

Chapter Twelve — Instincts, History, and the American

Dream

Our history as a nation is significantly easier to understand when we look at our history through the lens of our instinctive behaviors.

There are many things about our country that are wonderful. There are many things in our history that we can point to with pride and celebrate and honor without hesitation. We have many very positive and clearly enlightened elements of our history that we can use as a foundation to build on with confidence and enthusiasm as we go forward to create our future.

There are also many elements, events, and developments in our history that are far more negative, damaging, and highly unfortunate — things that we should regret, reject, and mourn. There is an entire array of important and clearly negative things in our history that should cause us to feel shame, sorrow, and deep regret as a nation because those particular things happened in our country and they happened to our people.

We have clearly not been perfect. In many important respects, we have been far from perfect.

We need now to understand and celebrate the many important things we have done well and we need to understand and deeply regret the things

we have done badly — things we should not ever repeat, renew, echo, or do again in any way.

To succeed in achieving our key goals for the future at this point in our history, we all need to understand very clearly the role that our basic packages of instincts have played both in the things that went well and in the things that we should deeply regret.

We Need To Learn From Our History To Never Repeat The Bad Things We Did

Knowledge is power. If we truly understand what we did badly and if we also understand why we did those bad and unacceptable things in this country, then the likelihood of us being able to eliminate, avoid, and even purge those negative and damaging behaviors from our future national processes and from our future functional realities as a people will be significantly improved.

As we look at our history, we can see the clear and constant footprints of our full package of instincts extending back in every direction. Instincts have very clearly shaped major aspects of our history and our nation.

If we look at the sets of instincts that have been described in the first ten chapters of this book, we can clearly see the impact of those instinct packages everywhere.

Our hierarchal instincts have clearly been evident everywhere. We have obviously assembled many hierarchies in many places. We have people with Alpha instincts in every hierarchical setting. We have seen both negative and positive group Alpha behaviors in a great many settings and places over the course of our history.

We have also obviously identified, delineated, defined, and defended turf at multiple levels. We have created, used, and been part of a broad number and range of collective us-focused identities and we have built, supported, enforced, perpetuated, and enhanced multiple cultures.

We have created teams, and we have created team loyalties at multiple levels in a wide range of places.

We have spent a significant amount of time, energy, and talent to put together the various rule sets that have been needed and used for us to function as a country.

Laws have been a major part of our tool kit for achieving our goals. We have chosen to be a country that operates and governs itself under

explicit and universally applied laws rather than choosing to be a country that drifts along in a more generic situational and unstructured version of leader-centered, leader-defined governance functionality and circumstantial individual centered power-based decision making.

Our Cultures Have Codified Our Key Rules

We have chosen to be a culture as a nation that codifies and formalizes its key rules — with the clear goal of being a nation where all people can have the protection of being ruled by laws and not ruled by men.

All of the instincts that are listed in the first ten chapters of this book have clearly been relevant to our history as a nation and to us as a population of people. We can clearly see the current and functional impact of each of those instincts on all of us every day of our lives.

It is obvious that there is no way for any of us today to escape the impact of our various packages of instincts.

It is also equally obvious that the impact of those sets of instincts has been evident for people living here going back to the first landings of people on these continents many thousands of years ago. The earliest sets of people who lived here on these American continents eons ago left clear evidences

of our various instinctive behaviors in the archaeological and anthropological records that exist today.

Our National History Has Been Heavily Influenced By

Us/Them Instincts

Probably the most significant and historically relevant set of instincts — the instinctive areas that have given us some of our greatest successes and the instinct packages that have also inspired, enabled, structured, and sculpted some of our most grievous faults and our most horrific sins — have been our instincts to divide ourselves into us and them and then to create very different realities for each us and for each them who exists in each setting.

It is very useful in figuring out who we are today to look back at our history as a nation and to see our history clearly in the context of those very specific instinct-driven us/them behaviors, us/them values, and us/them belief systems.

Instinct influenced tribal behaviors have obviously been deeply embedded in the entire history of people living on those continents for as long as people have been living here.

The earliest Americans had their tribal history and their tribal cultures and traditions. The earliest tribal groups in American settings all clearly had various levels of intertribal conflicts and intergroup divisions.

The pattern we see everywhere on the planet for intertribal behavior was also followed here. The various sets of people who were living here for many centuries generally found themselves in various levels of intergroup conflict with other sets of people who were also living here.

Intergroup conflicts and a number of intergroup damage stories create a significant part of our entire historical past going back to our very first know inhabitants.

Tribes and tribal cultures existed across both continents. The original Native American peoples, on these continents, were all organized into a number of very specific and clearly defined ethnic groups or tribes.

The Original Tribes All Had Us/Them Behaviors

Each of those original tribal groups had their own language, their own identities, their own cultures, their own rule sets and their own turf.

The Native American Museum that was recently constructed in Washington, D.C. has been very clearly organized by tribes in order to tell

the basic historical story of our Native Americans as people whose tribal identity has been and continues to be extremely important to each tribe.

Us/Them instincts were clearly triggered in multiple settings by those instinct-supported identities, because each tribe tended to be an “us” to itself and each tribe tended to perceive other nearby tribes to be some category of “them.”

Intertribal and intergroup conflict happened with regularity across both continents wherever tribal turf either touched or overlapped the turf of another tribe. The Sioux and the Chippewa had contiguous turf and those tribes had a long-standing traditional state of enmity toward one another.

The Apache and the Navaho also lived in contiguous areas and those contiguous tribes also engaged in intergroup battles where blood was periodically shed for many centuries.

The tribal people from each of our legacy tribes all tend to refer to their “traditional enemies” in their tribal histories. The original tribes tend to have great clarity in each tribal setting about who their “traditional enemies” were.

The Pueblos Were Created For Intergroup Safety

The oldest dwellings on the North American continent are a number of old cliff side Indian pueblos that continue to exist in the Southwestern United States. Those hillside homes each bear clear visual testimony and serve as functional proof points relative to the long-standing history of intergroup conflict that happened for a very long time in that piece of our world.

Those pueblo homes were carefully and skillfully built high into the side of cliffs. They had entry doors that were so high that no enemies of the tribe who lived there could attack at night when the ladders that allowed access to those doors and to the tribal sleeping areas were functionally pulled up into the dwellings. That is an extremely inconvenient way to live.

Those impressive buildings and those clearly defensive living sites serve as pure and permanent archeological proof points for our long-standing cultural continental history of intergroup conflict and intergroup bloodshed.

