9

Prisons of the Forgotten: Ghettos and Economic Injustice

TOMMIE SHELBY

According to Martin Luther King, Jr., two developments marked the end of the first phase of the civil rights movement (1955–1965) and the start of a new radical black freedom struggle. The first was the passage of the Voting Rights Act, which Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law on August 6, 1965. The second was the emergence of riots in black ghettos, particularly the violent and destructive uprising that began on August 11, 1965, in the neighborhood of Watts and that spread throughout South Central Los Angeles.[1] The black freedom movement, King insisted, must turn *North* (here understood to include all U.S. regions outside the South) to attack the problems of the ghetto.[2] As usual, King backed up his words with action. He moved with his family to a West Side ghetto in Chicago.[3]

The aims of the largely southern civil rights campaign were to end racist brutality, to abolish Jim Crow ordinances, to secure freedom of association, and to establish an effective right to vote. The Voting Rights Act brought to a close the struggle for minimally "decent" treatment for blacks. The new phase aimed to realize substantive equality. We must, King argued, move beyond ending humiliation to ending poverty, prohibiting labor exploitation, and creating greater economic fairness.[4] The two phases, in King's conception, are part of one long struggle, because racial injustice and economic injustice are "inseparable twins."[5]

This second phase, however, would be even more challenging than the first. Abolishing Jim Crow cost affluent whites little. It mainly involved desegregating public spaces and allowing blacks to vote and to be elected to public office. It was costly to working-class whites, for now they had to

compete with blacks for jobs and promotions on fairer terms. But fully realizing economic justice *would* cost more-advantaged whites. Thus, many white citizens, from all social classes, are inclined to resist it.[6] Abolishing poverty, ending involuntary unemployment, building affordable housing, providing quality education for all, and controlling crime would require money, probably a lot of it, and so would be harder to achieve than desegregation.[7] King was right about the difficult road that lay ahead, for here we sit, more than fifty years later, without these goals accomplished.

This chapter considers King's account of the injustices ghettos represent and his proposals for how to rectify them. In particular, I highlight the strengths and the limits of King's conception of economic justice. To do so I explain how he understood the problems of the ghetto and outline the activism and policies he believed were necessary to remedy these problems. I then delve into the political morality, the specific ethical principles, that he took to justify his practical prescriptions. Next, I take up how King compared his vision of economic justice with two competing political ideologies—capitalism (classical liberalism) and communism (Marxism). Going beyond King's well-known commitment to ending poverty, I aim to better understand what kind of "egalitarian" or "radical" he was and to determine the degree to which he was committed to socialist principles. I close by considering the relevance of his theory for understanding and combating contemporary ghetto poverty.

Social Problems of the Ghetto

Because of the enormous influence of Daniel Patrick Moynihan's *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* (often referred to simply as "the Moynihan Report"), most post–civil rights discussions of ghettos take up questions of black family life, if only to reject the infamous report's conclusions. Like Moynihan, King offered a historically informed account of what he regarded as the "disintegration" and "disorganization" of black families in ghettos.[8] He emphasized the destructive role of slavery, noting that black families might have been able to repair themselves if newly freed persons had not been "thrown off the plantations, penniless, homeless, still largely in the territory of their enemies and in the grip of fear, bewilderment and aimlessness."[9] After the Civil War, most blacks toiled away in poverty for generations. Those who migrated north were contained in ghettos, which increased the challenge of adjusting to city life and industrialization.

Women have dominated black families in ghettos, King conceded, because they have had more ready access to education and employment than black men. Black women's employment was largely restricted to domestic service, however, so their wages remained low. Lack of marketable skills and racial discrimination kept blacks, men and women, out of the higher-paying jobs and prevented some from gaining employment altogether. Demoralized, many black fathers suffered low self-esteem, undermined their children's ambition, and in frustration struck out violently against their wives and children. Such families are fragile and often dysfunctional. At the root of their difficulties is punishing poverty, lack of opportunity to develop marketable skills, and humiliating forms of economic exploitation.

Crime is a serious problem in ghetto neighborhoods.[10] While police harass and brutalize ghetto denizens, they make little effort to protect black residents from crime. Street crime is de facto permitted in ghetto areas (provided it doesn't threaten to spill over into white neighborhoods), and law-abiding residents live in fear of it. Because parents are forced to work so much (and often at night and at great distance from home), children are left playing unsupervised in the streets, where they are exposed to crime and vulnerable to the influence of unsavory characters.[11]

Housing in ghettos is inadequate—unhealthy, overcrowded, and dilapidated.[12] Yet rents are high for even these appalling accommodations, and housing discrimination restricts blacks' housing options. Real estate brokers and white residents will allow only a few token blacks (if any) to reside in white neighborhoods, where housing is more plentiful and of higher quality. When blacks do overcome barriers to entry, whites flee these neighborhoods.[13] Therefore blacks, with only a few exceptions, are forced to live in deeply disadvantaged and segregated neighborhoods—that is, ghettos.

King argued that ghetto social problems are rooted in economic disadvantage, particularly in unemployment, low wages, and restriction to menial labor.[14] The resulting poverty and economic insecurity undermine healthy family life and make it difficult to escape from decaying and dirty housing. Some of these economic disadvantages are caused by ongoing racial injustices (for example, racial discrimination in employment, schooling, and housing). Some are caused by past racial injustices (generations of black bondage under chattel slavery and subjugation under Jim Crow). But there are general economic disadvantages that harm people of all races, though blacks are hurt disproportionately. For instance, some

unemployment and underemployment is due to automation and plant relocation.[15] Automation increases productivity but, in the absence of government action, creates massive unemployment, as employers seek to lower labor costs to raise their profits.[16] Only a full-employment economy (with the creation of public sector jobs if necessary) can offset the damage done to low-skilled workers through automation.[17]

Riots and Economic Injustice

For King, the Watts riot and similar urban uprisings were not just a challenge to his philosophy of nonviolent resistance. Riots signify economic injustice, and they serve as a lens for understanding the problems of the ghetto. As he tells us, "The explosion in Watts reminded us all that the northern ghettos are the prisons of forgotten men."[18] Ghettos are combustible—there, as he says, "rage replaces reason"—because their inhabitants have suffered many abuses over a long period yet their voices of protest are disregarded.[19] The rioters would rather strike out, even in potentially self-destructive ways, than continue to be ignored.

