Racism 4.0, Civity, and Re-Constitution

by PALMA JOY STRAND*

The moral arc of the universe is long, but it bends toward justice.
~The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.¹

Introduction

I begin this essay with a personal introduction. All of us understand the world through our own stories. And the stories that we send out into the world are most useful in contributing to our collective story if we honestly acknowledge that they arise from individual experiences.²

¹ Quote Investigator, http://quoteinvestigator.com/2012/11/15/arc-of-universe/(Dr. King paraphrasing Unitarian Minister, Transcendentalist, and Abolitionist Theodore Parker from 1857: “Look at the facts of the world. You see a continual and progressive triumph of the right. I do not pretend to understand the moral universe, the arc is a long one, my eye reaches but little ways. I cannot calculate the curve and complete the figure by the experience of sight; I can divine it by conscience. But from what I see I am sure it bends towards justice.”)

I am a White woman; my husband is a Black man. We were married in the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1984, seventeen years after the landmark Supreme Court decision in Loving v. Virginia held state laws against interracial marriage unconstitutional. My biracial children drew me into issues of educational disparity. The public schools they attended in Arlington, Virginia, engaged in a tempestuous soul-searching process around acknowledged achievement gaps between White students and Black and Latino students. My participation included contributing to cultural competence training for the district, which shifted and deepened my understanding of race and racism. Conversations within my family added a powerful dimension.

At Creighton University, the interdisciplinary 2040 Initiative offers a framework for pursuing issues of equity related to race. The 2040 Initiative responds to demographic projections that a shift will occur in the United States population over the next generation: By about the year 2040, non-Hispanic Whites will be a minority. The 2040 Initiative faces and facilitates constructive public dialogue around this dramatic shift. We contribute to decisions and actions to “not just make the best of the changes that are coming but to make the best the changes that come.”

ul?_r=0 (discussing limitations of traditional Western philosophy based on its restriction to White subjectivity: “Knowledge requires self-knowledge”).

3. In this Article, except when quoting others, the racial descriptors I use are Black and White. See Beverly Daniel Tatum, “Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?” AND OTHER CONVERSATIONS ABOUT RACE 15–17 (1997); Palma Joy Strand, Inheriting Inequality: Wealth, Race, and the Laws of Succession, 89 OR. L. REV. 453, 455 n.12 (2010).


5. Id.

6. See generally Robert G. Smith et al., GAINING ON THE GAP: CHANGING HEARTS, MINDS, AND PRACTICE (2011) (narrative of background and development of APS cultural competence initiative, co-authored by former Superintendent and other school system personnel as well as this author).


The Civity Initiative reinforces the insights that equity is fundamental to a healthy democracy and that both equity and democracy are rooted in relationships as well as in formally enacted law. Civity—people working together to tackle complex civic challenges—emerges from relationships of respect, empathy, and trust across social dividing lines and the vibrant civic networks that result from those relationships. In contrast, attenuated or absent relationships leave gaping holes in the civic fabric, which undermines democracy. Civity surmounts racism by building bridges over the social chasm of race.

I. Racism 4.0

Bryan Stevenson, Law Professor and Founder and Executive Director of the Equal Justice Initiative, takes the long view of racism in the United States. In 2014, he identified four manifestations of racism over the multi-century arc of our nation’s history. Racism, deeply embedded in our culture, has evolved over time.

I label these “operating systems” Racism 1.0, Racism 2.0, Racism 3.0, and—the current “update”—Racism 4.0. These versions of racism reflect a chronological progression characterized by distinctive iterations of social mores, institutions, and law. Yet the four versions overlap; as with different operating systems, earlier versions are still around and running on at least some computers even as updated versions have become the norm.

16. Id.
Racism 1.0 was slavery, the enslavement first of Africans and then of their descendants. The Civil War, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution abolished slavery in this country. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments along with the Civil Rights and Reconstruction Acts of the late 1860s and early 1870s went further, affirmatively protecting civil and political rights for Black citizens.

Racism 2.0 was the reign of violence and lynching during which Whites sought to control and marginalize Blacks, primarily but not exclusively in the South. This domestic terrorism spanned decades from the latter part of the 1800s well into the 1900s and was a major cause of the Great Migration, the exodus of “some six million black southerners” over six decades out of the South to the relatively benign environments of the Northeast, Midwest, and West.

Racism 3.0 emerged as Whites regained control in the post-Reconstruction South, and it spread to the rest of the country as Black populations grew with the Great Migration. In the South, Racism 3.0 took the form of “Jim Crow,” legislatively enacted separation by race with “separate but equal” rhetoric and “separate

---

20. U.S. CONST. amend XIV (citizenship and Equal Protection of the laws, 1868); U.S. CONST. amend XV (voting, 1870).
21. Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat. 27–30 (defining citizenship and equal protection); Civil Rights Act of 1875, 18 Stat. 335–337 (mandating equal treatment in public accommodations and transportation; prohibiting exclusion from jury service); Reconstruction Acts of 1867, 15 Stat. 2 (providing for military occupation of the South and setting forth terms for readmittance of Southern states to the Union with parameters for new state constitutions including the abolition of slavery).
24. LYNCHING IN AMERICA, supra note 22, at 5.
and unequal” reality. 27 Nationally, residential segregation, enforced through racially restrictive covenants 28 and the federal policy of redlining, disfavored those who chose (Whites) or were forced (Blacks and others) to purchase homes in non-White or racially integrated neighborhoods. 29 The Civil Rights Movement, the Equal Protection litigation campaign of the NAACP Inc. Fund, including the keystone decision in Brown v. Board of Education, 30 and the legislative triumvirate of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968 31 neutralized Racism 3.0’s overt discrimination.

By the mid-1970s, however, it became apparent that Equal Protection doctrine invalidated intentional and individual acts of discrimination but not incidental or systemic discrimination. For example, the Court in Washington v. Davis 32 and Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corporation 33 declared that “[p]roof of racially discriminatory intent or purpose is required to show a violation of the Equal Protection Clause.” 34 At the same time, Milliken v. Bradley 35 revealed a Supreme Court that was unwilling to take on systemic arrangements such as school district boundaries in the cause of desegregation. 36 Overall, the anti-discrimination law that emerged to counter Racism 3.0 was limited to addressing overt actions.

