

The Perils of Dehumanizing Man: A Judgment against Prejudice*

by
Azhar Ibrahim Alwee
National Institute of Education

“But a person who experiences his own integrity only in opposition to other people, who feels secure only by undermining the security of others, can scarcely be said to have a purpose or integrity of his own.”

Gordon W. Allport

Introduction

To understand the causes of prejudice and stereotyping is crucial for a humane ordering of society. According to Gordon W Allport, prejudice can be generally attributed to (a) hostility of one group against another and (b) ignorance or erroneous judgment about the others. It is “an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or towards an individual because he is a member of that group.”¹ Similarly, James W Rineheart defines prejudice as “a feeling of hostility toward the members of racial, nationality, and ethnic groups.”² Prejudice as an attitude can manifest in a number of ways. It could be an aversion to avoid an individual/group (conative component); an irrational belief about the target group (cognitive component) and sheer dislike of the latter (affective component).³ It will be naïve in thinking that a prejudice that a person may hold is only directed against ‘one’ group that s/he is not comfortable with, since this attitudinal pathology does not operate in this selected-directed fashion. On the contrary, writes Allport, “A person’s prejudice is unlikely to be merely a specific attitude to a specific group; it is more likely to be a reflection of his whole habit of thinking about the world.” It means prejudice does not discriminate only one, but *all*. This

* This is an edited version of a paper presented by the author at the HarmonyWorks! Conference 2005: "Regardless of Race, Language or Religion" Organized by Central Singapore Joint Social Service Centre on 22nd November 2005 at Jurong Junior College.

¹ Gordon W Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*. (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 9

² James W Rinehart, “The Meaning of Stereotypes,” *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 2, No.3, 1963, pp. 136-7

³ Read John F Dovidio and Samuel L. Gaertner, “Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism: Historical Trends and Contemporary Approaches,” in *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*. (New York: Academic Press, 1986), p.3

recognition is very important because prejudicial thinking/act if once allowed to persist in one particular domain, will soon spread cancerously to other domains of life, thus affecting not only the victims of the prejudiced acts but also the prejudicial person himself. A climate of mistrust generated from prejudicial thinking must be diagnosed accordingly in all societies before it snowballs into reactive and fascist tendencies.

Speaking of prejudice, one of course cannot ignore the problem of racism. The latter refers to, “the belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance.”⁴ The horrendous effects of hatred stemming from prejudice and racism are well documented in human history. Hundreds of genocide, massacres and riots were the result of racism exploded into bloody conflicts. It is a human frailty, in as much as it is a human failure and ignorance to address the problem. But failure can be avoided if we diagnose our current situation, planning wisely to avert at all cost the tolerance for any forms of prejudice, racism and bigotry.

Prejudice Propensity

In one way or another, all of us have, albeit in differing propensity, harbored or entertained the feeling of prejudice against Others, whom we regard as not belonging or being part of us.

“This propensity [of a human being to prejudice] lies in his normal and natural tendency to form generalizations, concepts, categories, whose contents represent an oversimplification of his world of experience. His rational categories keep close to first-hand experience, but he is able to form irrational categories as readily. In these even a kernel of truth may be lacking, for they can be composed wholly of hearsay evidence, emotional projections, and fantasy.”⁵

The point here again is not to say that since all of us have prejudice, that itself equals off everything, and it is therefore natural to be so. Constraint of space would not allow us to discuss the reasons for prejudice which fulfill certain human cravings and psychological needs, albeit detestable its reasoning. Amongst these are: (a) the need for categorization and simplifications ; (b) anxiety and the need for security and (c) the ease of scapegoating to blame others for one’s misfortunes or guilt/fault.⁶ In this paper, we are more concern with the fact of how we mitigate it, that is, how we can prevent it from snowballing into a crisis. This is obviously not just the task of the State, but also the responsibility of all citizens who may function in the private sectors, civil societies, religious groups, educational institutions, and the bureaucracy, bearing always in mind that, “[a]ll progress toward the reduction of

⁴ Cited in Daniel G. Solorzano & Tara J Yosso, “From Racial Stereotyping and Deficit Discourse: Toward a Critical Race Theory in Teacher Education,” *Multicultural Education*, Fall 2001, p. 4

⁵Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, p. 27

⁶ Allport, “Prejudice and the Individual,” in *The Person in Psychology: Selected Essays* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), pp. 212-14

prejudice will be met by vociferous resistance from the functional bigot,”⁷ yet without making any chance for them to set the agenda in our determination in combating against prejudice, stereotyping, discriminations and racism. If we are truly serious to build a democratic society, the recognition of the equality of all is imperative. This in turn is very much condition of how we see or perceive Others. If it colours by prejudicial thought, then it impairs the very idea of equality which we think we hold dearly. In a meritocratic ethos that we embrace, the equality in opportunity must also be affirmed, that is, the quality in dignity in all aspects of life, both as human being and as rightful citizens.

The challenges of prejudice are not something abstract or conceptual matters. It should never be underestimated since it affects human relationship deeply whether we realize or not. It affects the individual’s security and even goodwill. It can pervade in social interaction and in our imagination, especially in the case where we tolerate exclusive feelings and thinking. What we failed to understand is that the prejudice and stereotypes that we made against one group (consciously or unconsciously) is injuriously insulting for them. This in turn unnecessarily harbors ill-feeling, especially in the case where the perpetrator simply dismissed any discomfort by the others (victims) as “you’re being sensitive” or “we mean it as a joke.” Often we fail to realize that in our daily utterance, whether we are conscious or otherwise, contain a number of prejudicial and stereotypical statements, which we sometime may naively be apologetic about it. The following utterances drawn from the American context, certainly has its parallel to our case:

“When I talk about those Blacks, I really wasn’t talking about you.”

“You’re not like the rest of them. You’re different.”

“I don’t think of you as a Mexican.”

“You speak such a good English”

“Aren’t all Asians good in math?”

“If only there were more of them like you”

“All Native Americans are such spiritual people.”

“But you speak without an accent.”⁸

One need not necessarily master a theoretical paradigm to understand why prejudice exists. Instead, one needs to reflect deeply as to why we think and act in a certain way in accepting and uttering categorical prejudicial terms, whereby we put fixed (natural) traits to a particular ethnic group or to our own. For instance, it is not uncommon that some of us hold the views that *generally* the Chinese economic success is attributed to their unethical dealings and money-minded thinking; that the Malays lagging behind economically and educationally because they have not tried hard enough, having undesirable work ethic or simply lazy; Indians’ theatricalness making them unreliable and rhetorical. We are also quick to associate gambling and cheating with the Chinese; divorce and drug addiction with the Malays; and drunkardness and wife-beating with the Indians, as if their culture and practices condone or encourage such practices. Unfortunately, these prejudicial views or stereotypes

⁷ Ibid., p. 216

⁸ Cited in Daniel G. Solorzano & Tara J Yosso, “From Racial Stereotyping and Deficit Discourse: Toward a Critical Race Theory in Teacher Education,” p. 6

are always attributed as the “general view” towards a particular group and not many are concern to problematize it since it bears no immediate harm, nor malicious intention. This view must be rejected and corrected. Moreover for some ill-gotten reasons, we do not want to have neighbours of certain ethnic groups; we do not want to stop or share cab because for fear the cab will be affected by body odors; we do not want to employ someone because he speaks a different language, is of different colour skin and has different work ethic; we do not want to eat on the same table in the canteen because we think the food others eat as filthy; we do not want to enter the place of worship of others because we think they are wayward and many more.