In *The Trumpet of Conscience* (1968), King identified five factors that explained ghetto riots: a "white backlash" that took the form of resistance to racial equality and hostility toward blacks who demand justice; discrimination across several social domains (housing, education, employment); high unemployment, especially among black youth; blacks' disproportionate conscription into an unjust war in Vietnam; and inadequate public services in black neighborhoods.[20] But it is clear he thought unfair obstacles to acquiring well-paying jobs were the most important factor. As paths to economic mobility are closed off, cynicism inevitably sets in. This should not surprise us, because hope cannot be sustained without visible signs of economic progress.[21] Riots (like other ghetto problems) are primarily caused, King insisted, by unemployment, underemployment, relegation to menial jobs, and employment discrimination. The ubiquitous harassment and disrespect by police officers makes blacks' sense of economic insecurity more acute. Hope turns to despair; festering resentment turns to rage.[22]

King was convinced that ghetto denizens understood the source of their plight. This is evident in the fact that the damage done by black rioters was overwhelmingly done to property. There was little violence aimed at physically harming white people, King insisted.[23] (The deaths and injuries that did occur were mainly due to aggressive military and police action in suppressing the riots.)[24] Looting and the destruction of property are, he claimed, forms of protest directed at symbols of wealth and objects of need.[25] Riots communicate a message: outrage over economic injustice.[26]

King, however, sharply criticized political violence and morally opposed rioting as a mode of resistance. Nor did he think it would be an effective strategy: "As I have walked among the desperate, rejected and angry young men I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems."[27] This steadfast opposition to rioting is sometimes obscured when commentators invoke King's memorable phrase "the riot is the language of the unheard."[28]

Yet King did not think that when blacks riot in America's ghettos, the rioters alone deserve blame. He believed whites share responsibility for these explosions of black rage. The white majority doesn't hold government accountable for changing the conditions in disadvantaged black communities but instead directs all its resentment and hostility toward black ghetto dwellers. In fact, the crimes of white society, King argued, are even greater than the lawbreaking of ghetto denizens. Welfare laws, rights to due process, building code regulations, employment laws, and entitlement to educational opportunity are all violated when it comes to blacks. It is *this* long-standing and pervasive lawlessness, perpetrated by the broader public, that has created and perpetuates ghettos: "The slums are the handiwork of a vicious system of the white society; Negroes live in them, but they do not make them, any more than a prisoner makes a prison."[29] Ultimately, only social justice will quell the threat of riots.[30]

The task, then, is to abolish the ghetto. This is the next step in the black freedom struggle, and it will require, King maintained, an "economic reconstruction."[31] It necessitates "radical changes in the structure of our society."[32] The question is what practical measures—from policy to activism—must be undertaken to effect these changes. Let's consider King's proposals.

Practical Remedies

Ghettos won't disappear unless aggressive actions are taken to address racial inequality and discrimination.[33] Effective antidiscrimination measures are needed to deal with ongoing racial injustices. King also suggested that compensatory measures were required to "atone" for past injustices and to remove inherited obstacles to equal opportunity.[34] Blacks can't compete on fair terms in a market society unless these handicaps are repaired or offset: "It is obvious that if a man is entered at the starting line in a race three hundred years after another man, the first would have to perform

some impossible feat in order to catch up with his fellow runner."[35] Moreover, blacks can't escape poverty in the same way white European immigrants did in earlier periods, because there are too few decent jobs for those with low skills and educational disadvantages.[36]

However, the unemployment problem at the heart of the ghetto can't be solved by race-conscious policies alone. What's needed is a full-employment economy that makes a place for those with few skills and little education but without exploiting these vulnerable workers or relegating them to only menial jobs. Indeed, the historic March on Washington (August 28, 1963) was a demand for freedom *and* jobs, for the equal protection of basic liberties *and* economic justice. The principal organizers of the March were Bayard Rustin (a close adviser to King) and A. Philip Randolph, both leftwing organizers and labor movement activists. At the March, in his justly famous "I Have a Dream" speech, King not only condemned racism and discrimination but also remarked, "The Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity."[37] And in light of this, he says, "we cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one."[38]

In *Where Do We Go from Here* (1967), King made several concrete policy proposals for creating a full-employment economy that includes the ghetto poor.[39] He believed government should subsidize (or lower the tax rate for) private companies that hire and train workers with limited education. There should also be an expansion in public sector jobs in human services for disadvantaged communities, and these jobs should be reserved for workers who lack a college degree. Colleges should be open to, and develop a curriculum for, those who in the past have not been successful in school but want to try their hand at it again. And there must be special employment opportunities for the hardcore jobless—those who have dropped out the labor market altogether and have subsequently lost the necessary work habits—where employers are tolerant and patient while their employees cultivate the relevant discipline.

