes apparent that the provision of welfare is contingent on the commodified labour power of citizens, and the right to existence outside of the capitalist system becomes unrecognized (Riches, 1997). This stark increase in charitable food programs, for example, results from a shift in governance style outlined by David Harvey (1989). The “managerial approach so typical of the 1960s has steadily given way to initiatory and entrepreneurial forms of action in the 1970s and 1980s” (Harvey, 1989, p.4). Bouinot (1987) refers to the 1985 colloquium of North American policymakers in New Orleans as a salient moment of the shift into entrepreneurialism, where a reduction of the managerial style was recommended to assuage the economic slump. Various other scholars such as Swyngedouw (1986) also point to the recession of the 1970’s, where unemployment and deindustrialization were used to justify an entrepreneurial style of local governance. An entrepreneurial stance on governance appears to have gained widespread consensus as a ‘beneficial’ tactic across the political spectrum; such a consensus is visible across geographical boundaries between nation states and in political ideologies touted by different political parties (Harvey, 1989). The entrepreneurial shift and the increase in charitable food programs show that freedom from hunger and poverty is not a responsibility of the state to its citizens.

The increasing difficulty faced by governments in controlling flows of capital in an international and globalized economy is yet another reason for abandoning a managerial approach to governance (Harvey, 1989). The inability to control flows of capital often puts urban centres in positions where a competitive advantage must constantly be secured for continued

investment in the city. Such inter-urban competition is a powerful force in shaping policy, and often brings cities “closer into line with the discipline and logic of capitalist development” where urban centres must constantly address the “ability of capital to exercise greater choice over location” (Harvey, 1989, p.10). The heightened competition as described by such scholars would likely construct an acutely location-sensitive form of capital, where even slight changes in market regulation by cities often translate into risks of losing investment. A shift towards entrepreneurialism directly affects distributive outcomes as corporations and financiers of capital are aggressively subsidized in an attempt to persuade investment in urban centres, often diverting funds at the expense of marginalized populations (Harvey, 1989). Using the work of Boddy (1984) and Wilson (1987), Harvey illustrates a “general increase in problems of impoverishment and disempowerment, including the production of a distinctive underclass, has been documented beyond dispute for many of the large cities in the United States,” and highlights development as “property- led, business and market oriented and competitive, with economic development rather than employment the primary focus, and with an emphasis on small firms” (1989, p.12).

Despite their thorough analyses, both Harvey and Baeten fail to integrate ideas of ‘race’ and racism within their examination of neoliberal capitalism. In his discussion of the role of the city in relation to its residents, Baeten does not discuss racialization as an intertwined process in capitalism. Similarly, Harvey’s ideas on the shifts in governance styles do not take into account the parallel process of racialization that becomes inseparable from capitalism. In such analyses, race becomes conceptually separated from political economy and class (Bannerji, 2005).

Planning for diversity in an increasingly neoliberal terrain requires a renewed analysis of the relations of capital and race, where a comparative historical analysis must connect with the lived experiences of people. In her black feminist critique of feminist theory and antiracist

politics, Kimberley Crenshaw points out that studies in race and feminist theories have often employed a “single-axis framework” that fails to grasp the complexity of oppression by granting certain groups the privilege of analysis over others; “black women are sometimes excluded from feminist theory and antiracist policy discourse because both are predicated on a discrete set of experiences that often does not accurately reflect the interaction of race and gender” (Crenshaw, 1989, p.58). Here, the mere sum of racism and sexism fails to adequately grasp the intricacy of the distinct experiences of black women. For Crenshaw, an intersectional approach is required to contest the isolated analysis of oppressive processes that excludes large subsets of lived experience and cannot account for the multifaceted interactions of race, gender and class categories. Others, such as Patricia Hill Collins (1990), have echoed Crenshaw’s contentions, and refer to the inability of current sociological analyses to epistemologically incorporate the lived experiences of people at the intersections of various systems of power as hindering an understanding of the mutually reinforcing nature of oppression.

In contrast to Crenshaw and Collins, Bannerji (2005) problematizes the fragmentation of the social form that results from addressing issues of race, class and gender through an intersectional approach. Although it is recognized that race, class and gender work cumulatively to strengthen each other as social relations of power, these three axes of power are often approached by theorists of intersectionality as having separate conceptual and historical roots which intersect each other as such. Here, issues of race, class and gender become awkwardly situated in the wider partitioning of the social into the cultural, the social, and the economic (Bannerji, 2005). In the process, race is often treated as a cultural entity while gender and class are categorized as social and economic phenomena respectively. For Bannerji, intersectionality fails to acknowledge actual lived experience, where class, race, and gender are experienced

instantly in a fashion that supersedes a mere congregate of these elements, and makes them conceptually inseparable prior to their perceived ‘intersection’. Using Marx, Bannerji interprets “the social” to mean “a complex socioeconomic and cultural formation, brought to life through myriad finite and specific social and historical relations, organizations, and institutions... [that] involves living and conscious human agents” (Bannerji, 2005, p.146). It becomes comprehensible here that race has been separated from ‘the social’. In turn, reductionist theorists see class as an economic category and relegate race to a more subordinate cultural form of inequality (Bannerji, 2005).

Bannerji’s contention that multiple forms of subordination are formed together becomes pivotal in understanding the inseparable connections between race and capital. Indeed, this paper is both an exercise in understanding the historical ties of race with the development of capitalism and an exploration of Bannerji’s ideas of the shared conceptual and historical roots of class and race. Here, a Marxist framework will be employed to better grasp the dynamic nature of racial identities within distinct economic processes. Through an exploration of a selection of specific Marxist thinkers pertinent for the study of race and capital, American labour history and Caribbean slavery will be used as analytical points of departure for a thematic analysis that focuses on the construction of race as an integral process in the development of capitalism. From the United States to Haiti, the development of slavery in the Americas in the latter part of the last millennium remains an important topic of research in understanding race and capitalism. In 1770, the labour requirements in the fields and households of the New World were met by two and a half million African slaves (Blackburn, 1988). In 1789, produce from French San Domingo alone constituted the majority of France’s overseas trade (James, 1938). The economic and social implications of slave labour transcended both social and geographical boundaries across multiple

nations and their colonies. By highlighting the historical relationship of race to labour control, slavery, colonialism and imperialism, this major paper will discuss the shared conceptual and historical roots of race, class and capital.

A Marxist framework becomes constructive in light of the inability of various economic theories to adequately conceptualize race and capital within a socio-historical milieu. Tomich (2004) critiques new economic theories for having a purely technical and universal view of production, where theories become divorced from social or historical context; in this process, slavery does not present itself as analytically problematic. A significant example of such theories is neo-classical economics, which applies statistical methods and modeling to analyze historical issues. As Tomich states, such a theory abstracts capital from “social relations and constructs categories of economic analyses that are presumed to have universal validity” (Tomich, 2004, p.5). Here, it can be seen that simply adding issues of labour and slavery to established ideas of capital will not suffice in understanding either, and one must rethink capital in a way that treats slavery and labour as seminal in the development of capitalism (Tomich, 2004).

Although Marxist views are diverse, Tomich criticizes the frequent separation of slavery from capitalism, where slavery is seen as a backwards and irrational social relation. “Having separated slavery from capitalism, the latter becomes the measure of the backwardness of the former...the categories of the capitalist economy are judged to possess a universally valid rationality while the slave economy is characterized by “irrational tendencies that inhibit economic development and endanger social stability” (Tomich, 2004, p.11). Slavery is understood as a feature of the American South, where it is somehow isolated from the development of global capitalism. Even when a relationship is made, the capitalist economy is

placed spatially outside of slavery, and slavery is analyzed as if it was a separate phenomenon (Tomich, 2004).

American Labour History

From the slave labour of African Americans to the use of an array of immigrant workers in mines and railway construction, the labour history of the United States is fraught with racialization during processes of capital accumulation. Starting with the establishment of Jamestown and its indentured servants to the recent struggles of African Americans, it becomes clear that the economic development of the United States is inseparable from the construction of race. Here, through an analysis of thinkers such as Allen, Roediger, James, and Ignatiev among others, one can explore the dynamic connections between race and capitalism throughout American labour history.

The Social Control Strata

In his many years of analyzing the colonial records of Virginia, American writer and activist Theodore W. Allen remains unable to find any reference to the use of the word white as a meaningful emblem in social hierarchy until the late seventeenth century, despite the arrival of Africans in Virginia in the preceding decades. Allen contends that the white race and its historical ties to social status are the constructions of the Anglo-American ruling elites, and connects the formation of the white race to fears of labour solidarity and the need for social control after Bacon's rebellion in 1676. Here, the creation of the white race was not only detrimental to the prosperity of African Americans, but also to the European American working class.

The white race was invented as “social control strata;” such strata ensured a buffer between the ruling elites of Virginia and the African immigrants whom they enslaved (Allen, 1997). The creation of social control strata by evoking ‘white’ solidarity required the presence of a white race. For Allen, the presence of social control strata is vital in understanding the racialization of European Americans as ‘white.’ Here, a buffer along lines of ‘race’ muffled class solidarity among European and African workers. Race and its relationship to labour control remain a consistent theme in understanding slavery throughout the Americas. For example, C.L.R. James’ recounting of struggles in San Domingo discussed in the following chapter also highlight the importance of racialization in maintaining labour control.

Allen (1997) traces the recent development of whiteness to the dynamic economic situation of England and its colonies. Unlike its European neighbours, England was unique in its substantial use of European plantation workers in continental America (Fields, 1990). Allen positions this as a direct response to a labour shortage experienced in the colonies and the resulting hindrance to the expansion of English capital, which was complemented by an effort to expel a growing number of unemployed workers and peasants from England in the sixteenth century. With the rise of the textile industry in England, the price of wool rose substantially; the conversion of arable land into pasture was a direct result of the relative price of wool compared to that of grain. The emigration of a large number of English plantation workers was to a significant degree the result of land deprivation and underemployment of peasants in this shift during the Enclosure Movement. Historian E.P. Thomson (1963) sees this movement as pivotal in the creation of the English working class. In securing large portions of land for their own benefits, wealthy landowners were able to create the landless labour required for the development of capitalism. Here, one can see that the onset of indentured servitude and free

labour in the American colonies was directly linked to changes in English economic structure (Allen, 1997). The growth of this very 'basic' English peasant workforce in Anglo-America is vital in the establishment of a social control mechanism, as "the peculiarity of the 'peculiar institution' derived, rather from the *control* aspect; yet not merely in its reliance upon the support of the free non-owners of bond-labour, as buffer and enforcer against the unfree proletariat; for that again was a general characteristic of plantation societies in America" (Allen, 1997, p.12). For Allen, the uniqueness of the Anglo-American institution of white supremacy rests in the exclusion of non-European proletarians from the control stratum used to uphold the unfree proletarians; here, the control stratum itself was composed of free proletarians.

The social control stratum is not a novel concept in English economic policy, as Allen discusses the preservation of the small-land holding yeomanry in the sixteenth century. Even though the end of feudalism resulted in some small, land holding peasants, the majority were heavily exploited as wage labourers for capitalist employers (Allen, 1997). Nor was it foreign to other European Empires, who had attempted to varying degrees of success to take advantage of a social control stratum for the exploitation of indigenous peoples. While the lack of a social stratum in Hispaniola and the resulting military conflict made it too difficult to force the indigenous community to work, the indigenous empires of Mexico and Peru already possessed buffers for slavery which the Spanish used to their advantage (Allen, 1997). Consisting of a three-layered stratum, the Spanish encountered "an elaborate system of levy providing products of all kinds, slaves, and services for the three capitals of the so-called Aztec Empire" (Allen, 1997, p.32). Allen demonstrates that the Spanish inserted themselves into an already established social system after disposing of the rulers of these indigenous societies. The Spanish then gave privileges to parts of the ruling class which they called the *cacique* and relegated them to

perform the functions of a social control stratum (Allen, 1997). Virginia was a continental colony with little stratification in the indigenous society and was too difficult for abject labour exploitation (Allen, 1997). In Virginia, the mid-1600s saw the implementation of laws against “Indians” that aimed at “optimizing of the combination of the rate of capital accumulation and social control”; the laws challenged the question of the “legitimacy of Indian tribal society, “where the Anglo- Americans subscribed to the view that the victors of war with savages can enslave them, and slaves were acquired through wars between competing tribes (Allen, 1997, p.36) The settlers’ attempts to create an intermediate strata by giving certain chiefs privileges proved unsuccessful, as the chiefs were unable to control the entire indigenous population. The English colonies of the early 1600’s were also weak militarily, and were unable to launch a military operation like the Spanish to try and exploit labour from the indigenous people. The English, to a large extent, had to trade with the indigenous communities for their survival (Allen, 1997).