Colonial Racist Ideology

Like all other social phenomenon and ideas, prejudice and racism do not exist in vacuum. Historically, racist ideology formed a central repertoire in colonial authority to justify their dominance over the ‘inferior’ subjects.⁹ The legacy of colonial rule is significantly a racial ideology which still permeates our thinking and action in the present. Contemporary racial prejudice has its roots in colonialism since in the latter, as Fanon aptly points out: “is not possible to enslave men without logically making them inferior through and through. And racism is only the emotional, affective, sometimes intellectual explanation of this inferiorization.”¹⁰ It was the colonial projection of racial hierarchy that somehow colours the perception about race in post-colonial period:

“[C]lassifications of race within humanity are primarily instruments for subordinating one human to another on the alleged grounds that racial differences constitute degrees of humanity. The maintenance of the colonial system gave rise to a particular legitimation of racism. Racism became one of the principal instruments of colonial domination and the means of defining one’s place as object and subject.Colonialism draws significantly from Darwinism for its legitimation....The Darwinian paradigm became the basis for scientific racism...”¹¹

If racism fed the colonial imagining of its superiority, the end of colonialism does not mean an end to this. As one scholar observed: “Even if Asian rejected the colonial assumptions of white superiority and the stereotypes of their own ethnic community, they tended to accept the unfounded generalizations of innate racial differences about other communities.”¹² Hence to say that it is gone, along with colonialism, is utterly naïve. Violent

⁹ Read Syed Hussein Alatas. *The Myth of the Lazy Native: A Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th century and Its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*. (London: Frank Cass, 1977).

¹⁰ Cited in Claudia Wright, “National Liberation, Consciousness, Freedom and Frantz Fanon,” *History of European Ideas*, Vol.15,No.1-3, p. 431

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.430

¹² Charles Hirschman, “The Making of Race in Colonial Malaya: Political Economy and Racial Ideology,” *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 1, No.2, 1986, p. 357.

racism and apartheid still persist in some parts of the world. Subtle and sophisticated racism exist today in various fronts; in socio-cultural activities, economy, academic scholarship, state policies, mass media, education, and international relations. The legacy of colonial racist ideology perpetuates the contemporary prejudice and stereotype amongst people of different cultural and religious background. In an uncritical intellectual milieu, the proposition of ideas from the superior West (formerly colonial masters) has always gained greater currency and ascendancy. Instead any form of criticisms of the latter's biases are seen as polemical and emotional, thus allows for the continuation and transformation of the negative views towards those who are deemed as inferior, be it in the past or present or perhaps also in the future.

Fear and Misunderstanding of Others

Indeed the fear and suspicious of the Others had manifested throughout human history, invariably resulted to feeling of superiority of one group against another, leading to great destruction and displacement.¹³ But this should not be taken as innately human, such that human being is naturally prejudicial and therefore we cannot do much about it. Such idea is dangerous, not unlike the argument that war is something 'natural' in human societies.¹⁴ Most importantly, we must be made to see that the acts of prejudice against another human being dehumanizes the latter's of his/her rights and dignity. But it doesn't stop here. By being prejudice to the others, one actually exposes himself to a dehumanizing living. In deliberating the problem of prejudice, it will be counterproductive if we just narrate how one group had been the victim of prejudice of another (e.g. the colored people by the Whites or the colored Asiatic against black Negro). Instead, following the perspectives of problem-posing pedagogy, it will be wiser in fact to narrate and critique the various manifestations of prejudices and stereotypes as embraced, harbored or uttered by *all* groups. Obviously the point here is not to affirm these prejudices but to subject it to open critical scrutiny, asking throughout why these prejudice or stereotypes came about, why it persists and what can be done to denounce and mitigate it.

The Bad Exclusive

The challenges in many societies, especially so in a pluralistic setting, is the fact that "to the out-groups we ascribe all vices, all evil intentions, all atrocities. To the in-group belong all virtues."¹⁵ Exclusionist thinking breeds prejudicial thinking, with high correlation between

¹³ Read, for instance Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States*. (New York: HarperPerennial, 2005) especially Chapter I.

¹⁴ Such idea is forcefully argued against by the humanist psychoanalyst, Erich Fromm's *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. (London: Cape, 1974)

¹⁵ Allport, "Basic Principles in Improving Human Relations," in *Cultural Groups and Human Relations*. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 24

the two. Prejudice does not select against what it dislikes. Once we harbor prejudice against one group, it could mean that it extend against others, in a matter of time, or even immediate. As Allport noted,

“A person who is anti-Negro is usually anti-Semitic, anti-labour, anti-foreigner. Conversely, if a person’s self-esteem and his esteem for other have blended, he is likely to be friendly with members of all groups.”¹⁶

The psychological and attitudinal profiling of a prejudicial bigoted personality is best given by Allport. The bigot person sees “human relations predominantly in terms of power, not love.” He continues:

“Hierarchies are thus created in his thinking. Most groups are seen as standing below his group, and as pressing for power, and therefore as menacing his security. To stay firmly on his island of security, he develops a strict, institutional and conventional style of behavior. The bigot is conservative, very much of conformist in general. But to be conventional means that he has to repress many of his own impulses. Thus he is a person in conflict; he is not an integrated person. Much that happens to him seems alien, something dangerous, something apart. He cannot grapple with it. Any sort of ambiguities and indefiniteness – and democracy is replete with ambiguous, unstructured situations – troubles him and he cannot take it. He is rigid in his way of solving problems. He cannot flex his mind to take new way of living – a frozen style of life. His categories are fixed and narrow. Unable to extend his circle of affiliation, he is suspicious, provincial, hostile. Afraid of freedom, he favors an authoritarian way.”¹⁷

A young nation like us, which is made up of mosaics of ethnic, religious and linguistic groupings, the social fabric can be easily affected if we allow elements of racism and prejudice in our midst. Respect of differences must come along with the recognition of common values. Differences, through critical education, should be accorded in positive light, such that differences of others (against oneself) do not mean an inferiority, substandard or aberration. Yet at the same time, differences cannot be a license to legitimize exclusivism of a grouping/community. Thus any forms and manifestations of exclusivism must be kept in checked.

Types of Prejudice

(a) **Ethnic/Colour:** The most common prejudice is the racial type which manifest the suspicion/fear/intolerant against the out-groups . The latter as the epitome of all negatives, while we (or the in-group) are untainted of all those negativities. Racial prejudice can range from subtle to overt and violent ones. It manifests not only in inter-human day to day relationship, but also in ideologies and intellectual scholarship, in which the latter may even

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 23-24

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 24

support such prejudice or remain ambivalent about it. In human history, it is this racial prejudice that has given sanctions to genocide, wars, apartheid, riots and overall hatred and animosity against other ethnic groups.

