



Vol. 7 Number 1 – March 2025

MAC Arrow

Unitarian Universalist
Multiracial Unity Action Council
(UUMUAC)

“For the Unity of the
light and dark skinned
people of the world.”

Mailing Address: UUMUAC

1448 E. 52nd St., Box 267, Chicago, IL 60615

Editor’s email: uusj@sbcglobal.net

The Mission Statement

It is the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Caucus to carry out and foster anti-racist and multiracial unity activities both within and outside the Unitarian Universalist Association through education, bearing witness and other actions, and expansion of our membership both within and outside the walls of our congregations.

We also seek to defend our UU Principles against those who seek to undermine them.

The Vision Statement

We envision our congregations, denomination, and society as not being color blind but color appreciative; as judging and treating members of the world’s rank and file by the content of their character, not the color of their skin or their cultural heritage; and as treasuring diversity in the context of the “Beloved Community.” We call this vision Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

To unsubscribe please send a note to uusj@sbcglobal.net.

Note: Articles reflect their author's views. They do not necessarily reflect a position taken by the UUMUAC Board of Directors

A proposed new UUMUAC Preamble, Vision and Mission

UUMUAC adopted its original Preamble, Mission and Vision statements in 2009, when the organization was founded as a Caucus to oppose the UUA's neo-racist policies. Almost a decade later the organization was incorporated as a Council, but the Preamble, Mission and Vision were not revisited at that time. This year it was time to revisit and update them. A six person committee of the Board worked for six weeks to come up with the proposed new Preamble, Mission and Vision. The UUMUAC Board has endorsed the revision. Next the UUMUAC membership must vote to approve the revisions, before they go into effect. Herewith you will find a clean version of the 2025 proposal.

The Preamble lays the groundwork for the Vision and Mission statements. The proposed new version says what racism is, when it is revealed. It also speaks of racism and related forms of prejudice, because ethnic prejudice is very similar to racism.

The proposal moves the Vision statement before the Mission statement because the Mission flows out of the Vision. The word association was made plural as we now have both the UUA and NAUA. Treating people by the content of their character was expanded to those of other identity. The proposal clarifies "Beloved Community" by stating "in the context of Martin Luther King Jr.'s Beloved Community". The Vision ends by saying we call this vision Multiracial Unity, rather than Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

The Mission statement would now state that we work to counter racism and neo-racism. In its second paragraph it states that we strive to defend freedom, reason and tolerance as articulated in the Seven Principles of Unitarian Universalism, adopted in 1985. It further states, in response to the UUA's new Article II, that this includes their use in our individual congregations, through congregational autonomy.

This proposed new UUMUAC Preamble, Vision, and Mission statement will be voted on at a UUMUAC Special Membership meeting to be held on Saturday, March 29, 2025, at the conclusion of the UUMUAC Convocation on *Neo-Racism*.

Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council (UUMUAC)

Preamble, Vision, and Mission Statements

Adopted July, 2009, Amended 2025

Preamble

Racism and related forms of prejudice are revealed when someone treats another person differently due to their perceived race or ethnicity. These prejudices affect people around the world. Such disrespectful conduct is especially harmful in religious communities because of their commitment to strong ethical and moral standards.

Vision Statement

We envision our congregations, associations, and communities as being not color blind but color appreciative; as judging and treating people by the content of their character, not the color of their skin, their cultural heritage, or other identity; and as treasuring all forms of diversity in the context of Martin Luther King's Jr's "Beloved Community." We call this vision Multiracial Unity.

Mission Statement

It is the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council to foster activities for multiracial unity and to counter racism and neo-racism through worship, education, bearing witness, and other actions, and to find and engage like-minded individuals and groups.

We affirm the inherent worth and dignity of every person, and strive to defend freedom, reason, and tolerance as articulated in the Seven Principles of Unitarian Universalism adopted in 1985. This includes promoting their use in individual congregations, through congregational autonomy, and in our own actions.

Is Power + Prejudice a good definition of Racism?

By Dr. Kenneth Christiansen

I first heard the formula, "Racism is Prejudice plus Power" at a church conference in 1994. The person who made the statement was the Chair of the racial justice commission of a prominent Christian denomination. I wasn't surprised by the formula. Prejudice plus power is a definition of discrimination, and discrimination based on race is racism. If you look at all the ways individuals from any background exercise power over people, that definition can accurately portray what racism is.