Anti-Racism-3.0 law does not reach today’s variation, Racism 4.0, which manifests as patterns of racial disparity. Though stark,

30. See Strand, Law as Story, supra note 2, at 615–17 (drawing from Michael J. Klarmann, From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality (2004)).
34. Id. at 265.
36. See also San Antonio Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1 (1973) (refusing to address Texas statewide system of financing public schools).
these patterns generally do not result from explicit or intentional racial discrimination. Nor are they the product of specific, identifiable policies. Because of their systemic and non-invidious character, they lie beyond the reach of current anti-discrimination law. These disparities do not run afoul of the Equal Protection Clause because discriminatory purpose (as opposed to discriminatory effect) is absent. Nor do the protections of the Civil Rights or Fair Housing Acts apply: Even the disparate impact doctrine does not encompass disparities that do not result from an identifiable policy or law but from the combined effects of multiple policies, laws, and individual actions.

Bryan Stevenson identifies the mass incarceration of Black men as the current manifestation of racism. Blacks are “13% of the general U.S. population, yet they constitute 28% of all arrests, 40% of all inmates held in prisons and jails, and 42% of the population on death row.” I see this specific disproportionality as only one facet of Racism 4.0—though an especially poisonous and devastating one.

Racism 4.0 is also characterized by racially disparate outcomes in education, health, economic resources, housing, and employment. In education, Black students lag behind in academic achievement in reading and math while being more likely to be referred for special education.


42. See Alan Vanneman et al., Achievement Gaps: How Black and White Students in Public Schools Perform in Mathematics and Reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, July 14, 2009 (average White student test scores higher than average Black student test scores on all assessments at all levels).
education and disciplined than other students. In health, our Black population experiences high infant mortality, lacks health insurance, and has lower life expectancy. In economics, Black family income is less than two-thirds of White family income, and Black family wealth is on average one-twentih of White family wealth. High degrees of segregation in housing continue in metropolitan areas, and a disproportionately high proportion of Black citizens live in high-poverty neighborhoods. The


46. Id. (“African-Americans are 55 percent more likely to be uninsured than white Americans”).

47. Kenneth D. Kochanek, Elizabeth Arias, & Robert N. Anderson, How Did Cause of Death Contribute to Racial Differences in Life Expectancy in the United States in 2010?, NCHS Data Brief No. 125 (July 2013) (“The gap in life expectancy between the white and black populations has decreased, from 7.6 years in 1970 to 3.8 years in 2010, but the disparity still exists.”).

48. CARMEN DE NAVAS-WALT & BERNADETTE D. PROCTOR, INCOME AND POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES: 2013 7 (2014) (in 2013, “the ratio of Black to non-Hispanic White income was 0.59”).


unemployment rate for Black workers is about twice that for White workers.  

As it stands, Equal Protection jurisprudence is incapable of countering racism in the current form of substantial racial disparities. Determined ahistoricism, such as that exhibited by the Supreme Court in *Shelby County v. Holder*, now often accompanies the focus on discriminatory intent with individual consequences. Judicial remedies for Black citizens are suspect, or refused outright. Chief Justice Roberts’s reasoning that “[t]he way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race” reflects an almost surreal blindness to racial realities. And yet this learned legal helplessness is almost inevitable with a view of racism that sees only individual causation and harm, that does not see systems at work. From a Racism 3.0 point of view, the Court’s constitutional ruling to limit the Affordable Care Act’s Medicaid

---

52. The color of unemployment, FACE THE FACTS USA, A PROJECT OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (14.1% unemployment rate for African Americans compared to 7.2% for Whites in mid-2012).  
57. Parents Involved, 551 U.S. at 748.  
58. Compare Schuette, 134 S. Ct. at 1676 (Sotomayor, J., dissenting) (“The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to speak openly and candidly on the subject of race, and to apply the Constitution with eyes open to the unfortunate effects of centuries of racial discrimination.”).
expansion does not even present a racial issue. From a Racism 4.0 perspective, the Court’s ruling and its repercussions allow uncabined disparities in health care.60

II. Racism 4.0 “Software” and “Hardware”

The persistence of Racism 4.0 and the lack of legal remedies to address it call for searching inquiry into how it operates: If overt discrimination does not cause the observed racial disparities, what does? I see two distinct though intertwined strands of causation, each of which has two aspects. The first strand consists of personal interactions, what we might think of as the “software” of Racism 4.0. The first aspect of these personal interactions, implicit bias, is anti-Black; the second, White privilege, is pro-White. The second strand is comprised of social structures, what we might think of as the “hardware” of Racism 4.0. Again, the first aspect of these social structures, structural racism, is anti-Black; the second, white advantage, is pro-White. I describe each of these separately and then discuss how they operate together.

A. “Software”—Implicit Bias

Psychologists Tony Greenwald, Mahzarin Banaji, and Brian Nosek developed the Implicit Association Test (“IAT”) in 1998 to discern “attitudes or stereotypes that affect our understanding, actions, and decisions in an unconscious manner. These biases, which encompass both favorable and unfavorable assessments, are activated involuntarily and without an individual’s awareness or intentional

control. For race, the IAT assesses the degree to which people unconsciously associate “European American” and “African American” with “good” and “bad” by measuring reaction times for takers to correlate race with positives and negatives. Results over more than seven hundred thousand tests show that “most Americans have an automatic preference for white over black.”

The fundamental characteristic of implicit bias is precisely that it is implicit rather than explicit, unintentional rather than intentional, unconscious rather than conscious. Humans are hardwired to take cognitive shortcuts based on prior personal experiences and cultural messages and norms that we internalize through socialization. Implicit bias, including implicit racial bias, does “not necessarily align with our declared beliefs” but can have “real-world effects on behavior.” Individuals harboring implicit bias may act on that bias—in the context of race acting to disadvantage Blacks and prefer Whites—without being aware that they have such bias or that they are acting upon it. Many who vehemently disclaim racism carry the racism virus and are unknowingly affected by it.

B. “Software”—White Privilege

In 1988, Professor Peggy McIntosh published her landmark essay “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack.” In this essay McIntosh applied Women’s Studies insights about male privilege to the privilege of being White. She likened White privilege to “an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools and blank checks.” This White privilege is similar to implicit bias in that the person who wears it is

---


64. See generally WRAY HERBERT, ON SECOND THOUGHT: OUTSMARTING YOUR MIND’S HARD-WIRED HABITS (2010) (describing both evolutionary benefits and contemporary pitfalls of human cognitive shortcuts).

65. STAATS, supra note 61, at 17.

66. Id.


68. Id. at 1.
unaware of it and its contents. In fact, McIntosh wrote, “I was ‘meant’ to remain oblivious.”

McIntosh listed twenty-six characteristics of White privilege, including shopping without being followed or harassed, not being seen as a representative of the entire White race, and having same-race role models in curricula and public settings. Many of these, she pointed out, are “positive advantages” that everyone should have and that “we can work to spread;” others are “negative types of advantages which unless rejected will always reinforce our present hierarchies.”

