

WHITE MALE PRIVILEGE? A SOCIAL CONSTRUCT FOR POLITICAL OPPRESSION

Hugh Murray*

Each day in America, white males face government-sponsored discrimination. If in high school, the white male may be denied a chance to apply for special programs because he is not a preferred minority, or in some cases, a female. There are scholarships available, but many cannot be awarded to white males. In applying for university, admissions will admit “basically qualified” minorities, but reject better qualified whites. When applying for a job, the same type of discrimination occurs. If the teen finally succeeds in finding employment, special on-the-job training may be denied him in order to guarantee slots for minorities, even if they be lesser qualified, even if they have been on the job for a shorter time. At the firm, he may be subjected to the racial and sexual harassment rituals called “diversity training,” whereby he is supposed to confess guilt to crimes committed before his birth. Yet, at the same time, he must deny his own experience; he must utter not a word about the discrimination he has encountered because he is a white male. His is the discrimination that dare not speak its name; were he to mention it, he would immediately be labeled “racist,” disruptive, and a possible threat to the firm’s good graces with the federal government’s Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and its commissars in his employer’s personnel office. If he tires of such oppression, or if he is fired, or wins a lottery, or somehow scrapes together enough money to begin his own firm, he will be denied even the opportunity to bid on many government contracts simply because he is a white male—those contracts are set-aside for minority or female companies.

And how is this discrimination justified by our courts, our media, our academia? First, it is ignored. When occasionally the issue surfaces, it is dismissed as an aberration. But on another level, liberals proclaim that in the name of “equal opportunity,” equal opportunity must be denied white males. Before her appointment as Chair of the Civil Rights Commission during President Clinton’s first term, Mary Francis Berry, a black woman, had announced that civil rights do not apply to whites. The way liberals interpret and enforce the law, equal opportu-

*Hugh Murray is an independent scholar living in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

nity and civil rights are granted to some but denied to others. Moreover, discrimination against white men is to be encouraged because it is the discrimination to end discrimination; government takes race into account so in future we will not have to take race into account. Such is the sophistry of liberal Supreme Court Justices and Civil Rights bureaucrats! To our governmental, corporate, and academetic elite, the white man deserves to be discriminated against because he is privileged. How did this system come to prevail throughout America?

It is clear that the answer cannot readily be found in the media, with its liberal bias on race. Just ponder how what I described above has been purposely avoided on the nightly TV news. Sociological journals have so neglected white male victims of affirmative action that Frederick R. Lynch titled his book on the subject *Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action*.¹ Historians have distorted the history of the civil rights movement so as to pretend that this racial discrimination IS civil rights.

In monster movies of the 1950s, scientists combed the countryside with Geiger counters measuring radioactivity; today “civil rights” proponents investigate every institution in America with their “proportional” counters. If blacks, or women, or Asians, or “Native Americans,” or Hispanics do not have their proportional share of jobs, promotions, managers, scholarships, etc., there is an immediate outcry in the media of “racism”; the EEOC, Justice Department, and other agencies swoop in to punish culprits and set quotas under the euphemism “establishing goals and timetables.”

To understand the incredible injustice of affirmative action, and the cover up of this injustice by the liberal elite, we must look more closely at this policy and the arguments presented to justify it.

How do liberals justify such discrimination? Their theory is based on a number of assumptions. First, all peoples are equally talented in all fields. Liberals modify the Jeffersonian “all men are created equal,” acknowledging differences in intelligence, athletic ability, character, between and among individuals. However, they assume that all large groups of people are equally talented in all fields. Women are just as intelligent, and given a chance to prove themselves, just as strong as men (though to

¹Frederick R. Lynch, *Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989)

maintain this some liberals will redefine strength to emphasize endurance or areas where women may outperform men.) Blacks have already proven themselves on the athletic fields, but given a fair chance, they can be seen as just as intelligent as whites (again, some liberals redefine intelligence to include emotional intelligence or artistic ability to emphasize areas wherein blacks may outperform whites). And so the assumption is made for all large groups—Hispanics, Asians, Amerindians, etc. If all groups are equally talented, then why are white men so dominant in business as CEOs, in government, and in academia? The reason is prejudice, past and present. Because blacks were enslaved, and then denied equal educational and other opportunities during the era of segregation, they could not rise to their proper place in government, medicine, business. Women, too, were oppressed, even being denied the right to vote for President until 1920, and denied equal rights in other areas until quite recently. And so with other groups. They lag behind in America today because of their history of oppression—racism, sexism, ethnocentrism. The beneficiaries of this oppression were and are white men. Today, the imperative of justice is to break the historic chain of injustice by ending the historic advantage inherited by white men.