I was surprised by what the speaker said next. She added a very important qualifying phrase. She said, "Racism is Prejudice plus Power. Since black people don't have any power, they can't be racist. They can be prejudiced, but they can't be racist."

In that meeting, nobody challenged that statement. The speaker was black, and she was the authority by institutional position as well as by race. I saw a problem

with the overly simplistic understanding of “power.” But I didn’t have the words or the courage to immediately share another view despite the shortcomings of the logic.

I have heard that definition of racism many times since 1994 and wondered when and where this definition originated and why so many people take it as gospel truth. I recently found the answer in a book titled [*Redefining Racism: How Racism Became Power + Prejudice*](#) by Joseph (Jake) Klein. Klein did an immense amount of research to find out how and why that definition got so widespread.

The story starts with actions taken immediately after a riot in Detroit that began on July 23, 1967, and lasted five days. The riot began as a response to a police incident. 43 died and 7,200 were arrested. Before the riot ended, President Johnson appointed a Commission to study problem. Seven months later the Commission concluded that “Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white, separate and unequal. ... what white Americans have never fully understood – but what the Negro can never forget – is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it. White institutions maintain it. And white society condones it.”

Days after the riot ended, the governor, the mayor, and heads of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler met with more than 160 leaders of government, retail, and industry in Michigan. The goal was to stop the property damage. A “New Detroit Committee” was formed and empowered to utilize all available means to change the racial climate. While only about four percent of Detroit’s black community had actively supported the rioting, the decision was made to include them in the design of the committee’s work.

Much of the initial work was accomplished by the Detroit Industrial Mission (DIM). DIM was founded by religious groups in 1956 with the initial goal of helping production line workers have meaningful lives. It had the support of the big three Detroit automobile manufacturers. By 1967 DIM had increased its community involvement by doing what they called “switchboarding.” That meant playing a go-between role between industry and an activist group pursuing issues that affected the black community. It was a natural development when DIM was tapped to anchor the mission of the New Detroit Committee.

DIM added new staff including Robert Terry, a white ordained Baptist pastor, and Douglass Fitch, a black pastor, social worker, and racial justice advocate, in leadership roles. Up to now, the DIM staff had been all white. Douglass Fitch had worked with Martin Luther King in the 1960s, but had become more radical over time, much like Stokely Carmichael had done. Immediately prior to coming to DIM, Fitch worked with the Black Congress of Los Angeles, a united front of Black Power organizations.

Some tension surrounded Fitch's involvement. Most of the staff thought of their first loyalty being to their employer and through them to the industries and government that wanted an end to the rioting. Fitch, on the other hand, maintained a strong loyalty to the black community. DIM published an article by Fitch titled "Doing My Thing." In the article, Klein reports, "Fitch distinguished between two broad periods of black development: 'African Greatness' and 'Exile in Western Hell,' with the exile ending in a 'New Era' of Black Power." Fitch also asserted that "Stokely Carmichael's development of Black Power was 'the most significant of the decisions made by black men down through history.'" Terry dedicated his 1970 book, *For Whites Only*, "To Douglass Fitch, a black man who confronted me with my whiteness and challenged me to come to terms with it."

So far, we have the white establishment very upset about property damage, a white preacher with excellent leadership skills and good intentions, and a black preacher with very strong feelings about race rooted in the Black Power movement. How could this motley crew make a difference in the history of antiracism in this country?

Enter a nationally and internationally connected organization dedicated to creating "change agents" called the National Training Laboratories (NTL). A key member of DIM's staff attended NTL workshops and was an enthusiastic supporter of the strategies NTL had developed for changing the minds of large groups of people. NTL methodologies became central to DIM's work.

NTL was founded in the 1940's by the Office of Naval Research, the National Education Association (NEA), and the Carnegie Corporation Foundation. NTL conducted original experiments with possible methodologies for changing peoples' minds and bringing large groups of people to a common mind. Key learnings along the way involved the implementation of *sensitivity training* and *T-Groups* where members of a group take time to "participate in discussions, share experiences, and receive feedback from peers to enhance their understanding of themselves and others." NTL taught the use of controlled confrontation as part of these dynamics.