King lamented the lack of a minimum wage that guarantees a decent standard of living, where "decent" means something like material well-being consistent with dignity.[40] Thus, he argued for a guaranteed annual wage and an adequate hourly minimum wage.[41] What King had in mind is that the minimum wage should be set so a full-time worker would have yearly earnings above an appropriate poverty line. He also insisted that all who are "willing to work" should be guaranteed employment, in the public sector if necessary.[42] When employment cannot be secured for everyone who wants it, a decent income should be guaranteed to the unemployed and underemployed.[43]

In some of his later labor speeches and writings, King advocated moving away from antipoverty initiatives that focus exclusively on finding poor people jobs to ones that attack poverty by directly providing necessary income.[44] He asserted that, just as each citizen has a constitutional right to vote, each should be constitutionally entitled to adequate housing, a quality education, and the income necessary to acquire basic necessities.[45] King's militant antipoverty stance led him to advocate a "Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged" and to denounce the inadequate funding for the War on Poverty.[46]

Even more radically, he asserted that guaranteed income should be aimed at reducing economic inequality and not just at eliminating absolute poverty.[47] Here he suggested guaranteed basic income should be some percentage of median income, not set solely to meet basic physical needs. The guaranteed income must "automatically increase as the total social income grows."[48] Otherwise, those who receive it would suffer a relative decline over time. This position suggests King's concern went beyond securing basic necessities for all—an instance of his staunch commitment to abolishing poverty. He was also concerned with everyone's *relative* standing in society, with substantive equality. In other words, his proposal would appear to rest on a moral objection to certain forms of inequality. But this, I confess, isn't entirely clear, because he described his worry as about "nullifying the gains of [economic] security and stability," which need not be about relative social position.[49]

To reduce racial discrimination in employment, King called not only for more marches and demonstrations, but also for organized and sustained economic boycotts of businesses that served black customers but didn't hire or promote blacks in significant numbers.[50] This "Operation Breadbasket" (a form of nonviolent direct action initially launched in Atlanta but later expanded, under the leadership of Jesse Jackson, to Chicago) could work in ghetto communities to effect a more just distribution of non-menial jobs and to increase black employment.[51] King did not believe Operation Breadbasket was a form of extortion. Given the injustices blacks face, it was a permissible form of political dissent: "Basic to the philosophy of nonviolence is a refusal to cooperate with evil. There is nothing quite so effective as a refusal to cooperate economically with the forces and institutions which perpetuate evil in our communities."[52] He thought this same method could be used to improve housing conditions in ghettos. Black residents could establish tenant unions or organize rent strikes to pressure

landlords to make repairs and to offer fair rents. In this way, the methods forged to fight segregation in the South could be deployed to fight economic subjugation in northern ghettos.

Unlike many Black Power advocates, who were generally skeptical of the mostly white labor movement, King called for a civil rights–labor alliance.[53] The problems of labor are also black problems, because the vast majority of blacks are ordinary workers. Even as early as *Stride toward Freedom* (1958), King realized "the poor white was exploited just as much as the Negro."[54] The black freedom struggle and the labor movement have, he claimed, essentially the same concerns.[55] Blacks must therefore join the labor movement and attempt to influence its demands. Together with workers of other races, blacks can create just economic conditions in America and elsewhere.

For this to be a fruitful alliance, though, the labor movement had to change.[56] It must steadfastly oppose racial discrimination in employment and union membership, which the movement had not consistently done. It must welcome blacks into the skilled trades, making training available to all seeking promotion to higher-skilled positions rather than reserving the most desirable roles for whites. The movement must fight for all workers, not just those who belong to unions or labor organizations.[57] Organized labor will be weak if millions are poor, as this will bring down wages and workplace standards. The existence of an economically insecure workforce is profitable for business, as it pushes down wages.[58] So the civil rights–labor alliance must fight for economic security for all.

Principles of Economic Justice

As is well known, King was a Christian minister. So many of his political views were rooted, in part, in his theological commitments, particularly in his reading of the gospel texts. But he was also a public philosopher who defended his political stances by relying on secular arguments and empirical evidence. He was fully aware that he had an audience (including many black radicals) who did not share his religious convictions. And his arguments were not designed to convert them (or bring them back) to the Christian faith. Rather, in the spirit of public deliberation in a pluralist democracy, he sought to persuade his political opponents using principles they could accept even if they had different religious beliefs or professed no religion at all. I believe his arguments have merit and import for the problems of the ghetto today. I contend that underlying King's practical recommendations are a set of moral principles that justify his proposed economic policies and social movement goals.

One of King's most basic principles, one he invoked frequently, is that: *No one should be forced to live in poverty while others live in luxury.*[59] This principle is open to an antipoverty and an egalitarian reading. King thought that knowingly allowing some to live in poverty when one has enormous wealth exhibits callous indifference to the suffering of others and thus is morally wrong. But he also regarded this social circumstance as a threat to the "dignity" of the poor and thus an injustice. Let me explain.

Indifference to human suffering is obviously wrong. We needn't rely on egalitarian principles of economic justice to condemn it. Yet this kind of indifference, when it prevails among advantaged members of a society, constitutes a moral indictment of that society.[60] Such poverty is unnecessary, given the resources and technology available, and so is a sign of barbarity—equivalent, King believed, to allowing cannibalism in an otherwise civilized society.[61] Given that economic impoverishment is gratuitous suffering, the refusal of the affluent to share their wealth with the poor is not just selfish but reflects insufficient concern for their fellow human beings. It demonstrates that some value profit and property more than they do persons, both indefensible priorities.[62] It is therefore a serious moral vice (not to mention un-Christian).[63] King took the same position with respect to the global poor. He insisted that we, as inhabitants of rich countries, have the resources and scientific knowledge to eliminate poverty wherever it exists, at least with respect to food, shelter, clothing, and basic medical care. Wealthy nations, King maintained, have a moral obligation to institute a Marshall Plan for Africa, Asia, and South America.[64]

Focusing explicitly on the ghetto poor in the United States, King emphasized that black ghetto residents feel humiliated to be living in such squalor while just blocks away others, mostly white, live in luxury and engage in conspicuous consumption.[65] Although whites lack intimate knowledge of ghetto impoverishment, black ghetto dwellers are fully aware of the opulence just beyond their reach, and this knowledge makes them miserable.[66]

This is an important observation and, if correct, explains a lot. But to be fully convincing, King needs to help us understand why these feelings of misery are rooted in reasonable resentment rather than irrational envy. It is not obvious why the poor's claim to have their impoverishment ameliorated is stronger because some have great wealth. If dire threats to

physical health and mental well-being can be removed without great sacrifice, then surely such actions should be taken. Perhaps all King had in mind is that opulence is a visible sign the society has the *capacity* to reduce poverty yet does not take appropriate action to address the problem. But is there more to his principle than this?