Since all peoples are equal, it follows that in a just society, all peoples, equally talented in all fields, will each have their proportional share of lawyers, doctors, fire chiefs, criminals. But as this is clearly not the case in America today, the aim of justice is to strive for such in society. Thus, it is necessary, and *fair*, to give preferences to groups that have been excluded or underrepresented in various fields. So if a white teen has a higher score than a black teen from the same high school on an SAT for a scholarship, it is not really discrimination to deny the white that award and give it to the black. It only *seems* like discrimination; in reality, it is fair and just.

After all, why is the black teenager not performing as well as the white on the test? His father may be in jail; his mother on drugs; he may not have been encouraged enough toward academic pursuits. His cultural milieu is the heritage of slavery and segregation. The SAT test, far from measuring the intelligence or academic abilities of the two teens, merely measures the privileges inherited by the white. And so the SAT, the LSAT, the medical exams, nursing exams, teachers exams, and all other objective exams are objective only in highlighting the degree of prejudice experienced by blacks, women, and other minorities. Such “objective” exams are thus objectively racist and sexist.

Similarly, police and firefighters exams, even if minorities help construct the tests. Even drug exams are racist because it is natural that more oppressed minorities might be more prone to use illegal substances. Clearly then, seemingly color-blind objective exams are racist; sex-blind objective exams are sexist. The only test, the only exam that should be used is proportionality. Only when the same proportion of women and blacks and Hispanics do as well as whites on an exam is that examination truly free of immediate bias and the effects of past bias. The proportionality exam thus provides the test for discovering bias, the measure of discovering the degree of bias, and the method of overcoming such bias. The proportionality test is the test that tests all other tests. Thus, the white teen and his successor should be denied the scholarship until the black teen, and his successor, have a proportional number attending college, teaching in college, and as CEOs.²

This is the theory that underlies affirmative action (hereafter AA). For example, Barbara Bergmann, an economist, in her widely-publicized, *In Defense of Affirmative Action*, presents her case. To her, AA is a matter of conscience, “planning and acting to end the absence of certain kinds of people . . . from certain jobs and schools.” The purposes of AA are to end discrimination, promote integration, and reduce poverty of minority groups. “The heart of an AA plan is its numerical hiring goals, based on an assessment of the availability of qualified minority people and women for each kind of job.” Bergmann acknowledges that AA programs “do have quota-like aspects,” but she contends that this is the only method to get qualified women and minorities into jobs, for without AA they would be rejected. One of her points is that not only is AA necessary to redress the wrongs of slavery and segregation in the past, but that in today’s job market there is considerable racist and sexist discrimination proved by her charts showing continued racial and sexual segregation in employment. Furthermore, the wage gap continues to exist between white men and black men, white men and women.³

Because “a majority of Americans desire to live in a country that is fair,”⁴ the only method to overcome such discrimination is by continuing and intensifying affirmative action. Bergmann does consider alternatives to AA, such as a program based on economic

²See my “The Case Against Affirmative Action,” *Telos* (Fall 1992): 145–58.

³Barbara Bergmann, *In Defense of Affirmative Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1996), pp. 7, 9, 12, 13, 43, 37.

⁴Bergmann, *In Defense*, p. 61.

need rather than race, but as most of the poor are whites, they might overwhelm such programs unless there were quotas and set-asides established for poor blacks. So Bergmann concludes, the present system is the best.

