

Light Supremacy vis-à-vis Non-White Immigrants as Racism in the 21st Century: A Question of Color

Ronald E. Hall, PhD., Professor
School of Social Work
Michigan State University

doi: 10.19044/esj.2016.v12n29p62 [URL:http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n29p62](http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n29p62)

Abstract

Racism focuses attention upon African-Americans assumed victimized by Euro-Americans as an outcome of White supremacy. The recent trend in immigration by light-skinned non-White immigrants sustains racism via light supremacy. Distinct from racism per se White supremacy is contingent upon race, racism per light supremacy is contingent upon skin color. Demonstration of light supremacy is referenced in civil litigation and government hate crime statistical data. The most dramatic illustration of light supremacy as racism is referred to as “brown racism.” As suggested by Washington, brown racism is perpetrated by Mestizos, Chinese, Filipinos and South Asians against dark-skinned, persons particularly African-Americans. Considering definition light supremacy is a product of White supremacy attributed to the aftermath of European conquest and/or domination. Lacking acknowledgement of light supremacy as a product of White supremacy will then sustain racism well into the 21st century and beyond if not immediately and effectively challenged by the Sociology academy.

Keywords: Racism; white supremacy; immigrant; skin color

The Complexion Connection vis-à-vis Non-White Immigration as Vehicle of Light Supremacy: Racism in the 21st Century

Introduction

In social science discourse the issue of racism focuses attention upon African-Americans assumed victimized by Euro-Americans assumed the sole perpetrators as an aftermath of the antebellum. The fact that recent trends in non-White immigrant people of color perpetrate racism, simultaneous to the focus upon Euro-Americans as culprit, and the existence of evidence to sustain the non-White fact is attributed to the trivialization of skin color (Sullivan, 2013). The trivialization of skin color in social science

discourse and relative to racism inspires disparities in what exists as pertains to social science literature including peer-reviewed and text book publications. Such disparities in discourse negate the urgency of light supremacy as racism acted out by newly arrived light-skinned non-White immigrant perpetrators against dark-skinned African-American citizens and other dark-skinned non-White victims. In the aftermath is an affront to the prestige and sanctity of Sociology as objective science and Social Work as a social justice profession.

In The Psychology of Skin Color (Gaborro, 2008) Rondilla and Spickard contend that it was at the time of the American colonial occupation that "racial marking of a biological sort" was intensified "in support of United States colonial domination." Their conclusions are commensurate with that of the University of Washington Professor Vicente Rafael who proposes that "It is only with immigrant Filipinos and Filipino Americans that you get this obsession with skin color, obviously a by-product of their historical integration into the North American milieu which assigns to them a racially inferior place" (Gaborro, 2008, p. 47). Subsequently heretofore overlooked is a predisposition of light-skinned non-White immigrants to perpetrate and contribute to the prevailing racism of White supremacy. Said racism that they encounter in the U.S. is evolving to become a newer version of racism in the 21st century.

In consideration of learned scholars and per the aforementioned suggestions will have significant implications for racism, relative to the reputation of the Social Work profession and the Sociology discipline. In publication of The Psychology of Skin Color (Gaborro, 2008) the author dramatically illustrates what many among the lay community had already known. That is by the trivialization of skin color via the standardization of race as currently portrayed in discussions of racism cannot meet the standards of intellectual rigor gleaned from the dearth of available literature on the subject. Contained in such literature is more often contradictory evidence to the suppositions compiled by those who characterize the perpetration of racism as the exclusive domain of Euro-Americans i.e.: light-skinned and dark-skinned African-Americans being exclusive victims (Garriott, Love & Tyler, 2008). The role of African-Americans and other non-White light-skinned people of color in particular who enable White supremacy conducive to racism are all but ignored due to influence of the academy and its restrictive cultural publication norms. In the aftermath racism is couched in limited and misleading contexts which merit preferred institutional funding to study, funding to analyze and then quasi-educate the unknowing public. This is so despite the fact that racism as a product of White supremacy via light skin is no less sustained by people of color via