Among the negative advantages, I find number sixteen to be particularly salient: “I can remain oblivious of the language and customs of persons of color who constitute the world’s majority without feeling in my culture any penalty for such oblivion.” I see number sixteen as the core of White privilege. It captures the power dynamic of Whiteness as the norm, which marginalizes and silences those who are not White. At the same time, it hides from those who are White the reality that they are also raced, that Whiteness is all-too-frequently taken as the cultural and human norm, and that the White experience and the White story are actually only one experience, one story that by no means represents the story of all of humanity.

C. “Hardware”—Structural Racism and White Advantage

Structural racism and White advantage are the two sides of a single coin. The coin in this metaphor represents access to actual resources that make a tangible difference in the quality of people’s lives. Over the course of our history, public policies that imposed disadvantages on Blacks have benefited Whites; conversely, public policies that offered advantages to Whites have excluded Blacks. The accumulation of advantages by Whites and disadvantages by Blacks has, in combination with deep racial separation, led to a Black

69. Id. See also TIM WISE, WHITE LIKE ME: REFLECTIONS ON RACE FROM A PRIVILEGED SON 15–59 (2005) (personal experiences of White privilege); THANDEKA, LEARNING TO BE WHITE: MONEY, RACE, AND GOD IN AMERICA 1–19 (1999) (socialization of Whites).
70. McIntosh, supra note 67, at 1–2.
71. Id. at 3.
72. Id. at 2.
73. See Strand, Law as Story, supra note 2, at 628–30 (describing marginalization of stories, including Black stories). As Philosopher Linda Martin Alcoff observes, “[e]ntitlement is a core feature of white subjectivity.” Yancey & Alcoff, supra note 2.
citizenry that as a group has less and a White citizenry that as a group has more.\textsuperscript{74} This is the “hardware” on which the “software” of implicit bias and White privilege runs.

Slavery, as an institution, consisted of \textit{de jure} economic arrangements that systematically enriched Whites and divested Blacks of the tangible benefits of their labors. Southern slave-owners and those who profited from the slave economy directly benefited from the institution of slavery. Northern Whites did as well through the accumulation of wealth derived from slavery.\textsuperscript{75} Significant components of our physical infrastructure, including the United States Capitol Building, were also built by enslaved persons.

Far-reaching public programs that enriched the citizenry, programs that were primarily accessible to Whites and substantially inaccessible to Blacks, augmented the White wealth that existed when slavery ended. The 2003 California Newsreel film “Race: The Power of an Illusion,”\textsuperscript{76} summarizes the series of federal investments and actions that subsidized White wealth creation: “A Long History of Affirmative Action–For Whites.”\textsuperscript{77} In the 1860s, the Homestead Acts opened up huge tracts of land in the Midwest and West to those who settled on them; the 10% of the nation’s land that was transferred to private ownership through these Acts went overwhelmingly to Whites, including White immigrants.\textsuperscript{78} Formerly enslaved persons, in contrast, did not receive the “forty acres and a mule” that would have provided a property foundation on which to build prosperity.\textsuperscript{79}

In 1935 the Social Security Act, which created an economic cushion for our elderly citizens, excluded domestic and agricultural


\textsuperscript{76} See supra note 29.


\textsuperscript{78} Adelman, supra note 77. This land was forcibly taken from Native American Indian tribes, who have also been the targets of racism for centuries. It is also no accident that White immigrants (including my own Swedish forebears) benefited disproportionately from homesteading; United States immigration policies discriminated explicitly by race until the 1960s.

\textsuperscript{79} Lui et al., supra note 74, at 85.
workers, two occupations in which Blacks were heavily represented.\textsuperscript{80} This cushion benefitted not only the elderly, but also their children, who received relief from the economic burden of supporting aging parents.\textsuperscript{81} The same year, the Wagner Act instituted labor protections enabling unions to bargain collectively on behalf of their members.\textsuperscript{82} Those unions, however, were allowed to discriminate on the basis of race in determining membership, which reserved to White workers jobs and the benefits associated with those jobs. As with Social Security, racialized unions affected the economic well-being not only of individuals but also of their families.

In the mid-1900s the federal government also acted to support White citizens in terms of housing. “Between 1934 and 1962, the federal government backed $120 billion of home loans. More than 98% went to whites.”\textsuperscript{83} Federal Housing Administration guidelines for home mortgages explicitly preferred all-White neighborhoods— and the Whites who could buy there—and channeled loans away from predominantly Black or racially mixed neighborhoods—and the Blacks and other racial minorities who were restricted to buying there.\textsuperscript{84} Non-White neighborhoods were “redlined” on maps; disinvestment in those neighborhoods led to lower housing values, lower home equity for Blacks, and lower household wealth overall.\textsuperscript{85}

Another mammoth federal public works project following World War II reinforced and magnified spatial racial separation by neighborhood. The interstate highway system provided the physical infrastructure for suburbanization, which led to Whites creating racial-residential enclaves within commuting distance of city centers.\textsuperscript{86}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{80} Id. at 92. Because of these exclusions, 65% of the Black work force, as versus 27% of the White work force, was originally excluded from Social Security. Larry DeWitt, \textit{The Decision to Exclude Agricultural and Domestic Workers from the 1935 Social Security Act.} http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/ssb/v70n4/v70n4p49.html. Social Security was extended to include these occupations in 1950. Wilbur J. Cohen & Robert J. Myers, \textit{Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: A Summary and Legislative History} (1950), http://www.ssa.gov/history/1950amend.html.
\item \textsuperscript{81} Strand, \textit{Education-as-Inheritance}, supra note 49, at 286–87.
\item \textsuperscript{82} Adelman, supra note 77.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Adelman, supra note 77.
\item \textsuperscript{84} Kenneth Jackson, \textit{The Federal Housing Administration, in} KENNETH JACKSON, CRABGRASS FRONTIER: THE SUBURBANIZATION OF THE UNITED STATES 203–09, 213–18 (1985).
\item \textsuperscript{85} PBS, \textit{Race: The Power of an Illusion, supra note 29}; Strand, \textit{Inheriting Inequality, supra note 3, at 462}; LUI ET AL., supra note 74, at 97–98.
\item \textsuperscript{86} CASHIN, supra note 29, at 113–15.
\end{itemize}
Racial and socioeconomic exclusionary zoning created “hypersegregation” between suburban Whites and a significant number of Black citizens in impoverished inner city neighborhoods.

Spatial separation by race has proven to be a powerful vehicle for the creation of White advantage and Black disadvantage. Relatively affluent White communities, assisted by generous municipal incorporation and local district creation state laws, have successfully garnered for themselves robust tax bases comprised of higher-value White homes and the businesses that locate near them. These tax bases enable White jurisdictions to enjoy both low tax rates and generous public services, including quality public education through which the human capital of the next generation is developed. Tax subsidies in the form of home mortgage deductions support these amenities.