Allen also challenges the assertion by thinkers such as Almon Wheeler Lauber (1913) and Eric Williams (1944) that the indigenous people were physically unfit for chattel slavery. He frames the lack of indigenous slavery as an issue of social control. He points to the deportation of captured indigenous slaves to the West Indian colonies as evidence of the inability to successfully enslave the North American tribes encountered by Europeans resulting from a weak social control buffer. Although inter-tribal rivalries were often used to create such buffers, the shifting alliances among the oppressed indigenous tribes made such a social control mechanism impossible to maintain (Allen, 1997). Following an initial stage where the possibility of indigenous slavery loomed, the seventeenth century saw a more widespread use of European indentured workers and African slaves. Roediger and Esch (2012) place the turn of this century

as critical in the formation of racial categories. Laws were passed in Virginia to add specific socioeconomic significance to race in light of the constant conflicts over the system of tobacco production. Bacon's Rebellion, as discussed by Allen, is a prominent example of such a conflict, and "spurred the transition to African labour and to highly gendered elaborations of race as a means of social control, even as it aided the legitimation of cross-class European claims to Indian land" (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.12).

An analysis of the history of colonial slavery immediately points to bonded white servitude as the foundation of racial slavery (Allen, 1997; Williams, 1944; Fields, 1990). The overproduction of tobacco turned the Virginia Company into an economic failure and it resulted in the importation of non-tenant workers such as prisoners and street children for the sake of company viability. The two-way bondage system, where the workers could not leave and the masters could not make workers leave, while imperative to the feudal system, became detrimental to the development of modern capitalism (Allen, 1997). The reign of the Virginia Company between 1607 to 1624 saw the immigration of English workers who were put under contract to pay off their immigration fees. The lack of a large and unattached labour force for keeping labour costs down coupled with declining returns in tobacco production prompted the implementation of a one-way bondage, where workers gradually became exchangeable property (Allen, 1997). Such demand for bonded labour can be seen in the prevalence of "spirits" in England, who "spirited" away vulnerable people through kidnapping or trickery to be bonded labourers in the New World (Williams, 1944). In England, the Statute of Artificers 1563 forced the majority of society to work and included provisions to ensure that upward mobility and workers' bargaining positions were blunted. For a short period of time, English laws considered

the unemployed to be vagabonds, subject to slavery for two years, and possibly for life depending on number of attempted escapes (Fields, 1990).

By recounting a plethora of cases in seventeenth century Virginia and Maryland, Allen highlights the abuse and oppression of both African and European bond labourers, along with the joint resistance to oppression by both labouring groups. Cases of jointly running away and aiding in the escape of fellow bonded labourers regardless of race were common; 22 of the 54 court cases regarding ‘fornication’ that were analyzed by Allen involve the union of African American men and European American women. In light of this research, it becomes unequivocally clear that, despite attempts by the plantation bourgeoisie to deny rights to African Americans, the working class was united in their response to oppression; in most of the seventeenth century, ideas of white supremacy did not exist to the point where the white labouring class demanded privileges based on the supposed inferiority of Africans. In fact, of the hundreds of cases of “oppression” and “resistance” examined by Allen, none with the exception of two included any attempts by the white labouring class to differentiate themselves from the Africans in their suffering, and most cases showed signs of solidarity. Only a few cases even showed signs of racial hatred by the labouring class, and in these cases the bystanders actively “disassociated themselves from such chauvinism” (Allen, 1997, p.162) Here, it becomes clear that class solidarity initially triumphed over the importance of racial unity in the dynamics of labour in the very early stages of American colonial development.

The early seventeenth century witnessed the absence of an adequate intermediate stratum akin to the yeomanry of England and a lack of a sufficient constabulary to police rebellious bonded labourers. Allen demonstrates that a significant reason for the lack of a proper social buffer in the decades prior to Bacon’s Rebellion is the declining profitability of tobacco, which

sent the plantation bourgeoisie into debt. A few elite members gained, others did not; the plantation bourgeoisie was itself divided (Allen, 1997). While plantation elites continued to struggle to find an easily exploitable labour source, the high demand of labour in England, the subsequent rise in wages, and the need for soldiers in its combat with France led to diminishing immigration to the colonies, which contributed directly to the prominence of the new Royal African Company (Allen, 1997). Perpetual bondage was a direct response to the rapidly expanding global economy, where rapid economic growth was essential in remaining viable and competitive (Tomich, 2004). The initial labour power of the colonies in the early 1600s, composed mainly of English indentured servants, slowly transitioned into a slave labour force brought in from the West Indies, with a switch to African labour in the 1680s (Fields, 1990). England and its colonies now had direct access to labourers bonded for life, and hereditary bondage where pregnancy and the bearing of children were not detrimental to the masters, but economically viable options. The outlawing of women who are bonded labourers in getting married and bearing children no longer applied to African slaves who inherited their slave status. Indeed, Allen points to evidence where slave women were often coerced to reproduce; women unable to bear children were often given the more arduous tasks assigned to slave men (Allen, 1997). Here, it becomes clear that the reproduction of slaves and gender roles of slave women were actively managed by the plantation elites.

“The hallmark of racial oppression in its colonial origins and as it has persisted in subsequent historical contexts is the reduction of all members of the oppressed group to one undifferentiated social status, a status beneath that of any member of any social class within the oppressor group” (Allen, 1997, p.177) Systematic racial oppression as described here did not exist in the seventeenth century. Allen points to evidence of labour solidarity and the lack of

cross-class racial solidarity. The late seventeenth century showed a desire among some planters to extend the time of bondage, and possibly bond African Americans for life. However, a racial system where being black automatically meant a lifetime of bondage did not yet fully materialize in the late 1600's, and records indicate that African Americans owned property and were integrated into the regular legal structure of English society (Allen, 1997). In discussing a case where a black runaway labourer was punished with a lifetime of bondage while his white companion was not, Allen indicates that a combination of race and status as a non-Christian could explain the verdict. Here, Allen intricately shows that while racial oppression was clearly present prior to the eighteenth century, blackness was not indisputably tied to hereditary slavery. Allen's examinations of cases regarding interracial marriages for social mobility, along with landholding rights granted to African Americans clearly demonstrates the lack of distinct racial identities imperative for systemic racial oppression.

Allen demonstrates that the latter part of the seventeenth century witnessed a change in policies that pushed African American workers towards lifetime bondage and hereditary slavery, such as the exclusion of Christian principles that once prohibited enslavement after baptism. Another prominent example includes the expunging of English common law, where African Americans can no longer inherit free status from an English father (Allen, 1997). Allen refers to the latter policy as a clear sign of the plantation bourgeoisie's desire for higher profits through the implementation of lifetime hereditary slavery. The removal of English common law to inheriting status from the mother can also be interpreted here as a tool for creating more concrete boundaries between black and white racial identities, as the legal recognition of mixed race children as citizens can blur racial lines and weaken the social control stratum.

Barbara Fields (1990) notes that to degrade European bonded labourers to perpetual slavery would have been a “dangerous undertaking, considering that servants were well armed, that they outnumbered their masters, and that the Indians could easily take advantage of the inevitably resulting warfare among the enemy” (p.103). European bonded labourers entered Virginia as an English lower class that had a history of negotiated rights with their ‘superiors’. Here, they were able to continue with a tradition of negotiation that established their relationship with the elites. For Fields, newly arrived African labourers were vulnerable without a historic basis to settle their relations to the English colony; the history they held became obsolete in their new environment (Fields, 1990). Here, the process of racialization becomes tied to the historical processes of economic and political negotiation.

As life expectancy began to increase in the colonies, European indentured servants increasingly lived to gain their freedom dues and independence. It also became more sensible to purchase African slaves for a lifetime of bonded labour (Fields, 1990). The increasing mortality of potential slaves came at a coincidental historical moment with the increasing rebelliousness of recently freed European workers. Fields demonstrates that the dangers of continuing to use Europeans for plantation labour was compounded by its relative ease with which African Americans were being enslaved.

The inevitable rebelliousness of degraded labourers mentioned by Fields materialized in the form of Bacon’s Rebellion. Bacon’s Rebellion was an armed revolt in 1676 by “frontier” settlers against the rule of Governor William Berkeley of Virginia. Initiated by disagreements on the details of Berkeley’s policies with neighbouring Indigenous populations, the rebellion saw the rise of colony council member Nathaniel Bacon as a leader of the rebels. From unfair taxation to privileges given to close acquaintances of Berkeley, the grievances behind the

rebellion expanded beyond “Indian” policy (Allen, 1997). Bacon’s Rebellion, which Allen credits to the lack of social control strata, was especially harrowing for the plantation elite as they witnessed the solidarity in rebelliousness of African and European labourers. The united demands of the labourers were not against capitalism itself, but of the oppressive nature of a specific form of capitalism which they believed had been unfairly thrust upon them by the plantation bourgeoisie (Allen, 1997). Bacon’s rebellion remains critical in demonstrating that the focus on race over class was not simply a result of subjecting African Americans to chattel servitude, as European and African Americans both felt oppressed as bonded labourers. Here, one can see that the subsequent subordination of class to race was constructed specifically to dismantle such unity-in-resistance (Allen, 1997). As historian Gary B. Nash (1985) notes, the ability of the plantation elites to fashion unity and consensus among European Americans on a terrain where race superseded class as a symbol of social status appeared to be vital in the maintenance of bonded servitude and continued capital accumulation.

The analysis of a social control stratum begs the question of why free African Americans and people of mixed ancestry were barred from this category, in contrast to the Caribbean. Allen’s examination of a case where the British Attorney-General Richard West challenges a law passed by the Virginia Assembly in 1723 may hold some answers. A measure excluding free African Americans and “mulattos” from voting, after being challenged by the Attorney-General, was upheld by the Assembly to prevent revolts by free African-Americans and slaves, and to discourage the apparently “aberrant” sexual relations between the European and African labourers. Allen dismisses these reasons as disingenuous, and points to the statements of West’s contemporary, Governor Francis Nicholson of Maryland, who expressed worry over the “prospect of ‘great disturbances’ in which he believed that the Irish bond-labourers would

‘confederate with the negros’” (Allen, 1997, p.244). In fact, cases of the elites expressing their anxieties over labour solidarity and revolts were numerous in the early eighteenth century. Governor William Gooch of Virginia, in 1729, expressed his fear of African bond-labourers escaping and forming an independent society in the mountains of Virginia, while Virginia Colony Councillor William Byrd in 1736 vocalized his anxieties over the growing number of African Americans in the colony (Allen, 1997). The plantation elites’ fears of losing control of bonded labourers and their interest in subjugating free African Americans and mixed people is central to understanding the formation of a social control stratum. The historical reasons to manipulate racial identities regardless of class for the purpose of continued capital accumulation becomes evident.

As demonstrated by Allen in his analysis of Bacon’s Rebellion, the presence of a few supporters within the inner circles of plantation elites was simply not enough to disregard the potential threat of rebellion from the working class white society. The labour solidarity of Bacon’s Rebellion had shown that free labourers were able to sympathize and recognize common interests with bonded labourers in a fashion that transcended racial lines (Allen, 1997). In light of increasing labour solidarity, the plantation bourgeoisie explicitly attempted to fracture such unity. English statesman Sir Francis Bacon advocated “dividing and breaking of all factions and combinations that are adverse to the state, and setting them at distance, or at least distrust among themselves” (Allen, 1997, p.248). The slaveholders created a society where the hope of owning bonded-labourers was unattainable to much of the Anglo-American population due to monopoly, which excluded small farmers from the capital required to transition into a more secure economic position (Allen, 1997). A forged belief of liberty was given to labourers without any real chances of upward social mobility. ‘White’ labourers were encouraged to settle with a

system where whiteness came to represent social status. For this to be kept up, free blacks had to be denied the same presumption of liberty, regardless of their economic status (Allen, 1997). In fact, as Allen demonstrates, laws enacted in the early eighteenth century in the colonies were to the direct detriment of black slaves and to the betterment of white bond labourers. Laws were passed to subdue African Americans. For example, making an assault of any white person subject to thirty lashes effectively revoked the right to self defence. These laws ensured a clear distance between the two groups, and aided in creating the racial identities themselves (Allen, 1997). Here, Allen contends that the white race itself was invented as a social control mechanism, which had the European labouring classes unite with the white bourgeoisie through a sense of racial birthright as opposed to class solidarity with African Americans. Due to the success of this system at the turn of the seventeenth century in Virginia and Maryland, it quickly spread throughout the American colonies (Allen, 1997).

While Allen sees the creation of the white race as a necessary precursor for African enslavement and continued subjugation of European labourers, Fields sees racialization as more salient *after* African enslavement. For Fields, race is an ideology that develops when pre-existing economic relations become reified as somehow inherent and natural (Fields, 1990). Here, ideas of race and racial inferiority of Africans developed after the establishment of slavery. Indeed, Field's analyses of court documents in the mid-1600's condemning sexual relations between slaves and European women show that such documents reference the need to protect "English birth right" and slave status; they do not condemn sexual relations in the context of protecting 'white purity' or of repelling the supposed inferiority of 'black' slaves (Fields, 1990). It becomes clear from Field's analyses that race is not merely created for economic reasons, but can be created and reinforced by the very economic and political relations themselves.

