

Five

CONSTRUCTIONS OF THREAT AND THE BARACK OBAMA PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

1. Barack Obama's "Imperfect Candidacy"

In his speech, "A More Perfect Union," delivered on 18 March 2008, then-Senator Barack Hussein Obama commented:

Contrary to the claims of some of my critics, Black and White, I have never been so naïve as to believe that we can get beyond our racial divisions in a single election cycle, or with a single candidacy—particularly a candidacy as imperfect as my own. (2008a)

This statement, embedded within a speech on race relations in twentieth-century America, conveys how Obama understood his position as a Black man within the United States—a nation that has historically constructed the category "Black man" in terms of menace and threat.

As Robert Gooding-Williams remarks in *Look, a Negro!*, "Black bodies have been saturated with significance, for they have been relentlessly subjected to characterization by newspapers, newscasters, popular film, television programming, public officials, policy pundits" and "other agents of representation" (2005, pp. 1–2). The majority of these characterizations, Gooding-Williams elaborates, serve "as forms of sociopolitical imagination" for the remainder of the public (*ibid.*, p. 2).

Despite the mostly negative significances historically attributed to Black men within the United States, Barack Obama was elected its president on 4 November 2008. We suggest that his election to the United States presidency, in light of narratives of threat surrounding Black men, is a moment worthy of analysis. We offer such an analysis in Chapter Six. In the present chapter, we address the fact that Obama's election, though heralded as a change in history and a giant step toward racial equality, also conveys a complicated story of threat situated within a post-9/11 frame of reference.

~~This framework included the reconstitution of the category "America(n)" and the identification of threats to the category, the country, and its people.~~ Within this framework, the body of Barack Obama was used to foster and maintain a climate of fear—not only vis-à-vis his position as a Black man, though this position is certainly significant, but through mechanisms of "browning" that translated his Black body into a precise sort of threat given post-9/11 constructions of terror(ism).

Black man
- menace
threat

Redefining
Americans

As a browned body (a browned Black body), the figure of Obama was perceived as an un- and anti-American body and a cause for fear. Some sectors of the public, or, the "agents of representation," discussed by Gooding-Williams in his work, constructed Obama as a threat to the country and its people. These agents included the media, the United States military, and the American public itself.

We argue for an interpretation of the 2008 presidential election results as not necessarily constituting the obliteration of the last bastion of racism in the country, as *The New York Times* implied in its 5 November 2008 headline, "Obama Elected President as Racial Barrier Falls" (Nagoury, 2009). Instead, we claim that Obama's election to the presidency serves as a culmination of overlapping discourses and ideas involving Americanness, security, and threat that developed within the United States in the aftermath of the 9/11 events, including the constitution of a new kind of threat rendered as the brown(ed) body.

We primarily focus, in this chapter, on the 2008 United States presidential primary campaign. We do so with an understanding that the patterns identified during this time continued and were perhaps amplified after Obama became the presidential nominee for the Democratic Party in June 2008. We maintain that during the 2008 presidential primary campaign season, agents of representation used means similar to those discussed throughout this project to render the body of Barack Obama as threatening and in need of containment.

The figure of Obama became a canvas on which constructions of terrorism, post-9/11 anxieties, and fears of renewed terrorist (and anti-American) threats were sketched. Depictions of Obama as threat were assembled through questions surrounding his Americanness. These questions were articulated in terms of loyalty to his nation and through public concern over his religious and national affiliations. In turn, these questions served to frame opposition to him as he campaigned to become the Democratic presidential nominee.

In what follows, we outline the systematic process by which Obama and his public persona were rendered un-American; that is, the process by which he and his public persona were "browned."

Interestingly, through this process, a cycle was set into motion whereby threatening bodies were "browned" via their constructed association with terrorists/terrorism. Once "browned," these same bodies were offered as threats in need of containment. This cycle mirrors the pattern addressed in Chapter Two through which the United States government manufactures the same objects of fear that are then presented to the American public as objects demanding governmental protection and security. Consequently, browning marks a dialectical and self-supporting process through which the same bodies marked as threats are rendered in need of constraint given their very construction as threatening (or, "browned") bodies.

Obama is a threat

Worry that Obama wasn't American enough

2. Re-conceptualizing the "Browning of America"

Toward the end of the twentieth century, social critics trumpeted the so-called browning of America. For the most part, these discussions occurred prior to 9/11 and highlighted two particular components: (1) a growing number of racial/ethnic minorities and immigrants (especially Latinos) within the United States, and (2) perhaps due to that growth, an embrace of multicultural ideals by the United States public.