Spatial concentrations by race at the state level are deeper and similarly devastating. Southern states with high Black populations and long histories of racial oppression continue to display political cleavages that embed often-insurmountable barriers to investment in citizens in the form of health and education in conjunction with violence-based forms of social control. The legacy of slavery persists today in cultural anti-Black attitudes held by Southern Whites.

87. Id. at 104–10; Arlington Heights, 429 U.S. 252.
88. See supra note 50 and accompanying text.
89. Cashin, supra note 29, at 108.
94. See Bouie, Mississippi, supra note 93; Strand, Is Brown Holding Us Back?, supra note 11, at 324–25.
95. See Bouie, Mississippi, supra note 93; Colin Woodard, Up in Arms, TUFTS MAGAZINE (Fall 2013), available at http://www.tufts.edu/alumni/magazine/fall2013/features/up-in-arms.html.
States’ rights principles provide the “neutral” justification for sanctioning state-based laws and policies that reflect and entrench these attitudes and the racial hierarchy they represent and reinforce.

D. “Software” and “Hardware” Together—Institutional and Systemic Racism

Institutions and social systems are constituted of and by the individuals who comprise them; they function by virtue of those individuals interacting with each other and with outsiders. All institutions and social systems have cultures, patterns of interactions complete with interlocking roles. These roles are communicated by cultural customs and stories—formal and informal, explicit and implied.

Implicit associations affect how individuals perceive and interact with other people. Implicit bias against Blacks and in favor of Whites causes people to treat those of different races differently without being aware of it. At the same time, White privilege “norms” disparate treatment and disparate outcomes and discourages self-examination by Whites. Through individual perceptions and interactions, implicit bias and White privilege affect institutional and social system culture.

In schools, for example, implicit bias creates higher expectations for White students than for Black students. Teachers and other adults communicate these expectations through course selection, investment of relational time and energy, and even subtle cues such as how long they wait for a student to answer a question. Students internalize and fulfill these expectations, which lead to academic success or a lack thereof. White privilege prevents White teachers teaching minority students from seeing implicit bias and how it operates to benefit or harm.

98. Id.; CLIFFORD GEERTZ, THE INTERPRETATION OF CULTURES 35 (1973) (“men unmodified by the customs of particular places do not exist, have never existed, and most important, could not in the very nature of the case exist”).
100. SMITH ET AL., supra note 6, at 65–66.
101. Id. at 64–68; see also Ronald F. Ferguson, Teachers’ Perceptions and Expectations and the Black-White Test Score Gap, 38 URBAN EDUCATION 460 (2003).
Implicit bias also operates in health care, criminal justice, housing, and employment in hospitals and doctors' offices, from police stops to judicial sentencing, in apartment rentals and mortgage lending, from hiring offices to promotion decisions. In all of these institutional contexts and more, implicit bias causes racially disparate actions and interactions, which result in racially disparate outcomes. White privilege's normalizing mantra inhibits the self-reflection that can lead to recognition of implicit bias.

Decentralized, incremental, non-overt, and "normed" actions that embody implicit bias do not constitute discrimination in the traditional legal sense. The non-linear links between individual interactions and collective results make tracing cause and effect extremely challenging: A localized action in a complex system such as an organization, region, or society influences but does not control system-level outcomes. Instead, those outcomes emerge from the interactions of all the system's individuals.

Even individual interactions that are relatively free from implicit bias and White privilege can reproduce existing disadvantage or advantage. My own work, for example, has focused on how our apparently racially neutral inheritance law perpetuates racial wealth disparities. Though our law provides for freedom of testation, most decedents direct their wealth to their families. Because most families are of one race, White wealth goes to the next generation of Whites, and Black wealth goes to the next generation of Blacks. Racial

---


103. Birute Regine & Roger Lewin, Leading at the Edge: How Leaders Influence Complex Systems, available at http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327000EM0202_02#.VS6MIbo7PX8 ("Organizations, like complex adaptive systems, cannot be controlled or predicted to the degree that the mechanistic perspective implies; but their direction and how they evolve can be influenced.") (emphasis in original).


105. Strand, Inheriting Inequality, supra note 3, at 464–68.
economic advantage and disadvantage grounded in historical enrichment and disinvestment practices continue. Similarly, relatively affluent parents are better able to invest in their children’s human capital through education. 106 Those with more (who are more likely to be White) pass down wealth in this manner; those with less (who are more likely to be Black) cannot. 107 Though there is not an absolute correspondence between wealth and race, there is sufficient correlation that any social institution that gives better outcomes for wealthy citizens and worse outcomes for poorer citizens reproduces the racial as well as the economic hierarchy.

President Lyndon Johnson said, “You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say you are free to compete with all the others, and still just believe that you have been completely fair.”108 This justification for affirmative action on an individual basis is consistent with Racism 3.0’s emphasis on overt, linear, cause-and-effect discrimination. As opportunities for Black citizens have expanded, individual affirmative action has become more fraught in terms of its appropriateness.109 But the kernel of Johnson’s observation remains applicable to Racism 4.0’s institutions and systems: Advantage and disadvantage at the group level reproduce over time as a collective matter absent counter-measures and absent affirmative interventions in the system.

III. Civility—Rewriting the “Software”

The anti-racism responses to Racism 3.0 (as well as earlier permutations) do not effectively address Racism 4.0. Current anti-discrimination law addresses intentional acts of discrimination that result directly in identifiable harms to specific individuals. Racism 4.0, however, operates primarily through unconscious acts of myriad individuals and the automatic reproduction of advantage and disadvantage that have arisen over time from past collective

107. There is a racial effect that operates in intergenerational elasticity in addition to a purely socioeconomic effect. Id. at 290. This may indicate the concurrent operation of implicit bias.
discrimination. The harms of Racism 4.0 are disparate group outcomes.

The quote at the beginning of the essay from the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. emphasizes that justice is a long-term goal. The derivation of that quote from the words of abolitionist Theodore Parker a century earlier highlights the realization that the struggle continues. The fundamental orientation of this essay is developing new responses to new manifestations of racism. Racism 4.0 calls us to search for, devise, and support ways to challenge it. In this Part, I offer strategies for neutralizing implicit bias and White privilege. In the next, I consider ways to address structural racism and white advantage.