According to Klein, NTL defined a set of Change Agent skills that included:

- "Determining the barriers, the resistance, the degree of readiness to change"
- "Making changees aware of the need for change" including through tools of "shock" and "guilt"
- "Creating a feeling of responsibility to engage in this change by active personal participation"
- "Making catharsis possible"
- "Skill in dealing wisely with changees' ideology, myths, traditions, [and] values"
- "Understanding stress on changees' beliefs and behavior"

Sound familiar? I had wondered for a long time where the skill sets utilized by the UUA to change the mission and polity of the association and congregations had originated.

By late 1967, DIM had Black Power ideas about race and racism, capable staff organizers, the backing of the captains of government and industry, and a tested and proven strategy for changing minds. What could this group produce? And how far could the new ideas go?

Between 1967 and 1974, the Detroit Industrial Mission and spin-off groups popularized the view that all white people were racist and that eliminating white racism would solve black people's problems. This was in tune with thinking that went back to Stokely Carmichael. In addition, the goal of eliminating white racism didn't conflict with the New Detroit Committee's goal of protecting property and the "American way of life" in the same way the Civil Right Movement and its attendant backlash did.

DIM created a volunteer speaker's bureau with an emphasis on creating a new white consciousness. The committee ultimately developed a presentation that was delivered throughout the Detroit area over the next seven years with the aim of creating a new white consciousness.

Klein reports that "after Terry would open with the question, 'What does it mean to be white today?' participants would often include negative words such as angry, frustrated, inadequate, insecure, and guilty. ... New Detroit speakers regularly faced personal consequences for attempting to evangelize the new white consciousness ... [including] isolation and loneliness because they have been ostracized by their own community." This kind of outcome was taken as evidence they were touching nerves they needed to touch.

Rather than stopping, these ideas grew very strong legs and moved to a national stage via the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Meanwhile, a woman named Pat Bidol tested a 10-week elective curriculum for high school students in the Detroit area. Bidol's curriculum brought a new and very influential definition of racism into the discussion. Klein identifies Bidol's curriculum as the first time anyone stated that Racism = Power + Prejudice with the added stipulation that since white people have all the power, only white people can be racist. In 1970, the New Detroit Committee published Bidol's curriculum under the title *Developing New Perspectives on Race: An Innovative Multi-Media Social Studies Curriculum in Race Relations for the Secondary Level*. It was picked up and distributed by the National Education Association.

Race relations was also a big issue in the military. Klein writes, "In September of 1969, Army Chief of Staff General William Westmoreland directed that race relations be incorporated into the Army's educational system, leading to a four-hour block of instruction at the Infantry School. In 1970, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird expanded this initiative and created the Inter-service Task Force on Education in Race Relations. ...

Between 1971 and 1974, every military employee was mandated to receive eighteen hours of race relations seminars. ... More than 2,500 service members were trained to teach race relations..."

This is where things began to fall apart. Teaching the idea that all white people were racist led to disruptions in the life of military units causing the military to shut this program down in 1974. Similarly, disruptions resulting from training sessions in many other places caused the New Detroit Committee to defund its work in this area in 1974. The focus of the nation was no longer on race relations in the same way it had been in the 1960s.

Klein goes on to explain how the new ideas about race and antiracism didn't just die in 1974. Two books in particular had many readers. Robert Terry's 1970 book *For Whites Only* promoted a new white consciousness and advocated specific tactics for changing individuals and institutions. It was widely distributed in religious and non-profit communities. Judith H. Katz's 1978 book, *White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-Racism Training*, based in part on Pat Bidol's curriculum, had a powerful influence on many educators and some educational institutions partly because she continued to give lectures and write books. Her work is featured on the [Member Publications page](#) of the (still existing) National Training Laboratories. Her latest (2022) book is titled *Change Champions: A Dialogic Approach to Creating an Inclusive Culture*. Chapters like "Disrupting and Transforming Mindsets" lift up the same tried and proven NTL tactics employed by the Detroit Industrial Mission and its spin-off organizations, 1970-74.

Klein follows the history of these ideas right up to Robin DiAngelo. He writes, "DiAngelo does not cite Katz, Terry, Della-Dora, Bidol, or Edler in any of her available published works. However, DiAngelo's ideas are so strikingly similar to those developed by these theorists years earlier that her decision not to cite any of them could arguably be described as plagiarism." Klein then gives examples of many of the similarities.