light supremacy as a product of the heretofore unprecedented version of racism in the 21st century. Light supremacy in the 21st century is then acted out by light-skinned non-White immigrants who relocate to the U.S. with aspirations of assimilation. Not a few arrive with preconceived notions as pertains to human hierarchy whereby light-skinned Euro-Americans and to a lesser extent light-skinned non-White persons in proximity to light skin maintain a superior status and dark-skinned African-Americans by default of racism are considered inferior (Thomas, 2016). The ethnocentric cultural traditions which light-skinned non-White immigrants revere are exacerbated by the American racist dichotomy when they arrive on American soil. In the aftermath is a virulent form of 21st century racism which subjugates sectors of humanity not only by race but by skin color when assessed as dark. Subsequently, the sociological study and Social Work activism as pertains to dark-skinned African-Americans and other dark-skinned non-White victims of racism have not only failed the society at-large but according to various statistical data have all but neglected such victims as a demographic category. This is so notwithstanding calls for racial equality and the ever present notions of Sociology and Social Work as being more rooted in science and social justice respectfully (Van Landingham, 2014). Thus commensurate with the trivialization of skin color, Euro-American perpetrators and African-American victims of racism are disserved by inaccurate just cause rhetoric.

The intent of this paper is to illustrate the role of light-skinned non-White immigrants traveling to the U.S. as vehicle of light supremacy. Light supremacy is herein defined as a 21st century version of White supremacy from whence White racism is derived and perpetuated not by race but by skin color. In various ways light supremacy can be statistically demonstrated in reference to government descriptive statistics such that sustaining racist traditions at the expense of African-Americans and/or dark-skinned populations can be verified. Given the increased immigration of light-skinned non-White populations to the U.S. and elsewhere West 21st century victims of racism will remain an otherwise vulnerable population distinguished by their dark skin color (Glasker, 2014). Continuation of this racist transgression will sustain a permanently vulnerable underclass of Americans forever subject to the abuses of racism increasingly less so by race and more so by color. The following objectives will facilitate comprehension of the prevailing circumstances: (1) the history of White supremacy; (2) non-White U.S. immigration; and (3) light supremacy as racism in the 21st century.

The History of White Supremacy

Historians contend that about the middle of the 15th century the light-skinned Portuguese began abducting dark-skinned Africans from Africa and by threat of violence forced them into slavery. Such an act is regarded as the start of what resulted in the enslavement of untold millions of Africans transported to Europe and the New World Americas. Malcomsen (2000) contends that near finality of the 15th century that light-skinned Europeans who had enslaved dark-skinned Africans rationalized African dark skin as justification for their bondage. Suffice it to say that Africans were enslaved because of their dark skin which contrasted with European light skin. In combination with what Europeans referred to as “pagan” faiths practiced by Africans, Africans were eventually defined as a “black” race which necessitated the eventuality of Europeans being defined as a “white” race. In conclusion historians suggest that there existed no “white” race prior to “invention” of the “black” race. Subsequently, British migrants to the New World then regarded themselves as “white” prior to their arrival. It is for this reason that once British colonists came to the Americas that they brought with them a sense of racial consciousness and a concept of whiteness which defined supremacy in their very existence. That definition was applied to substantiate British superiority to Africans and other darker-skinned, non-White populations. This definition is the foundation of White supremacy in both attitude and tradition (Nogueira, 2013).

In the 1500s following their slavery initiative Caucasians i.e.: light-skinned European Whites began an effort to conquer non-Whites beginning with dark-skinned Africans for purposes of colonizing the non-White world. That effort resulted in such New World and other locations as when the Spanish arrived in the non-White geographic of what is today called South and Central America. They were joined by the Portuguese who invaded the Canary Islands, Cape Verde, and Brazil. The French invaded North America and areas of Africa. The Dutch moved on into Indonesia. They were joined by the Belgians who took control of the Congo. Most of all the British were luminaries in the efforts of Europeans to colonize and otherwise dominate the non-White world by virtue of acting out their belief in White supremacy (Moore, 2014). To understand the dynamics of White supremacy in the U.S. and how said dynamics pertain to racism will require a multi-national explanation of the situation.

Prior to becoming a national sovereignty four European nations struggled against one another for control of the land that would eventually become the U.S.A. They consisted of France, Spain, Holland, and England which later became Great Britain. The British participation for control of the New World is well-known and who frequently challenged the French. As a

consequence of challenge they confronted each other in a number of battles including the French and Indian wars to decide who would assume ownership of the future sovereignty. Eventually both the French and the Indians were defeated as the British ultimately prevailed (Miller, 1996).

Among the perpetrators of White supremacy the British are regarded as the most egregious of racists. They depicted themselves as morally and culturally superior to all of humanity which included non-British Europeans such as the French and the Spanish. Therefore by the time that the British arrived in the New World their racist beliefs about non-White Africans and non-White Indians had assumed a powerful force in daily life of the British common man. The enslavement of Africans had previously been a fact of British life as Queen Elizabeth is said to have owned an African page. Scholars such as Audrey Smedley would write in Race in North America that “It was the English in North America who developed the most rigid and exclusionist form of race ideology” (Gardiner, 2009, p. 3). Contributing to this fact Smedley suggests that the British initially were more segregated considering both White and non-White populations and hence their formidable allegiance to White supremacy.