I believe there is. King thought persons who are poor can't maintain their *dignity,* that is, their sense of intrinsic worth and equal civic standing, in the presence of great wealth. Allowing one's fellow citizens to languish in poverty communicates to the poor that they lack inherent equal worth and is therefore an insult. In what is supposed to be a society of equals—where each has the same moral standing and no one has natural authority over anyone else—it is a public expression of contempt to act in a way that suggests others' urgent needs have less moral weight than one's own access to extravagant objects of desire. The poor naturally, and appropriately, see such attitudes as an attack on their status as equal citizens.

Moreover, workers cannot sustain self-esteem and morale if their market position suggests their abilities are practically worthless to others in society. Poverty stigmatizes the jobless in a society that measures worth in terms of how much money each has or can earn. Dignity can be restored or maintained only if each is widely recognized as entitled to either a job or basic income. A sense of equal standing will be secure for everyone only when no one's basic worth is measured in terms of their labor-market competitiveness. A widely recognized right to basic income establishes these conditions, for it publicly conveys that everyone is entitled to live a decent life even if the market won't reward their conscientious efforts with a living wage.[67]

King also relied on a second principle that: *Individuals should be equipped with adequate material means so they can take full advantage of their formal freedoms.* While mere formal liberties provide *some* protection from threats to dignity, they are of limited value to those who possess them if these persons are poor.[68] The same holds true of formal opportunities. Even with discriminatory barriers removed, one can't move to an integrated neighborhood without the money for rent or mortgage payments. Real freedom and opportunity must be accompanied by sufficient means to take advantage of them: "Negroes must not only have the right to go into any establishment open to the public, but they must also be absorbed into our economic system in such a manner that they can afford to exercise that right."[69]

This principle rests on a distinction King made between an *abstract* right and a *concrete* right. Mere legal recognition of equal citizenship, even

when adequately enforced, is not sufficient for social justice (concrete emancipation), for it does not, taken alone, enable each to enjoy the privileges of equal citizenship. Abstract rights, though codified in law, still allow second-class citizenship. This all strikes me as correct. But King could have made more of the fact that the value of the rights of some is substantially greater because they have considerably more resources than others, which enables them to exercise these rights more effectively and across more social domains. To emphasize this *inequity,* a kind of civic unfairness, would be to connect equality—as a democratic value—with liberty and opportunity.

King comes closer to explicitly egalitarian concerns when discussing employment compensation. However, the principle he invokes is vague: *The fruits of labor should be shared equitably, with labor and capital on equal footing.*[70] The exact content and scope of this principle isn't specified. Nor is it clear what it means in practice. Without an account of what grounds property rights and the relative moral weight of such rights (which so far as I'm aware King did not provide), we don't have a usable standard for deciding what constitutes a fair wage or profit margin. We do know, relying on King's first two principles, that full-time workers should not be paid poverty-level wages. "Labor needs a wage-hour bill which puts a firm floor under wage scales."[71] But this is compatible with capital taking the lion's share of the benefits of economic cooperation, so it doesn't help us understand what the call for "equity" comes to. Indeed, as discussed earlier, King believed everyone was entitled to basic necessities whether or not they are employed or own capital.

Recall that King emphasized the importance of building and strengthening labor organizations. So one might conclude that fair employment compensation is whatever union representatives and management agree to when labor's right to organize is concrete and not merely abstract. Perhaps when capital exploits labor this amounts to taking advantage of workers' weak bargaining position and blocking their attempts to strengthen it. Yet King makes it clear that the power of labor organizations is needed because the owners of capital operate, not from goodwill or reciprocity, but solely from the motive of private economic gain.[72] He laments this single-minded focus on accruing profit. Increasing the bargaining power of unions is merely a concession to this political reality, an effective means to acquire equitable compensation for workers, given that capitalists are inclined to withhold it. So he must have thought there is some independent standard for workplace distributive justice. But it isn't evident what he took that standard to be.

We gain some insight into King's overall conception of distributive justice by considering a final principle: *Productivity gains should benefit all, not just the owners of capital.*[73] As things now stand, capitalism, given how it spurs technological innovation, creates unemployment and underemployment. Joblessness is often interpreted as laziness or lack of ability, when in fact it is a byproduct of our economic system and our increasing reliance on machines in production. The market demand for efficiency and low labor costs pushes many into joblessness or insecure employment and thus poverty.[74] The purchasing power of the average worker has not kept pace with gains in productivity. It is this situation that justifies organizing labor, so workers can bargain for a greater share of the benefits of economic cooperation. It justifies guaranteed basic income for those whose labor has become less useful as labor-saving technology has evolved. It also justifies creating public sector jobs when private sector employment is insufficient to meet the demand for opportunities to make a positive contribution to society. Finally, it justifies dramatically expanding leisure time for working people, as technology reduces the need for burdensome and unrewarding labor.[75]

King argued that while technology is the product of human labor, imagination, and ingenuity—and as such something we all can be proud of—within a capitalist economy it can be a tyrannical and frightening force in the lives of everyday working people. It must therefore be subordinated to democratic will and used to promote human welfare, not utilized solely for profit or war.[76] We should of course seek scientific discoveries, but the resulting technology must be tamed by moral principle and concern for the most vulnerable.

Beyond Communism and Capitalism

To the disappointment of his revolutionary black nationalist and leftwing critics, King never advocated the overthrow of liberal-capitalist regimes. He was still, I maintain, a radical when it comes to economic justice. To achieve economic justice, King believed, there must be a "revolution of values."[77] And this revolution must ultimately transcend the values of both capitalism and communism. "The good and just society is neither the thesis of capitalism nor the antithesis of Communism, but a socially conscious democracy which reconciles the truths of individualism and collectivism."[78]

King's opposition to communism is consistent throughout his writings. He insisted that communism is "antithetical" to Christianity and the faith's

most "formidable rival."[79] King rejected historical materialism (Marx's theory of historical change) on the grounds that it denies the efficacy of moral thought and action in radical social change. The Marxist commitment to metaphysical materialism leaves no room for spirituality.[80] Historical materialism makes no place for God, whom King believed to be the sustainer of life and the foundation of value. Materialist philosophy treats religion as ideological delusion rooted in fear and ignorance. It treats humans as self-sufficient, when in fact they need God.[81] The Marxist conception of human beings and history made it impossible for King, as a Christian, to embrace its philosophy.