Allen's ideas of the social control stratum in Virginia are developed from a comparative analysis of Anglo-American and Anglo-Caribbean colonies. The large scale monoculture of plantations in Anglo-Caribbean colonies meant that "social control in the Anglo-Caribbean colonies...diverged in historically significant ways from that which was adopted in continental Anglo-America" (Allen, 1997, p.224). The initial prospect of using freed European bonded labourers as a control stratum was simply not realized. Indeed, Allen demonstrates that instances of plots for rebellion by bond labourers were common throughout the early seventeenth century in Barbados and Jamaica. The years between 1675 and 1701 saw four significant plots for revolts in Barbados. European and African bond labourers worked closely together in 1686 in attempting to overthrow the plantation elites of Barbados (Allen, 1997). In Jamaica, over 1,500 African labourers who fled to form independent communities in the mountains "remained a "thorn in the side of the English colony" for almost a century (Allen, 1997, p.225).

The plantation bourgeoisie occupied large portions of land in a monoculture economy centered on sugar and rum. The capital-intensive nature of the plantation system excluded the development of small farmers in the Anglo-Caribbean (Allen, 1997). A growing number of free former bond-labourers of at least partial African ancestry further hampered the creation of a social strata based on ideas of race. Here, the sheer number of free Africans halted the production of a social control stratum that excluded non-Europeans (Allen, 1997). Allen demonstrates that the lack of a strong social control stratum in the Anglo-Caribbean required the constant presence of military and naval forces on the islands. Although English troops were stationed in the Anglo Caribbean for combat with other Imperial powers during disputes, Allen notes that "it was customary for British troops to police the slave population" (Allen, 1997, p.232).

The Working Man

While Allen emphasizes the creation of the white race as a social control stratum, Fields focuses on racialization as a continuous process that is shaped by economic relations. Both Allen and Fields emphasize the role of the plantation bourgeoisie in constructing racial identities. In doing so, they give less attention to the everyday lived experiences of the labourers themselves. Here, one can see that the role of the workers as an essential component in the racialization process becomes muted. American historian Roediger (1991) sees the white labouring class itself as a vital player in the formation of racial identities. Despite structures implemented by the elites to construct race in favour of capital accumulation, workers simultaneously construct their own identities in responding to the dynamism of economic processes. Here, it becomes clear that racial identities are continually constructed through both politico-economic structures and the resulting lived experiences of the workers (Roediger, 1991). Incorporating both into an analysis of race and capital has profound consequences for our understanding of race and the working class.

The very idea of a worker is problematic if it abstracts from the gendered and racialized dimensions of class experience. Expanding on Sociologist David Halle's work on New Jersey chemical workers, Roediger shows that the term "working man" not only implies class and gender identities, but also connotes race. When referring to themselves as working men, these chemical workers are distinctively engaging with the term in a context that assumes 'whiteness' as an integral quality of the working man (Roediger, 1991). Specifically, the workers in the study failed to consider African Americans in analogous jobs as constitutive of the "working man" grouping. This process of identification shows that the worker is interpreted as somehow

‘naturally white’. In turn, being non-white signifies a place outside of the ‘working man’ category (Roediger, 1991).

Roediger sees the development of the white working man as a relatively recent phenomenon, tracing its roots to the nineteenth century. The association of ‘white’ and ‘worker’ became closer during the American Revolution. The contradictions of the newly formed United States, where freedom and independence were juxtaposed with the realities of chattel slavery, were complemented with a range of conflicting emotions in the white working class (Roediger, 1991). In a country where wage labour and its associated demands for a new capitalist discipline were becoming more pervasive, the abasement of African Americans and the institution of slavery became hallmarks of comparison for measuring economic independence (Roediger, 1991). Roediger does not propose that racial tensions were absent in preceding centuries but contends that racist attitudes prior to the nineteenth century did not attach race to the economic independence of workers. By relating the emotional turmoil of wage labourers to race and racism in the nineteenth century, Roediger illustrates the formative intersection of class and race.

Ideas of *whiteness* began to form during European exploration, which resulted in the interaction of European traders with people of African and Indigenous ancestries. Roediger situates the early connections between work and whiteness in the racist connotations given to Native Americans by early European settlers, where the management of land as a distinct skill of whites was utilized as a rationale for the appropriation of indigenous territories. The supposed inability of Native Americans to husband the land provided by God was a powerful justification for dispossessing indigenous groups from their lands, and helped form the early connections between work and whiteness (Roediger, 1991). In contrast to the subordination of indigenous people as a process that produces whiteness, Roediger does not make as strong a connection

between the early development of the white worker as an antithesis to African workers prior to the American Revolution. Referring to the prevalence of cases where the working classes of both races were often freely intermingling, Roediger contends that “the many gradations of unfreedom among whites made it difficult to draw fast lines between any idealized free white worker and a pitied or scorned servile Black worker” (Roediger, 1991, p.25) Here, Roediger is referring to the array of oppressive labour conditions ranging from indentured servitude to convict labour faced by white workers and the difficulty of distinguishing these conditions from slavery. The use of the term *servant*, often used to describe both free white workers and black slaves, became taboo after the American Revolution when used to reference white workers (Roediger, 1991), thus demonstrating the link between racial formation and class formation in the newly formed United States.

Antagonism towards the British prior to the American Revolution resulted in the usage of slavery as a metaphor to depict the injustices of British colonial rule. Many Anglo-Americans saw taxation and debt imposed on them by the English as comparable to a road to slavery (Roediger, 1991). However, Roediger points out that they were acutely aware of their status as free men and the uncertainty of their identity became more salient only after the American Revolution. A sharp divergence in the social significance of indentured workers and slaves occurred around the time of the American Revolution. The revolution resulted in a decline in white servitude as the surviving indentured workers eventually gained freedom in return for serving their time or fighting in the war, and assimilated into the free white population (Roediger, 1991). Black chattel slaves, who faced hereditary slavery, remained more economically viable and were not assimilated as citizens. After the American Revolution, “white

servitude was a problem that could be and was conquered both at the social and at the individual level in a way that black slavery was not” (Roediger, 1991, p.32).

For Roediger, the development of the free white man necessitated a comparison with its opposite, the black slave. During the years of turbulence and uncertainty after the American Revolution, African Americans, both free and enslaved, came to be seen as the “opposites of ‘free white labour’” (Roediger, 1991, p.36). With the decline of indentured servitude between 1763 and 1830, Anglo-Americans’ expectations of a new country based on independent, small producers was sharply contradicted by the rise of wage labour in the early 1800’s (Roediger, 1991). Although the view of the ‘hireling’ as a non-patriotic form of labour that bred laziness flourished, the shift from labourers who boarded with families and ate meals at their tables to ones that negotiated wages and boarded out became a symbol of independence despite the anxieties of increased job insecurity (Roediger, 1991). This shift gave workers an increased sense of economic independence, and drew a much clearer line between wage labour and chattel slavery. While trying to remove the perceived meanings of class inequalities as a slave-like experience common in the European Empires, working class whites in the United States used black slavery and servitude as a way of separating themselves from it (Roediger, 1991). In this transition, any negative connotation of ‘hire’ dissolved in light of the term’s development as the very antithesis of slavery. Similarly, other terms such as “servant” that were once used analogously with slave became unacceptable in the vernacular of working class whites following the American Revolution. As Roediger points out, “blackness and servility were so thoroughly intertwined...that assertions of white freedom could not be raceless...the existence of slavery (and increasingly of open Northern campaigns to degrade free blacks) gave working Americans both a

wretched touchstone against which to measure their fears of unfreedom and a friendly reminder that they were by comparison not so badly off” (Roediger, 1991, p.41).

The term ‘freeman’ soon replaced servant to preserve the dignity and masculinity of working men, while ‘men’ evolved to represent any wage labourer, where ideas that already have racial connotations also developed gendered ones (Roediger, 1991). Roediger points out here that African Americans were not only noncitizens, but anticitizens; the development of the independent free man as a white male immediately cast African Americans as dependent, threatening symbols of the oppressive potential of the rich and powerful elites. Even incremental signs of power from African Americans were therefore seen as hostile. Weakening of established barriers between free workers and slaves threaten the very reality and veracity of white independence (Roediger, 1991).

In the 1830’s, working class whites made numerous comparisons to African slavery when discussing their subjugated role in evolving capitalist relations. However, sentiments based on these perceived similarities evaporated whenever laws and policies were made in favour of working class whites. Here, one finds the emotional turmoil of white workers comparing themselves to black slaves, while simultaneously rejecting any acts of solidarity with the slaves. Indeed, sentiments that refer to the fears of ‘white slavery’ in the newly formed United States rarely had the rationale of achieving any class unity with black slaves and were used only to address white workers’ fears of oppression. Here, one can see that the white workers’ habit of constantly comparing their own economic situation to that of African Americans while simultaneously avoiding class solidarity was a result of the inability of the new American Republic to maintain an economic system based on independent farmers and mechanics.

The ability of the working class to influence racial categories becomes evident in Noel Ignatiev's (1995) contributions to Irish American history. Ignatiev understands the incorporation of the Irish into the white grouping as a product of the reaction of Irish workers to racially aligned economic impediments. The consolidation of Ireland as an English colony by the Anglo-Irish elites resulted in the loss of economic independence for Ireland, which was left with the task of supplying agricultural goods to the rest of Great Britain (Ignatiev, 1995). The Napoleonic Wars led to a short boom in production in the Irish countryside. There was also a rise in rents and the growth of a class of middlemen "rackrenters" who leased their land. However, the conclusion of the wars in 1815 brought sharp drops in agricultural prices (Ignatiev, 1995). The resulting inability of Irish tenants to pay their rents led to mass evictions and the fall of the "rackrenter" class. At the same time, Irish manufacturers were unable to cope with English competition. Here, one can see that the surplus agricultural population was neither able to find work in Irish manufacturing industries nor cope with the fall of agricultural prices (Ignatiev, 1995). This transformation of the Irish countryside prompted the mass migration of Irish people to the United States. There, they became the answers to the American unskilled labour shortage. Newly arrived Irish Americans were often housed in close quarters with African American labourers. Both groups often intermingled. Despite predictions that racial harmony in the United States would start with camaraderie between African and Irish Americans, such friendly relations quickly turned south as the Irish became conscious of the economic benefits of white privilege (Ignatiev, 1995). Here, one can see that the whiteness that was gradually ascribed to Irish Americans is inseparable from the continued subjugation of African Americans. As Ignatiev states, the Irish "came to a society in which colour was important in determining social position. It was not a pattern they were familiar with and they bore no responsibility for it; nevertheless, they adapted

to it in short order” (Ignatiev, 1995, p.2). Ignatiev situates Irish Americans as having an active role in their own history and the racialization process itself. To the Irish, entering the white race ensured a significant advantage in economic competition, and gave them access to a highly segregated job market (Ignatiev, 1995).

The 1841 address written by Daniel O’Connell and signed by sixty thousand Irish from Europe urging support for the abolition movement was ill-received by Irish Americans. Although O’Connell was credited with the emancipation of Irish Catholics in Europe, many Irish Americans did not appreciate a foreign intervention from Ireland attempting to control their stance on American slavery (Ignatiev, 1995). The Irish Americans wrote back to O’Connell stating that his harsh words on America might be detrimental to them. This shows the “insecurities of an immigrant group whose claims to the rights, privileges and immunities of native Americans was not as secure as they might have wished” (Ignatiev, 1995, p.8). At the time, multiple newspapers described abolitionism as an attempt by British forces to weaken the union, and questioned whether the Irish should help their former tormenters in this plot. Indeed, a contradiction began to appear as Irish Americans objected to being acknowledged as a distinct ethnic group in the United States of America, while simultaneously asserting their unity with European movements for greater Irish Catholic freedoms (Ignatiev, 1995).

Marxist Thought after Emancipation

In exploring the life of Afro-Trinidadian historian and social theorist C.L.R. James, editor of *C.L.R. James on the Negro Question* Scott McLemee notices a lack of publications by James between 1938 and 1963. These two dates correspond to *Black Jacobins* and *Beyond a Boundary*; both works were influential in their respective domains. *Black Jacobins* remains a powerful recounting of the Saint-Domingue revolution while *Beyond a Boundary* resists categorization by

analysing the sport of cricket from a multiplicity of lenses. McLemee's attempts to locate C.L.R. James between these dates lead him to a series of unpublished works investigating ideas of race and racism in the United States from a distinctly Marxist framework. McLemee notes that while James' work in the late thirties were associated with his involvement in the Trotskyist movement, later texts diverge from Trotsky. Here, one can inspect the evolution of James' Marxist perspective on life as an African American in the early to mid twentieth century. McLemee places James' experiences with racism in the American South, and his discussions with Trotsky in Mexico in 1939 as vital for his ideas on the "Negro" question in the United States. Upon returning to the United States, James' new insights led him to become a founding member of the Workers Party.