The intertribal wars that were happening across most of North America at that pre-European point in our history were both serious and long standing. But those intertribal conflicts that were happening in the North American portions of this hemisphere were generally not deeply destructive to any large scope or scale at that point in time.

Genocide Was Not The Goal Of Those Wars

Genocide was not a strategy or a goal for those conflicted North American tribes. At that point in the history of this continent, the various tribes who lived on the Northern American continent weren't trying to entirely eliminate other local tribes.

The various tribes in various settings typically just periodically had relatively small-scale local battles. Each tribe periodically killed some members of each other's tribes over issues of tribal turf and long-standing intertribal animosity and dislike.

The intertribal conflict situation that existed at that point in time in this hemisphere was more serious and problematic, however, for some of the tribes who lived in some of the geographic areas that are located in the more southern part of our hemisphere.

There were clearly a number of large-scale intertribal warfare situations in Mexico, Central American, and several parts of South America that were much more serious in intent and scope than the tribal wars that were happening in North America.

Some of the Aztec and Inca tribal kingdoms actually did do some serious intertribal killing that sometimes resulted in the extermination,

forced assimilation, or even the functional enslavement of some of the smaller tribes in several of the geographic areas that sit south of what is now the United States and Canada.

Even the more isolated tribes in the Andes Mountains and the more isolated tribes in the rain forests and river deltas of South America tended to have some basic levels of local intertribal conflict and local intergroup bloodshed that created on-going facts of conflicted and personally dangerous life for the people of those tribes.

Hunting turf was protected in multiple settings by people killing each other over that turf in intergroup skirmishes and battles. Warriors were honored and celebrated in the cultures of many tribes.

The existence of warriors and warrior hero stories in multiple cultures also makes and proves the point that instinct-incented intergroup conflict was functionally relevant to those groups.

America Was Not Conflict Free Before The European

Invasions

So our two American continents were not conflict-free and they were not entirely peaceful places for people to live before the European invaders

arrived. Intergroup instincts were activated in a wide range of settings and they were influencing intergroup behaviors wherever they were activated.

Tribal and interethnic conflicts were common and they were very long-standing in a great many areas of those continents.

And then, history changed and several tribes from Europe sent well-armed warriors in wooden boats across the Atlantic Ocean to invade both American continents.

That invasion process changed history for both American continents. It very significantly changed the nature of the prior intertribal conflicts that had been happening in all of those settings. Those well-armed European tribes took intertribal conflict to a whole new level for both American continents.

That invasion from Europe brought its own massive new sets of intertribal us/them negative behaviors and intergroup consequences to our country and to our history.

The historical reality that we should recognize is that there wasn't a state of universal intergroup Peace for the millions of people who were living on those continents before the Europeans arrived.

But we need to understand that the status of all of the original America tribes was changed hugely and it was significantly changed for the worse in most settings when those two continents were both invaded in multiple waves by the various very intrusive, disruptive, well armed, and very effectively militant tribes who sent people here from Europe to conquer and colonize that American turf.

The Invaders Had Us/Them Instincts Fully Activated

Us/Them instincts were clearly activated in very negative ways at multiple levels during and by those invasions.

Some of the invaders from Europe felt very justified in simply killing the local people. Some of the Native American peoples who lived on some of the Caribbean islands, for example, were exterminated almost immediately by the invaders.

In parts of South America, pure ethnic cleansing practices very intentionally wiped out entire existing Native American peoples in several settings.

Some of the South American nations that were formed by the colonial powers encouraged having the people who moved there from Europe either

kill or drive away any people from the indigenous tribes who lived in those areas.

It is very hard today to find any groups of indigenous people in Argentina, for example.

In North America, the original American tribes who lived here at that point in history were usually not exterminated — but almost all of the original tribes who lived there were very intentionally and very consistently uprooted and displaced.

To make matters worse for those tribes, a couple of significant epidemics of contagious diseases that were brought to North America from Europe functionally wiped out entire American tribes in several settings.

A few of those epidemics were deliberately created by exposing unsuspecting local tribes to the clothing and the blankets of diseased people. Biological warfare may have been invented in that process.

That particular strategy was a functional reality and it was a highly successful way to conquer territory for the invaders in some settings in this country.

Us/Them Negative Behaviors Blossomed

The European tribes who invaded the Americas were better armed and better organized to go to war than the original America tribes. The European tribes were also generally much more militant at an intergroup level.

The evil and deliberately destructive Us/Them instinctive behaviors that were exhibited by some of the invaders from Europe generally embodied the classic full-blown manifestations of the very worst features of our most primal us/them instincts. We need to understand the evil side of those instincts in order to understand the behaviors we saw in so many intergroup interactions in our early history.

One of the common thought processes that generally happens when our us/them instincts are triggered in any setting is to dehumanize whoever is defined by any group to be a “Them.”

That depersonalization and the related dehumanization elements of that thought process on the part of the invaders were so complete and so entirely disrespectful of the humanity status for the local tribes in this country that the tribes who sent people here from Europe actually claimed to have “discovered” America.

“Discovery” is a very important word that we need to understand to fully appreciate our history. For generations, a number of Euro-oriented

policy makers and historians have debated with some energy and with some levels of tribal pride about which European tribe actually “discovered” America.

Columbus “Discovered Those Lands For Mankind”

The imposing statue of Christopher Columbus that still stands today very near our U.S. Capital Building in Central Washington D.C. actually is engraved with very specific words that congratulate and honor Columbus for “discovering those lands for mankind.”

Discovering America For “Mankind” is the most striking part of that inscription.

The term “discovery” of America illustrates how the invaders very explicitly depersonalized and dehumanized the millions of Native Americans who already lived on both American continents.

The term “mankind” means that the millions of people who lived here did not hold the status of actually being “people” in the eyes of the invaders.

Saying that our American continents that already had millions of people living on them were “discovered” — for “mankind” — by the people who sailed here from Europe is a quintessentially ethno-centric way of thinking about people and about the world.

That level of ethnocentricity is a very clear example of how our us/them instincts cause us to think about people who were perceived to be “Them.” The level of “Them” was so extreme that the people who lived on those continents were literally not even considered to be people.

The Europeans further depersonalized the original Native American tribes by setting up processes that were based on the belief that all of the land on these American continents actually “belonged” in some legal way to people who lived in Europe. The invaders claimed that the land here belonged to European nations solely because the people who had travelled here from Europe had planted flags in various settings and then declared that they had “discovered” and now owned each piece of land where a flag was planted.