Bergmann opens her book by commending President Clinton for his desire to choose a Cabinet “that looks like America,” shortly after his first election. But, which group was most over-represented in the Cabinet by the end of Clinton’s first term? Is it the privileged white males, villains of Bergmann’s book and liberal ideology? Of the 14 members of his Cabinet in the summer and fall of 1996, eight were white men. As whites are about 76% of the national population, those eight white men and two white women compose approximately the “fair share” Bergmann would allot to whites. But white men are 57% of the Cabinet, far more than their 38% of the population. Again, just looking at the Cabinet, one can encounter white male privilege! Bergmann seems correct. But look closer. Four of those white males are Jewish. So white male gentiles, who compose about 37% of the population, form only 28% of the Cabinet—*they are underrepresented*. Yet, Jewish males, some 1% of the population, compose another 28% of the cabinet. And, because Jews are so vastly overrepresented, the underrepresented white male gentiles are branded by liberal Jews as the “privileged” group!

Bergmann and the other liberals distort the picture of America through their misuse of statistics. Thus, gentile white males are called “overrepresented” and deemed worthy of being discriminated against, when they may indeed be underrepresented and, by the liberals’ own standards, “deserving of affirmative action.” But white male gentiles are denied any aid because liberals consciously ignore them in their statistics by including with them the overwhelming overrepresentation of Jews! Liberals seek to camouflage the overrepresentation of Jews by pointing the finger at alleged “white male privilege.” But what is true in Clinton’s Cabinet is true in medical schools and law schools and other elite areas. No wonder, Bergmann can declare, “we no longer have a ‘Jewish seat’ on the Supreme Court because it is no longer needed.”⁵ Of course not! The reason: of the nine justices, two are now Jews. So representatives of 2% of the population compose 22% of the highest court of the land. Bergmann does not complain about this “unfair” proportion. Similarly, when Mrs. Bergmann complains about so few women and minor-

⁵Bergmann, *In Defense*, p. 97.

ities in the United States Senate as an illustration of discrimination,⁶ she neglects to mention Wisconsin, where both Senators are Jewish men. Thus, less than 1% of the state's population provides 100% of its Senators. True, Bergmann might complain, but only because it is an all-male delegation. Then, consider California's Senators—two female Jews. No complaint from Mrs. Bergmann. She is from the most privileged, the most over-represented group in America. Yet, she diverts attention by decrying the overrepresentation of white males, even declaring white male waiters in restaurants privileged, though they serve her!

Mrs. Bergmann's statistics are aimed at obfuscating and distorting. She seeks to portray all white men as privileged because some are overrepresented in profitable enterprises. And because of this "privilege," preferences must be granted to all those who are not white men. But the group most overrepresented is NOT white men, it is Jews. Even economically, the gap between whites and blacks is NOT as great as that between Jews and gentiles.⁷ So, if Bergmann is accurate that the purpose of AA is to narrow the economic gap between blacks and whites, how much greater the necessity for AA on behalf of gentiles to narrow the ever-wider economic gap between Jews and gentiles? If Bergmann were to reply that this is beyond the scope of the Civil Rights Act, she is wrong. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited discrimination based on religion as well as any based on race, sex, or ethnic origin. Bergmann, the EEOC, and the civil rights lobby all stress that the individual is less important than the statistical aggregate in exposing "discrimination"; that statistics are the method of revealing what is wrong in the work place, and, with, AA (quotas) goals, and timetables, providing the best means of overcoming the discrimination proved by the numbers. Then, by her own system of determining discrimination, it is clear that Jews are the most overrepresented group in the most lucrative positions in the nation. Furthermore, the average income of Jews is sufficiently higher than gentiles to exhibit a massive economic gap. Why does not Mrs. Bergmann include this among her statistics? After all, she is an economist.

Bluntly, the proportional test, the liberals' test of all tests, when applied to the religious clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, shows Jews to be the most privileged and oppressive people in America. The favorite test of liberals reveals white men to be

⁶Bergmann, *In Defense*, p. 16

⁷Christopher Jencks, *Rethinking Social Policy: Race, Poverty, and the Underclass* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 28.

less privileged than Jews. Why does not the *New York Times*, the EEOC, the television networks, report that statistic? The media is silent on Jewish privilege. But if the media began to expose “Jewish privilege” and demanded preferences for gentiles until they had received their “fair share” of important posts, there would be immediate denunciations of the media’s bigotry. However, the media and government are even more bigoted when they denounce white male privilege and demand preferences for women and minorities. Yet, few denounce this bigotry.