A reading of C.L.R. James sheds light on the continued oppression of African Americans by American capitalism in the early twentieth century, decades following emancipation. By situating racial oppression within capitalist processes, James highlights the shared revolutionary paths of African Americans and anti-capitalist organizations for social change. In *The Historical Development of the Negroes in American Society* (1943), James shows that connecting questions of race to economic freedom allows the "negro question" to be elevated to that of a national, American question. Here, an analysis of the concerns of African Americans and the working class can identify the multiple forms of oppression that they are subjected to and illuminate the formative roots of their oppression and their subsequently shared paths for liberation. As James puts it, "any theoretical analysis of the contemporary Negro problem must begin with the developing relation of the Negro struggle to the general struggles of the proletariat as the leader of the oppressed classes in American Society" (James, 1996, p.69). James notes Trotsky's assertion that self determination for African Americans is not possible without a "war against

American capitalism” (James, 1996, p.75). James calls for an incorporation of this ideology within the Workers Party of the time. Here, one can see that James views the fight for democratic rights by African Americans as tied to the struggle for socialist liberation by the proletariat. However, James insists that “under no circumstances are these separate elements to be confused or treated as one” (James, 1996, p.76). The Party’s role is not to subordinate the struggles by African Americans for democratic rights to the needs of the white proletariats. Indeed, James echoes Trotsky’s assertion that the Party should not merely advocate African American needs, but struggle jointly with African American resistance.

In “*My Friends*”: *A Fireside Chat on the War by Native Son*” (1940), James speaks of Roosevelt’s Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1934, where government subsidies provided to the landlords were to be distributed appropriately between sharecroppers. Upon discovering that the money could be retained by the landlord in the absence of sharecroppers and tenants, over twenty thousand workers in Missouri were told to vacate the land by the landlords. Thousands of workers, mostly African Americans, camped out on a highway in St.Louis demanding immediate action by the Roosevelt Administration. James, however, does not explain this protest simply as a result of an abrupt emergency, but as a coordinated effort by socialist organizations and unions to initiate a sustained protest against the oppression of a mostly African American labour force. The fierce repression of unions in Missouri and Arkansas in the years that preceded the highway protests directly led to the congregation of a multitude of groups, which led to the rapid growth of the St. Louis highway protest. For James, this protest is one of a plethora of examples where anti-racist struggle and socialist organization were appropriately complementary; the large African American presence, the subjugation of sharecroppers, and the socialist organizations involved in the protests showed the inseparable nature of multiple oppressive forms, and the

subsequent opposition to American capitalism in the early twentieth century. James understands the violence and poverty put upon African American workers as existing within capitalist oppression, where “the recent cases where a landlord shot a cropper dead because he dared to argue with him is no ordinary murder. It typifies the economic relation between ruler and worker in the process of production” (James, 1996, p.27).

Even in cases where sharecroppers were treated fairly by the landlords, the workers are conscious of the perpetual state of poverty that results from their socio-economic conditions. James places a growing awareness that “they do not want to be sharecroppers any more” as fuel for the St.Louis highway protests, where a quarter of the labourers were participants. Writing about the protests within a few years of its occurrence, James places such an event as the beginnings of a joint militancy between various groups, and calls for a careful analysis of the protests, with “good points emphasized and the mistakes and weaknesses pointed out”...as “the action has given them a sense of power and a consciousness of solidarity” (James, 1996,p.28). Despite the eventual removal of protesters, this initial demonstration had been in many ways successful. As James points out, the discussions by landlords to introduce a system where they retained a larger share of the profits from sharecropping was immediately halted in light of the highway protest.

In *The Economics of Lynching* (1940), James uses a Marxist analysis to understand the violence inflicted upon African Americans, and situates lynching as a phenomenon that is embedded in the socio-economic conditions of the Southern United States. Using the work of Arthur F. Raper , James demonstrates that the prevalence of lynching is directly related to labour, where threats of African Americans successfully taking jobs away from working class whites in rural areas for lower wages often results in areas with a high rate of lynching. Indeed, Raper’s

data shows a correlation between the number of lynching cases per year with the price of cotton, validating James' hypothesis by suggesting economic conditions as precursors to racial violence. In the more concentrated "Black Belt", however, African Americans are valuable sources of labour, and are crucial for continued capital accumulation (James, 1996). The few cases of lynching that do occur here are often viewed as labour matters between workers and employers, and explains why employers in the Black Belt are often opposed to anti-lynching legislation; such legislation would aid in recognizing the rights of African Americans, and subsequently impede production (James, 1996). Plantation owners in the Black Belt, though opposed to anti-lynching measures, often protected their African American labour source from lynching by outsiders, while property owners in other regions had no such incentives. Here, James reiterates that capitalism is the source of lynching, and suggests that managing issues of production directly affects both white and black workers.

James situates the labour movement as a mechanism that can integrate difference, and deconstruct racial barriers created in the historical development of capitalism. Commenting on the belief that African Americans "cannot fight the whole white population," James points out that the white population itself is not to be fought, and such a statement is a slander on both European Americans and the multiplicity of unions that have incorporated 'blacks' and 'whites'. Over five hundred thousand men have placed their faith in the Congress of Industrial Organizations as opposed to the state, the latter of which James remarks as an institution, via the Roosevelt Administration, that has been incapable of integrating difference. Indeed, for James, Marx's conception of the state as "the executive committee of the ruling class" is of paramount importance; the search for returns on capital investments by the bourgeoisie is directly connected to the brutality which the state imposes on African Americans. A fifth of the mine workers in the

Congress of Industrial Organizations are African American, and “yet nobody thinks of white miners and Negro miners...they are just ‘the miner,’” as James places the integration of the labourers and shared economic interests as vital in incorporating perceived racial differences (James, 1996, p.45). Even in the presence of prejudice within unions, the vast majority of such organizations, including the United Auto Workers (UAW) of Detroit, sympathized with the African American cause; this suggests that an understanding of the shared oppressive roots of white workers and African American racial oppression had been achieved by some factions of militant labour organizations. James places the Southern planters’ modern conception of the supposed inferiority of African Americans between 1830 and 1860, a necessity in responding to the chasm left by the divergence of increasing democratic ideals and the continued importance of the slave economy. James situates this conception as a reaction to fears of labour unity, and places the African American’s “increasing integration into production which becomes more and more a social process” as a twin process with the “consciousness of his exclusion from democratic privileges as a separate social group in the community...this dual movement is the key to the Marxist analysis of the Negro question in the U.S.A” (James, 1996, p.64).

White as Management

In *Wages of Whiteness* (1991), Roediger emphasizes the role of workers in influencing the racialization process. In Roediger and Esch (2012), however, the emphasis is tilted to the role of management in creating racial categories. Here, the authors sway towards Allen’s focus on the role of elites in driving the racialization process for economic gains. Roediger and Esch analyze how racial differences are continually generated to facilitate increased production throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Here, the overseer’s role as a racial manager is situated in an ideology that trumpets white-as-management, and racial management is positioned as a key

‘innovation’ in the development of American labour history. Naturalizing whiteness as management has been a key component in justifying radicalized labour policies, and its effect on individual overseers and managers (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

In interpreting the work of Commons (1907) on the development of scientific management, Roediger and Esch contrast the “bloodless efficiency of stopwatches and assembly lines” emphasised by Commons with the lack of insight in the early twentieth century on the “bloody history of race” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.6). Here, both Commons and Marx focus on the body, where ideas of labour and the human form have converged to centre on “standardized movements, on its race yielding to its class.” Indeed, mainstream Marxists have often focused on class rather than race. The authors explain the silence about race with reference to mainstream Marxist interpretations of labour. They claim that Marxism has increasingly treated the human body’s capacity as a resource as based on an abstract form; here, one runs the risk of having the differences between the individuals yield to the overarching category of class (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Lisa Lowe (1996) points out that the logic of maximization of profits is inconsistent with viewing labour abstractly. In fact, the interplay of differences, produced and sustained within labour, has been vital for the continued exploitation of workers; grappling with the contradiction of capital’s attempts to produce difference, and yet simultaneously standardize labour for the organic motions of the human body appear to be essential. Roediger and Esch’s aversion to interpreting labour in an abstract form suggests that labour could be a normalizing process, where labour becomes and accentuates a seemingly natural category of ‘white’. This becomes evident in Roediger and Esch’s analysis of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which essentially labelled the working class as white. However, labour and exchange do become abstract under capitalism; without such a process, labour could not be

bought on the labour market. Here, one must take into account both the abstractness of labour and its concrete physical and social conditions of various groups of workers. Marxist thinkers who have sidelined race have not given salience to the use of racialization for capital accumulation, and often disregard the fact that racialization in the labour market is itself a form of abstraction that reduces workers to ‘racial’ categories.

Americans, as European settlers, developed a sense of identity entrenched in beliefs of right and ability to better manage both property and labour over others, including a firm conviction of the inability of indigenous people to manage their own land (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Different African ethnicities were stereotyped with different attributes for labour, and this was often seen as the wisdom of white managers and plantation owners. Such stereotypes, which existed for European immigrants and indigenous people as well, were often malleable; judgements made by whites about Indian tribes and their ability to manage the land varied depending on the continually changing alliances made with other tribes (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Using the work of Daniel Usner (2009), Roediger and Esch show that when white mountain and backwoods people resisted the advance of agriculture, comparing them to the imagined narratives of the highly patriarchal hunter society of indigenous people was often used to dull their resistance. It becomes clear that to manage, and for men to manage women “properly”, was a trait given to the whites. Here, one can see the expansive nature of whiteness-as-management as it includes and reinforces the subordination of women. The supposed proper management of women attributed to European Americans was often juxtaposed with the “supposed gender brutalities of the imagined hunter state” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.14). Management was often used in the 1800’s as management of the land and resources, and slaves, as a crucial asset, were often included in this idea of management. The concept of whites as

masters of managing land put into perspective ideas of who was not capable of managing (Roediger and Esch, 2012), and makes race a profound idea that connects the destruction and appropriation of Indians and their lands with the enslavement of Africans. The unity of white society in managing the slave economy was vital in masking the immense disparity of class differences found in the European American population; a perception of a common interest was held together through ideas of slave management (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

Roediger and Esch highlight the corresponding nature of racial management and the ‘humanitarian’ approach of enhancing the lives of supposedly inferior people. American Historians of the early twentieth century such as U.B. Phillips expressed a proslavery attitude by applauding the supposedly charitable and paternal nature of whites in “developing” African Americans (Roediger and Esch, 2012). In contrast, Phillips’ contemporary W.E.B De Bois demonstrates the exploitative nature of race management through an exploration of management periodicals published throughout the era of slavery in the United States; Roediger and Esch continue the analysis by W.E.B De Bois to demonstrate the extent of these publications in securing supposed racial knowledge between plantation owners, and their role in cementing ideas of white as management and black as servile. Conscious of the gaze of anti-slavery sympathizers, Southern plantation owners remained discreet in their references to slave brutality, revolts, and slave patrols, while opting for a more paternalistic view of white as management for the development of African Americans (Roediger and Esch, 2012). By illustrating the prominence of these publications early in the development of labour management in American history, Roediger and Esch present a narrative that makes it impossible for the reader to separate the roots of labour management from the construction of race and slavery. The management of slaves and the knowledge of race management became entire professions, and slave management

seeped into other professions such as medicine. Doctors cured “slave diseases” and testified in courts over the health of slaves in trades (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Working class whites were often employed in ensuring that slaves do not escape at night, and the mutual collaboration of the entire community was used as a patrol system in managing African Americans. Roediger and Esch refer to an array of publications that speak of managing slaves properly to avoid the Haitian revolution occurring in the United States. Strong discipline among slaves was upheld as paramount while sexual intercourse with slaves was discouraged (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Management ideas were thus expansive, transcending the scope of economic production to deal with sexuality and labour more generally.

Roediger and Esch show that despite inconsistent results achieved in the interviews with race managers in the nineteenth century, race management was continually used as a management tactic in agricultural and industrial work places; a strike by skilled white workers at the Norfolk Dry Dock in 1830 was met with race management statistics by the federal government that showed the superiority of slave labour (framed as black labour) over paid labour (described as white labour) (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

The question of how slaves can be motivated to work at their highest potential came into the planter class’s literature via antebellum Southern plantation journals (Roediger and Esch, 2012). This literature identifies control tactics ranging from using force and the threat of violence to instilling a belief in the slave that he or she must obey the master as it is the right thing to do. Either way, the “language of the marketplace” was used to justify the management procedure. Slaves who obey out of love of the master could be sold for a higher price (Roediger and Esch, 2012). The publications pronounced the threat of sale as a force stronger than the whip to demand obedience. Threats of separating families were touted as powerful management tactics in

increasing productivity. Management methods thus connected themes of “paternalism, race management, race development, and the slave market as parts of a whole” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.42). Such themes demonstrate the complex nature of white supremacy (which justified the brutal dehumanizing of African Americans) and the acknowledgement of the capacities and skills of the slaves (and the important role they played in the development of the south).

Roediger and Esch’s analysis of interviews with plantation owners and overseers show the contradictory nature of management. Owners and overseers often mixed contempt for slaves with praise of their ability to learn new tasks quickly. Roediger and Esch connect C.L.R. James’ contention that slaves ran the plantations in the Caribbean with the words of overseers who “praise the intelligence and skill” of slaves; the same overseers often contradicted their previous statements by speaking of the “utter helplessness and ignorance of the black race” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.43). Roediger and Esch point out that slaves often gained considerable expertise at their tasks and that such knowledge was well known to overseers. Examples include titles of engineer and cooper in working complex sugar mills (Roediger and Esch, 2012). The cognitive dissonance of managers and overseers in simultaneously believing in the presence of intelligence and incompetence in slaves highlights the contradictions present in the racialization methods through labour.