Yet King had secular objections to communism as well. For instance, he regarded Marxists as moral relativists.[82] Communism denies there are universal and absolute moral principles. King (like many secular philosophers) didn't accept moral relativism but instead regarded justice and peace as fundamental and transhistorical values of the highest importance. Communists also advocate revolutionary violence, or at least they hold that political violence is sometimes permissible, even outside the just-war context.[83] King rejected the idea that good ends can justify violence or deceit as means: "Means represent the-ideal-in-the-making and the-end-in-progress."[84]

Communists also oppose liberalism. They deny that liberty is a paramount value, treating individuals as mere instruments to revolutionary change. Communists value the state and the ideal of a classless society above the individual and above personal autonomy. Though communists believe the state will eventually become obsolete in the socialist utopia, in the meantime individuals are regarded as mere means to abolish capitalism with no claim to any liberties that might interfere with the success of the revolutionary project or slow progress toward a classless society. Regarding totalitarianism as an acceptable political expedient in revolutionary times, communists don't recognize basic political liberties as human rights.[85]

King maintained, with other liberal thinkers, that individuals have inherent and inalienable rights, including a claim to participate in collective self-governance as equals. Freedom, here understood as the capacity for rational deliberation and choice, is what makes us human and gives us dignity. Communists don't appreciate the moral significance of this fact about us. Echoing a principle familiar from Immanuel Kant, King insisted: "To deprive man of freedom is to relegate him to the status of a thing, rather than elevate him to the status of a person. Man must never be treated as a means to the end of the state, but always as an end within himself."[86]

Nonetheless, King praised Marx for being a champion of the poor, the exploited, and the dispossessed. He believed the communist movement was, notwithstanding its official pronouncements, ultimately rooted in an abiding concern for social justice and is itself a protest against injustice.[87] Communists oppose racism and seek to realize a classless society.[88] Despite the fundamental flaws in communism, King was adamantly against suppressing it through war.[89] We must defeat communism by ending the injustices it is a response to and is nourished by. Indeed, King insisted there is truth in its collectivist spirit. We should seek to unite its concern for community and the least advantaged with respect for individual rights and free enterprise.[90]

King criticized capitalism, maintaining that it created not only immense economic inequality but also "superfluous wealth" and degrading forms of poverty.[91] He condemned the fact that in America "one-tenth of 1 percent of the population controls almost 50 percent of the wealth."[92] The driving ethos of capitalism makes people indifferent to the suffering of others. Given market dynamics and the centrality of the profit motive, capitalism rewards a win-at-all-costs competitive spirit and narrowly self-interested ambition. It also encourages us to evaluate everything, including the worth of other people, in terms of commercial values.[93] But King seems to have thought capitalism could be reformed to avoid (most of) these consequences. "We can work within the framework of our democracy to make for a better distribution of wealth."[94]

Although King is a radical (particularly by today's standards) when it comes to economic justice, it would be misleading to describe him as a socialist.[95] Though he called for a fairer distribution of wealth, he didn't criticize private ownership of productive assets and natural resources as inherently unjust. Nor did he argue for the nationalization of finance or industry. He simply didn't think such private wealth should be concentrated in the hands of the few, which would give them inordinate and dangerous power over the lives of others.

King did invoke Psalm 24: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."[96] But the point of doing so was to emphasize that we should use natural resources (and the technology constructed from these resources) in a way that would garner God's favor, which means not wasting them on the consumption of luxuries (at least not while poverty exists) and being compassionate and generous toward those in need. This would not, it seems, require public ownership of all natural resources, productive technology, and banks.

King called for higher wages and a regulated labor market to protect vulnerable workers. But he did not regard wage labor as inherently exploitative. Nor did he demand that all workers, irrespective of their skills, be paid the same hourly wage. Although in favor of greater workplace democracy and strong unions, King didn't call for nonprofit worker cooperatives either. To be sure, the profit motive, left unconstrained by considerations of justice and state regulation, is a corrupting influence. And valuing the accumulation of profit over securing the basic well-being of others, he maintained, is immoral. But King didn't condemn for-profit enterprises as such. Capitalist profit is legitimate, though, only if workers are not reduced to poverty and every family is guaranteed a "livable" income.[97] King is therefore best described as a liberal egalitarian or social democrat.[98] His vision embraced the best elements from capitalism and socialism. He favored a mixed economy—a combination of private and public ownership—within which wealth and income are equitably shared under democratic self-governance, labor rights are robust, and no one is forced to live without basic economic security.

King's Philosophy and Today's Ghettos

Deeply disadvantaged black neighborhoods are still with us. We have yet to abolish the ghetto as a sociospatial site of racial and economic injustice. Discrimination in employment and housing remain a problem. None of King's four principles of economic justice have been fully realized in the United States. There is still enormous poverty in the midst of great and visible opulence. Approximately 15 percent of Americans live below the federal poverty line, and more than a third of all black children. The black unemployment rate is roughly double the white unemployment rate (and has been for decades), and the jobless rate among the ghetto poor is even higher. The federal minimum wage does not ensure that a full-time worker can raise a family outside of poverty, particularly those workers living in northern metropolitan regions where the cost of living is high, which is where many among the ghetto poor reside. Labor organizations wield limited power because unionization rates are low and "Right to Work" laws make it harder for workers to bargain for fair compensation. Even though technological innovation and productive efficiency have soared since King's death, the real wages of the average worker have remained flat. Federal spending on the military remains high. And it would be an understatement to say that we have not transcended traditional bourgeois values.