The first component can be explained in terms of sheer numbers, meaning that a larger minority population and greater number of immigrants within the United States meant demographic change—a change assumed to influence "the face of America" (more "brown people" = a "brownier America"). The second component, on the other hand, was presented as a specific and even constructive element of inclusive liberal democracies, highlighting the idea that "the many" become united into "the one" (the idea that, even in the face of our differences, "we are all Americans").

The second component to discussions of the browning of America is particularly interesting at this historical juncture, because Latinos have become the largest minority group in the United States. The United States Census Bureau projects that by the year 2050 racial minorities will comprise 50 percent of the country's population (United States Census, 2007). The racial composition of the country does not necessarily mean changes to racial dynamics between Whites and non-Whites or in the material conditions under which racial minorities live and operate daily. Many predominantly working class individuals do not necessarily transform into one unified and comfortable middle class.

This second component also assumes an acceptance and embrace of multiculturalism both as an ideology and a reality. As an ideology, multiculturalism has been offered as an alternative to the prevailing Black-White binary of race relations embedded within United States racial discourse. As Ronald Sundstrom conveys, this binary has served "as a sort of master key to all things racial" (2008, p. 5). For Sundstrom, the classic Black-White binary "has assumed the role of conceptual baseline in national discussions of race" (ibid., p. 27).

Within this context, the browning of America has been seen as offering a covert attempt to upset the powerful Black-White binary. However, the concept of multiculturalism has proven to be no antidote to binary thinking and the notion of the browning of America has proven highly problematic, despite appearing to be illuminating, perhaps, on initial consideration. In the remainder of this section, we address some of the difficulties residing within the ideological components of the notion of the browning of America.

In addition to browning as numbers and browning as multiculturalism, authors such as Richard Rodriguez (2002) describe the process of browning as a cultural form of *mestizaje* in which elements (and people) mix and are

US mythology of cultural

America becoming brownier

Browning of America is a conspiracy man.

Copyright © 2010, BRILL. All rights reserved.

mixed. "Brown," in his view, is an ideology, a philosophy, and a feeling. In Rodríguez's words, "by brown I mean love" (p. 225). In his book, *Brown: The Last Discovery of America*, Rodríguez conveys that in general terms, brown is an impurity. More personally, Rodríguez views brown as "a cave in [his] memory" (2002, p. 7). In an interview with Suzy Hansen (2002), Rodríguez expands on his notion of brown:

I had a sense that most Americans probably regard Hispanics as brown. But my interest was not in the Hispanic part of that observation but in the brown part of it—what is brown? And it seemed to me that the larger questions about America that the color raised is the fact that we are, all of us, in our various colors, our various hues, melting into each other and creating a brown nation (Hansen, 2002).

In this interview, Rodríguez also discusses browning as Latinization. From his perspective, "the Latinization of the United States is proceeding, is going . . . toward a more playful and vivid notion of brown" (ibid.). Rodríguez's articulations of brown led Ian Stavans to observe that for Rodríguez, "America is about to become América—everyone in it a Hispanic, if not physically, at least metaphorically" (Stavans, 2002).

Two years earlier, *Time* magazine had supported the "blending" notion of the browning of America when journalist Frank Pellegrini suggested that true colorblindness (which he termed "vertical colorblindness") could be achieved through the browning of America (2000). For Pellegrini, the browning of America would be accomplished after "generations of inter-marriage," which he says, "Tiger Woods embodies and will occasionally talk about" (ibid.). Strangely, then, according to Pellegrini's piece in *Time* magazine, a mixed-race Chinese-Black man exemplifies the browning of America. Rodríguez's notions of brown and of Latinization and Pellegrini's concept of vertical colorblindness articulate the conceptual core residing within the browning of America.

For our purposes, the aforementioned notions of the browning of America, as articulated by both Rodríguez and Pellegrini, are problematic for two primary reasons: (1) they adopt a celebratory stance in relation to this browning—assuming that it will be embraced within, and passively accepted by, the United States mainstream, and (2) they assume a particular and given construal of brownness—exemplified either by Latinos/Hispanics or by mixed-race individuals. Acceptance is thought to occur via sheer numbers, multicultural ideals, or mixture/hybridity.