Discussions and publications regarding the management of slaves were indistinguishable from a rhetoric that also spoke of managing African Americans as a race (Roediger and Esch, 2012). The issue of race and supposed racial characteristics constantly intruded into writings of slave management, and judgements of African Americans were a critical aspect of managing slaves. When a slave criticized his overseer in front of the master, his or her credibility would often be questioned because of broader racial stereotypes against African Americans (Roediger

and Esch, 2012). Roediger and Esch demonstrate the interplay of science and religion in the management of race by highlighting the writings of University of Louisiana professor and slave doctor Samuel Cartwright. Cartwright used the bible to justify the enslavement of Africans, and maintained that understanding slave ethnology through the bible was necessary to manage slaves. Cartwright invented an array of pathological illnesses in slaves that were said to compel them to run away or not work unless forced to do so. As Roediger and Esch put it, Cartwright and the managers who followed him “pathologized resistance of slaves, transforming it into a [racial] disease,” with the preventative treatment of “whipping the devil” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.59). Looking at the work of Cartwright, one can clearly see that the psychological and physical conditions brought upon by the cruelty of slavery are categorized as illnesses of African Americans, where the slave and the African become inseparable, and natural human responses to extreme stress turn into intrinsically pathological behaviours of a racial group (Roediger and Esch, 2012). All of these theories and their contradictions were included into the highly esteemed knowledge of managing Africans by white plantation owners. Other religious thinkers of the day stated that God created all humans together, but later cursed Africans. Either way, the paternalistic view that enslavement was beneficial to Africans was widely accepted (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

Even after emancipation, white elites insisted that all African Americans refer to all whites as “bosses,” a new name for the despised slave term “master” (Ignatieff, 1995). Whiteness-as-management thus persisted long after slavery. Indeed, the principles developed in the management of slavery continued to persist through the Ku Klux Klan. Roediger and Esch discuss the historical involvement of Klan members in labour organizations after emancipation. In the 1870’s, a series of federal investigations of Klan activities revealed that many railway

contractors were active Klan members (Roediger and Esch, 2012). The Klan often acted as an “employers’ association” that targeted Asian and African American labourers. Former slave masters and traders such as Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest became significant figures as entrepreneurs and railway managers while simultaneously holding leadership position in the Klan (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

Race management as an aspect of management science was present on the Western frontier as well. The most dangerous jobs in infrastructure and mining were completed by labourers seen as non-‘white’, and knowledge of race management acquired in the West was coveted nationally and internationally (Roediger and Esch, 2012). By referring to the thousands of kidnapped indigenous American children, and the mobilization of multiple groups of poor and desperate labourers in railway construction, Roediger and Esch challenge the notion that the “post-civil war west was marginal to the national and international economy and that its development was the product of the individualism of whites” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.70). The construction of the transcontinental Railroad, completed in 1869, started both in the east (Central pacific) and the West (Union Pacific), with payment given for each mile while accounting for the difficulty of terrain. Roediger and Esch note that, for these, and other lines such as the Great Northern, a variety of workers were “pitted against each other” (Roediger and Esch, 2012, p.71). Immediately after the Civil War, railway companies used emancipated slaves to deal with labour shortages. White managers presented themselves as “humanitarians” in the business of “developing” African Americans. However, few emancipated slaves were railway workers (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Most were “buffalo soldiers” used to protect the railroad from Indigenous resistance. Others were used as surplus labour to threaten the organizational capacity of Irish workers to demand better wages and working conditions; in 1867, African

American workers were once again used to defeat a strike organized by Chinese labourers (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

In 1876, Charles Crocker of the Central Pacific Railway Company testified to a congressional committee on Chinese Immigration that the inability to secure white labour for such a gruelling track-laying job and their inability to commit to the job made them “experiment” with 50 Chinese workers to determine their suitability (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Although he contended that the ability of Chinese workers to work in teams had won him over, Crocker admitted years later of having used Chinese labour to squash an impending Irish strike (Roediger and Esch, 2012). His testimony highlights the acceptance of labour management through ‘race’. Roediger and Esch assert that ‘white’ workers were in a better labour market position. They had more choice and better access to relatively safe and well-paid work elsewhere. Chinese labour was increasingly favoured by the railways due to their vulnerability and lack of options (Roediger and Esch, 2012). However, Roediger and Esch demonstrate that the Chinese workers were not always compliant. They often struck and fought back against violence even though debt to facilitate passage and family responsibilities made them second guess before leaving abusive jobs. They were not citizens and white power structures were specifically designed to exclude them if they required assistance. For example, Chinese labourers were denied voting rights and the right to serve on juries (Roediger and Esch, 2012). They were often unable to directly negotiate their relations with white power structures and depended on merchants to broker such relations. Here, one can see that the Chinese were racialized in part through labour management. In addition, racial categories and stereotypes were created to exclude them from white structures that could give the Chinese workers political power (Roediger and Esch, 2012). As a result, they were kept in a state of constant susceptibility. The

skills of Chinese workers acquired elsewhere were known to the CP officials, but such skills were associated with racial types as opposed to individual experience (Roediger and Esch, 2012).

Roediger and Esch demonstrate that other industries such as mining explicitly pitted one 'race' against another. "Americanizing" various Southern and Eastern European immigrants had to be balanced with strategies to create and reproduce racial differences to promote competition among workers and buttress the power of management. Mixing 'white' citizen miners with non-'white' immigrants also served mining management's interests when it came to accidents. As non-citizens, immigrants often lacked access to the vote or courts to demand retribution for damages (Roediger and Esch, 2012). As immigrants were put into more dangerous work situations, mine inspectors often played on pre-existing stereotypes that immigrants were careless. Putting the blame for accidents on immigrants made it easier for management to avoid improving workplace safety (Roediger and Esch, 2012). Race, skill and management became closely entwined.

In this chapter, one can see the pervasiveness of racialization in the economic development of the United States. James recognizes this fact as vital to the liberation of African Americans as he calls for differentiated unity between the proletariat and African American struggles. Allen highlights the shared roots of race and capitalism by showing that whiteness itself is constructed; no group was above the construction of race in the development of American capitalism. The inclusion of everyone on the racialization process in their attempts to negotiate with various forms of labour highlights the inextricable roots of both 'race' and capital. This can clearly be seen in the work of Ignatiev, where the supposed naturalness of whiteness is challenged as Irish Americans were able to transcend racial boundaries in taking advantage of white privilege. Others, such as Roediger, show the conscious management of race by elites to

facilitate capital accumulation. By analyzing the various dimensions of the racialization process as outlined by these scholars, it becomes clear that the labour history of the United States is a history of 'race.'

Caribbean Slavery

Studies of slavery in the Caribbean remain vital in understanding the importance of slavery to the world economy. In analyzing the development of the plantation economy in the Caribbean, it can be seen that the role of slavery is directly responsible for the economic boom of European metropolises. The evolution in the twentieth century of the understanding of Caribbean slavery can be traced through scholars such as Williams and James to Tomich, Blackburn, and McMichael. The complex relations between the economic institution of slavery and the corresponding struggles by people of African and mixed ancestry demonstrate how racialization and the development of the world economy are in tandem.

Sugar and Capitalism

A noted historian and the first prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Williams' work on *Capitalism and Slavery* in 1944 changed the direction of the tide in studies of Caribbean slavery. Until Williams, Caribbean history often depicted a positive and paternal view of colonial powers, a fact that may help explain the delayed publication of *Capitalism and Slavery* in the United Kingdom. For Williams, slavery's economic roots are paramount. He sees racism as a tool employed to justify the methods used in increasing production. Here, slavery was first and foremost an economic institution, one that represented the indifference with which the emerging capitalists accepted the destruction of human life for the sake of production. Compared to Allen, Williams offers a more functionalist approach to understanding the relationship between race and capitalism. Here, race was not constructed specifically as a necessary precursor to slavery, but was created subsequently as a result of economic relations. "Slavery was not born of racism: rather, racism was the consequence of slavery" (Williams, 1944, p.07).

Williams explains slavery as a function of the need for a large labour force for the mass production and export of commodities. Prior to the American Revolution, the British colonies in North America were composed of independent and self-sufficient small farmers. On the sugar islands of the Caribbean, the British developed a second type of economy based on large scale production of export commodities (Williams, 1944). The latter required not only capital but also a large work force. The abundance of land in North America made it easier for farmers to disperse and work independently in small farms, thus making it difficult to develop a plantation economy (Williams, 1944). Williams sees the rise of African chattel slavery as a result of the economics of the plantation system. He thus frames slavery not as a moral dilemma, but as a result of the circumstances required for the accumulation of European capital.

The abuse of poor whites that predated black slavery in the form of indentured white immigrants and convicts, along with the active role played by home countries in shipping off poor workers to the colonies led Williams to characterize African slavery as an unsurprising and banal phenomenon for its time. More importantly, focusing on white indentured servitude as a precursor to African chattel slavery allows Williams to expand on the economic requirements that gave birth to slavery. European nations saw immigration as a means of expelling “undesirable” people from their respective countries, while simultaneously increasing the population and workforce of their colonies. Poor Irish and Germans accepted indentured servitude in a foreign land because they fled feudalism, oppression and war in the hope of better lives (Williams, 1944). The towns of London and Bristol witnessed regular kidnappings by “spirits” facilitating forced labour overseas. Convicts were the source of a large labour supply. Those convicted for any one of 300 petty offences that carried capital punishments were given the supposedly more humane choice of indentured servitude overseas (Williams, 1944).

Williams makes a connection between such draconian laws and the economic need for more labour in the Caribbean colonies; a year after emancipation, forced transportation became the penalty for various trade union activities. Civil strife in England between 1640 and 1740 led to the transportation, mainly to the sugar islands, of many “political and religious nonconformists” such as the Quakers (Williams, 1944). Williams uses the inhumane treatment of white servants in the Middle Passage to show that brutality was a part of the age and that “the horrors of the slave ship are [not] to be accounted for by the fact that the victims were negroes” (Williams, 1944, p.14).

The end of the seventeenth century saw an economic shift that focused on domestic development, such as the promotion of employment and an increase in exports (Williams, 1944). It was decided by the mercantilists that low wages and a large working population was necessary in England to compete with the neighbouring powers. Such policies came to be in direct conflict with the idea of shipping working class labourers to the New World. Augmented by the ability of whites to escape more easily and demand land after servitude, the resulting labour shortage set the stage for the growth of African chattel slavery (Williams, 1944). The capital gained from kidnapping indentured white servants financed the transport of Africans; Bristol made a transition from being a major centre of the servant trade to being a key slave port. For Williams, as for Allen (1997), “white servitude was the historic base upon which negro slavery was constructed...the reason was economic, not racial” (Williams, 1944, p19). Racist rationalizations were used later on to justify economic imperatives. As small, white farmers growing tobacco in the Caribbean were displaced by large plantations, the poor white farmer simply did not fit into the economic reality of the Caribbean, and the need for uninterrupted production ensured a high population of African immigrants (Williams, 1944).

Williams highlights the emergence of free trade as an English right, and its close links with the development of the slave trade. The Stuart Monarchy created a monopoly in the African slave trade through, first, the Company of Royal Adventures in 1660, and, second, the Royal African Company in 1672. The monopoly was constantly challenged by both slave merchants and planters, who demanded the implementation of free trade for African slaves (Williams, 1944). A single company controlled many aspects of the plantation economy, from the importation of plantation produce to the sale of slaves. Free trade advocates, known as ‘interlopers,’ complained to the English Board of Trade regarding the “quality, prices, and irregular deliveries,” and declined to repay their debts to the Royal African Company (Williams, 1944). Subsequently, in 1698, free trade was established as a right of Englishmen, and the Royal African Company lost its monopoly. The free trade of slaves led to the immediate economic development of cities such as Liverpool, a city that had multiplied its slave ships by sevenfold between 1730 and 1771 (Williams, 1944). The slave trade produced immense returns, with profits of 100 to 300 percent not uncommon in Liverpool and Bristol. Williams demonstrates that a significant portion of the workforce in Britain- anyone from barbers to tailors- can connect their labour prosperity to the slave trade.

The slave trade had almost unanimous support from governments, churches and the public as a whole. Williams shows just how comfortable the English were with slavery, as many slave traders were often recognized as great citizens and as loving fathers. A prominent example is John Cary, an advocate of the slave trade who Williams describes as “conspicuous for his integrity and humanity...the founder of a society known as the Incorporation of the Poor” (Williams, 1944, p.46). Many of the artistic voices who sympathized with the slaves often spoke of the “noble negro”, an example of a just individual who even surpasses his white masters.

Williams points out that such a characterization implies that enslaving “ignoble negroes” was somehow justifiable. The late 1700’s saw many debates and bills for abolition proposed before the House of Commons. All of these were quelled as many in the House were keenly aware of the indispensability of slavery to the growth of Britain (Williams, 1944). Williams traces the accumulation of capital necessary to finance the Industrial Revolution directly to the slave trade. Entire new industries were created, and the economy of virtually every English town was connected directly to the triangular trade and the trade of slaves in general. Williams contends that, in terms of exports, the tiny island of Barbados was more valuable to eighteenth century British capitalism than the combined productivity of New England, New York and Pennsylvania. Unlike northern mainland colonies, the tropical produce of the islands did not compete with home-grown British goods, and the large African population ensured that England did not have to worry about threats of independence (Williams, 1944).