(b) Religious. It will be naïve simply to reduce religion as the primary cause for many prejudices that we witness today in as much as it will be the assertion that religion can be antidote for hatred and animosity. But to blame or pin point scriptural/textual sources as motivation for prejudice reflects our own reductionistic stand about religion. Mere scriptural reference to justify or demonstrate prejudice is naïve. Herein lies the importance of a sound psychological and sociological clarity about this subject matter. Allport's mastery over the nuances of this complex and sensitive issues is crucial to be pondered upon, though he specifically discussed on White religious affiliation in America:

“The reason churchgoers on the average are more prejudiced than nonchurchgoers is not because religion instills prejudice. It is rather that a large number of people, by virtue of their psychological makeup, require for their economy of living both prejudice and religion. Some, for example, are tormented by self-doubt and insecurity. Prejudice enhances their self-esteem; religion provides them a tailored security. Others are guilt-ridden; prejudice provides a scapegoat, and religion, relief. Still others live in fear of failure. Prejudice provides an explanation in terms of menacing out-group; religion promises a heavenly, if not terrestrial, reward. Thus, for many individuals, the functional significance of prejudice and religion is identical.”¹⁸

An important point that needs to be stressed is that it will be erroneous to speak of religious doctrines itself as *the* source of prejudice, because the socio-economic and political-cultural factors come into play in the manifestation of prejudice. Also, we need to know what type of religious affiliation/orientation that has been promoted or tolerated in the public domain.¹⁹ A universal pluralistic ethical religion is surely more able to mitigate prejudice and exclusivism than an inclusive and parochial one.²⁰ Thus Allport is right when he opines: “The role of religion is paradoxical. It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice...Some people say only cure for prejudice is more religion; some say the only cure is to abolish religion.”²¹ If history had proven that many religious sentiments had failed to perform the healing for human animosity, and instead fuelling it, then one needs to go further to explore what type of religion that had been promoted, conceptualized and mobilized. Simply put, an authoritarian reading to religious scriptures will engender an

¹⁸ Allport, “The Religious Context of Prejudice,” *The Person in Psychology: Selected Essays*, p. 225

¹⁹ According to Allport, an intrinsic type of religious orientation is one that could minimize prejudice, in comparison to an extrinsic type. “The relationship between religion and prejudice hinges on the type of religion that the personal life harbors. When it is extrinsic, the tie with prejudice is close; when intrinsic, prejudice is restrained...” Read, “Religion and Prejudice,” *Personality and Social Encounter: Selected Essays*. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), p. 266

²⁰ This is a point made in Richard Miller, “Reflecting on Racism,” *The Journal of Religious Thought*, Vol. 55/56 Issue 2/1, Spring-Fall, 1999.

²¹ Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, p. 444

authoritarian will and ethics, while a humanistic and biophilic reading restores a sense of common humaneness and love of mankind regardless of creed and colour.²² Therefore, instead of just speaking about the resources of religion that can undo prejudice and promotes harmonious living, we need to be aware of the differences amongst the diverse religious communities in our midst, of its theological structures and the socio-cultural contexts where it operates.²³ This means our preparedness to engage in problem-oriented deliberation on the ways in which religion induces prejudice and exclusive thinking.

(c) **Linguistic.** This type of prejudice manifests when we see the spoken and written language of others as backward, unsophisticated and even threatening.²⁴ Viewing that only one's language is standard while others are aberrations complicates the problems of prejudice in a multi-ethnic society. The claim of one's language superiority means an 'expectation' of cultural subordination of others, in fact a denial for the latter's identity. The devaluation of others' languages and cultures certainly has pedagogical effects on the student ability to learn, as some studies have suggested.²⁵ In a more extreme case of prejudice, we see the assertion of language deficiency and biological determinism, in which there is a tendency of "blaming the children's parents, the culture, and their language for the lack of success in school" – a view that persists, unfortunately in many societies.²⁶ Moreover we also need to be sensitive of the fact that ideological prejudices "express themselves in language – in the syntax and the semantics – and also in concrete forms of acting, choosing, of valuing, of dressing, and even in the way one says hello in the street."²⁷ A point made by Donaldo Macedo, further clarifies how prejudice is sustained through language used, although many seem to accept it as purely incidental or lexical choice.

“[L]anguage [can] be used to distort so as to make social discrimination invisible. The same ideological mechanisms operate with the label people of color, which has even been embraced by many racial and ethnic groups to designate themselves. By calling non-White racial and ethnic groups “people of color,” one is proposing that white is not a color, even though colorless white as a proposition is a semantic

²² Read Pitirim Sorokin, *The Ways and Power of Love: Types, Factors and Techniques of Moral Transformation*. (Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2002); Erich Fromm, *The Heart of Man: Its genius for good and evil*. (New York: Perennial Library, 1964).

²³ For instance when we see how theological injunctions sanctify ethnocentrism as shown in the Christian Whites exclusion of the Blacks from their churches in some parts of America, albeit the pulpit's advocacy of universality of brotherhood and love in Christendom. But it must be emphasized here that the presence of racial bias in theological discourse or in religious institutions are the making of human being, and not *innately* the characteristics of universal religions.

²⁴ Read, Bill Aschcroft, "Language and Race," *Social Identities*, Vol.7, No.3, 2001, pp. 311-328

²⁵ Read Donaldo Macedo, "The Illiteracy of English-Only-Literacy" *Educational Leadership*, Dec 1999/Jan 2000, pp. 62-67

²⁶ Read Barbara Flores, Patricia Tefft Cousin & Esteban Diaz, "Transforming Deficit Myths About Learning, Language and Culture," *Language Arts*, Vol.68, 1991, pp. 369-379

²⁷ Read, Freire and Macedo, "A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol.65, No.3, 1995, p. 395

impossibility. Ideologically, “people of color” functions as a mechanism to make “White” as an ideological category invisible. However, it is precisely this through this invisibility that the dominant category White supremacy makes the ideological distinction against which all non-White groups are measured so as to be devalued and denigrated. This process facilitates the continued dance with bigotry without having to take responsibility for the poisonous effects of racism.”²⁸

In multi-lingual societies an imposition or preference of one language is a politically divisive issue in as much as it impairs the democratic morale. As put forward by an American writer who calls for multi-lingualism: “If we lived in a democratic state our language would have to hurtle, fly, curse, and sing, in all the common American names, all the undeniable and representative participating voices of everybody here. We would not tolerate the language of the powerful and, thereby, lose all respects for words, per se. We would make our language conform to the truth of our many selves and we would make our language lead us into the equality of power that a democratic state must represent.”²⁹

(d) **Class.** The preference of class distinction expresses when an economically superior group deemed the style, taste and values of other (economically-inferior) groups as substandard and demeaning. The intolerance of other groups’ dialect, consumption pattern, fashion, diet, lifestyle and even residential location marks the classic class prejudice, for the association with the latter means affecting the rich’s social standing and reputation. In fact the most common distinction made between the affluent and the working class group is the spoken language. Those who speak the non-standardized version of the language (especially English) are regarded as one from low social origin and educational background.