A. Civity Defined

I have previously explored the civic conditions that lead to sustainable legal change. In that exploration, I identified as key small-world civic social networks in which bridging relationships join people in distinct bonded groups. When people tell their stories to others who are like them, they create a shared identity, which provides a valuable sense of autonomy. When they tell their stories to others who are unlike them, they forge bridging relationships, which offer interpersonal connections. When they see their stories in an overarching collective story, they experience relevance, which provides meaning. Bonding relationships provide safe, nurturing spaces; bridging relationships enable the emergence of a larger “we” from numerous smaller “we’s.”

Two qualities of civic networks are particularly important for countering racism. The first is the existence of relationships that bridge between distinct, cohesive social groups. Race divides people

---

110. Vincent Harding spoke of the successful work of the Civil Rights Movement as calling for renewed, adaptive strategies: “Because this country has been changed, we must change too if we are going to continue to carry on the struggle. . . . You move into a struggle with certain kinds of visions and ideas and hopes. You transform the situation and then you can no longer go on with the same kinds of visions . . . because you have created a new situation yourselves.” FUNDI: THE STORY OF ELLA BAKER (Fundi Prod. 1981).

111. Strand, Civic Underpinnings, supra note 12, at 134–61 (general discussion and three contemporary applications).

112. Id. at 146–48.

113. Id. at 134–37; Strand, Law as Story, supra note 2, at 632–34, 639–42.

into different social groups. Bridging, cross-racial relationships link these groups in a civic body that encompasses White and Black and indeed all races. Not every person in every race needs to be connected to individuals of another race, but strategic bridging relationships diminish the separation and isolation that lead to fragmentation and division.

The second important quality of civic networks is “power-with” respect in bridging relationships. Race by definition creates power differentials. “Power-with” respect based on shared humanity narrows those differentials. Respect grounds empathy and trust, which enable shared civic norms and stories as well as collaboration and creativity.

In a single word, “civity” embraces all the aspects of civic networks. Civity describes social groups in which relationships of respect form civic networks that reach across social divides—divides such as race but also politics, geography, sector, and other socially salient characteristics that polarize and render difference destructive. Civity—civic “small-world” networks with bridging relationships of “power-with” respect—harnesses difference. With civity, diversity serves as the wellspring of resilience, creativity, and the capacity to adapt to internal and external challenges and stresses.

B. Civity and Racism 4.0

Implicit bias and White privilege contribute to Racism 4.0 through innumerable interpersonal interactions. We can think of interactions that embody implicit bias as having a negative racial “valence” that communicates dysfunctional racial stereotypes and associations and reinforces racial hierarchy. Such interactions may be relatively “micro” but have substantial cumulative effects. White privilege cloaks implicit bias, operating as a secret door that must be seen and opened for awareness to arise. In contrast, with civity,
cross-racial “power-with” relationships of respect have a positive racial valence and people of all races are aware of both the importance of cross-racial bridging relationships and the quality of those relationships. Civility nullifies implicit bias and White privilege on their own terms.

While implicit bias may be pervasive, it is also malleable. Once aware of implicit bias, we can take action to diminish or eliminate it; we can also monitor ourselves for actions we might be inclined to take instinctively that stem from implicit bias. Similarly, once aware of White privilege we can be rigorous with ourselves, intentionally acknowledging privilege and acting to counter it.

Each of us has the ability to create civility by entering into “power-with” relationships of respect across divides. In fact, “[b]ecause the links in social networks are created by the people in those networks, creating civic networks [civility] is something that only we can do.” Building the civility that nullifies Racism 4.0 calls for “power-with” relationships of respect across racial lines. And, as with all civility, creating the necessary cross-racial civic relationships “is something that only we can do.”

How do we do this? Awareness and communication. We pay attention to the importance of forging relationships across racial lines and especially the valence of those relationships. We interact with others who are of a different race. We tell stories about our experiences and listen to and learn from those of others. Renowned storyteller J.G. “Paw-paw” Pinkerton said: “Storytelling is a shared experience, and shared experiences are the basis of all relationships.” Cross-racial storytelling is a powerful way to heighten awareness of the privilege that impedes authentic cross-racial conversation; to enter into cross-racial relationships; to confront our unconscious race-based stereotypes, associations, and biases; and to expand our racial horizons in ways that rework those stereotypes, associations, and biases. New relationships, new collective identities, and new collective stories emerge.

121. STAATS, supra note 61, at 17.
122. Strand, Civic Underpinnings, supra note 12, at 157 (emphasis in original).
124. SMITH ET AL., supra note 6, at 175.
We, especially White people, are often not practiced at this. White privilege enables many to live without engaging with or talking much about race. The downside of White privilege is missing out on so much of what is happening in the world, on the experiences and stories of so many. Though rejecting White privilege calls for opening ourselves to stories and experiences that it may be uncomfortable to hear, it transforms our view from monochrome to Technicolor.

Cross-racial conversation about race may feel risky. This past fall, Creighton’s School of Law and 2040 Initiative hosted “Talking About Race: A Conversation with Jamelle Bouie.” Bouie writes about politics, policy, and race for Slate.com.

In the Q&A session at the end of the hour, a White student raised his hand. He said that he is interested in talking about race but fearful of saying the wrong thing.

Mr. Bouie’s . . . advice was to just take the plunge: It is better to get “pie on your face” than to never say anything. The key is to start, to be in the conversation. Conversations about race, he said, are so few and so fraught that we need to have them, even if something goes awry.  

The conversations, storytelling, and relationship-building that counter the “software” of Racism 4.0 also build civity, which enables collaboration, creativity, and resilience.

C. Building Civility Institutionally and Systemically

Because every individual has the power to heighten awareness and to engage in relationships that seed change, each of us can counter Racism 4.0 and build civity. This “bottom up” work can be encouraged within institutions and more broadly. Leaders can articulate a cultural story that explicitly values cross-cutting relationships and work to create an environment that supports building them.

I have written previously of two examples of anti-Racism 4.0 civity-building initiatives here in the United States. In the first, an

effort in which I was personally involved, the Arlington Public Schools (“APS”) in Arlington, Virginia, directly tackled relationships communicating low expectations to Black and Latino students:

As a result of a collaborative effort involving the school board, the Superintendent, administration and other school system personnel, teachers, and parents, APS concluded that institutional racism must be addressed by changing the individual interactions between students and teachers. To reach into and transform those interactions, APS developed “cultural competence training” for all instructional personnel that calls for self-awareness of implicit bias and privilege. The goal is to raise expectations and change pedagogy by teachers who are mostly White for a student body that is majority students of color.127

APS responded to racially disparate outcomes with a system-wide initiative to transform cross-racial, cross-ethnic, student-teacher relationships for the better. Consistent with a civility approach, APS recognized that “[i]t is . . . in classrooms, hallways, and on the playground before, during, and after school that kids experience school—whether they feel anonymous and disrespected and likely to fail or known and respected and likely to succeed.”128

On a much larger scale, President Obama’s Department of Housing and Urban Development proposed regulations in 2013 to begin to reverse the residential segregation that haunts us.129 The regulations sought to implement the “affirmatively further fair housing” (“AFFH”) requirement of the Fair Housing Act of 1968—a requirement that has languished for almost fifty years—by providing that HUD will supply local entities with comprehensive data on housing patterns related to race, ethnicity, poverty, employment, environment, and transportation. Local entities engaged in community planning will thus be in a better position to

128. SMITH ET AL., supra note 6, at 73.
not simply prohibit housing discrimination but to affirmatively further fair, equitable, and integrated housing . . . . [The thrust of the regulations was enabling] local governments . . . to facilitate more bridging relationships within neighborhoods through increased residential integration.  