England maintained a monopoly in colonial trade. The Navigation laws dictated that trade with the colonies was confined exclusively to England, notably as far as sugar and slaves were concerned (Williams, 1944). A popular argument against the abolition of slavery was that such a measure would decrease ship building and reduce the number of seamen, weakening the English militarily (Williams, 1944). More ships visited the sugar colonies than the North American mainland. Ancillary trades related to ships built for the plantation trade included various tradesmen and artisans. Williams concludes that most of Liverpool’s industries would have been negatively impacted by abolition. The profits of slavery made British seaport towns such as Bristol and Liverpool boom. The enormous wealth of these English towns was directly related to the human suffering in the Antilles (Williams, 1944). Williams points to claims that without the slave trade, many of these towns would be mere fishing ports. He states that, in 1830,

5/8ths of trade with Bristol came from the West Indies. While Bristol grew more from the sugar trade, Liverpool grew directly from the trade of slaves, as it went from having a population of five thousand in 1700 to thirty four thousand in 1773 (Williams, 1944).

Williams demonstrates that capital accumulation in Liverpool derived directly from the African slave trade and sparked the growth of industries in Lancashire and Manchester. With the Act of Union in 1707, Scottish towns such as Glasgow also grew dramatically due to the sugar and tobacco industry. Williams makes connections between the industrial development of England and the triangular trade by focusing on the production of specific products and industries. “Finery for Africans, household utensils, cloths of all kinds, iron and other metals, together with guns, handcuffs and fetters: the production of these stimulated capitalism, provided employment for British labour, and brought great profits to England” (Williams, 1944, p.65) Similar to Liverpool’s growth from building ships for the transport of slaves, Manchester’s textile industry boomed because of the slave trade and colonial cotton production. Capital generated in Liverpool poured into Manchester to finance textile manufacturing (Williams, 1944). Cotton products were taken back to Liverpool to be shipped to Africa in Liverpool’s slave ships. In 1770, a third of all cotton exports from Manchester reached the African Coast, while the rest were shipped to the North American and West Indian colonies (Williams, 1944). Manchester’s manufacturers shipped to the African Coast and to the plantations, while relying on the plantations for the raw materials, further strengthening the relationship between industries in home countries and the slave and cotton trade of the colonies (Williams, 1944). Another industry was the sugar refining industry. The conversion of brown sugar to white sugar increased the economic prosperity of English towns (Williams, 1944). The distillation of molasses (a by-product of sugar refining) to create rum began to bloom while the metallurgical industry saw its

own share of growth to produce guns, chains and slave brands. Along with many other industries, metal manufacturers continually protested against the proposal for abolition (Williams, 1944). Williams shows that slavery was vital in nearly every industry, and its abolition had grave economic consequences for European cities.

Once they made their fortunes on the islands, planters returned to England and tried to blend in with the English aristocracy. Absenteeism often led to mismanaged plantations and the high proportion of black to white workers created worries of rebellion (Williams, 1944).

Williams speaks of the lavish London estates of the countless family dynasties that profited immensely from the slave trade with the sugar islands. Many wealthy planters bought their way into parliament. “10 out of fifteen members of one of the most important committees of the Society of Planters and Merchants held seats in the English Parliament” (Williams, 1944, p94). Williams claims that almost all noble houses have some West Indian strain, and slaveholders dominated much of society with the wealth they had accumulated.

For Williams, the abolition of the slave trade was directly linked to the decreasing profitability of West Indian monopoly. He shows that abolitionists had economic interests, not humanitarianism, in mind when pushing for abolitionism. The abolitionists boycotted West Indian produce on the basis that it was slave grown, but “the very existence of British capitalism depended on the slave-grown cotton in the United States, equally connected with the slavery and polluted with blood” (Williams, 1944, p190). When Britain abolished the slave trade through the Slave Trade Act 1807, the word “justice and humanity” were asked to be removed as it reflected badly on the slave traders, but was later kept anyways to thwart French suspicions that the slave trade was halted for economic reasons, and encourage rival colonies to abolish the slave trade (Williams, 1944).

Economic benefits from slavery demanded the existence of stable European colonies overseas. For the purpose of securing the subordination of the African labour force, racial divisions remained vital. In the *Black Jacobins*, C.L.R. James' (1938) recounts the lives of San Domingo residents with mixed ancestry. He analyzes the shifting class struggles and the economic nature of racial alignments. People of mixed ancestry, despite being free, were often given the most arduous jobs on the island (James, 1938). As mixed people amassed wealth, there was fear among the whites that the educated 'mulattoes' would join their enslaved mothers and half-brothers in rebellion. The children of mixed people sent their children to France to be educated, where they were free and relatively free of colour prejudice. They served in high ranking positions in France, and yet returned to humiliation in San Domingo (James, 1938). The mixed people, as they became numerous, had to face harsher oppression from the fearful whites who were often in debt. While the mixed people "demonstrated the falseness of the white claim to inherent superiority", they resented the blacks with whom they were associated. "The advantages of being white were so obvious that race prejudice against the negroes permeated the minds of the mulattoes" (James, 1938, p.43). Racial distinctions were vital for the 'small whites' of Hispaniola who wanted to avoid abject servitude. "No small white was a servant, no white man did any work that he could get a Negro to do for him" (James, 1938, p.33). The creation of racial distinctions is displayed by James:

"They divided the offspring of white and black and intermediate shades into 128 divisions. The true Mulatto was the child of the pure black and the pure white. The child of the white and the Mulatto woman was a quarteron with 96 parts white and 32 parts black. But the quarteron could be produced by the white and the marabou in the proportion of 88 to 40, or by the white and the sacatra, in the proportion of 72 to 56 and so on all through the 128 varieties. But the sang-mele with 127 white parts and 1 black part was still a man of colour."

C.L.R. James, 1938, p.38

Here, such elaborate examples of racial categories used to ensure the “coloured” status of people with African ancestry demonstrate the importance of preserving the boundaries between ‘whiteness’ and ‘blackness.’ The legal system of the colonies often reinforced such racial distinctions (James, 1938). “In legal actions the decision nearly always went against the mulattoes, and to terrorise them into submission a free man of colour who struck a white man, whatever his station in life, was to have his right arm cut off” (James, 1938, p.38). Here, racialization took on the form of a classification along a hierarchy of colours, and this “colourism” was complemented by the arrival of South Asian and Chinese labourers to parts of the Caribbean after slavery. However, the use of colour distinctions was unsuccessful in preventing abolition. Although colourism reinforced processes of racialization, it also weakened black-white colour boundaries. As discussed by Allen, the longevity of the white control stratum in the United States is directly a result of the increased preservation of the white-black colour line.

Like Williams, James explains the development of this racial prejudice with reference to the economics of the island, and emphasizes the formation of classes as vital for the creation of racial distinctions. He also emphasises the importance of class distinctions in understanding race. James’ narrative of the Haitian revolution allows for an analysis of the distinct classes that are created in colonial slave economies. By situating race within the economic structure, the roots of racial distinctions and their dynamic social significance become visible. The changing alliances and social orders of the supposed ‘big whites, small whites, slaves, free blacks, and mulattoes’ demonstrate that racial distinctions fail to be static, and flow inseparably with the economic tide (James, 1938). James reveals that race prejudice was significantly weaker in the seventeenth century, and points to the “Negro Code” in 1685 where marriage between European Americans

and slaves were permitted; such a procedure immediately freed the wife and her children from servitude (James, 1938). He argues that racial distinctions were heightened as the economics of San Domingo evolved. They were not constant throughout the colonial history of Hispaniola. James also sees dynamic political processes as key forces for abolition. Most notably, James connects the roots of the revolution in San Domingo with the French Revolution. He shows how the uprising in France had a profound impact on the slaves of Hispaniola. Revolutionaries in both places shared an impetus for freedom and liberation. On this latter point, James is in line with thinkers such as Robin Blackburn, who have insisted that the ability to exploit political fractures is vital for the emancipation of slaves.

James sees the Haitian revolution as having widespread historical significance to the struggle and emancipation of oppressed Africans. He places the gains of Africans against oppression in the New World as starting from “the decisive patterns of Caribbean development that took form in Haiti” (James, 1938, p.393). For surrounding Caribbean territories, Haiti’s development after independence showed that “within a West Indian island, the old colonial system and democracy are incompatible” (James, 1938, p.406). Here, one can see the struggle of oppressed Africans in relation to the wider political and economic systems established by European imperialism. Such connections likely informed James in his essays on the conditions of African Americans that he had written in the years before and after *Black Jacobins*. The negotiation of relations by Haitians with the capitalist system inherent to the plantation economy can be tied here to the struggles of African Americans with American capitalism. It becomes clearer here as to why James elaborates Trotsky’s contention that African Americans cannot be free until they wage a “war against American capitalism” (James, 1996, p.75). James insists on the collaboration of African Americans with the proletariat in fights for democratic and

economic rights. Although he feels that African Americans represent a portion of the American proletariat, not a nation struggling for independence, he insists that their distinct struggle remains crucial to that of the wider proletarian population.

British Historian Robin Blackburn sees economic imperatives and interests as central to the establishment of slavery. Despite a history of racial prejudice found among European explorers, evidence of prejudice as the primary motivation behind the slave trade is weak. Prejudice is easily eclipsed by the dynamics of economic development (Blackburn, 1988). Blackburn, unlike Williams, does not however reduce the abolition of slavery to economic forces. Others, such as Seymour Drescher (1977) also criticize the work of Eric Williams, and state that slavery was abolished while the sugar and slave trade of the West Indies was still highly profitable. He does not see a link between the abolition and the rise of industrial capitalism. He also denies that abolitionists had economic motives, and does not connect economic processes to abolition.

Blackburn suggests that the conditions for slavery became indefensible not because of declining profitability but due to political and military processes both within and between European powers. Blackburn is unique here in meticulously analyzing slavery from colonies throughout the Americas. In undertaking such a comprehensive task, Blackburn is able to view the successive challenges faced by Atlantic slave colonies in relation to their European metropolises. It can be seen here that the destruction of colonial relationships with their respective empires, while remaining distinct from the downfall of colonial slavery, became inextricably tied to movements towards abolition (Blackburn, 1988). While the European metropolises witnessed rapid growth from their colonial enterprises, they were simultaneously required to resist the urge to over-regulate and tax their colonial planters (Blackburn, 1988). As colonists increasingly

contested imperial rule from across the Atlantic Ocean, the slaves were able to exploit fractures in social control brought upon by such conflicts. In line with thinkers such as Tomich and McMichael, Blackburn is careful here to avoid giving the impression that slavery was in anyway uniform throughout multiple European Empires, or in stating that the downfall of slavery was a linear process. Indeed, Blackburn states that the development of capitalism witnessed a decline in slavery in the Caribbean while slavery was extended in the Southern United States and Brazil (Blackburn, 1988).

Blackburn demonstrates that capital accumulation continued to occur unreservedly in the plantation economy during the overthrow of the slave systems. For Blackburn, the development of complex class struggles in increasingly vulnerable political environments led to the end of slavery. Politics is emphasized over economic profit as a cause of abolition. The beneficiaries of abolition were not industrialists, but slave owners in neighbouring regions who continued to supply the produce of the slave economy (Blackburn, 1988). Blackburn suggests that in a situation where slavery is economically unprofitable, emancipation would unlikely be the primary response; the result would be the “sale of surplus slaves to more dynamic sectors of the slave economy” (Blackburn, 1988, p.521). When slaveholders challenged the state, state support for slavery weakened, thus creating political fractures between elites that were exploited by the voices of abolitionism. In Blackburn’s analyses of the overthrow of slavery, three recurrent conditions required for emancipation can be noted: the development of a political crisis where the slaveholders are alienated; the possibility or actual occurrence of slave resistance; and social revolutions where popular mobilizations have the sympathy of anti-slavery actors.

Other thinkers such as Dale Tomich emphasize the gradual development of rights won by slaves through subsistence agriculture as pertinent in emancipation. By highlighting the work

day and night shifts of slaves during various parts of the year, Tomich (2004) demonstrates that giving of land to slaves to grow their own food allowed for the development of a system where the “slaves’ reproduction became separate from commodity production and a de facto division between necessary and surplus labor time was created” (Tomich, 2004, p.145). Subsistence cultivation and the free Saturday made it easier for the slaves to resist the encroachment of work time defined by the master on their own time. One can see here the development of “rights” as demanded by slaves (Tomich, 2004). The free Saturdays and subsistence farming was often encouraged by the slaveholders as the majority of the land was used for sugar production, increasing the demand for food production. Sydney Mintz (1974) has referred to this as the development of a “proto-peasant” lifestyle. Here, “a mode of response and a mode of resistance” slowly evolved in various slave systems (Tomich, 2004, p.174). Slaves sold surplus food to nearby towns, and developed a complex social and economic system that gave them relative autonomy. Tomich provides evidence that suggests the development of a system where masters often paid or reimbursed in other ways personal time taken from the slaves’ off days; a division of personal time and the master’s time developed (Tomich, 2004).