(e) **Gender prejudice** commonly exist in a situation where men see women as inferior partner that should not be accorded equal rights, respect and opportunity. In a patriarchal society, men’s elevation to superiority often takes place at the expense of women’s subordination. Sexism in language and hesitancy in granting equal privileges and opportunities to women are some of the obvious prejudice and discrimination against women. Nevertheless it must be emphasized here that gender prejudice does not mean exclusively referring to the prejudice or discrimination of men towards women since the reverse could also takes place.³⁰ One common example of how prejudice against women manifests is the expectation that women should be the symbol and repository of a community’s cultural tradition. Women must be the keeper and demonstrator of ‘authentic’ tradition, but never likely to be its interpreter. Thus they are easily expected to dress “ethnically”, (in important occasions and events), behave accordingly to the traditional cultural norms and etiquette, while the men are free to maintain or acquire the modern (often Western) manifestation in dressing and lifestyle.³¹

²⁸ Ibid., p. 398

²⁹ June Jordan, cited in Donaldo Macedo, Bessie Dendrinos and Panayota Gounari. *The Hegemony of English*. (Boulder, Colo. : Paradigm, 2004), pp. 43-44

³⁰ Or for that matter, prejudice or discrimination against “the third sex” or other sexual orientations.

³¹ This tendency can be observed in many Asian societies, such had been the case in post-colonial India: “The feminine and the woman came to be the signifier of an essence of Indianness. It thus became necessary for the

The Unproductive Internalization

The internalizing of stereotyping can lead to self-contempt, and ashamed of one's own identity, which in turn has impact on personality development, self-worth, including the confidence to function meaningfully in public. We shall understand this perhaps from an utterance of a young Negro who lived in apartheid and racist America of the early nineteenth century:

“Why should I strive hard and acquire all the constituents of a man, if the prevailing genius of the land admit me not as such or but in an inferior degree! Pardon me if I feel insignificant and weak... What are my prospects? To what shall I turn my hand? Shall I be a mechanic? No one will employ me; white boys won't work with me. Shall I be a merchant? No one will have me in his office; white clerks won't associate with me. Drudgery and servitude, then, are my prospective portion. Can you be surprised at my discouragement?”³²

Indeed several studies have shown that negative stereotypes have great psychological implications for it “foster a climate of mistrust that results in depressed performance.”³³ Allport himself recognizes this: “One's reputation, whether false or true, cannot be hammered, hammered, hammered, into one's head without doing something to one's character.”³⁴ It even has great implication to education. Since stereotyping simplifies thought process in a very bias manner, it actually affects the nurturing of a rational mind and the capacity to think soundly with substantive evidence and reasoning:

“Stereotypes subvert these goal; they stand as the antithesis of both sound reason and accurate information. To the extent that persons categorically generalize about racial, nationality, and ethnic groups, the knowledge they transmit is erroneous. It is based upon fallacious logic and is not justified by facts. Stereotypes encourage and

nationalist-modernist project to define femininity so that it is adequately differentiable from what was considered “Western.” The moral and civil responsibilities of a modern citizen of the nation-state could then be carried out in the confines of the space outside of the “home” –the space for the masculine –while nationalist identity could be safeguarded inside the “home” –the space for the feminine. The control over the definition of the feminine attributes – and thereby a power to objectify the woman—became one of the necessities for the nationalist-modernist discourse. “True” feminine attributes came to be defined as those that would not threaten the difference between “home” and the “world.” Cited in Richard Harvey Brown, “Cultural Representation and Ideological Domination,” *Social Forces*, 71, 3, 1993, p. 671

³² Cited in Carol Camp Yeakey, “Race, Schooling, and Class in American Society,” *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 59, No.1, 1990, p. 3

³³ Read, David M Marx, Joseph L.Brown & Claude M.Steele, “Allport's Legacy and Situational Press of Stereotypes,” *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 55, No.3, 1999, pp. 491-502

³⁴ Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, p. 142

produce non-rational thought. Rational thought requires the individual to seek, sift, and evaluate evidence. Stereotypes, in contrast, furnish ready-made, oversimplified answers to complex problems. They also distort perception and impede rational judgments.”³⁵

And certainly, stereotypes as a form of prejudice will have a direct effect on policy formulations especially in the case when the majority (especially the power elites) holds certain stereotypes about the minorities. This is noted by Simo V Virtanen & Leonie Hardy on how new forms of racial prejudice in US still affect the policy-making on blacks.

“White public opinion, thus, moved in the early 1960s from an emerging consensus on the provision to blacks of basic rights of citizenship To growing disagreement over how to ensure equal opportunity especially on highly visible issues such as school integration and workplace equity. The consideration brought by citizens to discussions of racial policy changed in tandem with this shift in policy climate. Instead of debating blacks’ innate ability and intelligence, racial policy elicited concerns about blacks’ unwillingness to work to the forefront of the debate. In other words, the change in policy climate increased the relevance of long-standing racial stereotypes to discussions of contemporary government policy. In the past, these two forms of racial prejudice may have gone together, leading whites who supported racial stereotypes to oppose racial programs because they viewed blacks as inferior. But as growing number whites rejected the notion of black inferiority, the two forms of prejudice may have become increasingly dissociated. This meant that old-fashioned racists continued to oppose all government racial policies, while opposition to programs designed to increase black opportunity also arose among whites who endorsed negative racial stereotypes consistent with their belief that blacks lack ambition, violate the work ethic, and responsible for their own failures. In that sense, the new racism is not a new form of prejudice but rather an existing form of prejudice with a new relevance to considerations of racial policy.”³⁶

Generally the unproductive internalization of prejudice affects the confidence and the sense of self-worth. It further aggravates in the period of identity crisis among youth and adolescents. To avoid the negative attribution about their ethnic and religious stereotypes, there could be a tendency to flee from the fixed categorization as attributed to their ethnicity. All these are partly attributed to a lower confidence of one’s own culture, which had been attributed falsely in negative terms stereotypically. So it is no surprise that some youth start to imitate the cultural manifestations of other ‘sophisticated’ cultures such as the American, European and Japanese, and lately Korean, deemed as modern, cool and hype. This is an example of a captive mind at work as a result of internalizing the negative attributions on one’s own culture and identity.