Articulations such as these presume a transformation or conversion of mainstream culture: America will move from having an Anglo-Saxon sensibility to one that is colorblind or brown. Such browning is considered a fact—a fact not envisioned to be a source of antagonism and resistance by United States mainstream culture and the American public. Our view, to the

Browning
↓
colorblind
America

Latinos

~~contrary is that in a post-9/11 world, a growing United States "brown population" has created a sense of insecurity within the mainstream (with anti-immigrant sentiment being but one expression). This situation has opened the very category of "brown" to rhetorical (re-)construction and critique, including the reinforcement of binary categories post-9/11.~~

Browning
Anti-immigrant

We argue that although a process of browning has been taking place within the United States since 9/11, different from the positive stances that celebrate the merger of peoples and cultures, this browning has been used to consolidate individuals and populations perceived to be threats to the country and the American public. Within the post-9/11 context, a less celebratory notion of "brown" has been operative. This deployment of "brown" has capitalized on United States fears and anxieties about public and national safety. Those located outside of the United States' borders of security and comfort have been "browned," reinforcing fear and insecurity around those precisely rendered as "brown."

~~We have dubbed these anxieties and this process the "browning of terror"—a less festive concept than the one invoked by Rodríguez and Pellegrini with the browning of America. The browning of terror marks a purposeful pattern of articulating perceived threats to the security of the national imaginary as originating from racialized ("othered") bodies and spaces. While not exemplifying the classic binary upon which United States race relations have been premised, "brown" nonetheless comes to serve as one of two sides in a dualistic framework and as part of an ideology that constructs and juxtaposes "brown" to the security and safety of the nation and its citizens. "Brown," then, becomes a "racial project" (Omi and Winant, 1994).~~

Browning
of
terror

We will use this framework of "brown as a racial project" to develop our analysis of Barack Obama's candidacy during the 2008 presidential primary season. We contend that from the time that he announced his candidacy on 10 February 2007 until he became the presidential nominee for the Democratic party on 3 June 2008, Obama's persona underwent a systematic process of browning.

3. The Browning of Obama

A. The Question of Patriotism

It would be a shame if the 2008 campaign comes down to Obama's choice to forgo wearing an American flag pin on his lapel—but it could. (Vennoch, 2008)

A year after Obama announced his candidacy to the presidency of the United States, the Associated Press released a story on Obama's perceived lack of patriotism. Under the headline, "Patriotism Questions for Obama. No Flag Pin, No Hand Over His Heart: Is He Exposed?" the story began:

Sen. Barack Obama's refusal to wear an American flag lapel pin along with a photo of him not putting his hand over his heart during the National Anthem led conservatives on the Internet and in the media to question his patriotism" (Associated Press, 2008a).

In addition to Obama's perceived lack of patriotism, the story continued, is the fact that his wife Michelle "has drawn [the] ire [of conservatives], too, for saying recently that she's really proud of her country for the first time in her adult life" (ibid.). According to the article, "Obama already is the subject of a shadowy smear campaign based on . . . [false suggestions that] he's a Muslim intent on destroying the United States" (ibid.). The article also cites reactions from conservative commentators at Fox News, including Mark Williams, who said, "[Obama] felt it OK to come out of the closet as the domestic insurgent he is" (ibid.).

This was not the first time that the patriotism of a democratic candidate has been put into question. In April 2008, *Boston Globe* columnist Joan Vennochi outlined the way in which the past four presidential candidates for the Democratic Party (Michael Dukakis, William Jefferson "Bill" Clinton, Albert Arnold "Al" Gore, Jr., and John Kerry) were all accused of being unpatriotic during their respective election campaigns. Vennochi reminds us that Dukakis was deemed unpatriotic because, as Governor of Massachusetts, he vetoed "a bill requiring students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance" (2008). Clinton was deemed a "draft dodger," while Gore's "five-month tour of duty in Vietnam [was characterized] as military journalism," and Kerry's service in Vietnam was challenged when "fellow veterans . . . questioned the legitimacy of his combat medals and denounced his past antiwar activities" (ibid.). Vennochi concludes her discussion with the following admonition, "No Democrat should ever forget the chapter that embraces a zealous assault on their patriotism" (ibid.).

While certainly true that the patriotism of democratic presidential candidates has been systematically called into question over the past twenty-five years, in the case of the previous four (White) presidential candidates, questions surrounding their patriotism were not tied to questions concerning their Americanness. Dukakis, Clinton, Gore, and Kerry may have been seen as unpatriotic, but they were not seen as un- or anti-American. In the case of Obama, via the process of browning, questions concerning his patriotism were transformed into questions about his Americanness. Mark Williams' comment illustrates this phenomenon, for in a post-9/11 world, the phrase "domestic insurgent" represents much more than name-calling. The phrase draws on seven years of sociopolitical representation of terrorists and enemies of the country.