Tomich contends that “the relation between master and slave was not static but underwent a process of continual evolution” where Europeans and Africans “encountered one another through the unequal relations of slavery and engaged in a day-to-day struggle, sometimes implicit, sometimes overt, over the organization of work and the norms and values it entailed” (Tomich, 2004, p.150) Here, it becomes clear that the slaves themselves were active players in changing relations of power, as they adapted to the slave system and pushed for ways to loosen the bonds of slavery. Subsistence cultivation by slaves at once both “mediated and contested” the plantation export system (Tomich, 2004, p.154). While the planter needed the provision labour

system to keep the plantation system competitive, the provision cultivation system and its associated activities promoted a sense of autonomy and independence to the slaves. The slaves' dependence on the master weakened and the slaves' activities, while shaped by slave society, began to simultaneously transform it (Tomich, 2004). By the mid- seventeenth century, neither France nor the colonies regarded provision ground cultivation as a threat to the colonies, and such a practice was widely considered essential to maintain the food supply of the islands. France's Mackau law of 1845 gave slaves the right to own the produce produced on their masters' land, and legally recognized their right to own property in the French colonies (Tomich, 2004). The slaves came to see the provision grounds as a right, and the masters did not disturb them in fear of upsetting the masses. The provision grounds were such a symbol of independence that the property often passed down through the generations and to relatives (Tomich, 2004). The produce sold on the market on Saturdays allowed for the development of Afro-Caribbean culture. Agriculture on provision lands for subsistence and local markets remained important sources of independence and resistance in the time immediately after emancipation (Tomich, 2004).

Slavery and the World Economy

Williams situates both the rise and end of the slave system wholly in economic processes. Abolition and emancipation are directly linked to the increased unprofitability of slavery as a mode of production. *Capitalism and Slavery* gives emphasis to the power of capital and capitalists in determining racism and racialized relations. As a result, various socio-political processes become muted. Additionally, Williams presents slavery in broad strokes, simplifying the complexities and local specificities of colonial history and the slave system. Various thinkers, such as Tomich (2004) and Blackburn (1988) have problematised Williams' rendition of the processes surrounding New World slavery.

Tomich points out that Williams fails to make a distinction between events and socio-economic structures when forming causal relations. He meshes them into a singularity that “collapses structure and event into a single temporal plane” where relations between “events and structural elements appear as synchronous, fluid, and transparent” (Tomich, 2004, p.100). Tomich claims that treating a sequence of events as akin to structural transformation, and using motives of various actors for this purpose is a procedure that “eliminates complexity from historical understanding” (Tomich, 2004, p.100). He critiques the way in which Williams compares land and labour in different colonies, the units of comparison. In Williams, “the units of comparison and the attributes of those units are defined as independent of and external to one another” (Tomich, 2004, p.122). In reality, units of comparison are entrenched in specific spatial and temporal processes. This makes them dependent on each other. If one ignores this, Tomich says, one is tempted to conclude that “Martinique is Martinique because Cuba is Cuba” (Tomich, 2004, p.123).

Tomich sees the onset of slavery in the Antilles as a “formative moment” in the development of global capitalism, and refers to the production by slaves as imperative for the establishment of new hierarchies of trade, labour, and European hegemony. The world market was transformed with the victory of Britain over France in the Napoleonic Wars, and Britain’s hegemony allowed it to penetrate markets far beyond its own colonial boundaries, while also increasing demand for tropical goods from its own growing working and middle class (Tomich, 2004). Britain became the only power capable of both supplying the necessary capital for production in the periphery and absorbing the enormous produce created in the periphery. Such changes had profound implications for slave labour, as Britain was able to draw on a variety of labour forms. As slavery began to decline in British territories, it became clear that “the

particular social form of labour became less important than its cheapness” (Tomich, 2004, p.79). The very process that led to the reduced popularity of slavery in Britain led to the increased demand of slave labour elsewhere. The increased competition, demand, and “lack of alternative sources of labour” led to increased slavery in “Cuba, Brazil, and the United States” (Tomich, 2004, p.79). Saturation, lack of land, and more efficient production in areas such as Cuba and Brazil weakened slavery in some areas while strengthened slavery in others. The transformation of the world economy, including technological advances such as the rail network and steam power greatly increased the volatility of slave labour (Tomich, 2004).

Tomich notes that slavery is often viewed as an archaic and backward form of production that is external to the development of modern capitalism. In contrast, the emergence of wage labour is seen as a hallmark of the historical development of capitalism (Tomich, 2004). Instead of being another form of labour in capitalist development, slave labour is viewed as the very antithesis of wage labour. In this perspective, the abolition of slavery is regarded as a linear process from the pre-capitalist economy to the modern wage labour system. Such a view assumes a “singularity of slavery,” where “slavery is seen or presumed to be essentially the same phenomenon everywhere” (Tomich, 2004, p.57).

In the late eighteenth century, the slave economy in the Caribbean sugar industry rose to prominence as central to the world economy. During this time, slavery in non-sugar areas was relatively minor in scale. Tomich demonstrates that “during the course of the nineteenth century, slavery expanded on a massive scale precisely in these relatively backward areas in order to supply the growing world demand for cotton, coffee, and sugar” (Tomich, 2004, p.57). Slavery in the former strongholds declined sharply while other areas witnessed a rapid expansion of slavery.

Tomich notes that prior to the nineteenth century, European powers maintained strict monopolies and trade restrictions by dictating commodity flows in their colonies. The produce from colonies were often reserved for their home countries, while the colonies themselves acted as markets for the industrialists of European metropolises. The monopoly imposed on colonies often shielded producers from direct competition in the global market. According to Tomich, this organizational form in the colonies began to disintegrate with the restructuring of the world market initiated by the emergence of British economic hegemony in the early nineteenth century. The onset of the industrial revolution in Britain began to affect divisions of labour; the rapid expansion of the world economy directly affected slavery as a form of labour. While the restructuring of the world economy eliminated slavery in the British colonies, it began to strengthen slave production outside of the British Empire (Tomich, 2004). Here, this “second slavery” loosened the “prior interdependence of colonialism and slavery, and the conditions of existence, function, and significance of each were modified” (Tomich, 2004, p.61). These new centers of slavery became more entwined with industrialized production, and can be situated within the emergence of modern capitalism.

The second slavery became vital in strengthening a “new international division of labour and provided important raw materials and foodstuffs for industrializing core powers” (Tomich, 2004, p.69). Here, it can be seen that slavery was adaptable to changes in the world market, and was integral to capitalist development as another form of labour. Tomich concedes that “a full account of the history of the destruction of slavery during the nineteenth century would have to take into consideration a variety of political, social, and ideological factors, not least of which would be the actions of the enslaved themselves” (Tomich, 2004, p.69). Here, he does not refute Blackburn in understanding abolition in relation to the work of abolitionists and the slaves

themselves in using fractures in political processes to their advantage. Instead, Tomich emphasizes the integral role of slavery within the sphere of capitalist development while highlighting the fact that the “transformation of the world economy made the conditions of the existence of slave labour more vulnerable and volatile than previously” (Tomich, 2004, p.69).

In connecting Tomich’s analysis of changes in Caribbean slavery to the American South, historical sociologist Philip McMichael (1991) demonstrates that changes in global circuits of industrial capital reorganized the nature of slavery in the antebellum. Significant evidence of the dynamic role of slavery was the departure from the task-system of labour to an increased use of the gang-system of labour (McMichael, 1991). The task system often relieved the slave of labour after a particular task was complete, which gave the slaves the rest of the day to themselves. The more brutal gang-system, which demanded continuous labour from sunrise to sunset, was “associated not only with the cotton crop in particular (rather than tobacco), but also with the concentration of planter capital in the ante-bellum period (McMichael, 1991, p.322). For McMichael, the rise of the cotton culture is directly linked to the inclusion of the plantation economy within the emerging wage-labour regime. Such inclusion fundamentally altered slavery, “displacing its patriarchal form with an industrial form” (McMichael, 1991, p.323). McMichael calls for a reconceptualising of slavery as an integral component in the emergence of the wage-labour regime. McMichael notes that “nineteenth-century capitalism, under British hegemony, transcended segmented colonial system markets and forged a global unity of commodity reproducing industrial capital” (McMichael, 1991, p.342).

McMichael thus situates the political downfall of slavery within its inclusion into modern capitalism and departs from Williams in not viewing the end of slavery as a direct and logical outcome of capitalist modernity. Indeed, McMichael points to the “contradictory social and

political currents” created by the transformation of slavery as it was subsumed into the wage-labour regime (1991, p.323). McMichael notes that wage labour was not a self-contained and isolated relation independent of historical world processes. For example, McMichael points out that the peasant expropriation of land, as analyzed earlier through the work of Theodore Allen, and the creation of the world market itself as crucial precursors to the development of capitalism. The specific role of slavery was changed in its absorption into industrial capitalism due to the changing structure of the world market. McMichael notes that “these changes penetrated and reformulated the content of the slave relations, even though the slave form persisted” (McMichael, 1991, p.326). Here, it becomes clear that the fragmentation of the unity of historical processes involved in production leads to an inadequate understanding of the rise of wage labour (McMichael, 1991). McMichael does not, however, call for thinkers to abstract from the political dynamics of local production relations; instead, one must “conceptualize them as local expressions of a world-historical process” (McMichael, 1991, p.324). The increased prominence of slavery in the nineteenth century goes against a linear understanding of the decline of slavery when confronted with capitalist modernity. By understanding slavery as one of multiple labour forms present in capitalist development, slavery can be reconceptualised as existing within the emerging wage-labour regime (McMichael, 1991).

While Tomich and McMichael share Williams’ approach to understanding the relationship between slavery, racism and capitalism, they undertake a more nuanced route to highlight the geographical and temporal specificities of slavery across various regions in the Americas. Here, it becomes possible to grasp the unevenness in the decline of slavery. Slavery was not only essential in the formation of capitalism but certain forms of slavery were more deeply affected, and were affected by, capitalist development. Despite analyzing different

geographic areas, Tomich and McMichael conclude by insisting on the importance of historical specificity in understanding slavery in relation to capitalism. Other thinkers, such as Blackburn, show some differences with Tomich in their understanding of the downfall of slavery. Tomich's arguments regarding subsistence agriculture, while political, emphasize an alternate economic argument for abolition. Blackburn focuses acutely on a political argument that emphasizes the opportunities presented to abolitionists during conflicts within and between empires.

Nevertheless, Tomich and Blackburn demonstrate here that Marxist scholarship can move beyond functionalism in understanding slavery. Slavery and abolition can be analyzed in a terrain where they become more than "functions" of the economy.

Conclusion

The relationship between racialization and capitalist processes becomes important in light of an increased tendency by thinkers to sideline and vilify notions of ‘race’ due to it being a biological absurdity. Darder and Torres (2004) hold that the invalidation of race in the natural sciences should render it obsolete as a term, as the recurrent use of race abets the persistence of racial oppression. In addition, the continued usage of race allows for an ideology that masks class interests through the guise of multiculturalism and diversity. Roediger (2006) points out that, for Darder and Torres, the idea of race - indeed, the word itself - becomes the culprit in racism, and capitalist processes that continually recreate race are deemphasized. Though the lack of attention to class does create an inadequate analysis of inequality, Roediger contends that retreating from race is equally insufficient in approaching issues of oppression. Darder and Torres devalue here the pre-existing research which points to the inseparable nature of race and class, where work “from Cheryl Harris’s brilliant studies of whiteness as property, to Eduardo Bonilla-Silva’s research on racial systems, to somewhat older South African scholarship on racial capitalism, to Lisa Lowe’s important observations on race, universality, and labour at the start of *Immigrant Acts*...seeks to revive the class question by bringing racism and class together more systematically...but you would not know it from *After Race*” (Roediger, 2006, p.5). Indeed, Darder and Torres fail to grapple with the histories of slavery, colonialism, and capital accumulation that are crucial in constructing racial identities. As Roediger concludes, “the retreat from race and class will get us closer to addressing neither” (Roediger, 2006, p.7).

While acknowledging that Darder and Torres recognize that racism continues to be a relevant problem worth discussing, Roediger shows that thinkers such as Adolf Reed Jr. have dismissed discussing racism altogether. In his critique of Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton’s

American Apartheid (1995) with Merlin Chowkwanyun, Reed proposes that issues of African American segregation as analyzed by Massey and Denton continue to focus wrongly on race and racism. For Reed (2012), discussing inequality in racial terms merely highlights the statistical disproportions between “racial” groups, and is not useful in addressing or advocating against oppression. Here, studies of racial inequalities often conclude with vague calls to address the relevance of race as a salient variable (Reed and Chowkwanyun, 2012). Roediger points to the importance of race-based strategies for struggle, as evoking the pervasiveness of racism is a key tool by activist groups in addressing oppression. “Reed’s view that elite liberalism is the source of movements to expose and combat racism—a view much facilitated by his outspoken dismissal of the reparations movement—forestalls consideration of the dynamics of concrete struggles around race and class, leaving the call for a retreat from race itself as something of an abstraction” (Roediger, 2006, p.6). Roediger concludes that, from understanding declining union membership of African Americans to the segregationist rebuilding policies after Hurricane Katrina, scholars and activists should reject Reed’s “thumbs up/thumbs down approach to race and class” (Roediger, 2006, p.6). In witnessing Reed’s sidelining of important discussions on the profundity and depth of racism, the challenges at hand for Marxist scholars becomes clear. A serious discussion of the complexity of racism is important, but it should also not stray from its inseparable formative connects to class and capitalism.