Explorers from Europe competed to be the first Europeans to land on various parts of the American continents so that the explorers could plant their ownership flag where they landed and claim legal ownership of that new land for their own tribe back in Europe.

European Rules Claimed Ownership Of American Geography

Rulers of the various European tribes actually then claimed formal legal ownership over large expanses of American territory they had personally never seen, and would personally never see.

The European rulers made turf claims over major land areas in this hemisphere where the European rulers had no personal ancestral, historical, or functional legacy connection or historical legitimacy of any kind at any level.

Those European rulers then proceeded to buy and sell that land in this hemisphere to one another in deals made in Europe without involving the original occupants and the original owners of the American pieces of land in any of those buying and selling transactions.

When the Kings of England and France and Spain were issuing “land grants” in the Americas and when those kings in Europe clearly acted on the behalf their document based written “land grants” had inherent world-wide legal status, that issuance of those grants by those rulers is all by itself, another very powerful proof point for how the us/them instincts that were fully activated in the European tribes directly treated, defined, and dehumanized the original American tribes to function at the level of an instinctive “Them” for America.

America Was Invaded — Not Discovered

The obvious historical truth — the actual logistical functionality — is that America was invaded, not discovered, by the Europeans.

The European tribes who invaded America all then sent settlers to create their own colonies, towns, and provinces in the New Land.

The invasion patterns were very clear and very consistent. The new settlers in each North American setting displaced the local tribes, stole their land, built new homes, and those invading settlers each became the new legal occupants and the new owners of the local geography — taking ownership purely by force of arms and holding it because the settlers had the collective ability to imprison and execute anyone who dissented from that property possession approach and from that us/them based ownership strategy and paradigm.

A number of treaties were done with a number of the local tribes — in part to assuage the guilt of some people from the new invading tribes who felt that there was, in fact, some level of credibility that needed to be accorded in some way to the old tribes relative to the original tribe's ownership status relative to their own ancestral turf. A number of the

invaders made deals of various kinds to create a sense of legitimacy for the turf usurpation process.

Manhattan Island, for example, was purchased from the local Native American tribe for a box of trading goods. That particular trade may seem deeply insulting until you look at our actual history to see that many other treaties generally offered the local tribes even less in trade to take over their tribal land — and the trinkets in that box did have some trading value at that time.

More often, however, the land that had been owned by the original tribes was simply stolen — with the tribes, themselves, simply and explicitly displaced.

A favorite tactic used by the settlers/invaders to take over land was to use some local intertribal incident to say that one of the original tribes had committed an intergroup sin — a crime of some kind against the white settlers.

The invaders often said that the specific intergroup incident that happened justified tribal exile and that the tribe involved deserved to be displaced from their legacy lands in revenge and punishment for the incident.

Euro-Americans Formed An Intermarried White Tribe

Overall, some very bad aspects of our us/them instincts — coupled with our fully activated intergroup turf instincts and our strong culture building and bonding instincts — created a new core population base for the American continents. The Native American tribes were displaced from most of the land and that land was then occupied by “settlers” from the invading groups of people. The invaders from Europe created settlements, built homes and farms, and created, in each setting, a new European-ancestry based sense of us.

The new local populations in all of those areas were comprised of the descendants of the people who immigrated there from Europe.

The functional reality of those combined events was that a new tribe was formed for those areas and for that process.

Europe is full of tribes. Europe is a highly tribal continent. The people who came here from Europe all came here in the context of those legacy European tribes. They functioned as those tribes when they first invaded the American territories.

Those old separate European tribal definitions tended to melt away over time after the people from Europe had immigrated to this country and had children here.

Intermarriage happened. Those legacy tribes never intermarried in Europe. The rule set and behavior pattern that prevented intermarriage between the European tribes did not exist here. In North America, the descendants from all of the legacy European tribes tended to intermarry with each other.

Almost all of the immigrants also converted fairly quickly to speak English. Their descendants often spoke only English. In almost all settlement settings, English became the functional local language.

So the New American “Us” tribe that was created became the intermarried descendants of the various invading and immigrating European tribes who collectively now spoke English as their functional group and tribal language.

White Became a New “Us”

The descendants of the various European tribes tended to give up their legacy tribe’s identity and they generally took on a new collective identity — as “White Americans.”

White became the new us for most of the country.

The new White “us” then tended to react in very negative and extremely instinctive tribal ways to each of the sets of “Them” who lived in their local areas of the country. Them in each setting were generally displaced, expelled, or simply disenfranchised.

Ethnic cleansing and geographic displacement of the original Native American tribes became the official public policy of the new “us.”

Us/Them instincts clearly triggered a sense of who was us and who was them. The people who ran the country as the new majority us at that point in our history acted in multiple unethical and very instinctive intergroup ways — with no sense of group guilt relative to any of the negative things done in all of those settings to any local “Them.”

Those basic us/them intergroup behavior patterns and thought processes exist far too often whenever there is an us and a them in any setting. Those instinctive intergroup behaviors and thought processes are a key part of our history as a nation.

Slavery Is An Ultimate Us/Them Behaviors

That set of negative and damaging us/them intergroup behaviors that displaced and purged people perceived to be “Them” was particularly

exacerbated in our national history by a very clear set of us/them behaviors that are, beyond any doubt, a pure source of shame and sorrow for our collective national historical reality.

Many of the new “White” settlers took their basic us/them instincts a step further down the ethical ladder and those settlers imported slaves to these continents. People were purchased as slaves in other settings and those people were then brought as slaves against their will to both American continents.

The slaves who were brought to this hemisphere were almost entirely enslaved in Africa. Many slaves were bought in Africa, transported in what were often incredibly inhumane circumstances on overcrowded and filthy slave ships to the Americas, and then they were sold to slave owners on those continents.

Us/Them instincts that were already activated at a very clear level between various tribes inside Africa at that time allowed some African tribes to capture, enslave, and sell people from other African tribes to the slave traders. Those tribes chose to market the people they enslaved in their local settings to the new international slave trade that took the slaves from Africa to the Caribbean and to both American continents.

Ghana Held a Ceremony of Mourning and Regret

Some key people in Ghana who are direct descendants of the people from that area who ran the slave forts and the slave markets in that country during that time in history recently held a public ceremony of mourning to express deep collective regret and sorrow about that whole process. The people in Ghana who held that ceremony expressed official, personal, and deep sorrow, regret and remorse for the role that their ancestors had played in that slave trade.