After his lack of a lapel pin was noted publicly, Obama explained why he did not wear one. In his words:

Obama is
a Muslim
secret
black ops
operative
sent to
destroy
capitalism
etc.

interior
by question

I'm less concerned about what you're wearing on your lapel than what's in your heart. You show your patriotism by how you treat your fellow Americans, especially those who serve. You show your patriotism by being true to our values and ideals. That's what we have to lead with is our values and our ideals" (Wright and Miller, 2007).

He continued, "The truth is that right after 9/11 I had a pin." However, Obama explained, he stopped wearing it shortly thereafter—because talking about war "became a substitute for I think true patriotism, which is speaking out on issues that are of importance to our national security" (ibid.).

Questions regarding Obama's patriotism followed him throughout the primary campaign. What is telling about the repeated questions concerning his patriotism and, by extension, his status as an American is the fact that it cast doubt and positioned him as a threat to the presidency and the country itself.

B. Questioning a Name

"What kind of a name is Barry Obama—for a brother?" [Eric] More asked with a grin. "Actually, my name's Barack Obama," he replied. "That's a very strong name," More told him. Obama responded that he didn't want to have to explain his name. (Wolffe, Ramirez and Bartholet, 2008)

In March 2008, *Newsweek* published an article on Obama's supposed search for identity during his youth and college years. Titled, "When Barry became Barack," the story chronicles a coming of age of sorts, in which Obama matured from a free-spirited child seeking to fit in, to an adult capable of negotiating his mixed-race background and atypical upbringing (Wolffe, Ramirez and Bartholet, 2008). The story was published a month after the Tennessee Republican Party used Obama's middle name in a press release to express concern about the then-Senator's alleged lack of support for Israel. According to the statement, "the party is joining a 'growing chorus of Americans concerned about the future of the nation of Israel . . . if Sen. Barack Hussein Obama is elected president of the United States'" (Mooney, 2008). The statement included a photo of Obama's 2006 trip to Kenya, with a caption indicating his alleged "traditional Muslim garb." The attire was, in fact, "traditional Somali tribal garb" (ibid.).

For the majority of the primary campaign, Obama did not respond to attacks on his name. According to *Time* journalist, Nathan Thornburgh:

the real problem is that if the right wants to start a whispering campaign about the name Hussein, Obama is only helping them. By cutting short the discussion, Obama is banishing his name to the voters' subconscious, where the dark opposites of hope—bigotry and fear—can turn the word over and over again in their minds until November (Thornburgh, 2008).

Obama is a threat to the white House + America?

Barney → Barack

Barney

Copyright © 2010. BRILL. All rights reserved.

Thornburgh concluded his piece by arguing, "it's not too much risk for Obama to stake his campaign on voters' ability to rationally understand the difference between a Hawaii-born Christian and Saddam Hussein, the butcher of Baghdad" (ibid.).

Obama's alleged lack of patriotism and the demonization of his middle name were woven together to create the image of a threatening figure poised to assume control of the nation. Obama's last name was also consistently called into question and associated with that of terrorist Osama bin Laden. In June 2007, while campaigning in South Carolina, as part of his bid to become the Republican presidential nominee, M. Mitt Romney was photographed next to a White woman holding a sign that read, "No to Obama, Osama, and Chelsea's Moma [sic]" (Brusk and Mooney, 2007). Romney was also photographed holding the sign.

A few months later, in October 2007, Romney reacted to an earlier comment made by Democrat Sen. Johnny Reid "John" Edwards regarding "the War on Terror," saying it is a bumper sticker for the Bush Presidency:

I think that is a position which is not consistent with the facts. Actually, just look at what Osam—uh—Barack Obama, said just yesterday. Barack Obama calling on radicals, jihadists of all different types, to come together in Iraq. That is the battlefield. That is the central place, he said. Come join us under one banner. (Luo, 2007)

According to Michael Luo (2007), "the comment set off some confusion among the press corps," as they were "momentarily frantically searching for comments made by Mr. Obama about jihadism and Iraq. It turns out that Mr. Romney was talking about [an] audiotape from [Osama] bin Laden calling on insurgents in Iraq to unite" (ibid.).