This book helped answer a personal question for me. During the spring and summer academic quarters of 1967, I attended the Urban Training Center for Christian Mission in Chicago. By way of coincidence or connection, both the Urban Training Center and the Detroit Industrial Mission were underwritten by the Ford Foundation.

A curious thing happened while I was there. During the spring, there was a very alive conference phone call nearly every morning. The call connected leaders of black and white congregations that cared about civil rights all over the city. Things that happened the day and night before – unnecessary police actions, crises in a community organization, something that happened to a church building – all were heard and response strategies devised in a multiracial way.

Later, during the summer quarter, that changed. Several of the black congregations decided to exclude white people from all their meetings and deliberations. The word on the street was that they decided more would be gained by focusing on white guilt than

would be gained by any strategic cooperation with white individuals and churches. This was my first direct encounter with Black Power.

Reading Joseph Klein's book, *Redefining Racism*, was the first time I encountered an evidence-based explanation of how and why the Civil Rights Movement ended and prescribed forms of "antiracism" changed from working to eradicate discriminatory laws and policies to working to change white peoples' consciousness. Somehow, I was not surprised to learn that white people, not black people, were the primary movers in this change of focus.

The UUMUAC multiracial unity book club meets the first Saturday afternoon of each month. The next book this book club will be reading and discussing is Rev. Dr. William J. Barber II's newest book, *White Poverty: How Exposing Myths About Race and Class Can Reconstruct American Democracy*. To join this book club please send an email expressing your interest to uumuac@gmail.com.

The UUMUAC Chicago Area Chapter has voted to support the complaint filed by teacher Stacey Deemar. She and her legal representation have been informed of that support.

Trump administration asked to end racial segregation,

CRT trainings in Illinois school

By Austin Gergens | Chalkboard News contributor
Feb 18, 2025



A legal firm is calling on the Trump administration to follow through with its promise to end diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) policies as it relates to an Illinois teacher's lawsuit alleging racial segregation in schools.

The Southeastern Legal Foundation, which represents teacher Stacey Deemar, is now asking the Trump administration to take action after seeking remedy in court after Illinois's District 65 began using race as the primary lens of relating to teachers and students.

President Donald Trump signed an [executive order](#) last month aimed at ending "racial indoctrination in K-12 schools" because, in recent years, schools have been indoctrinating children in "radical, anti-American ideologies while deliberately blocking parental oversight."

The Illinois teacher and her representation argue that the focus on race is unconstitutional.

After Deemar initially filed an administrative complaint with the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education in 2019, the agency eventually issued a formal finding following a roughly 18-month investigation.

According to Kim Hermann, director of the Southeastern Legal Foundation, the report found that the Evanston/Skokie school district violated the Civil Rights Act.

"Which is no surprise because there was actual segregation going on, and not just some voluntary affinity group," Hermann said in an interview with Chalkboard. "This was white teachers go into this room, non-white teachers go into another room, in a teacher training."

According to Hermann, formal findings normally prompt schools to begin a negotiation with the DOE, in which the district must stop violating the Civil Rights Act to keep receiving federal funding.

“Within the first week of [the Biden] administration, the Department of Education withdrew its formal finding,” she said.

This withdrawal appears unprecedented to Hermann, who shared that SLF has spoken with many other groups about it.

“To the best of our knowledge, that has never happened,” she said.

Hermann addressed what’s lost for teachers and students who must work with critical race theory material, arguing it violates the law.

“Our civil rights laws in our constitution demand that everyone be treated equally and that the government cannot treat them differently because of the color of their skin,” she said in the interview. “Segregation has been outlawed in this county for many, many decades. It should have been outlawed for much longer than that.”

“When you have a school that’s separating students and teachers by just their skin color, it’s not only immoral, but it’s illegal and unconstitutional,” she added.

depicting an offer of “whiteness” being given by the devil to return for someone’s soul — teaching students both that everything white people own is stolen and that they will their souls for it



11. District 65's use of language is designed to promote a view of race essentialism and

A screenshot of the lawsuit filed by Stacey Deemar and the Southeastern Legal Foundation which says students in District 65 read a book that says "everything white people own is stolen."

Trump's executive order targeted the practices that Hermann said occurred at District 65.

"In many cases, innocent children are compelled to adopt identities as either victims or oppressors solely based on their skin color and other immutable characteristics," the executive order reads. "These practices not only erode critical thinking but also sow division, confusion, and distrust, which undermine the very foundations of personal identity and family unity."