Either the liberals’ proportionality test is valid, in which case Jews are the most privileged and oppressive people in America, or the proportionality test is flawed, providing bizarre results, and should not be used to allege white male privilege. Nor should that test be used to undermine the SAT, the LSAT, the medical tests, the police exams.

Concisely, here is the liberals’ dilemma—either white male privilege is a myth and AA, erected upon the myth, should be demolished; or, if white men are privileged, then Jews are even more so. And if, because of white male privilege, AA is essential to aid underrepresented minorities and women (the majority) until they have achieved their “fair share” (quota) of lucrative rewards in society, then because of Jewish privilege, all the more reason to institute AA to aid underrepresented gentiles (again, the majority) until they have achieved their “fair share” of lucrative rewards in society.

Conservatives Roberts and Stratton remind us that the debate about the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the debate over quotas; it would never have been enacted without a series of amendments to ensure that quotas would not result. Democrat Emmanuel Celler amended the proposal so that the EEOC could make no substantial interpretations of regulations. Sen. Everett Dirksen amended it so that discrimination must be “intentional” and seniority systems protected. Sen. John Tower amended it to protect continued use of aptitude tests in which whites invariably scored higher than blacks. All the supporters of the bill assured the nation that there would be no quotas—and Roberts and Stratton quote Senators Hubert Humphrey, Clifford Case, Thomas Kuchel, Harrison Williams, and even the Leadership Committee on Civil Rights to that effect.⁸

⁸Paul Craig Roberts and Lawrence M. Stratton, *The New Color Line: How Quotas and Privilege Destroy Democracy* (Washington, D. C.: Regnery, 1995), pp. 66, 72–73, 81, 82–83.

Roberts and Stratton do more by exposing the subversion of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by EEOC activist Alfred Blumrosen, who was determined to redefine discrimination based on statistical differences in outcomes between blacks and whites. Blumrosen aimed to make “intent” irrelevant and abolish use of most aptitude and intelligence tests or any other job requirement that had a disparate impact on blacks. Of course, to achieve these ends, Blumrosen got the EEOC to make substantive interpretations of regulations. He was aware that he was going beyond and against the law. Yet, he hoped that the courts would permit his changes as courts would defer to the expert status of the commission.⁹

By 1966 the EEOC was illegally collecting racial statistics from employers, setting in motion the data collections for the proportional representation and disparate impact theory of discrimination. If blacks (or later women, or Hispanics) were employed below their population in a given area, this might prompt a prima facie case of discrimination by the EEOC. Roberts and Stratton expose Blumrosen’s assault upon the Civil rights Act of 1964, which he totally subverted, a view acknowledged in its own history of the commission prepared by the EEOC during the Johnson administration. Blumrosen’s subversion was accepted as law by the U. S. Supreme court in 1971 in the *Griggs* decision, which completely misinterpreted the history and clear meaning of the 1964 law in order to accept Orwellian interpretations propounded by Blumrosen. After *Griggs*, in “employment and promotions, unequals had to be treated as equals,” and “race-based privileges had found their way into law.” Roberts and Stratton assert that *Griggs* killed four birds with one stone: 1) intent was hereafter unnecessary to show discrimination; 2) tests or qualifications in which blacks did poorly were judged discriminatory (for most jobs, employers were suddenly barred from inquiring about a person’s grades in school, if he had a diploma, or an arrest record); 3) quotas would be permitted, and 4) the EEOC could issue substantive regulatory interpretations.¹⁰

In the late 1980s the Supreme Court began to modify some of its disparate impact, pro-preference, and pro-quota rulings. In response, Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1991 which “in effect, repealed the 1964 act by legalizing racial preferences.” Legally, “the situation for white men today is . . . worse

⁹Roberts and Stratton, *The New Color Line*, pp. 90–91.