In December 2007, during an interview on ABC's "Good Morning America," Glenn Beck, the host of CNN Headline News, caught himself mid-word when he started to say "Osama" in a discussion regarding presidential candidates. He followed up with the statement, "unfortunate name" (Stelter, 2007). Also in December, Alina Cho, a CNN anchor stated the following during an "American Morning" newscast: "Senator Barack Obama's campaign has been dogged with false rumors, among them that Osama is a Muslim." She corrected herself immediately (Stelter, 2007). In April 2008, during a talk at Skidmore College, and while discussing the USA PATRIOT Act, former Attorney General John Ashcroft said to the attendees:

All I'm saying about the [USA] PATRIOT Act is that the elected representatives of this country including Osama, you know, no, not him . . . Obama . . . [boos from the audience] I'm s . . . I . . . I did not mean that. Sorry about that. I apologize publicly to him. And everybody who hasn't made a mistake like that should not continue . . . to . . . umh. . . .

He . . . He voted for the PATRIOT Act and he should have. And if he doesn't care enough to protect the United States to have it in place, it, you know, it be [sic] a serious mark against him (ABCNews.com, 2008).

In June 2008, after presidential primary candidate Senator Hillary Clinton ended her campaign, *The Detroit News* released the following headline: "Clinton, Osama meet to Discuss Unity" (Associated Press, 2008b).

These are just a few examples involving the browning of Obama's name. There are numerous instances in which Barack Obama's name was rendered suspect and many others in which it was confused with that of Osama bin Laden.

Arguably, the collective American psyche was browning Obama's persona even before he announced his presidential aspirations. For instance, in January 2007, a month before Obama announced his candidacy, CNN's Wolf Blitzer was discussing Osama bin Laden, when an on-screen graphic appeared with footage of bin Laden with the caption, "Where Is Obama?" (Stelter, 2007).

Intentionally or unintentionally, genuine mistakes or premeditated jokes, Obama's name was being browned and the associations it evoked became a signal for something nefarious in the collective psyche of the country. This implication added to the sociopolitical imagination, constructing him as a domestic insurgent, and a threat to the country.

C. The Question of Religion

The story of Obama's religious journey is a uniquely American tale. It's one of a seeker, an intellectually curious young man trying to cobble together a religious identity out of myriad influences. (Miller and Wolfe, 2008)

The browning of Obama's patriotism, along with the browning of his name, fostered anxiety and fear regarding other aspects of his life. A key example concerns religion. As pointed out above, Obama and his name have been associated with Islam by numerous online and broadcasting news commentators. For many in the United States, Islam is synonymous with terrorism. In a report released in July 2008 by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, Associate Director Michael Dimock conveyed:

Despite recurrent media attention to the issue . . . the incorrect perception that the Democratic presidential candidate adheres to the Muslim faith or to another non-Christian faith has remained remarkably constant over the course of the 2008 election campaign. (p. 1)

Where
is Obama?

American
Tale

Islam = terrorism

In August 2008, the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press released poll results indicating that 79 percent of those interviewed in March knew at least "a little" about rumors that Obama is a Muslim (2008).

Questions concerning religion were not limited to his perceived Muslim ties, as his actual Christianity was consistently questioned during the campaign as well, especially after videos of Reverend Jeremiah Wright, his pastor, surfaced on the internet. The videos showed Reverend Wright delivering what were deemed inflammatory, anti-American sermons. The two statements seized by the media denounced the country's treatment of Blacks and condemned America as a terrorist country. In 2003, Wright stated:

Jhis *Z* The government gives them the drugs, builds bigger prisons, passes a three-strike law and then wants us to sing "God Bless America." No, no, no, God damn America, that's in the Bible for killing innocent people. God damn America for treating our citizens as less than human. God damn America for as long as she acts like she is God and she is supreme. (Ross and El-Buri, 2008)

News agencies reported that Reverend Wright told his congregation on the Sunday after 9/11 that the United States had brought on al Qaeda's attacks because of its own terrorism. In Wright's words, "We bombed Hiroshima, we bombed Nagasaki, and we nuked far more than the thousands in New York and the Pentagon, and we never batted an eye" (ibid.). Although Obama never made such pronouncements, and although he was not in church when they were made, Obama's patriotism and standing as an American were again questioned. Senator Hillary Clinton, who was running against him for the democratic nomination, repeatedly expressed that she would not have remained at that church. The constant demonization of Obama as a Muslim, or the calling into question of his Christianity, contributed to his browning and marked him as an outsider and a threat.