The federal government proposed addressing regional housing disparities by reversing entrenched patterns of separation. The regulations recognized that reversal of residential segregation resulting from large-scale, legalized, collective government policies in the past calls for large-scale, legalized, collective government policies in the present. These proposed regulations have not been issued in final form.

A third example, hailing from India, focuses on Hindu-Muslim religious division, which can erupt into violence. Comparing levels of violence in Indian cities, sociologist Ashutosh Varshney found: “The key determinant of peace is interconnected civic life . . .” In civity terms, “associational [inter-ethnic] bridges . . . play an essential role at the system or city level by linking bonded groups sufficiently to enable social responses to shocks that protect against internal violence.” To the question: “Can civic links be forged?” Varshney responds in the affirmative. He describes an initiative in the town of Bhiwandi, where the police chief brought together individual Hindus and Muslims from religiously segregated neighborhoods.

If the Hindus and Muslims could meet each other often enough and discuss common problems, a reservoir of communication and perhaps trust would be created, which in turn would play a peace-making role at the time of communal tensions . . . .

Seventy such committees were created to cover the entire town. They would discuss “matters of mutual

133. Varshney, supra note 131, at 289.
concern.” They would meet as necessary, at least once a week normally but daily in times of tension, with a police officer presiding. And as time wore on, they turned out to be so successful that even non-members started attending important meetings, thus broadening “the base of mutual confidence.”

These Bhiwandi committees, in the face of a religiously divisive national incident, brought together Hindus and Muslims to keep the peace.

Leaders who recognize the transformative power of bridging relationships have at hand the means for creating conditions that encourage the forging of those relationships. When leaders seize the opportunity to nurture civity-building relationships, they embrace an institutional and systemic understanding of change. As they focus on cross-racial bridges, civity grows and Racism 4.0 declines.

IV. Rewiring the “Hardware”

Without affirmative counter-measures, structural racism and white advantage reproduce themselves. Eliminating Racism 4.0 calls for rewiring institutions and social systems. These actions, like the abolition of slavery, like the Great Migration, and like the invalidation of segregation, must be sweeping: Structural racism and white advantage reach wide and deep.

Imagining the sweeping transformations that will root out Racism 4.0 is an imperative: A vision of where we are headed energizes, motivates, engenders hope, and calls us to create the civity that makes possible both clearer discernment of and active movement toward that vision. In this Part, painting with a broad brush, I offer a grand design for bringing that vision to life. Three touchstones respond to the disparities of Racism 4.0. Each benefits Whites and people of other races as well as Black citizens. This “interest convergence” arises because the fates of all races lie together. Interest convergence fuels movement toward equity and justice by overcoming deep-seated instincts of Whites to act to the disadvantage

134. Id. at 293–94.
135. Id. at 294.
of Blacks “just because” and enabling them to act to further aligned interests.\(^{137}\)

A. Tax and Invest Progressively Throughout the Nation

The United States government has invested substantial funds, both directly and indirectly, in programs to increase the wealth and well-being of the citizenry. These funds were public funds raised through taxes on the general population. As described above, many of these programs increased the wealth and well-being of the White citizenry without substantial benefit for Black citizens: White advantage and Black disadvantage.

Relative economic equality\(^ {138}\) and high taxes\(^ {139}\) during the decades between the end of World War II and the late 1970s enabled substantial investment in public infrastructure.\(^ {140}\) About the time that the civil rights legislation of the 1960s began to bear fruit and increased immigration brought more non-Whites, especially Latinos, to the nation, public support for taxes to invest in the common good declined. Since about 1980, when Ronald Reagan was elected President, anti-tax rhetoric and action benefitting those who are better off\(^ {141}\) has led to sky-high levels of economic inequality\(^ {142}\) and reduced support for public infrastructure.\(^ {143}\)

It was not, perhaps, a coincidence that Reagan hailed from California, which was ahead of the national curve both in shifting racial and ethnic demographics and in anti-tax initiatives.\(^ {144}\) Research shows that older White voters are less likely to vote in favor of taxing themselves to support public investment such as schools for children

---
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who do not look like them, who are not White.\textsuperscript{145} The states of the former Confederacy with large Black populations have a knee-jerk reaction against programs that benefit the citizenry at large;\textsuperscript{146} the instinct to deny Black citizens the benefits of public investment goes deep.\textsuperscript{147} Politicians respond to their wealthier constituents,\textsuperscript{148} who are more likely to be White.

The fallout from decades of disinvestment in the public is evident all around us: crumbling physical infrastructure;\textsuperscript{149} children and youth who are not receiving the support they need to develop their abilities to contribute economically and in other ways;\textsuperscript{150} middle class families sinking under the weight of lagging wages, disappearing jobs, and increasing educational and other expenses. Black (and Latino) families and children, because of their relative lack of economic resources, are less able to substitute private for public goods. Thus, they are disproportionately affected by this public disinvestment.

A generation from now, non-Hispanic Whites are projected to be a minority of the nation’s population.\textsuperscript{151} For a long time, disinvestment in Blacks (and Latinos) has been a disadvantage for an easily disregarded sliver of the whole. This disinvestment is now becoming a disadvantage for the whole: From a purely economic perspective, racially tinged inequality dampens growth and resilience.\textsuperscript{152} White and non-White interests are converging: What is good for non-Whites is good for Whites, is good for all of us.

We need public investment to strengthen our national infrastructure—physical and human. That public investment must be paid for, and we must tax ourselves to pay for it. The taxes and

\textsuperscript{145} David N. Figlio & Deborah Fletcher, \textit{Suburbanization, Demographic Change and the Consequences for School Finance}, NBER Working Paper No. 16137 33–35 (June 2010).