Non-White populations throughout the world were not unaccustomed to peoples who differed from them by race, color, culture or manner. What’s more for extended periods of time the European White peoples of the Mediterranean were in contact with Africans. Most noted are those who resided in Portugal and Spain. Subsequently, when they arrived in the New World unlike the British the Portuguese and the Spanish were not averse to intermarry with the indigenous population. Therefore miscegenation via sexual contact between the Spanish/Portuguese, Indians, and Africans was quite common. Such contact stood particularly evident in Peru and Mexico which was the final destination of a great number of Africans. There were no laws in these and other Latin American countries that forbid intermarriage. However, light-skinned White Europeans nevertheless occupied superior status in rank followed by light-skinned mestizos as pertains to wealth and power which resulted in the genesis of light supremacy. Thus in every location throughout the New World and the Old, White supremacy was lodged firmly in the global human subconscious (Gardiner, 2009). In the aftermath of White supremacy is the promotion of racism to the level of a universal tradition.

By definition racism extended from White supremacy is initially a Caucasoid tradition grounded in the belief, and advancement of the belief that members of the light-skinned Caucasoid race including Euro-Americans as the British believed are in fact superior to all other races particularly dark-skinned African-Americans (Ogle, 2003). Caucasian superiority is thus assumed evident in Caucasian traits, evident in Caucasian attributes and

Caucasian characteristics when compared to darker-skinned, non-White people of color. Said superiority is most dramatically advocated in reference to African-Americans because persons of African descent by dark skin represent the most dramatic contrast to the light-skinned, Caucasian and/or White status quo. Subsequently, by virtue of their professed superiority Caucasians are then advocated as justified politically, economically and socially in their rule over African and other darker-skinned, non-Caucasian peoples where Caucasian is designated as “White” (Bery, 2014). This contrived justification is racism manifested statistically today in the governmental archives of U.S. hate crimes against African-Americans.

Government statistical data on hate crimes in the U.S. are contained in the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). These statistical data are derived from submissions of 11,211 law enforcement agencies to the FBI. The reporting of said data is required under the 1990 Hate Crime Statistics Act and the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996 (FBI, 1999). Tables 1-3 illustrate the manifestation of light supremacy racism by skin color where all non-White is assumed progressively dark as suggested in the number of hate crime incidents documented.

Table 1: Hate crimes by race and number of incidents

Race	Number of incidents
Anti-white	993
Anti-black	3,120
Anti-Indian	36
Anti-Asian	347
Anti-biracial	214

FBI, 1999

Table 2: Hate crimes by race and type of incident

Race	Burglary	Larceny	Arson	Vandalism
Anti-white	16	13	5	142
Anti-black	31	22	24	906
Anti-Indian	2	2	1	3
Anti-Asian	4	2	4	125
Anti-biracial	6	2	2	71

FBI, 1999

Table 3: Hate crimes by race and offenders’ race

Race	Total offence	White	Black	Indian	Asian	Biracial
Anti-white	1267	214	718	26	15	31
Anti-black	3838	2336	62	04	25	60
Anti-Indian	44	30	05	02	01	00
Anti-Asian	437	200	41	08	05	06
Anti-biracial	312	141	32	00	00	20

FBI, 1999

Display of FBI statistical data reveals startling facts pertaining to racism via hate crimes in proximity of non-Whites to whiteness and/or light skin. Accordingly, per data while all racial categories experience some form of hate crime as determined by 1999 governmental data African-Americans as FBI “black” race proxy are by far the most victimized. Nationally African-Americans represent approximately 13% of the total U.S. population but more than half (3,120) of all hate crime incidents are directed at African-Americans. Their victimization is arguably a matter of racism in a newer version where dark skin serves as a cultural motivation for the conduct of hate crimes.

The hate crime most perpetrated against African-Americans according to 1999 FBI statistics is vandalism. Vandalism occurred against “blacks” i.e.: dark-skinned a total of 906 incidences for the year. This exceeds the number of incidences for all other racial categories combined. Lastly, “whites” per light-skinned race proxy commit most hate crimes against “blacks” per dark-skinned race proxy (2,336). The same descriptive data for blacks as dark-skinned race proxy against “whites” as light-skinned race proxy was 718 incidences for the designated year (FBI, 1999).