4. The Depths of Browning and the Candidacy of Barack Hussein Obama

~~The browning of Barack Obama continued into the presidential race when primaries ended and Obama became the official candidate of the Democratic Party. Election night 2008 provided the most vivid example of the intensity of the process of browning during this time. At 8:00 pm Pacific Time, on 4 November 2008, CNN announced that Obama had become the President-elect of the United States (CNN, 2008). Shortly after the announcement, his opponent for the Republican ticket, Senator John McCain, delivered his concession speech to a crowd of disappointed supporters in Arizona.~~

Pertinent about Senator John McCain's concession speech is not its contents per se, which were described as gracious, but the visceral, violent reac-

tion emanating from the crowd. At each mention of Obama's name, the crowd furiously booed. When the Senator promised to work with Obama, "members of the dejected crowd shouted 'no way!'" (Keck, 2008). Kristi Keck remarks that "some McCain voters called Obama a 'terrorist,' while others expressed fear of an Obama presidency" (2008). McCain was booed when he urged everyone to be respectful and not fear Obama.

McCain was likewise booed just a month before election night in a town hall meeting in Minnesota every time he attempted to tell the crowd that Obama is not Arab (Martin and Parnes, 2008). When a woman in the crowd said, "I can't trust Obama. I have read about him and he's not, he's not uh—he's an Arab," McCain grabbed the microphone away from her and tried to reassure her that Obama was not an Arab, but "a decent family man" (ibid.). This remark followed a statement by McCain that Obama is "a decent person," to which members of the audience yelled, "Come on, John!" and "'liar,' and 'terrorist,' referring to Obama" (ibid.). The same scenario repeated itself across the country in various rallies held by Senator McCain and Governor Sarah Palin, his running mate.

McCain supporters going so far to disrespect him—their candidate and the man they wanted to be president—for making generous remarks about his competitor, reflects the depth of Obama's browning.

Obama won the election with the popular and electoral vote (he obtained over 63 million votes, and over 360 of the electoral vote—he needed 270 to win). But let us not forget that Senator McCain obtained over 56 million votes, and over 170 of the electoral vote. After the election, the map of the United States still looked impressively red. If those vocal Obama haters are any indication of the 56 million Americans who voted for McCain, we must conclude that the election results were the culmination of two years of intense browning, a process that began before Obama announced his candidacy, intensified during the primary campaign, and ripened during the presidential election process.

Obama viewed his candidacy as imperfect. Following the developments of his primary campaign, we can reason that his candidacy was also threatening. The questions in the public imaginary about his patriotism, his "Muslim name," and his religious affiliations, along with his race as a Black man, all contributed to a sociopolitical imagination that browned his public persona. During the seventeen months he was immersed in the primary campaign, and the five months he campaigned for the presidency, Barack Obama was cast as a threat to (White) America, tradition, and the American way. Obama was seen as a new kind of terror.

Don't
Fear Obama

WTF

That's a
Brown Ambassador

I am not Your Negro *Malcolm X*

- Duty to be free
- 1955 - 1968 Martin
- 1968 Malcolm
- MLK 28 1968
- Marxist people = Black students = no whites
- Little Rock Ark.
- - integration
- God hates integration
- white good
- Prayer Day
- Black - No
- Dance, folk, dance
- Bill Miller - white teacher
- - took in - 10 - yr. boy
- doesn't hate whites
- whites acted as if they were white
- Richard won't wake up
- Black janitor
- Uncle Louis Cabin
- My country men were my enemy
- Rooting for Jerry Cooper instead of Indian
- actor / witness

Thin line

- Not all ~~white~~ whites were devils
- NAACP - desegregation
- Oswald
- it is communist

- Birmingham
- non-resistance or non-violent resistance
- eldest rebel for the younger
- white don't believe that Blacks are human

- Moral conviction
- segregated at the school door
- Pity's game in their game
- Blacks have always been trying to survive

• Inspired by what you see

• Lamin' King 4/4

• brother has killed brother party they are brothers

• Tentation of Life

• root of hatred - negro - Black

• root of hatred - Jewish - White

• James Collier's unfinished Book

Remember This House: Remnants of the Love and Power of MLK, Malcolm X & Medgar Evers.

Documentary follows the themes seen as well as James Collier and views of Whites to Blacks and vice versa.

• Collier speaks most of how Whites cannot accept that Blacks are of the same flesh as Whites.