Roediger’s calls to not withdraw from race in analyzing oppression have real implications for planning scholarship. For example, in analyzing segregation in Vancouver, Kay J. Anderson (1987) notes that “Chinese” people and Chinatowns have been vilified (or, less frequently, promoted) in different contexts throughout history to advance specific state agendas. Despite her lack of a strong analysis on the relationships between racialization, capitalism and the state,

Anderson shows here that segregation cannot be understood through Darder and Torres' methods of withdrawing from race simply due to it being a biological fallacy. While Darder and Torres call for a retreat from race, planning scholars such as Sandercock (1998) and Qadeer and Sandeep (2011) have highlighted the importance of race by reifying its supposed natural characteristics where it becomes isolated from wider socio-economic processes. They refer to the values of diversity and equality as the basis for planning in cities where ethno-racial differences must be addressed. Here, diversity refers to the focus on racial and cultural markers, and their connections to various planning paradigms and processes (Qadeer and Sandeep, 2011). For Qadeer and Sandeep, planning must attend to two sides when addressing multiculturalism – it must plan to meet the needs of “communities of colour”, while simultaneously merge such diversity with a common provision of services and facilities and shared land use for all (Qadeer and Sandeep, 2011, p.138). The authors refer to this dual process as “reasonable accommodation”, where the planning needs of distinct “ethno-racial” groups must be balanced with the planning needs of the city as a whole (Qadeer and Sandeep, 2011, p.133). Qadeer and Sandeep use here a culturalist interpretation of race that remains divorced from its historical ties to class and capitalism. Indeed, the term “ethno-racial” used by Qadeer and Sandeep to connote people of non-European ancestry stands in contrast to the work of Roediger, Allen and Ignatiev in addressing that ‘whiteness’ was produced through racialization. In attempting to plan for “communities of colour” (p.138), Qadeer and Sandeep fail to acknowledge the racialization process by which whiteness itself was created and labelled as non-racial and colourless. Sandercock (1998) calls for approaches to planning that focus on oppression along lines of race and ethnicity. She states that an emphasis on class interests has denied planners the saliency of racial and cultural differences. Sandercock's attempts to understand a future cosmopolis where

'races' and "ethnicities" can successfully address their differences reifies the seemingly natural characteristics of 'race' and 'ethnicity' and ignores the complex political and economic processes that shape the very content of these categories. Sandercock's (1998, p.177) calls for "coalition-building across the boundaries of race and gender and class" assumes the separate conceptual roots of race and class, and stands as an example of the conceptual and historical fragmentation of the social form as discussed by Bannerji. Here, race is seen as a cultural entity while class becomes an economic phenomenon (Bannerji, 2005) as Sandercock attempts to build bridges across the boundaries of categories that are supposedly distinct conceptually.

In her prominent work *Towards Cosmopolis*, Leonie Sandercock (1998) outlines the historical beginnings of the radical political economy model and criticizes its inability to more wholly integrate race and ethnicity into its theories. Tracing the roots of the current Marxist approach to planning to David Harvey (1973) and Manuel Castells (1976), Sandercock contends that the Marxist theories of planning that arose became authoritative critiques of urban planning, and fundamentally changed views on the role of the planner, where "planning was no longer the hero but something more like the divine fool, naïve in its faith in its own emancipatory potential, ignorant of the real relations of power which it was serving and in which it was deeply and inextricably implicated" (Sandercock, 1998, p.91). For Sandercock, Marxist thinkers situate the historical roots of planning within the need to control disorder created by individual decisions through regulatory mechanisms. This procedure finds itself limited by the processes of capital accumulation and private property ownership; it is unable to appropriately respond to interventions in tackling oppression. Marxist thought situates planning as subordinate to capital accumulation, and diminishes the character of planning as a progressive tool in multicultural cities (Sandercock, 1998). Sandercock remarks here that Marxist thinkers merely focus on flows

of capital in planning, and place the role of planning as a tool to negotiate the relationship between competing fractions of capital and between labour and capital. “While some of the more theoretically oriented planning faculty have sought to import this new work into the planning field, more practice-oriented folk have denied its relevance...the latter reaction is understandable in the sense that Marxist analyses have denied planners a role in social transformation and that too much of this kind of theorizing has a paralyzing effect on policy debates” (Sandercock, 1998, p.92). Despite Sandercock’s contention that Marxist thinkers have sidelined issues of race, this paper suggests otherwise; while it is true that Marxist thinkers have often subordinated race to class, a rich subset of literature continues to proliferate in analyzing race and class together. By narrowing the foundations of Marxist thought in relation to planning practice to David Harvey and Manuel Castells, Sandercock fails to situate planning as the absolute central organizing tool in the whole Marxist tradition, which goes beyond just Harvey and Castells. In emphasising the irrelevance of Marxist scholarship to practicing planners, Sandercock reinforces here the narrow sense of planning that continues to proliferate in many planning schools.

In navigating the problematic terrain of multicultural planning seen as in Sandercock and Qadeer, it becomes clear that Marxist scholarship has much to offer planners in diverse cities. Moving beyond Kobayashi’s (1994) contention that Canadian multiculturalism is inadequate in addressing injustice as it is formulated against conflict (to quell Quebecois and First Nations issues), Goonewardena and Kipfer (2005) point to the constant commodification of difference and the yielding of Canadian multiculturalism to the urban bourgeoisie. In pointing to the inability of Canadian cities to develop Mike Davis’ notion of the radical ‘magical urbanism’ associated with Latino immigrants in the United States, Goonewardena and Kipfer (2005) refer to Canadian multiculturalism as the “unabashedly bourgeois urbanism championed by an

alliance of real-estate capital, petty bourgeois circles, specialists of the urban (academic and professional), and, of late, the so-called ‘creative class’” (p.672). Scholars that have adopted a culturalist view of identity have neglected rampant inequality along socio-economic lines; Goonewardena and Kipfer (2005) note that “both multiculturalists and their liberal, conservative and poststructuralist critics have remained mostly mute on not only the polarizations of *social* life along class, gender and race lines, but also the revanchist neoliberalism that clearly rules globalizing cities such as Toronto” (p.674). In expanding beyond Canada, the authors use the work of the editor of the journal *Race and Class*, Ambalavanar Sivanandan, to demonstrate how the British equivalent of multiculturalism has “co-opted and neutralized into a harmless ‘cultural politics’ the radical urban-based struggle of African, Asian and Caribbean immigrants against racism and imperialism” (Goonewardena and Kipfer, 2005, p.674). Here, it comes clear that multicultural planning that forgoes an analysis of ‘race,’ and struggles against capitalism will only reinforce culturalist approaches to understating either.

Bibliography

- Allen, T.W. (1997) *The invention of the white race*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso
- Anderson, K. (1987) The idea of Chinatown: The power of place and institutional practice in the making of a racial category, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 77(4), pp. 580-598
- Angus, I. (1997) *A border within: national identity, cultural plurality and wilderness*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Baeten, G. (2012) Neoliberal planning: Does it really exist? In T. Tasas-Kok, G. Baeten, (eds.), *Contradictions of neoliberal planning*, pp. 205-211
- Bannerji, H. (2005) Building from Marx: Reflections on class and race. *Social Justice* 32(4), pp.144-160
- Barth, F. (1969) *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural difference*, Boston, MA: Brown
- Blackburn, R. (1998) *The making of new world slavery: From the baroque to the modern, 1492-1800*. New York, NY: Verso
- Boas, C. & Gans-Morse, J. (2009) Neoliberalism: From new liberal philosophy to anti-liberal slogan, *Studies in Comparative International Development (SCID)*, 44(2) 137-161
- Boddy, M. 1984. Local economic and employment strategies. In M. Boddy & C. Fudge (Eds.) *Local Socialism*. London
- Brenner, N., Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2010) After neoliberalisation? *Globalisations*, 7 (3), pp.327-345
- Castells, M. (1976) *The urban question*. London: Edward Arnold
- Collins, P.H. (1990) *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston
- Commons, J.R. (1907) *Races and immigrants in America*. New York: McMillan
- Crenshaw, K. (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 140, pp.139-167
- Darder, A. & Torres, R.D. (2004) *After race: Racism after multiculturalism*. New York, NY: New York University Press

Drescher, S. (1977) *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Fields, B.J. (1990) Slavery, race and ideology in the United States of America. *New Left Review*, Issue 181

Goonewardena, K., and Kipfer, S. (2005), Spaces of Difference: Reflections from Toronto on Multiculturalism, Bourgeois Urbanism and the Possibility of Radical Urban Politics. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3), pp. 670-678

Harvey, D. (2005) *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Harvey, D. (1989.) From managerialism to entrepreneurism: The transformation in governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 71(1): 3-17.

Harvey, D. (1973) *Social justice and the city*. London: Edward Arnold

Ignatiev, N. (1995) *How the Irish became White*. New York: Routledge.

James, C.L.R. (1996) *C.L.R. James on the 'negro question.'* University Press of Mississippi: Jackson

James, C.L.R. (1938) *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo revolution*. New York, NY: Random House

Kallen, E. (1982) Multiculturalism: ideology, policy and reality. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 17(1), pp.51-63

Katiya, Y. & Reid, C. (2012) Urban neoliberalism and the Right to the City Alliance. In Aziz Choudry & Jill Hanley (eds.), *Organize: Building from the Local for Global Justice*, PM Press: Oakland

Kobayashi, A. (1993) Multiculturalism: representing a Canadian institution. In J. Duncan and D. Ley (eds.), *Place/culture/representation*, Routledge, London

Lauber, A.W. (1913) *Indian slavery in colonial times within the present limits of the United States*. New York.

Larner, W. 2000. Neoliberalism: Policy, ideology, governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy*, 63, pp.5-25

Lefebvre, H. (1968) The urban revolution. In N. Brenner & R. Keil (Eds.), *The Global Cities Reader*, pp.407-413. New York, NY: Routledge

- Lowe, L. (1996) *Immigrant acts: On Asian American cultural politics*. Durham: Duke University Press
- McMichael, P. (1991) Slavery in capitalism: The rise and demise of the U.S. antebellum cotton culture. *Theory and Society*, 20, pp.321-349
- Mintz, S.W. (1974) *Caribbean Transformations*. Chicago: Aldine
- Nash, G.B. (1984) Colonial development. In J. Greene and J. Pole (Eds.) *Colonial British America: Essays in the new history of the modern era*, London, pp. 244-5
- Patterson, J. (1979) A critique of the new ethnicity. *American Anthropologist*, 81, pp.103-105
- Reed, A., Chowkwanyun, M. (2012), Race, class, crisis: The discourse of racial disparity and its analytical discontents. *Socialist Register*, 48, pp. 149-175
- Riches, G. (1997) Hunger and the welfare state: Comparative perspectives. In G. Riches (Eds.), *Security and Welfare Politics*. London: Macmillan Press
- Roediger, D.R. (2006) The retreat from race and class. *Monthly Review*, 58(3), pp.40-51
- Roediger, D.R. & Esch, E.D. (2012) *The production of difference*. New York: NY: Oxford University Press
- Roediger, D.R. (1991) *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. Verso
- Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sandercock, L. (1998) Towards cosmopolis: A postmodern agenda. In N. Brenner & R. Keil (Eds.), *The global cities reader*, 3, pp.311-312. New York: Routledge
- Sassen, S. (1996) Cities and communities in the global economy. In N. Brenner & R. Keil (Eds.), *The global cities reader*, 3, pp. 82-88. New York: Routledge
- Swyngedouw, E. (1986) Baltimore: The self-evaluating city? In Stone C.N. and Sanders, H.T. (Eds.). *The Politics of Urban Development*. Lawrence, Kansas
- Tomich, D.W. (2004) *Through the prism of slavery: Labor, capital, and world economy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
- Usner, D. H. (2009) *Indian work: Language and livelihood in Native American history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Viswanathan, L. (2010) Contesting racialization in the neoliberal city: cross-cultural collective formation as a strategy among alternative social planning organizations in Toronto. *GeoJournal*, 75, pp. 261-272

Williams, E.E. (1944) *Capitalism and slavery*. New York: NY: University of North Carolina Press

Wilson, W. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Wood, P. K. & Gilbert, L. (2005) Multiculturalism in Canada: accidental discourse, alternative vision, urban practice. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29 (3), pp. 679-691

Qadeer, Mohammad Abdul and Sandeep Kumar Agrawal. (2011) The practice of multicultural planning in American and Canadian cities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 20(1), pp. 132-156