The War on Poverty yielded to an attack on welfare as an entitlement. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996) abolished unconditional, means-tested income support for poor families. There are now five-year lifetime limits on receiving federal welfare support (though some states grant extensions), and this support is conditional on recipients meeting work requirements. Notwithstanding this contraction of the welfare state, there is no entitlement to a public sector job for hard-to-employ workers. Under these conditions, dignity is threatened and equal citizenship is, for many, an abstract right at best. The abolition of the ghetto remains a distant dream, more than fifty years after the Watts riot.

Though many of King's insights are still relevant today, some must be revised or extended to take account of developments since his death. Three such developments stand out and are far reaching: (1) shifts in the class structure of black America, (2) the dramatic increase in black single-mother families, and (3) changes in the criminal justice system.[99]

In King's day, the black professional class was tiny, and most middle-class blacks lived in the same communities as working-class and poor blacks. Since his assassination (and partly in response to it and the riots it led to), opportunities in higher education have increased (in part a result of affirmative action policies). Now there is a large and visible black professional class whose members occupy positions throughout the economy and government. These well-educated blacks earn high incomes and many have moved out of traditional black communities, leaving a greater concentration of poverty in their wake. Although some affluent blacks remain committed to the principles of economic justice King espoused, the economic interests of the black elite are not aligned with (and, in some ways, may be opposed to) those of the ghetto poor. Black solidarity is much more fragile and a civil rights–labor alliance more difficult to cultivate and maintain. A social movement to abolish the ghetto would probably look quite different, in terms of the demographics of its principal constituents, from the one King envisaged. For instance, it would likely have to include many Latinos and disadvantaged undocumented workers, and black elites would probably have to play a smaller leadership role.

Since the Moynihan Report, single motherhood has risen among all racial groups but is particularly high among blacks. King, like Moynihan, saw black single-mother families as dysfunctional, brought about through the economic marginalization of black men. He did not address questions of gender inequality with the same sophistication that he tackled racial and economic inequality, and he largely viewed the situation of black women

and children through a patriarchal lens. He had not absorbed the insights of black feminists.[100]

I don't think single motherhood is inherently dysfunctional. Single-mother families are fragile largely because of weak labor protections, the standard length of a workday, and limited public support for those who give birth to or rear children. Women with children have little workplace power and so are rarely able to ensure that they can properly raise a family while remaining in good standing on their jobs. Because the typical working day for a full-time employee in America is long, it is difficult for a working mother to be available to supervise and care for her children when they are not at school. Because childcare isn't generally viewed as a valuable contribution to society (for example, raising the next generation of citizens and workers), the demanding work it involves isn't properly rewarded or recognized. Thus, women who want to be mothers but perhaps do not yet (if ever) want to be married are often economically disadvantaged and have difficulty maintaining a well-functioning household (unless they receive considerable support from extended family and friends). This is the situation of many women in ghettos. Rather than push such women into greater dependence on men, liberal-egalitarian policy could reduce the length of the standard workday, increase financial support for parents of young children, and offer publicly funded childcare services. When we consider the inescapable web of mutuality King emphasized, that "single garment of destiny" as he called it, we must take care not to neglect or subordinate matters of gender inequality.[101]

The War on Drugs, mandatory sentencing laws, and aggressive policing and prosecution (among other factors) have led to the mass incarceration of black people, particularly poor black people. The incarceration of a family member makes already disadvantaged black families even more economically insecure. There is not only the possible loss of income during the period of imprisonment. After release from prison, a former felon will find it even more difficult to find work in the licit economy, for it is not illegal to discriminate against those with criminal records. The measures King recommends to reduce unemployment and to guarantee income for those who can't find decent work would have to be extended to those with felony convictions. The black freedom movement would also have to include reforming the criminal justice system. For without dramatic changes in that domain, ghettos will persist.

In this chapter, I have recounted King's diagnosis of the ills of ghettos and his proposed remedies. I have offered a reconstruction of the political philosophy I believe undergirds his vision for the second phase of the black

freedom struggle. This phase, still far from over, focuses on questions of economic justice, which he regarded as the root of the problems of the ghetto. Although King does not have all the answers, we can learn from his approach to ghetto poverty, and we can build on it to address the persistence of ghettos in the post–civil rights era. His political thought, I would insist, should be regarded as a *living* legacy.[102]

10

Gender Trouble: Manhood, Inclusion, and Justice

SHATEMA THREADCRAFT AND BRANDON M. TERRY

Feminist approaches to the interpretation and assessment of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s political philosophy have primarily been characterized by two stances: *qualified acceptance* and *respectful rejection*. The first, *qualified acceptance,* combines a trenchant critique of King's sexism with an attempt to extract and salvage other features of his work for feminist thought and praxis. In one sense, this tradition follows that of black women activists who were contemporaries of King and worked alongside him, despite their criticisms. Septima Clark, the heroic educator and organizer of the Citizenship School movement, for example, criticized the sexist leadership of King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), where she served on the board. Recalling meetings where women were routinely prevented from placing items on the agenda, or openly mocked, Clark lamented, "Those men didn't have any faith in women, none whatsoever. They just thought that women were sex symbols and had no contribution to make."[1] Despite her "great feeling that Dr. King didn't think much of women," Clark still "adored" King and "supported him in every way [she] could," although she thought that SCLC should do more to promote local leaders and rely less on King. Nonetheless, she insisted that King's political philosophy and the example of "his courage, his service to others, and his non-violence" remained worthy of devotion.[2] Further, Clark appears to suggest that the *internal* logic of King's thought and praxis would have soon led him toward a more consistent egalitarianism in line with the demands of gender justice.[3]

67. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Address at Selma State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama on 3/25/1965," 5, King Papers, box 8, King Center Archive.

68. King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 94, 99.

69. Public Statement at the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, July 22, 1964; Statement before the Credentials Committee, Democratic National Committee, August 22, 1964, King Papers, box 8, King Center Archive.

70. Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Right to Vote, the Quest for Jobs 3/65," 7, King Papers, box 8, King Center Archive. In the annotated copy, King crosses out this passage; however, his remark is insightful and a point worth making.

71. Keesha Gaskins and Sundeep Iver, "The Challenge of Obtaining Voter Identification," Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law, July 29, 2012, available at http://www.brennancenter.org/publication/challenge-obtaining-voter-identification.

72. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Give Us the Ballot—We Will Transform the South," in *A Testament of Hope,* 197.

73. Ibid.

74. For an influential account of nondomination as a political ideal, see Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), chap. 3.

75. King also discusses the consequences of the political domination involved in denying blacks the vote: such domination erodes democracy, and puts democracy on trial. No one can govern or respect people as well as they can represent or govern themselves, he argues, and therefore when they are subject to political domination, they face pressure to flee their circumstances if they cannot change them within the legal system of rights. They might flee the Iron Curtain from East to West, says King, or the Cotton Curtain from South to North. He laments how mass Northern migration, prompted partly by political domination, depleted the South of blacks and how it burdened Northern dark ghettos. He observes that it also depressed economic development in the South and left congressional power in the hands of the most reactionary bloc, which made national social welfare and education bills difficult to pass, and which put American democracy on trial on the global stage. See King, "Draft of an Article."

76. This argument can be generalized to cover many of the evil monsters or racial injustices that King highlights. Our national commitment to dignity can be enhanced by a legal system of rights that includes rights and duties that vanquish or guard against the ways in which evil monsters assail our dignity. But I shall keep the focus squarely on voting rights in expounding the argument.

77. Beitz, "Human Dignity," 288.

78. For a very insightful and detailed overview of the modern struggle for voting rights, see Ari Berman, *Give Us the Ballot: The Modern Struggle for Voting Rights in America* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2015).

79. Beitz, "Human Dignity," 288.

80. Waldron, *Dignity, Rank, and Rights,* 145.

9. Prisons of the Forgotten

Versions of this chapter were presented at a colloquium sponsored by the philosophy departments at Haverford College and Bryn Mawr College; the Inequality Seminar Series at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government; the Department of Philosophy at Pennsylvania State University; the Mershon Center at The Ohio State University; the Department of Philosophy at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst; the Institute of Ethics and Public Affairs at Old Dominion University; and as the Audi Lecture at Colgate University. I thank the audiences and participants at these venues for their questions and criticisms and Macalester Bell, Wendy Salkin, Jessie Scanlon, Mario Small, and Brandon Terry for helpful comments and discussion.

1. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go from Here: Community or Chaos?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), 3; King, "Next Stop: The North," in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.,* ed. James M. Washington (New York: Harper Collins, 1986), 189–194.

2. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 19; King, "Next Stop," 192.

3. Clayborne Carson, ed., *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Warner Books, 1998), 298–301.

4. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 3–4; Martin Luther King, Jr., *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* ed. Michael K. Honey (Boston: Beacon Press, 2011), 125–126, 128, 175–176.

5. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Stride toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), 77.

6. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 128–129; Martin Luther King, Jr., "A Testament of Hope," in *A Testament of Hope,* 314–315; Martin Luther King, Jr., *The Trumpet of Conscience* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), 6.

7. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 5–6, 9–11; King, "A Testament of Hope," 321.

8. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 104–109.

9. Ibid., 105.

10. King, "Next Stop," 192.

11. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 114.

12. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 156; King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 114.

13. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 115, 118–119.

14. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can't Wait* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2010), 164–166; King, "Next Stop," 191–192; King, "A Testament of Hope," 326.

15. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 26, 51.

16. Ibid., 39, 51, 96; King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 153.

17. King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 165.

18. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 105.

19. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 21; King, "Next Stop," 193.

20. King, *Trumpet of Conscience,* 10–13.

21. King, "A Testament of Hope," 321.

22. Ibid., 324–325.
23. King, *Trumpet of Conscience,* 14, 57–58.
24. Ibid., 58.
25. King, "Next Stop," 192.
26. King, *Trumpet of Conscience,* 58–59.
27. Martin Luther King, Jr., "A Time to Break Silence," in *A Testament of Hope,* 233.
28. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 159; King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 112.
29. King, *Trumpet of Conscience,* 8.
30. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 21–22.
31. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 109.
32. King, "A Testament of Hope," 314.
33. I discuss King's vision of racial justice in "Justice and Racial Conciliation: Two Visions," *Daedalus* 140 (Winter 2011): 95–107.
34. King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 159–160, 162–164. Also see Chapter 11, by Lawrie Balfour.
35. Ibid., 159.
36. King, "A Testament of Hope," 317.
37. King, "I Have a Dream," in *A Testament of Hope,* 217.
38. Ibid., 218.
39. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 196–199.
40. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 28.
41. Ibid., 117, 131.
42. Ibid., 117.
43. King, *Trumpet of Conscience,* 15.
44. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 132–133; King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 162.
45. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 130.
46. King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 163–166. See also King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 81–82.
47. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 133.
48. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 164–165.
49. Ibid., 165.
50. King, "Nonviolence: The Only Road to Freedom," in *Testament of Hope,* 60; King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 143–146; Martin Luther King, Jr., "I See the Promised Land," in *A Testament of Hope,* 282–283.
51. For a thorough discussion of King's philosophy of nonviolent direct action, see Greg Moses, *Revolution of Conscience: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Philosophy of Nonviolence* (New York: Guilford Press, 1997), chap. 4. Also see Chapter, 4 by Karuna Mantena.
52. King, "Nonviolence," 60.
53. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 52; King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 168–169. Bayard Rustin, longtime advisor to King, strongly advocated an alliance between blacks, labor organizations, liberals, and progressive religious leaders. Only through such a multiracial coalition, he argued, could racial and economic justice be secured in the United States. See Bayard Rustin, "From Protest to Politics: The Future of the Civil Rights Movement," *Commentary* 39 (1965), reprinted in *Time on Two Crosses: The Collected Writings of Bayard Rustin,* ed. Devon W. Carbado and Donald Weise (San Francisco: Cleis Press, 2003), 116–129.
54. King, *Stride toward Freedom,* 78.
55. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 26, 38; King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 141–143.
56. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 39–43.
57. Ibid., 109.
58. Ibid., 115–116.
59. Ibid., 16, 59.
60. *Why We Can't Wait,* 151; King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 165–166.
61. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 165.
62. Ibid., 186; King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 39; King, "A Time to Break Silence," 240–241.
63. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 173–174.
64. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 176–181.
65. King, "Next Stop," 192.
66. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 111–112.
67. Ibid., 87, 164.
68. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 175–176.
69. King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 161; also see King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 79.
70. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 36–37.
71. Ibid., 28.
72. Ibid., 37–38, 177–178.
73. Ibid., 39, 92.
74. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 163.
75. Ibid., 169.
76. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 51–52.
77. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 186; King, "A Time to Break Silence," 240–241.
78. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 187; also see King, *Stride toward Freedom,* 82–83.
79. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Strength to Love* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 100.
80. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 59; King, *Stride toward Freedom,* 79.
81. King, *Strength to Love,* 100–101.
82. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 59; King, *Stride toward Freedom,* 79–80.
83. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 59.
84. King, *Strength to Love,* 101.
85. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 186–187; King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 59; King, *Strength to Love,* 102.