\textsuperscript{146} See supra notes 93–96 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{147} See Christopher D. DeSante, \textit{Working Twice as Hard to Get Half as Far: Race, Work Ethic, and America’s Deserving Poor}, 57 AMER. J. POL. SCI. 342 (Apr. 2013) (“racial resentment” negatively affects willingness to award Blacks public benefits).
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investment, moreover, must be progressive. We need to invest to bring into the fold of prosperity those who were excluded in prior waves of public taxes and investment. We need progressive investment in children and youth—in child care, K-12 education, college, and all the supports kids need to succeed there.\textsuperscript{153} We need progressive investment in health, families, housing, transportation, and more.

The lion’s share of this investment must be federal because the federal government is in the best position to make the level of investment required. When the federal government acts it expresses the national will, which, in this case, is a national commitment to investing in those who have previously been regarded as not worthy of investment. Federal investment makes the statement that those who are invested in are an essential part of the nation. The Homestead Acts, Social Security, home mortgages, and the interstate highway system were all national investments that spoke of the value of citizens. Today we need forward-looking national investment that will, through collective affirmative action, build our collective strength for the next generation.

\textbf{B. Regionalize Our Metropolitan Areas}

Our metropolitan areas are the engines of the nation. More than four-fifths of the population lives in urban areas.\textsuperscript{154} And our metropolitan areas, especially the large ones, are ahead of the demographic curve in shifting away from non-Hispanic White majorities:

\begin{quote}
America’s largest 150 metropolitan regions are home to the vast majority of the nation’s economic activity (80 percent) and population (72 percent). They are also at the vanguard of rising diversity: communities of color are driving population growth in almost all of these metros, and their economic fate hinges on whether Latinos, African Americans, and other diverse groups can participate and thrive.\textsuperscript{155}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{154} Frequently Asked Questions, \textsc{United States Census Bureau}, https://ask.census.gov/faq.php?id=5000&faqId=5971 (last visited Mar. 18, 2015) (“The urban areas of the United States for the 2010 Census represent [] 80.7% of the population . . .”).

\textsuperscript{155} \textsc{Treuhaft et al.}, \textit{supra} note 152, at 5.
President Obama emphasized the national importance of the health of our metropolitan areas in his 2015 State of the Union address. In significant part because of the high Black, Asian, and Latino populations in metro areas, the economic penalty for racial inequity is higher there than in the nation as a whole. The national GDP would be 14% higher with racial equity. The bonus for racial equity in the nation’s 150 largest metro areas would be 24%, “ranging from a low of 2 percent in both Portland, Maine, and Springfield, Missouri, to a high of 131 percent in Brownsville, Texas.”

Our metropolitan areas are also landscapes of advantage and disadvantage. Redlining created racially segregated neighborhoods that are very much visible today. These neighborhoods are often located in different local jurisdictions. Generous incorporation and district creation policies in many states have created what urbanist Neal Peirce calls the “governance gap.”

Multiple jurisdictions within a region (what Peirce calls a “citistate”) pulling against rather than with each other. Jurisdictions with wealthy citizens (often White) and robust tax bases are loath to literally “share the wealth” with neighboring jurisdictions with less-well-off citizens (often Black or Latino) and ailing tax bases. “Torn social fabric” (lack of racial civility) and “sprawl” (physical separation of wealthy suburban Whites from poorer urban minorities), along with the “governance gap,” sap energy and undermine regional well-being and prosperity.

School districts play a major role in perpetuating regional disparities, a role that United States Supreme Court decisions in the 1970s solidified as to both economics and race. Subsequent legal challenges under state constitutional law have resulted in equalization of school funding, but significant economic disparities remain—not only between districts within states but between districts in different
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states. We are left with “public” schools and school districts that in fact represent a wide range of “private” investment in the form of ability or lack of ability to buy into a “good” school district. “Good” and “bad” schools and school districts coexist in all metro areas.

States have, by and large, declined to acknowledge the organic, integrated nature of metropolitan regions. Revenue sharing in the Twin Cities in Minnesota and coordinated land use planning in Portland, Oregon are exceptions that reveal the rule. In state legislatures, those who represent suburban and urban districts often see their interests as opposed rather than aligned. Many metro areas, moreover, cross state lines, making regional cooperation an even greater challenge. Overall, actions based on the awareness that everyone in a region rises and falls together are far from the norm.

A significant step toward regional coordination can be traced back to federal initiatives in the 1970s that required planning for federal investment across jurisdictional lines. Regional environmental efforts, for example, were necessary because water and air cross local jurisdictional boundaries. More recently, the “Sustainable Communities” grant program, administered by the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Transportation and the Environmental Protection Agency, has supported regional planning for equity and sustainability.

Regional coordination in the form of networks of collaboration among local actors does exist. It emerges when local leaders see
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shared interests and act to forge cross-jurisdictional working relationships (civity) to address common issues. This kind of regionalism, though effective with respect to specific challenges, neither brings all affected to the table nor extends to the multiple ways in which local outcomes in a region are intertwined.

We need comprehensive and more effective regional coordination—systemic reforms to shift local jurisdictions toward seeing their interdependence with their regional neighbors and acting out of that understanding. Federal investment in metropolitan regions, with strings attached, moved the environmental and transportation needles. Federal investment in metropolitan regions can move the equity needle today. And this investment must bring along reluctant, even recalcitrant states and locals.

C. Recognize Economic, Social, and Cultural Human Rights

The United States is behind the international curve on economic, social, and cultural human rights. Decades ago, the United Nations adopted the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights ("ICCPR")\(^{172}\) and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ("ICESCR").\(^{173}\) The ICCPR declares that all people have human rights including traditional civil and political rights associated with the "popular control" value of democracy.\(^{174}\) These rights are well-represented in the United States Constitution: freedom of speech, expression, and religion; equal protection by race, ethnicity, and gender; the right to political self-determination; criminal process protections; liberty rights.\(^{175}\) As a signatory, a process that was completed with Senate ratification in 1992, the United States agrees to protect and support those rights.\(^{176}\)

The ICESCR declares that all people have economic, social, and cultural rights including the right to work, appropriate conditions of work, and the right to form and join trade unions; family protections including paid leave and/or benefits for working mothers; clothing,


\(^{175}\) U.S. CONST. art. I, art II; U.S. CONST. amend. I, IV, V, VI, XIV.

food, and housing; health care; education; and the right to participate in cultural and scientific life. These rights, which give effect to “equality,” the other primary value of democracy, are not guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

Protection of civil and political rights juxtaposed with lack of protection of economic, social, and cultural rights reflect our own democratic progression. Historically, our nation’s Constitution focused heavily on popular control. Only over time did equality as a democratic value gain traction, and only within the last half-century or so has its constitutional place been secured in practice. The Constitution’s mandate for equal treatment, however, has not been joined by rights to ensure equality of opportunity, of equal chance to develop human capabilities, or of equity. Constitutional Equal Protection doctrine lacks the economic, social, and cultural rights that enable equal outcomes. As we have seen, neutral law reproduces inequality. Economic, social, and cultural rights, in contrast, dismantle inequality.