It was, in fact, a horrible undertaking — both in Africa and in the U.S. Slavery became a major reality for this country at that point in our history that everyone logistically must have some ancestor who was enslaved.

People from Africa who had been captured by the enslavers in Africa were brought to those continents as property in a bloody and evil set of business transactions that created a clearly evil intergroup practice that lasted for more than 200 years in this country.

The Evil of Slavery is Beyond Debate

Slavery is an absolutely unconscionable, completely unforgivable, and totally sinful way for people to treat other human beings.

The slaves who were brought to those continents were very deliberately and very intentionally legally dehumanized.

They lost all legal rights as people. The slaves could not protect themselves without being punished. They were beaten and they sometimes starved. Enslaved people were taken to slave markets in the new world and they were sold like cattle to people in this country who were given the legal right both to own them and to own their children.

The evil behaviors that were embedded in slavery are beyond debate. Slavery is an ultimate “Them” behavior that is a horrifying consequence of fully activating some of our most fully realized and our most negative us/them instincts.

Anyone who doubts how much evil behavior can be both triggered and then made to “feel right” by those value-skewing intergroup instincts when they are fully activated only has to look at slavery as a collective behavior to see how much evil can be created by those us/them values and those us/them beliefs and to see how those instincts can blind people to basic decency and to the differences between ethical and unethical behaviors.

All People Have Slave Ancestors

Americans did not invent slavery. Slavery was part of the economy and infrastructure of Rome, Greece, the Asian Empires, and the Chinese Imperial Empires. All of the countries in Asia and the Middle East had slaves. Slavery clearly had long-standing status in the history of Europe.

Slaves were everywhere, if you go far enough back into history. The Vikings brought slaves back to Scandinavia. Slave markets existed in Ireland. The logistical implications of that universal slavery legacy for all our ancestral settings are clear.

All people who are alive today — white or black or brown or any other shade of skin color — logistically must have at least some ancestors who were slaves. That is true because slavery was so universal in so many places at so many earlier points in human history.

The Bible talks about slavery in both the New and Old Testaments. The pyramids were built by slaves. Rome was built largely by slaves.

Over time, there were slave markets in multiple settings and in multiple cultures.

We did not invent slavery in this country. We clearly did not invent slavery by race and we did not invent slavery by tribe. We also did not invent taking captives and turning those captives into slaves. Those

behaviors long preceded the European invasion of America and the development and perpetration of slavery here.

We Should Have Been the Exception to That Practice

The fact that we did not invent slavery here absolutely does not excuse slavery here. We are Americans. We should have done better.

It should be a matter of historical sorrow to us today that we did not do better. We Americans should have been the clear exception to that pattern of behavior.

America could have been and should have been the singular piece, place, and part of history that functionally managed to avoid that particular set of sins.

The other nations in the world all had their origins built entirely from the context of their local tribes and from their historic legacy cultures. In this country, Americans actually created a new nation with very idealistic goals and with highly enlightened roots from multiple and diverse settings.

We Americans had invented new levels of inclusive intertribal diversity for at least some of our people.

Our Founders Wanted Religious, Political, and Economic Freedom

We were enlightened in many significant ways about democracy and about individual freedoms at a point in time when Europe, Asia, and other major parts of the world were still very purely tribal and when both aristocracy and government leadership in all of those settings was done by hereditary rulers.

We made a decision to create democratic processes that were free from those legacy legal constraints, functional inequalities, and clearly and intentionally discriminatory practices that dominated the functionality and the governance approaches for all of those legacy settings and cultures.

We made significant and very real commitments to be both democratic and free.

Many of the Europeans who came to this country actually came here to achieve religious freedom. Others immigrated to our country to achieve political freedom.

Many of the immigrants came here to achieve economic freedom — and to achieve self-sufficiency as individuals.

The American Dream has always had a major portion of its foundation based on people being free and being able to pursue life, liberty and happiness.

Our Founding Documents Had Idealism Embedded In Them

There was very clear idealism inherent in the immigration process for many people who came to these shores.

Our founding fathers, as they were writing both our Declaration of Independence and our original Constitution very carefully embedded both highly idealistic and very enlightened beliefs in those documents in language that spoke explicitly to freedom, peoples' rights, and human dignity.

The enlightened language of our founding documents is and was a model and an inspiration for the world. That idealism that is clearly embedded in those thoughts and documents represented a major new paradigm for both national governance and for individual rights for the world.

Yet, at the same time that we were developing, articulating, celebrating, and even codifying the concept that "All Men Are Created Equal," we excluded women from having full equal status and we made some men and some women in this country completely and totally unequal

— slaves — subservient and dehumanized to the point of being property of the people who were defined as “free men.”

We made all women — regardless of race — into second-class citizens who had clearly defined and intentionally inferior economic and political status. At the same time that we were celebrating equality in clear and articulate ways, we made millions of captive and enslaved men and women pure chattel.

The irony of that divergent set of behaviors for this country is painfully obvious and it continues to be painful to anyone who looks at it clearly now.

On one level, we were expressing extremely enlightened beliefs about democracy, equality, and a noble sense of personal value — and at another level we were oppressing women, displacing Native Americans, and enslaving people who had African ancestors.

Our very best ideals have stood the test of time and deserve to be our guidance for our future behaviors for everyone in this country. They embody the best characteristics of the instincts we trigger with people who are an “us.” Simultaneously, at another instinct embedded level, our “Them”

perceptions and instincts allowed us to very intentionally exclude some people from being included in those enlightened approaches.

Slavery was an extreme us/them behavior — and it existed in a very robust form for a very long time in what was also being created and operated as the land of freedom for a significant subset of the people who lived there.

The harsh truth that we all need to recognize now as we look at our history as a nation, is that slavery was very real here and it was real here for very many years.

We Should Clearly Have Been More Enlightened

Slavery was a grim, sad, and deplorable aspect of our historical journey for far too many years. In the most enlightened nation on earth, we set up laws about slaves that could not have been less enlightened unless those laws had required actually mandatorily killing the slaves as well as functionally enslaving them.

That additional set of cruel behaviors that required people to actually kill some slaves actually did exist in some other settings in this hemisphere where slaves existed.

Some South American countries that also held slaves at that same time actually did have requirements to kill unproductive slaves. Some of

those settings on that continent actually had laws to keep their slaves from reproducing.

Those countries actually imported more slaves than North American, but then ended up with fewer slaves once the slave trade ended that brought them new slaves from Africa because they had fewer slave descendants in those countries.