¹⁰Roberts and Stratton, *The New Color Line*, pp. 95, 98, 99.

that it was for blacks under *Plessy*” for then it was separate and equal in theory; today whites are theoretically and legally denied equality before the law.¹¹

The quota laws and quota mentality have rippled throughout this nation. “The U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, which oversees the Civil Service, now measures in terms of a civil servant’s support for quotas.” For an FBI security clearance today, one will be checked on any ethnic or gender bias. And while the FAA encourages organizations of employees of blacks, Hispanics, Asians, gays and lesbians, any employee who is caught reading material of the Coalition of White Aviation Employees may be fired. The Forest Service, to discourage white male applicants and meet quotas, advertised for positions with the warning, “only unqualified need apply.”¹²

Roberts and Stratton fail to raise an important question. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed racial AND religious discrimination. Why did not Blumrosen, on the same questionnaires in which he queried about race, ask about the religion of those employed? The reason was simple, as Blumrosen undoubtedly knew: it would destroy his theory. Such a questionnaire would show that in some of the most profitable professions, the group most overrepresented (and by Blumrosen’s theory, most oppressive and deserving to be restricted by quotas) was not the “privileged white male,” but Jews. But, as Roberts and Stratton note, “personnel is policy” in the bureaucracy; Blumrosen asked the race question on the forms but insured that the second, related, religious question went unasked. White males became the scapegoats in the EEOC crusade against privilege.

And once smeared as privileged, the non-privileged middle-class, working-class, and poor whites pay for the “moral” system of AA by being legally discriminated against and denied equal opportunity. But then, the history of America since the 1960s is often the record of wealthy liberals using the law to curb and oppress blue-collar whites, because the blue-collar folk are deemed privileged, prejudiced, and provincial. Therefore, such blue-collar whites deserve to be passed over in scholarships, jobs, and promotions; the blue collar crowd should be shunted aside, and instead the “pets” of the elite should be elevated: the children of illegal immigrants, of wealthy minorities, and the daughters of wealthy liberals. And all this is rationalized in the name of morality, fairness, and justice!

¹¹Roberts and Stratton, *The New Color Line*, pp. 112, 113.

¹²Roberts and Stratton, *The New Color Line*, pp. 138, 141.

An academic supporter of AA, John Skrentny, treats the development of AA differently. Skrentny acknowledges, "Though civil rights and African American groups may have supported affirmative action as a preferred civil rights measure since at least the 1970s, the policy is largely the construction of white male elites who traditionally have dominated government and business. The historical record shows that these elites (who are often assumed by the Left, by definition, to act *against* minority interests) advocated different parts of the affirmative action model before or without the influence of any organized civil rights groups that was lobbying for affirmative action. At one point, the [Nixon] White House actually lobbied the civil rights groups to support affirmative action."¹³

Despite his emphasis on the riots, Skrentny concedes that the major change occurred in March 1966 when the EEOC sent out its reporting forms to the industries to be covered by the Civil Rights law. "Legal scholar and EEOC advisor Alfred Blumrosen instigated the development."¹⁴ Actually, the forms were sent to many industries beyond the jurisdiction of the EEOC, for the law had given priority to state FEPCs in those states that had them. Firms located in such states should have received no EEOC forms. This was another example of Blumrosen's "creativity," or going beyond the law. The idea of reporting employees by race had been debated at a White House conference in August 1965, and was debated again inside the EEOC that December, when only Bernard Frechtman opposed. A few months later, the EEOC sent out its race forms. A similar trend occurred inside the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC), created in September 1965 by Johnson's Executive Order. The OFCC was inside the Labor Department. Yet, the Executive Order, like the Civil Rights Act, emphasized that race NOT be considered.

Skrentny justifies the collection of race data by asserting that "agencies . . . are expected to gather information relevant to their goals" and "Washington is awash in various statistics, rates, and figures." Quantification is a feature of Western modernity.¹⁵ This seeming explanation is again, camouflage, distortion. The law was to prevent discrimination based upon race, color, and religion, among others. Why did Washington, aflutter in

¹³John Skrentny, *The Ironies of Affirmative Action: Politics, Culture and Justice in America* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 5. On p. 87, he reasserts that powerful elites pushed AA.