Reflecting equality’s delayed rise in this country, the United States has not—as yet—become a signatory to the ICESCR, and most of the rights it guarantees are only partially protected here. We have (only recently) the Affordable Care Act, yet the refusal of many states to extend Medicaid leaves millions of people—including many of our most vulnerable citizens—without health care. We have trade unions, yet many workers in many states cannot avail

177. See ICESCR, supra note 173, pt. III, art. 6–15.
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themselves of those protections. We have a minimum wage, not a living wage. We have inadequate leave for working parents. Every state constitution guarantees a public K-12 education, yet higher education is not "equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity." Currently, the rhetoric of equality in the United States far surpasses the reality. If we are serious about valuing equality, we need to get serious about the rights that make it real. It is past time that the United States signed on to the ICESCR. In doing so, the United States agrees to "take steps . . . to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the [ICESCR] by all appropriate means, including particularly the adoption of legislative measures." Once the United States signs, taking action to ensure and protect the ICESCR rights becomes a national responsibility and gives the federal government power to execute the treaty domestically, even if doing so brings the national government into arenas that generally fall within state purview.

The states, with broad general powers, can also take initiative vis-à-vis economic, social, and cultural rights. To the extent that states declare these rights to be integral to a functioning democracy, they have leverage to seek financial support from the federal government under Article IV of the United States Constitution, which provides that "[t]he United States shall guarantee to every

---
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State in this Union a republican form of government.\textsuperscript{192} Though this constitutional clause has most generally been invoked in the context of the United States imposing requirements on the states,\textsuperscript{193} it can also serve to give the states the ability to seek carry-through from the United States in ensuring democratic—republican—minima.\textsuperscript{194}

V. Re-Constiution

Civity-building and the three touchstones for dismantling Racism 4.0’s “hardware” are closely linked. Civity’s cross-racial relationships of respect pull toward greater equity as manifested in the progressive tax and investment touchstone. Civity’s empathy in the form of awareness of racial interdependence calls us toward robust democracy at multiple scales as reflected in the regionalization touchstone. And civity’s cross-racial trust opens the door to a contemporary understanding of a republican form of government as embodied in the social, economic, and cultural rights touchstone.

All three civic and civity-based touchstones evince a transformed sensibility of our political and legal constitution. Each of them calls for blurring of conventional institutional boundaries. Progressive taxation and investment on a nationwide basis necessitates federal investment in states and localities that have historically resisted such investment. Regionalization of metropolitan areas calls for federal, state, and local governments to pull together to support a traditionally unrecognized level of governance. Realization of economic, social, and cultural rights requires federal and state governments to hash through shared responsibility and authority.

All three touchstones embrace governance in which distinct governmental institutions act as enmeshed and networked entities, working through difference and conflict to generate creative solutions. Governments are networked, and conflict plays a positive role, just as the body civic is networked and powered by difference.

Conventional understanding of our constitutional structure is based on “separation of powers.” Substantial rhetoric and case law offer “formalist” and “functionalist” interpretations and applications of the doctrine.\textsuperscript{195} The reality, however, is interwoven and shared

\textsuperscript{192} U.S. CONST. art. IV, § 4.


power through assignments of specific authority combined with mandates of necessary interaction.\textsuperscript{196}

Networked entities working together to govern is increasingly recognized as not only the constitutional structure and reality but the way of the world in practice.\textsuperscript{197} In essentially every public arena, all parts of the federal government and federal, state, and local entities coordinate and collaborate to govern. Education, health, roads, gun regulation, economic development, housing, employment, crime, definition of family relationships, and more—all reflect networked governance. While each governmental entity has its core functions, there is substantial overlap.

Relational, networked governance is dynamic. Initiative courses through the system. Sometimes the federal government is in the lead. Sometimes the locals are ahead. Sometimes states are at the forefront. The same is true of legislative, executive, and judicial bodies.

This dynamism not only allows for conflict; it runs on conflict. Leadership and civic author Parker Palmer observes:

\begin{quote}
[T]his country was born out of conflict. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, 30 percent of the delegates walked out without signing the thing—and those who did sign disagreed so fundamentally that they were forced to create a conflict-holding system of government. In fact, they created the first form of government that treats conflict not as the enemy of a good social order but as the engine of a better social order. Conflict can be creative, and we have to recover that sensibility.\textsuperscript{198}
\end{quote}

Difference—diversity—is the raw material of conflict and creates resilience in a system, if it can be harnessed.

\textsuperscript{196} Id. at 1944–45 (“[T]he Constitution adopts no freestanding principle of separation of powers. The idea of separated powers unmistakably lies behind the Constitution, but it was not adopted wholesale. The Constitution contains no Separation of Powers Clause . . . the idea of separation of powers, properly understood, reflects many particular decisions about how to allocate and condition the exercise of federal power”) (emphasis in original).

\textsuperscript{197} See generally, NETWORKED GOVERNANCE: THE FUTURE OF INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MANAGEMENT (Jack Meek et al. 2011).

\textsuperscript{198} David Bornstein, Reclaiming “We the People,” One Person at a Time, N.Y. TIMES (Sept. 4, 2014) (interviewing and quoting Parker Palmer) (emphasis in original).
Palmer points to the “venues in which we live our lives—families, neighborhoods, classrooms, congregations and voluntary associations—as the vital infrastructure of democracy.”

He raises up the importance of “talking about what we love, because a lot of us love the same things . . . [and] we all doubt that what we love is being served well. Beginning a conversation with loves and doubts rather than political ideologies opens a new door to dialogue, driven by story-telling rather than political point scoring.”

He concludes: “[I]f you’re not humanly connected, you have no chance to pursue . . . complex issues communally in a way that might be transformative.”

Palmer’s emphasis on human relationship as grounding governance echoes a civility view and highlights the connection between civic and government. If we the civic are splintered and conflict-riven, the collective story that emerges and that our governing bodies reflect is splintered and conflict-riven. If we build civility, the collective story is about relationships among distinct bodies and connecting through difference to generate ideas and energy. With civility, dismantling institutional and systemic racism is possible.

Civic movements generate fundamental changes in our collective story—expressed in popular sentiment and in law. Civic movements sculpt and “re-constitute” our social and psychological constitution by shifting our collective perception of who we are as a people. From this re-constitution emerges a re-constituted political and legal constitution that gives formal expression to the newly formed collective story. To overcome Racism 4.0, we need both civility and the re-constitution—social, psychological, political, and legal—that will result.
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