Hermann reiterated that the goal is "to raise awareness to this case again."

"The crux of this really is that race is included in every single subject in every single grade across the entire school district," Hermann said.

Currently, the Southeastern Legal Foundation is waiting on the Department of Education to decide on an appeal that would reinstate the original decision from the Office of Civil Rights, condemning District 65's practices.

Abandonment of the Working Class & the Rise of Trump

A review of "Virtue Hoarders: The Case Against the Professional Managerial Class" by Catherine Liu (2021)

By Dick Burkhart

Catherine Liu is herself a professor – a member of the Professional Managerial Class (PMC) – but she does not hesitate to take her fellow PMC to task for promoting a *self-righteous* identity politics that has left the working class behind – easy pickings for the likes of Donald Trump. I was impressed both by her articulate message, a quick read in this book, and her personal courage when she was recently interviewed by Chris Hedges.

Even with a genuine *person-of-color* background (ethnic Taiwanese) she has been attacked for not toeing the party line. This ideology, sometimes described as “woke” for its hypocrisy, projects a highly selective compassion for certain groups designated as *oppressed* while masking the prosperity of the PMC itself and how this was achieved through collusion with the barons of neoliberal capital. In fact, Liu is an unabashed champion of Bernie Sanders-type socialism, contrasting the immense benefits of a true *Medicare for All* with the PMC blaming and shaming of the less educated for their supposed lack of virtue.

As this has morphed into cancel culture, revisionist history, and other illiberal practices, it has built strong resentments toward the PMC and a huge loss of its credibility among the general public. As Liu puts it, “When the tide turned against American workers, the PMC preferred to fight culture wars against the classes below while currying the favor of the capitalists it once despised” (p 3). “Right wing pundits heard the rage of ordinary people, but they weaponized that feeling for reactionary political purposes... To defeat reactionary politics masquerading as populism, we need anti-PMC class struggle from the Left, not more identity politics, which has become just another vehicle for PMC virtue signaling” (p 4).

To her credit, Liu digs more deeply into this “virtue hoarding”: “Although the PMC is profoundly secular in nature, its rhetorical tone is pseudo-religious and finds salvation, like most Protestant sects, in material and earthly success” (p 9). The bottom line is that “the PMC simply does not want its class identity or interests unmasked”, which explains the nastiness of its cancel culture. My own observation is that the PMC fear ethical and science-based dialogue on racism and gender ideology far more than they care about actual racism or transphobia.

Liu calls on the PMC to renounce its “fetishization of intelligence and refinement” (p 12) – to share both its “cultural and actual capital” rather than weaponizing it via the cultural wars, where it comes across as “hopelessly reactionary”. She notes that “yuppies helped birth a new world order for capitalism, a world of public austerity and private luxury” (p 15).

In the rest of the book, Liu goes into more detail on certain issues. First she explores attempts by the “cultural studies” faction of the PMC to destroy professional standards of scholarship, even science itself. Postmodern thought and Critical Theory are prime examples, based on the supposed virtues of “transgressing” normality. How the academic cultural warriors took the bait of the Alan Sokal hoax is a used as graphic illustration, though I found it strange that Liu did not cite the more recent “grievance study” hoax of James

Lindsay and associates.

Both Sokal, a scientist, and Lindsay, a mathematician, were well positioned to fight back against the nonsense but with limited success until the “shit hit the fan”. That is, when Critical Race Theory and gender ideology spread from academia to the larger public and engendered a backlash so big that it helped propel Trump to his 2024 electoral victory.

Liu also gets into the economic consequences, noting that “Under an Ivy-League-educated African American president, African American family wealth had collapsed”. She also took on “Occupy Wall Street”, noting that this was “squarely a PMC elite formation” (p 25) that cared more about the “progressive stack” speaking routine than about political demands that could make a dent in escalating inequality. And, of course, Hillary Clinton lost because she had become the incarnation of PMC values, and not just with her “deplorables” remark. More recently the much touted “1619 Project” showed the disdain for solid scholarship by the PMC. Here Liu could also have cited the pseudo-science behind DiAngelo’s “White Fragility”, only now exceeded by the pseudo-science behind puberty blockers.