³⁵ James W Rinehart, “The Meaning of Stereotypes,” *Theory into Practice*, p. 143

³⁶ Read Simo V Virtanen & Leonie Hardy, “Old-Fashioned Racism and New Forms of Racial Prejudice,” *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 60, No.2, 1998, pp. 313-14

The Simplification of Stereotypes

“Aladin was the son of a poor tailor. He lived in Peking, the capital city of China. He was always idle and lazy and liked to play better than to work: What kind of a boy was he: *Negro; Chinese; French; or Dutch?*”

The majority of the children gave *Negro* as their answer.”³⁷

Stereotype according to Allport is a consequence of prejudice and discrimination since it developed in order to justify and rationalize the prejudice itself. He defines stereotype as “an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category.”³⁸ However, in our context, the pervasiveness of stereotypical thinking is a challenge that has not been given its due attention, especially amongst the *avant-garde* circles, thinking that this subject as *passé* to be discussed. In our denunciation of stereotyping thinking, it is crucial for us to take note how stereotypes are being disseminated, socialized, and maintained:

“Stereotypes, like languages, are learned in interaction with others and undergo a developmental process. While children in their early years can often distinguish between themselves and members of some minority groups, they are unable to apply descriptive labels to these groups....As the child advances in age and in school, his beliefs about minority-group members become more definite, less idiosyncratic, and more in agreement with the beliefs of others. Once it is realized that stereotypes are learned and undergo a process of development, it becomes important to know from whom they are learned. The answer can be found primarily in the child’s network of interpersonal relations. Individuals responsible for the socialization of the child, such as parents, relatives, and educators, are basic sources of stereotype diffusion, along with siblings, classmates, and neighbourhood play groups.”³⁹

Some of the stereotypes in currency today are so blatant, which mean that it could be identified rather easily, and hence to be denounced. However the challenging ones manifested in many subtle ways, or a form of *vulgar ideas* presented in a palatable eloquence.⁴⁰ The domain of our daily language use is an important site where we could detect the overt and covert expressions of prejudice, which in turn allow for (a) the acceptance of words/concept that we use daily which may contain prejudicial sentiment, yet seen as

³⁷ Cited in James W. Rinehart, “The Meaning of Stereotypes,” p. 137

³⁸ Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, p. 191

³⁹ James W Rinehart, “The Meaning of Stereotypes,” *Theory into Practice*, pp. 140-41.

⁴⁰ Refer to our deliberation on this subject in Azhar Ibrahim Alwee, “*The Eloquence of Vulgar: Deliberation on the Corruption of Meaning*,” Paper presented at the Series on Social Discourses seminar. Organized by the Reading Group, Singapore, 10th June 2005.

something normal or standard ; and (b) it further buttress the ideology or orientation that support such prejudice to the point that such expression invokes no feeling of wrongdoing and harboring malicious thought. For instance, as expressed in the following articulation: “Janet is a black girl *but* she is kind and beautiful.” Such expression denotes an implicit prejudice, suggesting that it is almost an aberration for the fact that black people *can* be kind and beautiful, which in many ordinary instances, they *must* be unkind and unpleasant/ugly, by virtue of being black.

Donaldo Macedo’s criticism on the ambivalence on the part of language experts (or other intellectuals alike) to speak out against the corruption of meaning, warrant our attention. The academic circles, supposedly the eloquent interpreter of ideas, as Macedo noted, seldom object to the linguistic distortions that disfigure reality, albeit they may be preoccupied with the issues of language refinement, style and standard, and disciplined structures:

“[T]hey readily accept ‘ethnic cleansing,’ a euphemism for genocide, while, on the other hand, they will, with certain automatism, point to the jargon quality of terms such as ‘oppression,’ ‘subordination’ and ‘praxis.’ If we were to deconstruct the term ‘ethnic cleansing,’ a euphemism for genocide, while, on the other hand, they will, with certain automatism, point to the jargon quality of terms such as ‘oppression,’ ‘subordination’, and ‘praxis.’ If we were to deconstruct the term ‘ethnic cleaning’ we would see that it prevents us from becoming horrified by Serbian brutality and horrendous crimes against Bosnian Muslims. The mass killing of women, children, and the elderly and the rape of women and girls as young as five years old take on the positive attribute of “cleansing,” which leads us to conjure a reality of “purification” of the ethnic “filth” ascribed to Bosnian Muslims, in particular, and to Muslims the world over, in general.”

He continues:

“I also seldom heard any real protest from these same academics who want “language clarity” when, during the Gulf War, the horrific blood bath of the battlefield became a “theater of operation,” and the violent killing of over one hundred thousand Iraqis, including innocent women, children, and the elderly by our “smart bombs,” was sanitized into a technical term, “collateral damage.”...Although these academics accept the dominant standard discourse, they aggressively object to any discourse that fractures the dominant language and bares the veiled reality in order to name it. Thus, a discourse that names it becomes, in their view, imprecise and unclear, and wholesale euphemisms such as “disadvantaged,” “disenfranchised,” “educational mortality,” “theater of operation,” “collateral damage,” and “ethnic cleansing” remain unchallenged since they are part of the dominant social construction of images that are treated as unproblematic and clear.”⁴¹

⁴¹ Paulo Freire and Donaldo Macedo, “A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race,” *Harvard Education Review*, Vol., 65, No.3, 1955. pp. 392-3

There are many other instances where the prejudice in language escaped from being subjected to scrutiny. Some of our word corpus, which we have used and taken for granted, reflects the loaded prejudicial sentiments. Thus the term **black** denote all negations, ranging from **blackmagic**, **blacksheep**, **blacklist**, **blackmail**, **blackmarket** etc. Black has only meaning and can stand on its own only in relation to the superior white.⁴² In fact the idea of “the coloured people” (i.e. Asian, African and Latinos), exclude categorical compartmentalization to the white, since in this case, white is not a colour, while others are.⁴³

Essentialism to Mistrust

The holocaust of World War II in Europe was the terrible culmination of anti-Semitism that had pervaded in Europe for centuries, only to be mobilized into a murderous project by Nazism. The breeding of prejudice is certainly the result for the tolerance of mass murders. Today in Euro-American scene, a new form of anti-Semitism prevails. This time it is not against the Jews, but the migrant Muslim populations there. Post-September 11 saw a surge and sophistication of stereotypes and prejudicial sentiments in media, scholarship, policy-making and popular imagination. Suddenly any Muslim, regardless where they come from, is potentially seen as terrorist suspect. Even those who are thought to look like Muslims are harmed (e.g. the male Sikhs are thought to be Iranians or Taliban). Interestingly, the essentialist Orientalist gurus suddenly returned again as experts to characterize “the typical Muslim” as they had been consulted and revered by the unthinking bureaucracy, politicians, media mogul and even captive academics.⁴⁴ A report made by a group of Muslim intellectuals as documented in *The West and the Muslim World: A Muslim Position*, published in Germany, reflects the deep concern of the distorted image on Islam and Muslim. In particular they are concerned with the gaining momentum and persistency of prejudicial stereotyping that invariably associated with Muslims:

“Misconceptions, stereotypes, and clichés are difficult to fight. They continue to exist and are powerful tools in the hands of those who wish to rule others. The distortion of somebody’s image is the first step toward dehumanization, possibly even annihilation. Distorted images are not mere remnants of the past. They are images reinvented to serve the ideological and strategic needs of political and economic hegemony....These condensed, schematic, and simplified ideas prevailing among the public can have a great impact on political discourse and the polity,