In this country, we wrote clear, cruel, and evil laws that made slavery legal. We also wrote additional laws that completely supported doing all of the negative things that were necessary to suppress and oppress American slaves — both collectively and as individuals.

The utter, absolute, and sheer hypocrisy of many of those laws was stunning. Those laws argued at one level that slaves were naturally unintelligent and functionally subhuman and then a set of other very strict laws were enacted at another level to make it illegal to teach slaves to read or made it illegal for slaves to learn mathematics.

Clearly if the slaves had actually been irreconcilably, unintelligent, there would have been no need for strict and punitive laws to keep slaves from learning to read.

Sheer, blatant, deliberate, intentional, and shameless evil and pure hypocrisy permeated that whole set of laws.

Laws stated that slaves had no rights of any kind because slaves were not human. Other laws that were enacted at that same time actually allowed freed slaves in some settings to function independently and to own property — including owning other slaves.

That set of laws argued at one level that slaves deserved to be enslaved and deserved to be property because the slaves were genetically inferior — but that set of laws also gave slave owners the right to free slaves. Freed slaves were given the rights of non-slaves to own property, and to function as free men in several key ways.

There was no explanation in the laws of the obviously contradictory thought process that said the African slaves were inherently and functionally inferior, but also said that the condition of inherent incapacity and functional inferiority could be changed entirely and instantly for a particular slave with a simple piece of paper written by any master granting freedom to that slave.

Some of the most impressive achievements in our early history related to the economic success levels that happened for a number of former slaves

who ran their own business and who set up their own economic enterprises after being set free.

The internal intellectual contradictions that were clearly inherent in many of those slavery based laws can only be explained by intentional lawmaker judgments and by functional decisions that were fully and completely clouded by us/them thinking to the point that ethics and any sense of fairness, justice, or even rational thinking were suspended in significant ways relative to “Them.”

We Invented “White” in America

We actually invented the concept of white and white as a group label as a consequence of the slavery process in this country.

In Europe, no one was “white.” People in France were French. People in Holland were Dutch. People from Germany were Bavarian or Prussian or even German.

No one in those countries was “white.” That wasn’t a term used to describe any people in any of those settings.

In this country, when the Europeans first came here as immigrants, the initial generation of immigrants from each country were generally still each

personally identified by the name of their European legacy tribe. The initial immigrants from Europe all spoke their native tribal languages.

But the second generation of people here from every country tended to speak English and every generation beyond the initial immigrants referred to themselves as Americans rather than as Germans or Dutchmen.

People who immigrated here took pride in becoming American as quickly as possible.

Intermarriage Blurred And Blended Tribes

As noted earlier, intermarriage helped that new alignment process significantly. There were major barriers to intertribal intermarriage in old Europe. The barriers that existed to those marriages were rare here. There was a significant level of intermarriages between the various sets of Euro-American descendants.

That process very much blended and blurred the old European based tribal identities and alignments.

It was obviously much harder for a new family with both French and German parents to refer to themselves in later generations by either of those original basic tribal labels or names. The offspring of those mixed marriages

almost entirely called themselves by the name of their new American homeland — not by their European tribal names.

Those descendants of intermarried people who had European ancestors generally referred to themselves either as residents of their new states or purely as Americans. “I am a Virginian” was a common “us” identifier. “I am a Pennsylvanian,” was another.

Many people in many settings tended to identify themselves primarily with their states — particularly before the Revolutionary War. After the Revolutionary War, many people thought of themselves as being both Americans and as being New Yorkers or Virginians.

White was the functional term that was very often used, however, as a term of definition and as a label for group alignment for the new majority group in this country.

The new Euro Americans very intentionally added that very specific identifier to their basic set of new group labels. The Euro Americans functionally invented the term “white.” Slavery actually made the term white relevant and slavery made the term White functionally useful.

People used the term “white” to refer to anyone who had European ancestry.

They also used the term “white” as a barrier to identify clearly that the people who were allowed to use that label had no African ancestry. None. That very specific distinction about a person having absolutely no ancestors from Africa was made because the slavery laws that were written to identify who could be forced to be slaves specified that only people with African Ancestry would or could be forced to be slaves and held as slaves.

White people in this country could not be enslaved. Only black people could be legally forced to function as chattel in this country.

The law that was created to determine who was Black and who was White defined people who had any African ancestry of any kind at any level to be Black for those legal delineation purposes. The term Negro was also very specific for some laws. Any African blood or ancestry put a person into the category of someone who could be enslaved.

That same package of laws identified the people who had absolutely zero African ancestry — people who had a basic family tree that was made up exclusively and only of European tribal ancestors — as being White.

Anyone with even one drop of African blood was legally defined in several states to be Negro and Black.

Again — the sheer hypocrisy and the clearly evil intergroup intent of enslaving human beings and then creating an obviously artificial and arbitrary package of ancestry-based legal technicalities to use to continue to enslave those people and to enslave their children is almost unbelievable in its sheer hypocrisy and its very pure and clear intergroup malice.

There have always been some intermarriages happening in this country between white people and various sets of other minority groups. The status of the people born to those intermarriages varied from area to area. For a very long time, Native Americans were the most common set of intergroup intermarriages for White Americans.

The categories of people who were descended from those various intermarriage reproductive processes were generally legally considered to be non-white. But those “mixed breed” people who had mixed Native American or mixed Asian and White ancestors were very clearly not legally black.

Black included only people who had some African ancestors. Being Black and being legally Negro required at least one drop of African blood.

Black and White Are Both Invented Collective Terms

White and Black are actually both invented labels and functionally collective terms. Both group descriptors were invented. Neither was the term that was used in pre-immigration or pre-slavery generations to describe any groups of people.

Europe and Africa are both full of their own ethnic tribes — each tribe with their own tribal turf, tribal culture, tribal history, and tribal legacy. People from all of those African and European settings defined themselves by their ancestral, ethnic, and tribal group name.

People from Africa were Zulu or Bogandan or Hutu — not Black. People from Europe were Prussian or Irish or French, not White. The new labels of being Black or White only happened for people after people in this country had a legal and functional reason to differentiate between White and non-White.

“White” Americans tended to lose their primary linkages to their specific European ancestors fairly quickly and all of those people with that ancestry in this country basically became White.

African Americans also lost their individual tribal linkages to their ancestral tribes in Africa and all of the people from Africa who came here became collectively either Black or Negro.

No one in Africa was called either Black or Negro. Everyone in Africa related very directly to his or her explicit ancestral group — not to their skin color.