Other chapters look at how children are being raised, how books are being read, and how sex itself has become politicized. Liu notes that “parenting fads have become hot commodities in America’s wealthiest neighborhoods” even as “welfare reform inaugurated a relentless war against the youngest, the poorest, and the most vulnerable” (p 37). Her vision: “We can begin to build a world where happy parents and stable childhoods are a collective good and no child will ever be “fine-tuned” to “succeed”. The “good enough mother” is OK – it builds resilience on all sides.

Liu concludes that the PMC “love to weaponize outrage to fuel moral panics but are unable and unwilling to face their identity as a class...they police each other to enforce the sort of social and intellectual conformity required by their class” (p 73). They claim to “help” innocent victims yet “do not believe in the systemic changes necessary to remake economic systems that would allow the many to find rewarding work and lead meaningful lives of dignity and economic security.” (p 74).

Meanwhile, ordinary people “no longer believe in the dominant neoliberal narrative of austerity and competition” with the PMC seen increasingly as “pedantic, hypocritical, and punishing...In angry demagogues the people find the sovereignty they have been denied.” Yet this will fail because what is needed is “massive economic redistribution and the

strengthening of public infrastructure and public goods that will be necessary for the environmental survival of the planet and the political survival of democracy” (p 76). This requires that “we must be heretics”.

**Transgenderism and Transracialism:
Shared Foundations, Divergent Responses**

One is socially accepted, the other is taboo

By David Cycleback Ph.D.

(David Cycleback is cognitive scientist and philosopher, specializing in brain function and its relationship to knowledge, beliefs and behavior. He is a member of the British Royal Institute of Philosophy and author of the college textbook *Cognitive Science of Religion and Belief Systems*.)

Both transgenderism and transracialism challenge traditional identity categories—gender and race—by asserting that personal identity can transcend biological or socially assigned traits. These concepts confront rigid societal constructs and advocate for the flexibility of identity.

However, while transgenderism has gained increasing societal support and legitimacy, transracialism remains broadly rejected, often met with ridicule or condemnation. This contrast reveals inconsistencies in society’s acceptance of identity fluidity.

Scholars, such as the University of Chicago evolutionary biologist Jerry Coyne and Rhodes College philosophy professor Rebecca Tuvel, have explored this divide. Coyne’s essay *Why Can’t You Be Transracial?* critiques the double standards, questioning why one form of self-identification is celebrated while the other is dismissed. Tuvel’s philosophy paper *In Defense of Transracialism* argues that the logical foundations of both concepts are consistent.

Coyne wrote the following:

“There doesn’t seem to be a fundamental philosophical or moral difference between transracialism and transgenderism so long as the claimant expresses honest feelings. Sure, you can make up reasons why slight differences would render the former unacceptable, but they’re just made-up reasons to somehow defend the sanctity of race.”

Questioning Fixed Categories

Transgenderism and postmodernist gender theory argue that gender identity is distinct from biological sex, allowing people to identify and live as any gender. Similarly, transracialism involves identifying with a racial group different from one's assigned race, questioning the permanence of racial classifications. Both concepts say that gender and race are social constructs. They prioritize self-definition over traditional societal norms, challenging categories traditionally seen as fixed.

Some, such as Coyne, argue that transracialism, though socially controversial, aligns more closely with the fluid and spectrum-based nature of race than transgenderism does with biological sex. Examples of fluid or mixed racial self-identification are not uncommon. Public figures like Barack Obama, Kamala Harris, and Tiger Woods are mixed-race and pick their racial self-identities. Woods coined the term "Cablinasian" to describe his blend of white, Black, American, and Asian ancestry.

Cultural and ethnic groups, such as Jewish communities and American Indian tribes, demonstrate the socially constructed nature of identity through inclusion rules, often accommodating converts.

Diverging Societal Responses

The contrasting reception of transgenderism and transracialism exposes cultural inconsistencies. Transgenderism has received growing support from advocacy groups, medical institutions, and policymakers, with gender increasingly recognized as a spectrum.

Conversely, transracialism is often met with skepticism and disdain. High-profile cases, such as Rachel Dolezal's identification as Black, have been dismissed as appropriation and deceit rather than genuine expressions of fluid identity. Even Tiger Woods faced criticism for identifying as "Cablinasian," as some insisted he should identify primarily as Black.

This divergence reveals cultural and political biases rather than consistent principles.

Further demonstrating the lack of consistency and the complexity of the issue, the U.S. census changes its racial and ethnic categorizations and definitions regularly, demonstrating how, in cases and to degrees, changing one's ethnicity and race identification is legally and socially acceptable.