⁴² For further discussion on the ideology of whiteness, read Michael W. Apple, “Freire and the Politics of Race in Education,” *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Vol.6, No. 2, 2003, pp. 107-118

⁴³ In Malay society, a cultural space which the writer is aware of, there are instances of chauvinistic expressions like *Darab Keturunan Keling* DKK, *Darab Keturunan Arab* DKA and *Cap Naga*, (implying Chinese ancestry) complete with its crude imagining of its negativities. The aim is to make it distinctively apart from the so-called ‘pure’ blood (*Melayu jati*), which is nothing but a fascist fantasies. Certainly these are neither abbreviations nor euphemism. Even if one denotes it as a joke, it is surely a bad and vicious one, for it is an open sanctification to ethnic chauvinism. Read, Azhar Ibrahim Alwee, “[A]way of Cliché and Prejudice,” *The Muslim Reader*, Vol. 23, No.2, May-Aug, 2005, pp. 36-39

⁴⁴ One prominent Orientalist who gained such imminent status as “expert of Islam,” is Bernard Lewis. For criticisms of the latter’s project, read Edward W Said, *Orientalism*. (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

because they influence the opinions and judgments of social groups regarding the other side and themselves....Stereotypes can lead to the development of discriminatory attitudes toward those from different ethnic, social, religious, or national backgrounds. Herein lies the danger.”

In short, the problem of prejudicial expressions must be seen as part of the bigger intellectual and moral-ethical crisis of our time. Therefore a discerning understanding of our social phenomena sociologically is an intellectual prerequisite as well as an ethical obligation. The naivety to accept those prejudices and stereotypes can be avoided if we dare to engage and discuss it in rational manner, with the aim of addressing our common frailties, in as much as identifying our moral strengths to overcome it. Our ambivalence and denial or sheer underestimating it as merely a passing social phenomena, can be disastrous. But to approach it in a very emotional manner, feed in by politicized idioms, can turn such engagement ugly, since finger pointing generates further prejudices and hatred.

The Danger of Socialization of Prejudice

The approach of discussing problems of prejudice must be inclusive. Not just the varieties of approaches that we could employ, but the various domains of socio-cultural and educational arena, which we should explore to see how prejudice pervades, transforms and sustains. The failure to look into human propensities (and not *innateness*) in a certain socio-cultural and political contexts, and condoning (implicit or explicit) to prejudice, means paving the way to ethnic chauvinism, religious exclusivism and national parochialism. If this is allowed, our society social fabric will be in danger. This cannot be allowed to happen. In approaching the problems of prejudice, we should avoid the overt concern that we are the victims of prejudice or others have prejudice against us. Such approach, though not altogether incorrect, has great limitation since it brings to nowhere. Instead, it will be more wise that all of us, acknowledge the fact that we have the potentiality of (or even had committed) prejudice against others, whether we are conscious or unconscious about it. This really takes a moral courage to admit our own limitations. It takes our moral restraint not to be succumbed by the emotive ethnocentric pull. But having said that all of us have the propensity to act/view prejudicial against others, does not mean that this phenomena, an innateness of human being, in which little we can do about it. This will be tragic. Instead it becomes imperative for us, after acknowledging it, that we have a moral responsibility to correct it. Most importantly, in reflecting the predicament of human society, we take note the importance of moral reasoning, rather than racial or ethnic reasoning.

Racing Against Dehumanization: *Racism*

Our moral endeavour to address the problems of prejudice demands us to take sides with those who had been victimized by prejudices or brutalized by racism. But it cannot stop there. It is our humanistic calling that not only that we are to be on the side of the victims, but also to make sure that the perpetrators of prejudicial acts/ideas are to be free from the shackles of bigotry and exclusivism. This is achieved through our moral courage to speak up,

correct aberration and affirm the intellectual-moral virtues in dealing with this human predicament. One important point that we need to emphasize is that the act of prejudice against out-groups is tantamount of committing dehumanization to oneself. It sapped one of his or her sense of humanity. To those who are comfortable that the prejudice that they hold against others as a mark of their convinced superiority, then such thinking demonstrates a form of *false consciousness* or signify a demise of rationality.⁴⁵

Indeed, the universality of common humanity, as conceptualized in major world religions and ethical systems must be our guiding light in according respect and rights too all human beings as well as to other living beings. As Bertrand Russell once said: “An indisputable condition of survival [is] the kindly feeling toward others which religion has advocated” In as much as religious symbolism and teaching had and could be invoked to create phalanx of exclusivism and superiority, it is also from the wellsprings of religious traditions that the fountainhead of tolerance and compassion can be found. This in turn requires a humanistic reading of our religious and philosophical traditions, the way that can guide us to common humanity,⁴⁶ the way which reminds us against the abyss of dehumanization.

Pedagogy of the Dehumanized

Prejudices and racism can be perpetuated by various groups. In some countries, conflicting political powers used racial ticket to draw support and opposition. The process of dehumanization is attributed by a number of pathological causes in society’s political and economic arrangement. Certainly human prejudice and racism are part of the contributing factors. Herein lies the importance of education, not only to foster the notion of harmonious and co-operative living, but also being critical of the ideas and/or acts that dehumanize us. Laws can certainly deter us from committing acts of disseminating hatred and prejudice. But this certainly needs to be complemented by education. In this regards, the role of teachers is fundamental whereby the unraveling of the dehumanizing phenomenon in our life is made through the appropriation of critical pedagogy.⁴⁷ The subject of race must be discussed openly, rationally and responsibly. The approach of problem-posing is instrumental in this case. Public education and critical scholarship to diagnose this problem is a task that should never be neglected nor underestimated. In the education domain, the sustenance or source that allows (and ambivalent) about prejudice and stereotyping must be thoroughly monitored. Rinehart’s suggestion is worth to be considered in this regards:

“What can the schools do about stereotypes? Apart from establishing an all-out program of intercultural education, teachers can discourage stereotypes by being aware of the kinds and degrees of group differences. Armed with such knowledge,

⁴⁵ Read, Joseph Gabel, *Ideologies and the Corruption of Thought* (edited and with an introduction by Alan Sica and an epilogue by David F. Allen). (New Brunswick ; London : Transaction Publishers, 1997).