For second-generation people with African blood in this country, however, no one was Bantu or Zulu or Bogandan. Everyone who had African blood here was simply blended into the composite legal definition of Negro — and the collective label used was Black.

So “White” was a very useful invention for the people who wanted to differentiate in favor of people who were “White.” Laws were written that made White a legal term of art. Those laws made white a functional definition that had actual legal standing.

As noted earlier, that term helped define people during slavery. It also, unfortunately, served as a powerful tool that was used to enable, support, and achieve continuing discrimination against people with African ancestry long after actual slavery ended.

The Civil War Ended Slavery But Did Not End Discrimination

It took an actual major civil war to finally end slavery in this country. It was a very bloody war. More people died in that civil war than died in any other American war.

That massive civil war had multiple levels of conflict built into it. Us/Them instinctive behaviors and Us/Them intergroup differentiations that existed between the various Northern and Southern states on a range of economic and political issues were all part of that war.

Our civil war was an economic war and a tribal war as well as a war of liberation.

In the end, however, the key and most important impact of that conflict was that the practice of slavery in the United States was ended by that war.

Ending the practice of slavery wasn't done in that explicit and very definitive war context particularly gracefully or particularly well, but slavery did end. That was an extremely important cross roads moment in the history of our country. It was extremely important for slavery to end here.

We are a very different nation when we are a nation that allows any of our people to be enslaved. Our future as an enlightened nation depended on us ending slavery in this country. That horrible and bloody civil war ended slavery.

Ending Slavery Did Not Trigger Interracial Harmony

Ending slavery did not, however, simply and inevitably create a time of intergroup enlightenment and interracial harmony for America. We did not enter into a golden age for intergroup interactions. That golden age did not happen.

Many of the people who had wanted to keep their slaves as slaves who had lost that civil war were determined to do what they needed to do to win the Peace. Those people tended to continue to discriminate in a wide variety of ways against their former slaves — treating the former slaves as a very basic instinct-defined category of “Them.”

The us/them instincts that many people felt about racial issues were still functioning with a high level of energy after the war. Our instincts never leave us — and in this case, those instincts continued to be activated against non-White Americans with a major focus on discrimination directed against Black Americans.

There was a period of relative political equality during a very brief post-war “reconstruction” period and then that political equality situation and economic opportunity situation deteriorated significantly for Black Americans in most of the country.

The White Americans who ran both the states and the country created a wide range of deeply and intentionally discriminatory laws that were in place in many settings.

Those laws intentionally forced Black Americans into separate schools, denied access for Black Americans to some public settings, denied access to Black Americans to significant economic opportunities, and made it harder or even impossible for Black Americans to vote in major parts of the country.

Communities of Black Americans that achieved local economic progress and success were, in some settings, burned and destroyed.

Mobs and lynchings happened in multiple settings — with evil intergroup behaviors triggered very intentionally by White racists who used death, violence, and their Lynch mobs to keep Black Americans from making progress or even aspiring to progress in key areas.

All Non-White Americans Faced Discrimination

Jim Crow Laws, anti-miscegenation laws, and basic patterns of economic discrimination created what was clearly and intentionally second class or third class status for Black Americans in this country for more than a century after the end of the Civil War.

Black Americans were clearly not alone in facing those us/them negative realities in this country. The very negative sets of us/them instincts that were triggered by the White American “us” were applied to a wide range of minority group Americans.

Similar discriminatory laws and deliberately discriminatory behaviors were directed against our various groups of Asian American citizens, our Native American peoples, and against all of the various sets of people we include in our collective definition of Hispanic Americans.

Every set of people who were from ethnic or racial minority groups in this country faced direct and deliberate discrimination and legal constraints and barriers. Voting was denied or made impossible for many of those minority Americans.

Major Discrimination Occurred Against Non-Whites

Major economic and political discrimination was directed against all of those groups of non-White peoples — with the specific focus of that discrimination and of those negative behaviors in each case and each situation based on the specific intergroup realities that existed in each local setting.

Chinatowns and Japantowns isolated Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans.

Hispanic Americans were denied economic, educational, and political inclusion in a wide range of settings.

Hispanic Americans were denied voting rights, were unable to buy property, and were kept out of leadership positions in multiple communities that had significant percentages of Hispanic residents.

The education opportunities that existed for Hispanic Americans were limited and barriers to both political and economic success happened in every setting where we had significant Hispanic populations.

Only White American Males Were Excluded From Discrimination

Significant prejudice and deliberate and significant discrimination existed in various settings across America. For people from all of our minority groups, only White Americans were excluded from those levels of discrimination — and those levels of discrimination were, in fact, applied to some degree against White women as well.

The White American male “us” created positive and real inclusion for White American males and discriminated openly and intentionally against every category of “Them.”

We made slow progress in some areas relative to intergroup discrimination in the years after the Civil War and we made absolutely no progress in many other areas.

The Civil Rights movements of the 1950s and the 1960s had a very positive impact on some of those practices. White Americans who were not personally involved in those discriminatory practices in some of our states became more aware at that point of how horrible and discriminatory some of those practices were as a result of the Civil Rights Movement. Progress began to happen on many of those issues at that point in time — but progress was slow and painful.

Slow and painful progress is better than no progress at all.

Some White people obviously supported that progress as it began — or it would not have happened — but many White people from the most discriminatory settings very much did not want that progress to happen. Those people resisted the progress.

The energy and the intense anger that came from many White Americans in the areas where some of the most grievous and most discriminatory laws existed when those laws were ultimately challenged and then repealed by our country is another sad aspect of our history.

Some White Americans Resisted Giving Up Discriminatory

Status

The newsreel films and the television footage that was shot as those initial attempts at integration occurred in a number of settings clearly show a large number of very angry White people resisting the equal rights processes.

That film and footage shows people fiercely resisting giving up their functional power to blatantly discriminate against minority Americans in those settings and reacting to the progress on civil rights issues with resistance, anger, and even rage.

We have come a very long way since that news footage of those events was shot — but we have a long way to go.

Our news media helped immensely in that era of civil rights activism to move us as a country toward more enlightened behaviors and to a more enlightened intergroup context.

Much of that progress would not have happened for us as an entire country had the attempts to achieve equality in those settings not been made visible by the media.

The Internet, today, gives us instant access to information about new events in a very immediate way. Television in the civil rights protest era was not that immediate, but television in that era was both current and irrefutable. The pure visual impact of those negative and oppressive intergroup behaviors was invaluable for helping people to understand the problem and to get people in other states to be on the side of the people who were being oppressed.