¹⁴Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, p. 127.

¹⁵Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, p. 143-44.

statistics, knowing that figures are part of the Western project of modernization, not send out forms requesting the religious background of all employees of large firms? The reason is clear. Blumrosen at EEOC, Leonard Bierman at OFCC, and others would have been horrified. The same proportional standard that they were creating that would expose “discrimination” against blacks in employment, etc., would have shown greater “discrimination” against gentiles. Either their own group would be placed in a vulnerable position, or there was something clearly wrong with the standard that they were seeking to impose on America. Are we to believe that they were unaware that the standard they were preparing to inflict on the nation was flawed? Then why did they not demand the religious questions on the form? Pragmatic action or conspiracy?

The liberal’s American dilemma is this: either the EEOC is guilty of selective enforcement of the Civil Rights Act by not applying the religious features of the act as it does the racial, sexual, and ethnic features (i.e., by not requiring religious identification to insure religious “goals and timetables” for underrepresented groups), or the EEOC is guilty of selective malenforcement (subversion) of the Civil Rights Act (that was passed to provide equal opportunity to all and to deny privileges to any based on race, religion, national origin, or sex).¹⁶

Skrentny justifies the massive change that was occurring in the definitions of discrimination, race-consciousness, race-preferences, etc., by calling AA a “new kind of racial justice.” As courts gave the AA model the force of law through disparate impact decisions, businesses found that they had to hire by “voluntary” quotas or face heavy fines for discrimination.¹⁷

When the Nixon Administration revived the Philadelphia Plan, to make it legal, it decided to require definite quotas, instead of the vague ones that had been declared illegal the previous year. However, to dodge the 1964 Civil Rights Act’s provision that had explicitly forbade quotas, the Nixon Administration would call the quotas, “goals” and “targets.” This attempt was opposed by Republican Sen. Everett Dirksen. Dirksen reminded the public that it was in his office that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act had been written. Dirksen knew a quota by any other name was still a quota, and illegal by the provision of the

¹⁶Where are the civil liberties attorneys willing to challenge Affirmative Action as “selective enforcement” of the law?

¹⁷Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, pp. 145, 159.

1964 law. But Dirksen also had cancer, and he died before he could prevent Nixon's subversion of the Civil Rights Act. Nixon implemented and extended quotas.¹⁸

Nevertheless, Skrentny concludes that the Philadelphia Plan was "the most radical civil rights employment measure in American history. Skrentny observes that the white male elite pushed AA. Riots made it easier to accept, as jobs for blacks had a high priority. The Kerner Commission had blamed the riots on white racism and had heard some testimony urging racial quotas."¹⁹

Skrentny proclaims that business did not oppose AA, but the unions did.²⁰ This is both true and false. Look for example at the case of Brian Weber. Weber, a white male, was denied entrance to a training program based on seniority rights in order to make way for minorities with less seniority. Though there had been no previous discrimination against blacks in the plant, both the corporation *and* the union had agreed on double standards to promote black workers, at the expense of low-ranking white workers. Weber had to sue both Kaiser Aluminum and the United Steelworkers of America to seek equal opportunity. In 1979 the US Supreme Court rejected his demand, and legalized union discrimination against their white members.

Skrentny also asserts that all interests are social constructs.²¹ I ask, like "white male privilege"? And in whose interest was it to construct a category, white, male, and then denounce it as privileged and deserving to be discriminated against?

Skrentny discusses a Supreme Court Justice who, aware that the Constitution is color-blind, hoped to forestall accepting a case that would render a decision against AA. By delaying, he believed some social change would occur.²² But would that change be for the better? Justice delayed IS justice denied to poor whites who cannot get scholarships or admissions to universities, to their parents who are denied promotions and jobs because of their color. To the elite who composed and imposed this policy, it is no problem. But to the poor and blue collar whites, it is hell.

Conservative Terry Eastland exposes some of the mendacities of the supporters of AA, providing instances of when they have

¹⁸Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, pp. 193, 195–96.