86. King, *Stride toward Freedom,* 80.

87. Ibid., 81.

88. King, *Strength to Love,* 103–104.

89. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 189; King, "A Time to Break Silence," 241.

90. King, *Strength to Love,* 106–108.

91. King, *Stride toward Freedom,* 82.

92. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 59.

93. King, *Strength to Love,* 106.

94. King, *"All Labor Has Dignity,"* 59; also see King, *Strength to Love,* 105–106.

95. See, for example, Adam Fairclough, "Was Martin Luther King a Marxist?," *History Workshop* 15 (1983): 117–125; Douglass Sturm, "Martin Luther King, Jr., as Democratic Socialist," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 18 (1990): 79–105; Michael Eric Dyson, *I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Touchstone, 2000), chap. 4; Paul Le Blanc, "The Radical Roots of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Christian Core, Socialist Bedrock," *Against the Current* 16 (2002); Thomas F. Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Richard A. Jones, "Martin Luther King Jr.'s *Agape* and World House," in *The Liberatory Thought of Martin Luther King Jr.,* ed. Robert E. Birt (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012), 135–155; and Cornel West, "Introduction: The Radical King We Don't Know," in Martin Luther King, Jr., *The Radical King,* ed. Cornel West (Boston: Beacon Press, 2015), ix–xvi.

96. King, *Where Do We Go from Here,* 187.

97. Ibid., 189.

98. I offer an interpretation of King's *public* philosophy—that is, one based on his published writings, speeches, sermons, and public statements. It is possible that he held, as a private conviction shared only with intimates, a more strongly socialist position than his public philosophy suggests. For example, Garrow reports that King privately told a confidant (William A. Rutherford) that "obviously we've got to have some form of socialism, but America's not ready to hear it yet." See David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: William Morrow, 1986), 585. Just what this "form of socialism" comes to and whether it differs substantively from Scandinavian social democracy is never made clear.

99. I have attempted to develop a "black radical liberal" perspective on the black freedom struggle and ghetto poverty that takes these three developments into account in *We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005) and in *Dark Ghettos: Injustice, Dissent, and Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016).

100. For a nuanced discussion of this issue, see Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights,* 254–257. See also Chapter 10, by Shatema Threadcraft and Brandon Terry.

101. King, *Why We Can't Wait,* 87.

102. See Vincent Gordon Harding, "Beyond Amnesia: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Future of America," *Journal of American History* 74 (1987): 468–476.

10. Gender Trouble

1. Septima Clark, *Ready from Within: Septima Clark and the Civil Rights Movement,* ed. Cynthia Stokes Brown (Tremont, NJ: Africa World Press, 1990), 77. This does not mean that all ministers were equally abhorrent. Clark's interviews and recollection evince great esteem for King, but she is utterly disdainful of Ralph Abernathy, at one point describing him as "just a spoiled little boy" who needed to "grow up and be a real man" (Clark quoted in David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* [New York: Vintage, 1988], 366).

2. Clark, *Ready from Within,* 77–78.

3. Ibid. 79. See also, for example, Clark's account of political differences with Ella Baker on the question of sexism in the movement: "Ella Baker sees things and gets very angry about them, and I see things and I want to work on them, but without the hostility. I see the same things that she saw, but I'm not going to be hostile. I'm not going to get mad with a man because he said I shouldn't be on the. . . . I just sit up there and listen to what he has to say, and then when I get a chance I let him know that I have made a contribution and that I can make a contribution." Oral History Interview with Septima Poinsette Clark, July 25, 1976, Interview G-0016, Southern Oral History Program Collection no. 4007, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, published by Documenting the American South, May 16, 2017, http://docsouth.unc.edu/sohp/G-0016/G-0016.html.

4. bell hooks, *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism* (New York: Routledge, 2015), 177, also see 94–95.

5. bell hooks, *We Real Cool: Black Men and Masculinity* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 10.

6. bell hooks, *Killing Rage: Ending Racism* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 263–272.

7. bell hooks, "The Beloved Community: A Conversation with bell hooks," *Appalachian Heritage* 40, no. 4 (Fall 2012): 76–86.

8. George Yancy and bell hooks, "bell hooks: Buddhism, the Beats and Loving Blackness," *New York Times: The Stone* (December 10, 2015), https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/12/10/bell-hooks-buddhism-the-beats-and-loving-blackness/?_r=0.

9. Thomas McCarthy, *Race, Empire, and the Idea of Human Development* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 36.

10. Susan Moller Okin, *Women in Western Political Thought* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 4.

11. Charles Payne, a leading historian of this "view from the trenches," aptly characterizes these historiographical and critical accounts of the civil rights struggle as