Medical professor Norman Gilinski observes:

“Today, managing one’s identity is widely accepted. The question at hand is how far this practice can go; how much malleability will culture accept? Managing gender identity is quite widely accepted but not universally so. Choosing one religion over another is also widely accepted but not universally so. Race may prove to be an impenetrable boundary. The Rachel Dolezal case is instructive. It’s all about cultural tolerance. We’re witnessing the testing of boundaries, which is often contentious. While it may seem logical for race to be as fluid as gender, opponents will undoubtedly emphasize their differences.”

Another critic framed the disparity as a result of political power dynamics:

“Progressive political correctness dominates everything—education, academia, Hollywood, media, government, tech, and corporations. It sees itself as arbiter in these matters and declares transgenderism acceptable and transracialism forbidden. The distinction is not about logical consistency but political power and the arbitrariness and subjectivity of cultural norms.”

Some progressive social justice activists, such as in the Boston Review article *Why We Shouldn’t Compare Transracial to Transgender Identity* (linked to in References at the bottom of this article), argue there is important social distinction between transgenderism and transracialism, and give reasons for one to be accepted and the other to be taboo. Their objection to transracialism focuses on when someone of a majority race adopts or appropriates a minority racial identity.

Silencing of Critics

The disparity in societal acceptance is mirrored in the treatment of dissenting voices.

Philosopher Tuvel faced intense backlash from progressives for her paper. She endured public censure and humiliation, raising concerns about academic freedom and the limits of intellectual inquiry.

Similarly, University of Oxford evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins faced progressive backlash and retroactively lost a 1996 American Humanist Association award simply for asking the question of why is transgenderism acceptable while transracialism is taboo.

Articles such as *This Is What a Modern-Day Witch Hunt Looks Like* and *Academia’s Poisonous Call-Out Culture*, about the mistreatment of Tuvel, describe these responses as illiberal and ideological overreach, stifling legitimate debate and sincere academic inquiry.

Critics argue that silencing such discourse undermines progress, prioritizing political and ideological conformity over sincere exploration of complex issues. Academic freedom defenders, such as Coyne, University of Chicago philosopher Brian Leiter and Harvard psychologist Steven Pinker, wrote that it counters the principles of intellectual inquiry and open dialogue.

References:

[Why can't you be transracial? – by Prof. Jerry Coyne](#)

[In Defense of Transracialism – by Prof. Rebecca Tuvel](#)

[Why We Shouldn't Compare Transracial to Transgender Identity - Boston Review](#)

[The conundrum of a white Miss Japan - Asia Times](#)

[Are Jews White? : American racial categories misrepresent many groups](#)

[This Is What a Modern-Day Witch Hunt Looks Like](#)

[Academe's Poisonous Call-Out Culture](#)

[By Canceling Richard Dawkins, the American Humanist Association Has Betrayed Its Values](#)

[Open letter by Steven Pinker and Rebecca Goldstein to the American Humanist Association](#)

Daniel Penny Is A Hero

Jordan Neely was murdered...by NYC Democrats' failures

Distributed by the [Journal of Free Black Thought](#)

By Kayla Katin

Apparently, I've got to be the lone voice of sanity. The veteran Marine, Daniel Penny, was found not guilty of criminally negligent homicide in the death of Jordan Neely, the homeless black man that he put in a chokehold on the subway in New York last year.

I see that people are well vexed about that, so I need to come and spit some facts.

BLM of Greater New York co-founder Chivona Newsome was [not happy](#) about the Daniel Penny verdict.

The jury did the right thing. The ruling is correct. Penny is not guilty. The only problem is that he wasn't cleared of the charges sooner. The injustice is that this trial was even a thing in the first place.

Here are the facts. Jordan Neely was being belligerent, and threatening, and launching at people, and throwing things on the f__k__ subway. He said that he was ready to die, wanted to go back to jail, and was going to f__k__ kill people. The people were scared on that train. The passengers were scared. The mothers were trying to cover their children. That is when Daniel Penny intervened and put Neely in a chokehold to restrain him.

And guess what? I really don't see this being reported, but there were two other guys helping Daniel Penny to restrain Jordan Neely, and neither of them looks white. Plus, Penny's fellow passengers, including a black man and black woman, have said that Neely was terrifying and that Penny did the right thing. Yet, for some reason, the media seized on a race narrative.