In 1990 the United States Congress passed legislation on hate crimes in the aftermath of two citizens brutally murdered: Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. James Byrd, Jr. was a dark-skinned African-American who was murdered by White racists which motivated the U.S. Congress to adopt the Hate Crime Statistics Act, 28 U.S.C. 534 (HCSA). Subsequently it is now actionable by law to hold offenders motivated by hate legally accountable to the jurisdiction of the state where the crime occurred (FBI, 2013).

As a governmental agency the FBI today maintains a hate crime statistics database associated with the Hate Crime Statistics Act. In 2013 according to this database there were a total of 5,928 reports of hate crimes of 6,933 offenses reported by Law enforcement agencies. Their statistics are compiled by the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. Those victimized by hate crimes during the reported year totaled 7,242 victims which consist of individuals, businesses, institutions, or the society in toto. Fortunately reports of hate crimes declined slightly compared to the previous year (2012) which was 5,928 in 2013 compared to 6,573 in 2012. According to 2013 statistics in detail considering the 5,928 cases reported in 2013, six pertained to multiple-bias hate crimes that involved the victimization of 12 persons. Of the total 5,922 single hate crime incidents reported the leading categories were race at 48.5 percent; sexual orientation at 20.8 percent; and religion at 17.4 percent. Therefore race is better than twice the percent of hate crimes reported compared to the nearest alternative category. Furthermore pertaining to the same data where 3,407 single-bias hate crimes

on the bases of race 66.4 percent were committed against African-Americans per dark-skinned. A lesser 21.4 percent were committed against Whites per light-skinned. Subsequently hate crimes against African-Americans compared to Euro-Americans were tripled. When the race of the offender was considered as reported to Law enforcement agencies 5,814 of the identified offenders in the 5,928 cases 52.4 percent were identified as “white” and 24.3 percent were identified as “black.” Therefore the number of “white” offenders (52.4%) was more than double the number of “black” offenders (24.3%). A substantial number of “white” offenders in conjunction with a substantial number of “black” victims are a descriptive statistical government evidence of racism aimed primarily at African-Americans (dark skin) in the U.S. (FBI, 2013). This is a statistical fact that has encouraged racism among newly arrived light-skinned non-White immigrants who act out light supremacy against African-American and other dark-skinned non-White populations. They do so as self-serving submission to the dictates of an American tradition in an effort to appease the racist status quo.

Non-White Immigration

Increasingly, the U.S. is becoming a less White nation, less populated by European immigrants. In fact according to Fey (2012) by 2043 the U.S. will be a predominantly non-White country not irrelevant to current immigration trends. The most dramatic portion of immigrants who reside in America which attracts considerable attention lives in the country illegally. Considering reference to 2012 statistics such immigrants in the United States is calculated at approximately 11.43 million. This is about 3.7% of the total American population. Taking into account the total of that number approximately 59% originate from Mexico. This means that, most are non-White immigrants who have relatively dark skin.

For all immigrants collectively about 25% are located in the state of California. Most are male calculated at 53% of the population (Cohn & Passel, 2009). The top 10 as of 2012 are illustrated in the government descriptive statistics of Table 4: 2012.

Table 4: 2012

Country	Population
1 Mexico	6,720,000
2 El Salvador	690,000
3 Guatemala	560,000
4 Honduras	360,000
5 Philippines	310,000
6 India	260,000
7 Korea	230,000
8 China	210,000

9 Ecuador	170,000
10 Vietnam	160,000
All countries	11,430,000

Cohn & Passel, 2009

As per Table 4: 2012 each immigrant traveled from Mexico (6,720,000); El Salvador (690,000); Guatemala (560,000); Honduras (360,000); Philippines (310,000); India (260,000); Korea (230,000); China (210,000); Ecuador (170,000); and Vietnam (160,000) (Cohn & Passel, 2009). According to statistical data contained in the aforementioned Table 4: 2012 Asian and Latino countries represent the largest immigrant populations arriving in the U.S. Both have been colonized or otherwise dominated by light-skinned White European populations at some point in their nation's history. By contrast to light-skinned Whites, Asians and Latinos as non-Whites are relatively darker-skinned being defined as non-White which avails them to some extent to the racism normally perpetrated against non-White Americans. However compared to African-Americans they are light-skinned in proximity to White considering light supremacy. In an effort to assimilate and improve their quality of life those who are light-skinned non-White immigrants frequently act out behaviors otherwise defined as racist on the basis of skin color but for their non-White racial category.