⁴⁶ Read Paul F. Knitter, “Searching for the Common Thread within Religions,” *ReVision*, Vol. 22, No. 2. Fall 1999, pp. 20-26 ; Mehmet S Aydin, “The Religious Contribution to Developing Shared Values and Peace,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol.39, I, 1-2, 2002, pp. 32-38

⁴⁷ Read Paulo Freire, *Education for Critical Consciousness*. (New York: Seabury Press, 1974).

they can take care not to stereotype or accept stereotyped statements on the part of their students....oversimplifications [in textbooks] should be called to the attention of the student and his knowledge of the group in question....[Though] schools can hardly hope to erase stereotypes completelyit should not, initiate, substantiate, and accentuate stereotypes. In light of its goals, the educational system seems obligated to stand as a bulwark against stereotypes and the types of mental process involved in stereotyping.”⁴⁸

Moreover forging of tolerance and harmony cannot remain at the level of hortatory slogans nor could be easily accomplished through a racial harmony day, where we know each others cultural practices, dietary habits and traditional costumes. Amoralism of neutrality has no place in a humanized world. We must be very clear that the pervasiveness of prejudice affects respect, tolerance and solidarity amongst peoples of diverse cultural backgrounds. In the pedagogy of the dehumanized that we proposed, there is a consistent efforts to: (a) deliberate on the presence of prejudice, identifying it sources and causes ; (b) persistent in efforts, through education (formal and informal) in hammering the point that prejudice dehumanizes all, both the perpetrators and victims. Our empathy for the latter of course cannot be incarnated into animosity against the latter. Yet as we denounced prejudice as an act of dehumanization, there must be an affirmation and hope that things can be corrected, if not mitigated. This is exactly the point made by critical educators who saw the power of pedagogy in addressing predicaments of human(e) society. The views of Lilia I. Bartolome and Donald P. Macedo, is a case in point:

“[We need] a pedagogy that rejects the social constructions of images that dehumanize the ‘other’; a pedagogy that points out that in our construction of the other we become intimately tied with that other; a pedagogy that teaches us that by dehumanizing the other we become dehumanized ourselves....we need a pedagogy of hope that guide us toward the critical road of truth, rather than myths and lies, toward reclaiming our dignity and our humanity ...[that] will point us toward a world that is more harmonious and more humane, less discriminatory, less dehumanizing, and more just...[that] will reject ...policies of hatred, bigotry and division while celebrating diversity within humanity..”

“In order to fully embrace a humanizing pedagogy, we must go beyond technicism in classroom instruction and engage other fundamental knowledge that is seldom taught to us...It is necessary to dare, to learn to dare, to say no to bureaucratization of the mind to which we are exposed daily. It is necessary to dare to say that racism is a curable disease. It is necessary to dare to speak of differences as a value and to say that it is possible to find unity in diversity.”⁴⁹

⁴⁸ James W Rinehart, “The Meaning of Stereotypes,” *Theory into Practice*, p. 143

⁴⁹ Lilia I. Bartolome and Donald P. Macedo, “Dancing with Bigotry: The Poisoning of Racial and Ethnic Identities,” *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 67, No.2, 1997, pp. 243-44

In short, a public education that is directed at broadening our affiliative tendencies is crucial. It should also direct us into understanding the perils of prejudice in our midst, plus recognizing the potentials and limits of affiliation and hostility tendencies in human society. It must have the moral courage to speak against any form of stereotyping tendencies that accentuate prejudice and discriminations. If creative and critical thinking have been a catchphrase that is often invoked in our education system, it is about time that we emphasize the importance of *consciousness* against any form of prejudice, stereotyping, and racism that dehumanizes us. That is, the consciousness to fulfill the ideals of our National Pledge, that we uttered and committed by it. The consciousness to move away or mitigate prejudicial and stereotyping thinking is therefore a fundamental necessity in order to realize the very ideals we pronounced.⁵⁰

Conclusion: In Affirmation Against Prejudice

The challenges of prejudicial thinking must be our intellectual and moral-ethical concern. We must be on guard against any form of tolerance towards ideas and practices that condone and encourage prejudice. Equally important is our ambivalence about it, which must be subjected to serious criticism. Our great challenge today is not only to dismiss much of prejudice and stereotypes that persist in our society, but also to be on guard against the new form of scientific racism⁵¹ or the academism about racism which commodified the latter to only become a scholarly enterprise, without significant attempts to address the problems of prejudice and racism in society.⁵² Or even the current neo-liberalism that pronounced the ideas of *racelessness*, a sheer denial taking place whereby the race factor is being made as insignificant since, “neoliberalism negates racism, as an ethical and democratic values as a basis for citizen-based action.” A point raised by Henry Giroux is critical:

“[T]he ideology of racelessness, the state removes itself from either addressing or correcting the effects of racial discrimination, reducing matters of racism to individual concerns to be largely solved through private negotiations between individuals, and adopting an entirely uncritical role in

⁵⁰ This in turn requires a clear commitment in the education system to address this human predicament since: “[r]acial stereotypes, whether in popular or professional literature, continue to impact our students and communities. As educators, we must critically analyze their source, rationale, and impact on the people who perpetuate the stereotyping and on those who being stereotyped. The discussion of race, racism, and racial stereotypes must be a continuing part of our teacher education discourse. In our classrooms, we must seek out media, professional, and artistic images that depict people of color [or outside-groups] in multiple contexts.” Cited in Daniel G. Solorzano & Tara J Yosso, “From Racial Stereotyping and Deficit Discourse: Toward a Critical Race Theory in Teacher Education,” p. 7

⁵¹ Read, Alan Davies, “The Politics of the Living: A Case Study in Scientific Neo-Racism,” *Journal of Religious Thought*, Vol. 39, 2, 1983.

⁵² Read for instance, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, “On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s” *Cultural Critique*, 1990.

the way in which the racial state shapes racial policies and their effects throughout the economic, social, and cultural landscape ..”⁵³

To bring awareness of the debilitating effects of prejudices should not be a seasonal endeavour through awareness campaign or publicity. It must be consistent and persistent efforts. It is a responsibility of all to bring this awareness. This involves the government, NGOs, schools, religious institutions, private sectors, the family unit and certainly the intellectual leadership that conditioned and influence public perceptions and policies.⁵⁴ The ethical-moral dimension in evaluation of prejudice must be made from time to time. Issues of prejudice and racism are never topical or residual as some would like to claim. Its effect on dehumanizing men is real and painful. From the perspective of universal democratic ethics, prejudice that transgress the norm of rationality “often leads to segregation, discrimination, and denial of rights, it is a departure from the norm of justice...since it entails contempt, rejection, or condescension, it is a departure from the norm of human-heartedness.”⁵⁵ Hence, we must stay alert because prejudice can mutate and transform into something more sophisticated which renders detection and mitigation more difficult. As one writer opines: “Modern prejudice is subtle and indirect. It is part of widely and deeply held values, and it is reinforced institutionally. Old-fashioned bigotry can still be found throughout the nation, but confusion between it and modern prejudice obscures the current phenomenon. In fact, it is its careful separation from the older, cruder types of bigotry that helps to distinguish these new patterns of racism.”⁵⁶ In the end, the dehumanizing effects of prejudice and racism, can only be countered if we affirm the humane pedagogy of hope, and the impression of this point to our younger generation, is more vital than ever. Such is also in Allport’s conviction of deliberating prejudice in our midst, alongside a fundamental hope to overcome this predicament: “Our faith still holds that the forces in society and in personality that make retrogression, ethnocentrism, and hate can be controlled if they are understood.” Last but not least, comprehending and denouncing all forms of prejudice and stereotyping is a moral-ethical task that all of us have to bear upon. A reminder by a Southeast Asian scholar is worth quoted here:

⁵³ Henry A. Giroux, “Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy Under the Reign of Neoliberalism,” *Communication Education*, Vol. 52, No. 3/4, 2003, p. 207

⁵⁴ It is unfortunate that the notion of race, as conceptualised in pseudo-science still have not been eradicated totally. The timidity of social scientists reflects the ambivalence and moral courage of our time. But as Donal E Muir points out, though “natural scientist, who have affectively dropped the concept of race from their texts and journal, [t]hey have failed, however, to launch organized efforts to bring this rejection to the attention of the schools, government, general public, or even related disciplines....While racism persists throughout the world, many scientists, and social scientists in particular, remain scandalously aloof or ignorant. They appear content to join the general public in playing a contributory role of kind racist. Like the legendary “non-political” citizens of the Nazi period, by their silence they implicitly endorse racial categories rejected by science that continue to be used to define current equivalents of “non-Aryans.” Read, “Race: The Mythic Root of Racism,” *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol.63, No.3, 1993, pp. 101-102

⁵⁵ Gordon Allport, “The Religious Context of Prejudice,” in *The Person in Psychology*, p. 221.