¹⁹Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, pp. 198, 223.

²⁰Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, p. 232.

²¹Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, p. 232.

²²Skrentny, *Ironies of Affirmative Action*, p. 240.

indeed demanded specific quotas in hiring, and the hiring of *unqualified* minorities. He explains how many of the private “voluntary” AA programs are implemented only because, without such programs, the firms might suffer heavy fines. Thus, “voluntary,” like “equal opportunity,” “not quotas, but goals and timetables,” “ending discrimination,” “hiring only qualified minorities and women,” and other phrases take on Orwellian meanings when uttered by proponents of AA.²³

Eastland stresses the unanticipated role of the change in immigration laws on AA policy. Programs once justified to help American blacks overcome the injustices endured during slavery and segregation, now provide fewer preferences to American blacks than to recent third world immigrants and their children. Indeed, three-quarters of new immigrants qualify for AA preferences that give them an advantage over American born white men. Eastland relates how various ethnic groups have lobbied to be included on the Small Business Administration’s list of pet groups that receive preferences, how blacks have fought to rescind preferences for Asians in Ohio, while Latinos in California have complained that blacks have too high a proportion of government jobs there.²⁴

CONCLUSION

I contend that AA developed, in part, as a consequence of a conspiracy inside the EEOC, which can be seen by the agency’s sending out forms so that all major firms in the nation would have to report on hiring by race. 1) This was beyond the legal jurisdiction of the EEOC; and 2) the EEOC did not ask those firms to report on the religion of their employees—though the purpose of the Civil Rights Act was to end discrimination based of race *and* religion.

The strongly pro-AA Bergmann and Skrentny, and the strongly anti-AA Eastland all recognize that big business supported AA. Skrentny extends that to declare that America’s elite developed AA and made it policy. Bob Zelnick quotes black academic Glen Loury that affirmative action is “a small tax corporate America pays to the black elite.”²⁵ No matter how it

²³Terry Eastland, *Ending Affirmative Action: A Case Study for Colorblind Justice* (New York: Basic Books, 1996), pp. 11, 12.

²⁴Eastland, *Ending Affirmative Action*, pp. 150, 17, 146–47, 148, 18.

²⁵Bob Zelnick, *Backfire: A Reporter’s Look at Affirmative Action* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 1996), p. 7.

hurts millions of middle class and poor whites, it has been supported by corporate America. The National Association of Manufacturers and the Equal Employment Advisory Council supported and saved AA, especially during the Reagan Administration when some elements sought to have the President rescind the entire policy by Executive Order. Perhaps the culmination of this occurred when Congress passed the pro-AA Civil Rights Act of 1991. Many conservatives urged President Bush to veto it as he had vetoed the quota bill of 1990. However, big business lobbied in favor of the bill, and Bush signed the bill into law in 1991.

Why? “While AA may be one of the costs of doing business for the big fellows— . . . it is no threat to their existence and can even be viewed as raising the entry barrier to potential competitors, the little guys.”²⁶ To put it bluntly, IBM and Proctor and Gamble can afford to hire dummies, druggies, and violent criminals. Smaller companies cannot. Meanwhile, the large corporations gain an image of compassion and fairness. Better qualified whites who are not promoted or hired are poor or working class whites. But with AA, those poor whites are labeled “privileged,” and therefore deserving of being denied employment or promotion. Meanwhile, the wealthy, privileged, CEO’s receive humanitarian awards. Clearly what is most needed is a class analysis of the monstrosity called affirmative action.

Worse, Roberts and Stratton fail to answer the moral argument of the Left. For many who read their concluding statement—America has a choice of democracy or quotas—many will choose quotas. To them quotas are just, and justice precedes democracy. But their view is based on the notion that blacks were so oppressed in this country, 85 years in slavery, and decades of segregation, that “it’s our turn now,” as Justice Thurgood Marshall explained his philosophy. Quotas, set asides, and race preferments are deemed necessary to achieve justice. If democracy will not accommodate these, then democracy be damned. White America owes blacks.