Daniel Penny restrains Jordan Neely with the help of two other men. Video of the incident can be seen [here](#).

Maybe I'm mistaken but I've seen the video and it doesn't look like that chokehold was strong enough to cause asphyxiation. The forensic evidence found that Jordan Neely was still alive when that NYPD finally pulled up. Cops refused to resuscitate him because he was dirty and the police understandably didn't want to risk catching hepatitis or something. So, Jordan Neely died.

We found out that he had a ton of drugs in his system and he had underlying health issues. All of that predisposed him. But the chokehold and the stress from the struggle probably just pushed him over the edge.

Maybe he would still be alive if it weren't for that chokehold, but it's really unfair to try and pin his death on Daniel Penny. The intent clearly wasn't to kill. And Jordan Neely had to be restrained in order to stop him from attacking the passengers and following up on his threats.

The media, like some fucking vultures hovering over a corpse, couldn't wait to make this into a race issue based on literally nothing except for the skin colors of these two guys. Guess what? Around the exact same time, a black man, Jordan Williams, did basically the exact same thing as Daniel Penny, except he actually ended up stabbing the homeless guy to death, because the homeless guy was harassing the passengers on the subway and harassed his girlfriend. Jordan Williams walked free after a month, but this Daniel Penny trial took a whole year.

That's smelling really fishy.

As a black woman in the New York area, who had a run-in with my own “Jordan Neely” last year, I am really, really, really f__k___ frustrated at all of this hashtagging for this N_____.

Last year on the very first day of school, I was in downtown Newark waiting for my bus home, and some lady started mumbling shit at me. At first, I was trying to reason with her, asking what was up. But then I realized, she’s too far gone, she’s clearly on some shit. So I backed away, putting some distance between me and this lady.

But she kept being belligerent toward me. I was basically just ignoring it until she pulled a fucking baseball bat out from her backpack and threatened me with it. I’m dead serious. And there were multiple f__k___ people standing around, also waiting at this bus stop with me, and nobody gave an F. Nobody came and did jack shit.

This went on for minutes and minutes. Eventually, one middle-aged lady did come to stand by me to protect me. She said that she has daughters my age so she felt sympathy for me. And then, finally, the bus came. I thought that would put a stop to this, but the f__k___ crackhead got on the damn bus with me. I thought maybe she would get off but no, she stayed on all the way to my town and got off at my same stop. Thankfully, my mom was waiting for me in the car, so I ran into that car and I told my mom what happened.

I am so, so, so, f__k___ tired and frustrated by these race-baiting politicians and naive liberals, who act like some hugs and free cookies can solve all these altercations. The mentally-ill and drug-addicted of the world can be dangerous and violent. And it's not, right or fair for the rest of us to be put in danger because of their problems.

The bitter irony of everyone calling Daniel Penny a white supremacist is that the people who are most put in danger by the Jordan Neelys of the world are other working-class black people who have no f__k___ choice but to use public transportation.

As a black New Yorker, I will stand on this. Daniel Penny did nothing wrong. He’s a hero. He deserves a key to the city. Y’all are so desperate to follow a narrative and create another George Floyd that you’re just overlooking facts and justice and common sense.

The New York Democrats were so, so, so desperate to let Daniel Penny take the fall for their failures. They wanted this trial to be a distraction, a smoke screen from their failures to address drug addiction, homelessness, mental illness, and transit safety.

Those are all very real problems, and instead of being mad at Daniel Penny, we should be mad at the politicians. We need to get mad at the politicians, but they want to divert the people's anger to cover their own asses. Pretending like that was an act of systemic racism is a really easy way to take our eyes off of the other systemic problems that they're presiding over. Every single f__k__ politician and law enforcement official that participated in this sham trial of Daniel Penny should be required to pay him reparations out of their own damn pockets.

Oh, and I forgot to add: Jordan Neely's family is disgusting and fake as f__ for coming out the woodwork to cry crocodile tears over his death, when they did *nothing* for him in his life.

Kayla Katin is a YouTuber creating content centered around music, art, fashion, thrifty DIY, history, mental health, her Caribbean culture and her rock and metal subcultures—with some room for the occasional spicy sociopolitical take. She considers herself an Independent. She is an honorary New Yorker (New Jerseyan) currently in university to pursue an engineering degree