⁵⁶ Thomas F Pettigrew, “New Patterns of Prejudice: The Different World of 1984 and 1964,” in Fred L Pincus & Howard J Ehrlich (eds.) *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnoviolence*. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994), p. 58

“It should be recognized that prejudices and biases rear their ugly heads in all communities, setting off dangerous chain reactions all round. It is by no means monopolized by any one community. Thus, if we speak of the problem of the vicious cycle of poverty, maybe it is equally urgent for us to heed the problem of the vicious cycles of prejudice and stereotyping encompassing all communities. It is important for us to recognize the problem of not only the ugly American or Singaporean but also the ugly Malay, Chinese and Indian as they impinge on ethnic relations and regional ties in Southeast Asia. The task of building a better world in the region would stand a better chance if common humanity is not lost sight of, as people scramble for a piece of the economic pie guided merely by unbridled acquisitiveness.”⁵⁷

Herein lies the importance of continuing deliberating this important subject without prejudice.*

⁵⁷ Shaharuddin Maaruf, “Materialism as an Ideology in Malay Literature,” in Ong Jin Hui, Chan Kwok Bun, Chew Soon Beng, (eds.) *Crossing Borders: Transmigration in Asia Pacific*. (Singapore : Simon & Schuster , 1995), p. 437

* We record our thanks to Puan Sa’eda Buang and Che’ Azizah Zakaria for their critical comments. Also to David Koh, whose many conversations inspire the urgency to write about this topic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alatas, Syed Hussein. *The Myth of the Lazy Native: A Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th century and Its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*. London: Frank Cass, 1977.
- Allport, Gordon W. *The Nature of Prejudice*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Allport, Gordon W. "Prejudice and the Individual," *The Person in Psychology: Selected Essays* Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Allport, Gordon W. "The Religious Context of Prejudice," *The Person in Psychology: Selected Essays* Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Allport, Gordon W. "Basic Principles in Improving Human Relations," in *Cultural Groups and Human Relations*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
- Allport, Gordon W. "Religion and Prejudice," *Personality and Social Encounter: Selected Essays*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1960.
- Apple, Michael W. "Freire and the Politics of Race in Education," *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Vol.6, No. 2, 2003.
- Aschcroft, Bill. "Language and Race," *Social Identities*, Vol.7, No.3, 2001.
- Aydin, Mehmet S. "The Religious Contribution to Developing Shared Values and Peace," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol.39, I, 1-2, 2002.
- Bartolome, Lilia I and Donald P. Macedo, "Dancing with Bigotry: The Poisoning of Racial and Ethnic Identities," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 67, No.2, 1997.
- Brown, Richard Harvey. "Cultural Representation and Ideological Domination," *Social Forces*, 71, 3, 1993.
- Davies, Alan. "The Politics of the Living: A Case Study in Scientific Neo-Racism," *Journal of Religious Thought*, Vol. 39, 2, 1983.
- Dovidio, John F and Samuel L. Gaertner, "Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism: Historical Trends and Contemporary Approaches," in *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*. New York: Academic Press, 1986.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. London: Cape, 1974.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil*. New York: Perennial Library, 1964.
- Freire, Paulo and Donald Macedo, "A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol.65, No.3, 1995.

- Freire, Paulo. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974.
- Flores, Barbara, Patricia Tefft Cousin & Esteban Diaz, "Transforming Deficit Myths About Learning, Language and Culture," *Language Arts*, Vol.68, 1991.
- Hirschman, Charles. "The Making of Race in Colonial Malaya: Political Economy and Racial Ideology," *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 1, No.2, 1986.
- Gabel, Joseph. *Ideologies and the Corruption of Thought* (edited and with an introduction by Alan Sica and an epilogue by David F. Allen). New Brunswick ; London : Transaction Publishers, 1997.
- Giroux, Henry A. "Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy Under the Reign of Neoliberalism," *Communication Education*, Vol. 52, No. 3/4, 2003.
- Knitter, Paul F. "Searching for the Common Thread within Religions," *ReVision*, Vol. 22, No. 2. Fall 1999.
- Macedo, Donaldo, "The Illiteracy of English-Only-Literacy" *Educational Leadership*, Dec 1999/Jan 2000.
- Macedo, Donaldo, Bessie Dendrinis and Panayota Gounari. *The Hegemony of English*. Boulder, Colo: Paradigm, 2004.
- Marx, David M, Joseph L.Brown & Claude M.Steele, "Allport's Legacy and Situational Press of Stereotypes," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 55, No.3, 1999.
- Miller, Richard. "Reflecting on Racism," *The Journal of Religious Thought*, Vol. 55/56 Issue 2/1, Spring-Fall, 1999.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s" *Cultural Critique*, 1990.
- Muir, Donal E. "Race: The Mythic Root of Racism," *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol.63, No.3, 1993.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. "New Patterns of Prejudice: The Different World of 1984 and 1964," in Fred L Pincus & Howard J Ehrlich (eds.) *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnviolence*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1994.
- Rinehart, James W, "The Meaning of Stereotypes," *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 2, No.3, 1963.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Shaharuddin Maaruf, "Materialism as an Ideology in Malay Literature," in Ong Jin Hui, Chan Kwok Bun, Chew Soon Beng, (eds.) *Crossing Borders: Transmigration in Asia Pacific*. Singapore: Simon & Schuster , 1995.

Solorzano, Daniel G. & Tara J Yosso, "From Racial Stereotyping and Deficit Discourse: Toward a Critical Race Theory in Teacher Education," *Multicultural Education*, Fall 2001

Sorokin, Pitirim. *The Ways and Power of Love: Types, Factors and Techniques of Moral Transformation*. Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2002.

Virtanen, Simo V & Leonie Hardy, "Old-Fashioned Racism and New Forms of Racial Prejudice," *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 60, No.2, 1998.

Wright, Claudia. "National Liberation, Consciousness, Freedom and Frantz Fanon," *History of European Ideas*, Vol.15, No.1-3.

Yeakey, Carol Camp. "Race, Schooling, and Class in American Society," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 59, No.1, 1990.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: HarperPerennial, 2005.