My response is that because blacks were enslaved in the US for a century is no reason to oppress or enslave the descendants of those whites today. First, had the ancestors of American blacks not been taken from Africa, they might have been born in Africa to starvation, as in Somalia, to slaughter, as in Rwanda, or to continued slavery, as in Sudan and Mauritania. In addition, it was not the whites who were evil; it was the institution of slav-

²⁶Zelnick, *Backfire*, p. 60.

ery that was evil. Furthermore, slavery was abolished in a war in which more white Americans died than in all other American wars combined. If whites were guilty of slavery, that debt has been paid by whites in blood. Similarly, if blacks suffered from segregation and discrimination by whites, there is no reason to submit the descendants of those whites to segregation and discrimination. It was not the whites, but the institutions of segregation and discrimination that were evil. And whites, like blacks, sacrificed to end the evils of segregation and discrimination. The civil rights movement had black and white martyrs. But with AA, a new, evil, racial discrimination is imposed by government, this time against white men, and especially against poor white men. AA is therefore unjust and immoral should be abolished.

If Roberts and Stratton maintain that the choice is between quotas and democracy, Zelnick quotes some who seem to agree. When a black official in the Bush administration questioned the legality of blacks-only scholarships, Spike Lee responded that the black official was an Uncle Tom who should be beaten in an alley with a Louisville slugger.²⁷ When professors in California proposed an end to affirmative action and organized the California Civil Rights Initiative, California House Speaker Willie Brown spoke at the university where one of the professors taught.

Believe me, if you treat him correctly, during the time you are in his class, by the end of the session he should really need therapy. . . . You should do your best to terrorize professors you don't like, and I guarantee he will be a basket case by the end of the year.²⁸

Clearly, neither Lee nor Brown believe in free speech or democracy for their opponents. They believe in quotas AND terror. Brown is now Mayor of San Francisco.

Despite the massive belief of Americans that race and gender preferences constitute racial and sexual discrimination, and are therefore immoral, unfair, and unAmerican, our business elite, our governmental elite, and our liberal academe elite continue to uphold these policies. Why? This is a crucial question.

In summary, the great hoax that is concocted by and unquestioned in the media, academy, and government is “white male

²⁷Zelnick, *Backfire*, p. 147.

²⁸Zelnick, *Backfire*, p. 369.

privilege.” Most white men are not privileged. Those who are privileged often support affirmative action because it is no skin off their nose—their children will not require a scholarship, an entry-level job, a position as policeman or fireman, or a promotion. It is the poor and middle-class whites who, denied equal opportunity, must pay with thinning wallets and shrunken dreams for the “morality and conscientious efforts at diversity” imposed by the wealthy, liberal elite.

In reality, affirmative action is class war against poor and middle-class whites. This is why it is *not* surprising that corporate America has supported affirmative action, blocking attempts by the Reagan Administration to end the policy, and encouraging Bush to sign the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which he had earlier called “the quota bill.”

Even if every CEO in America were a white male, that would be no reason to discriminate against a poor, white teenage boy seeking a scholarship to college in order to give it to a lesser qualified minority or girl who may be studying beside him in the same school. We must end the discrimination called affirmative action.

Cultural Oppression: Language has a contribution to oppression in general, language with its marking function constructs social structure and an interplay in creating cultural values. Government records categorize people who are neither white or male, as ethnic presuming white people do not have an ethnicity but are the norm, and white people are often "de-raced" in discourses.[13]. Structural / Institutional Oppression: In 2004 Humphries stated failure to critically analyse legislation's and social policy led "failure to identify the inherent racism within immigration" But the later use of "white privilege" was completely different because the academics who took over the notion did not relate it to the class regime in the way that Ignatin and Allen had originally. Thus many Marxists would argue that the system of race discrimination and preference to whites has a different relationship to the (overwhelmingly white) ruling class (and the predominantly white) class of high end professionals and managers than it has to the working class. The reality is everyone is equal of having privilege, abuse, oppression, and committing great injustice. "white privilege" definitely does not apply to the farmers in Zimbabwe that lost their farms to party officials. I'll take being a Saudi prince over some broke white man in Florida taking bath salts.