Before television news existed, distant riots in various settings could be written about. But the writing that occurred about those riots generally had very little impact on people in other settings. Television gave us an entirely new and more immediate way of understanding and actually seeing what was happening in those settings.

When the television cameras at that point in time showed peaceful Black people being abused in various southern settings by White people in a number of very negative and often demeaning ways — including being beaten by White people and being drenched with the intense water flow from very powerful fire hoses and then beaten by police clubs — and when

clearly Peaceful protestors in some settings were actually killed — then White people who lived elsewhere in the country in less diverse settings who did not have their own us/them instincts currently activated began to find their own us/them instincts being activated in a positive way by those conflicts — with the new “us” for the television viewers in distant states being the Black victims of the White evil deeds.

The images of abuse that were shown on those TV screens caused many White Americans in other parts of the country to align as a human us with the victims of that blatant racism rather than simply aligning as a race or aligning as an ethnic group with the White people in those televised settings who were clearly doing the damaging deeds.

The Genius of Non-Violence Was It Allowed The Formation Of

A New “Us”

Part of the genius of non-violence as a strategy for achieving civil rights success in all of those settings was the fact that the non-violent Black people in those settings clearly took the high moral ground and those people therefore did not trigger a sense of fear or separation or intergroup division in the White people elsewhere in the country who were closely watching that television footage.

Had the resistance by the passive protestors in those televised settings been violent and bloody, instead of Peaceful, that film footage of blood and violence would have instinctively triggered an entirely different set of reactions in the White viewers who were watching those events from outside the South.

The visual image of a small, sweet, lovely, and very brave child going past a wall of hate to get to her school tugged at the heart strings of parents everywhere.

Had that television footage of that same day been film of a couple of dozen well armed Black parents actually using guns and taking over that particular school - the reaction elsewhere in the country by White Americans of that event would not have been supportive.

The Civil Rights non-violent strategy to create a broader sense of “us” was extremely effective for that reason. Peaceful resistance was brilliant from the perspective of our most basic instinct activation levels for all of America.

That strategy to identify the victims as “us” worked a little like the impact that the book *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* had on White readers in northern states before the Civil War.

Non-violence by the people who were being damaged called on people who saw that television footage to be saints — not sinners.

Both *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and Fredrick Douglas's autobiography allowed Northern White readers before the Civil War to align as a human "us" with the Black victims and with the Black people in those books. Without those very powerful and clear books that created that sense of "us" in so many Northern readers, the Civil War would have been a very different war if the war had happened at all.

Discrimination Affected All Groups of Minority Americans

The Civil Rights Movement focused on Black Americans, but discrimination in this country has very clearly not been targeted exclusively against black Americans.

At the same time that we were setting up all of the highly discriminatory Jim Crow and related laws relative to Black Americans that were noted earlier, all of our other minority groups in this country were also facing the brunt of very direct, explicit, significant, and intentional us/them discriminatory situations and behaviors.

The truth was that all of the other groups who were not White were also discriminated against in multiple ways by the people who were White for all of the years that precede the civil rights movements of the 1960s.

Our Hispanic populations in all of the areas where Hispanics live have faced significant prejudices and discrimination in a wide range of areas. That discrimination against our various Hispanic Americans has included being deprived of the vote in some settings.

The full array of discrimination that has been directed against Hispanic Americans has resulted in various levels of economic prejudice and challenges and in significant social and political discrimination in multiple situations and settings.

Educational opportunities have been lower and jobs have been significantly less available for people with Hispanic backgrounds — unless the jobs were in agriculture.

The agriculture economy of major parts of this country has actually been highly dependent in many ways on the fieldwork done by Hispanic workers. Many of those workers are migrant workers — moving seasonally to the various agricultural settings where workers are needed.

Those workers do very hard and very important work. We have food available to us across the country because that work is done where it is done.

Those farm site workers have often been very poorly paid, badly housed, and those workers have had generally weak and inadequate access to needed health care. The sister book to this book — *Ending Racial, Ethnic, and Cultural Disparities in American Health Care* addresses some of those disparity issues relative to health care delivery.

Multiple levels of discriminatory situations continue today for Hispanic Americans. The number of Hispanic Americans in our professions and in our senior leader roles continues to be very low, even today, and the current education levels for our Hispanic citizens is clearly in need of significant improvement.

We have a growing Hispanic population in this country. Because of significant levels of Hispanic immigration and because we have had a relatively high birth rate for our Hispanic people, our Hispanic population is now larger than our black population in many areas of the country.

We Have a Complex Hispanic Population

Our Hispanic population is actually significantly more complex as a group than either our white or our black populations. There is no equivalent

and simple collective “brown” descriptive category that can be functionally used in most settings to describe everyone who is labeled Hispanic. That is true because of the massive internal diversity that exists in this country within the various groups of people who we collectively call Hispanic Americans.

Hispanic, as an overall category of people, simply means any people who are American whose ancestors spoke Spanish.

Hispanic isn’t a racial term. It isn’t even an ethnic or a cultural term. The term Hispanic is purely based on a shared linguistic heritage. We have black Hispanics, white Hispanics, and we have various categories of brown and red Hispanics. There are even some Asian heritage Hispanics.

Each Hispanic group has its own legacy, its own history, and its own culture. Having ancestors who spoke Spanish is the only functional connecting factor for all of those groups.

The Spanish colonized a lot of places across both continents and their nearby island chains. So some Hispanic people in this country have European ancestors who came from Spain itself.

Other Hispanic people have major portions of their ancestry from the local American Indian people in a given setting. Some Hispanic people have ancestors from Africa. Some even have ancestors from Asia.

Cuban Hispanics tend to be a very different ethnic and cultural group than the Mexican Hispanics and both are clearly not the same ethnic group or the same culture as our Puerto Rican Hispanics or our Costa Rican Hispanics.

All Hispanic Groups Have Faced Discrimination

The various Hispanic groups do increasingly tend to have a collective sense of “us” that is centered on some specific political and economic issues, but there isn’t a blended “Hispanic” culture or any collective Hispanic grouping that serves as the functional definition or description of a total collective group of Hispanic people.

Probably the single most important distinguishing factor that unites the full array of Hispanic groups today in our country is the fact that each of the groups has faced significant levels of prejudice and discrimination in the various settings that have had our Hispanic populations.

The number one alignment factor for many of those groups is to have a common enemy.

In all of those settings, discrimination from the White group who has been the majority group in those settings has followed a consistent us/them instinctive behavior pattern and the consequences of those us/them instinctive behavior patterns have often not been good in those settings for the people who have Hispanic legacy.

The discrimination in each setting has been specific to the setting — with local laws and local economic realities that are created in each setting by the playing out of us/them instinctive intergroup behaviors by the local White majority population.

As a political force, the Hispanic voters in many constituencies and communities are now either the majority group or one of the largest minority groups. We are seeing Hispanic mayors of major cities, a growing number of Hispanic legislatures, and members of congress, and a growing level of Hispanic school-based involvement. The economic and education issues for our Hispanic population in many communities continue to be significant.

We have clear learning gaps for reading levels and computational skill levels for people from Hispanic groups in a number of settings.

The learning gap issues clearly need to be addressed in each of those settings where they occur — and the key strategy for making those gaps

disappear clearly needs to be to work with each child to exercise their brain in the first years of life.

That point about early childhood brain development is covered elsewhere in this book and it is described in significant detail in the book *Three Key Years*.

In all settings, we have seen levels of discriminations — and the fact that the local White “us” holding political power has perceived the Hispanic population to be a “Them” in multiple settings has had a negative impact on our Hispanic people in all of those settings.

Asian American is Also a Very Diverse Group

Likewise, our Asian American group category of people has suffered discrimination in every setting. That category of people is also not an actual ethnic label. That particular term also serves as a functional “catch all” label for multiple groups of Asian American peoples.

We currently use the label “Asian American” for some of our census taking purposes and the term is also embedded in some of our laws. It has some value for some purposes, but it really doesn’t tell very much about any given person who fits that label.

The truth is, clearly, that Asian Americans are actually also a rich medley and array of very separate and entirely distinct Asian cultures. Korean Americans are very different than Japanese Americans and both are very different than Chinese Americans.

Each of those groups of people who are labeled in our country as Asian American come from separate ancestral cultures that have existed for many centuries with their own group history, their own group legacy, their own group culture, and their own group languages.

There are many Asian languages — and each group from each setting tends to define itself at a very basic level as a group by its own distinct language.

There is no common mutual language group for Asian Americans that creates any group affinity that is the equivalent at any level of the Spanish language linkage that exists for “Hispanic” Americans.

The Asian American Groups Tend Not To Be Linked

There are actually a very large number of very relevant Asian American primary ethnic groups who have descendants and a significant number of people living in this country.

Southeast Asia alone contains more than a dozen clearly defined groups — each with their own ancestral language and legacy. All of those groups have their own history, culture, and language.

When people from those various ethnicities immigrate to America, there is a tendency for many of the immigrants to move to specific areas of this country where other people from their own group now live. That pattern of behavior creates very clearly ethnic neighborhoods and concentrated ethnic communities in multiple settings.

Those various ethnic groups and various ethnicities communities are functionally not linked to one another in any way. There is no equivalent common ancestral linguistic link for Koreans and Japanese and Chinese that can similarly create a single legacy or any kind of functional intergroup alignment or communities where people choose to live because those communities have a generic Asian American label.

We do use Asian American as a label on our census forms and, as noted earlier, that term is now used in some of our laws about discrimination — but in the real world, it isn't a very useful collective functional label.

That label confuses more than it informs people when it is used to describe any specific group of Asian American people.

Native American Groups Are Not Melding

The original Native American tribes across all settings in this country have also each have chosen to keep their own direct and linear ancestral tribal linkages. No one who knows and understands our Native American groups believes that the Cherokees have merged with the Mohawks or that the Sioux are now a subset of the Cree.

Very much like the Hispanic coalition, there are some key political and social issues where the various Native American groups share common ground. But the overall separate tribal identity for each Native American group continues to dominate definition for its people and each group continues to be fiercely independent of all other groups.

We can safely predict that Native American tribal identities are highly likely to remain that way for the foreseeable future. A visit to the Native American Museum in Washington D.C. makes that point about the separate tribal legacies starkly immediately, consistently, and constantly clear in every area of the Museum.

Neighborhoods Tend To Have Ethnic Concentrations

All of the ethnic groups in this country tend to have neighborhoods and communities that have a high and focused concentration of people from

their group. There are areas in our major cities where there are very high percentages of Native Americans.

There are also neighborhoods with high levels of shared ancestry from each of the various Asian groups. Viettown, Chinatown, Japantown, and Koreatown labels all are useful and accurate labels for describing specific of concentrated communities that exist in a number of major American cities.

The same situation of multiple ethnicities is true for our Americans who have ancestry from the Middle East. Each set of people from each part of the Middle East obviously has their own direct ancestral linkages and each group has their own separate culture and separate collective identity.

No one who describes the descendants of the people who immigrated here from that part of the world ever blends the Iranians and the Egyptians and The Turks into a shared ethnicity group at any level.

In our major cities, we have neighborhoods that have focused concentrations of people from each of those groups.

Each of those ancestral tribal and ethnic linkages from the Middle East continues to clearly and explicitly define very specific sets of people in all of those ancestral settings and each of those specific ancestral linkages continue to at least partially define their direct descendants in this country.

So as we are looking at the impact of our us/them instincts on our group behaviors and our history, we can't do that by dividing all of America into the broad subsets of people that are based on the labels currently used to take the U.S. Census and that are written into some of our discrimination laws.

What we do need to look at are all of the very distinct groups that do exist in each of our communities — and we need to build intergroup Peace realities in each setting based on the actual groups that exist in each setting.

We can, however, look at patterns of intergroup behaviors that relate as overall patterns for all of the various sets of people who have come to these shores and who are now part of the rich fabric of America.

All Of The Minority Groups Have Faced Instinct-Linked Discrimination

What all of those various ethnic, racial, and tribal groups in this country do have in common in this country as an overarching intergroup interaction pattern is that the White population of this country has very consistently discriminated against each and every one of those groups in various ways over the history of our country and has discriminated in each of the settings where the minority group members actually live.

Each of those specific groups has suffered economically to some degree in various settings relative to White Americans.

To understand the realities about intergroup interactions that we need to address as a nation today, we need to understand that it has tended to be harder for people from each of those groups to get jobs, to create careers, and to move ahead economically.

Each group has its own very specific and internally well-known legacy of unmet expectations that have been based on prejudices, discrimination, and significantly reduced levels of opportunity relative to the opportunities available to White Americans.

Each traditionally minority group has its own internal history of problem issues that have existed for a very long time and that still exist to some degree for each group.

The next chapter of this book deals with the impact of those behaviors on all groups of people — including White Americans.