Evidence of light supremacy as racism by skin color among Latinos is referenced in civil litigation. One of the first cases brought by Latinos was that of the dark-skinned Felix—plaintiff--versus the lighter-skinned Marquez--defendant. It was decided in 1981 by the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia. The plaintiff alleges that the defendant did not promote her on the basis of skin color bias. She testified that among her co-workers, only two were as dark, or darker in skin color than she. She alone was not promoted. As per defendant, the plaintiff was not entitled to a promotion in grade by virtue of her position, her qualifications, her seniority, and/or her length of service. Thus, the court decided that the plaintiff was not promoted in grade for legitimate business reasons having nothing whatsoever to do with her skin color (Felix v. Marquez, 1981). However, her inability to prevail in a court of law does not suggest that racism is non-existent but a fact in that such cases are brought.

Marriage is perhaps the ultimate indicator of racism acted out by light-skinned non-White immigrants. While Latinos actively intermarry with African-Americans and other non-Whites descriptive statistical data reveals disturbing conclusions in attitude studies. Chicano(a)s in Bakersfield, Los Angeles, and San Antonio, Texas (U.S.) confirm this suggestion. In a study documented by Stoddard (1973), investigators measured rejection rates of African-Americans in four categories--marriage, as neighbors, co-workers,

and becoming citizens via naturalization. Euro-Americans rejected African-Americans for marriage 89%, Spanish speaking 62%, urban Chicano(a)s 59% and rural Chicano(a)s by 78%. As neighbors, African-Americans were rejected by Euro-Americans 50% of the time, by Spanish speaking 45%, by urban Chicano(a)s 43% and 71% of the time by rural Chicano(a)s. As co-workers Euro-Americans rejected African-Americans 21% of the time, Spanish speaking 8% of the time, urban Chicano(a)s 39%, and rural Chicano(a)s 70%. Lastly, African-Americans were rejected for becoming citizens via naturalization by Euro-Americans 5% of the time, by Spanish speaking 4% of the time, by urban Chicano(a)s 41% of the time and by rural Chicano(a)s 74% of the time! (Stoddard, 1973). These statistics provide a startling revelation as to the racist attitudes which prevail among Latinos as pertain to African-Americans. Such a reality is no less prevalent among Asian-Americans and/or light-skinned non-White Asian immigrants.

In an attempt to discern light supremacy as racism among Asian populations the author compiled descriptive statistical data on Asian intermarriage. To complete the task said author requested random samples of a mail order bride magazine in brief for years 1991-2000 (one issue for each year). Listed were a total of approximately 620 girls ages 18 to 30. The groups included Filipinas, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Indonesian, Malaysian and “other” to accommodate an occasional Russian, etc. For the most part race was not a significant aspect of the girls’ requirement for correspondence. However of those who mentioned race approximately 96% requested Caucasian men, 2% requested Asian men and 2% requested Hispanic men. The most Caucasian select of the group were by far the Chinese (30%), the Japanese (27%) and the Koreans (14%). This would concur with the reputation of such groups as culturally inclined to human ranking by skin color hierarchy. Indonesian and Malaysian women, a much darker group, requested Caucasian men as well (12%). As pertains to Filipinas 11% requested Caucasian men and 2% requested Hispanic men. None reportedly among the women who participated in the study requested African-American and/or dark-skinned men as their skin colors are indeed considered a handicap.

Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of light supremacy as racism perpetrated by Asian immigrants pertaining to non-White people of color is labeled by sociologist Robert Washington (1990) as “brown racism.” According to Washington (1990), brown racism is perpetrated by Mestizos, Chinese, Filipinos and South Asians. It is considered a variation of white racism that probably occurred as a result of historical confrontation with Europeans and ultimately European domination.

Light Supremacy as Racism in the 21st Century

Light supremacy is a 21st century adaptation of racism perpetrated by light-skinned non-White immigrants against dark-skinned non-Whites contingent upon skin color i.e.: dark. By definition light supremacy is a product of White supremacy attributed to the aftermath of European domination (Polikeit, 2004). In operation light supremacy does not occur, limited to racial boundaries as do race which is indeed irrelevant. However, race boundaries are implicated in proximity to “whiteness” via light skin. Subsequently as an ideology light supremacy is grounded in the belief, and advancement of the belief that members of a light-skinned population in proximity to “whiteness” regardless of race are believed to be superior to all others on the basis of skin color most dramatically pertaining to dark-skinned and/or African-Americans as persons of color (Owen, 2007). The assumed superiority by light-skinned non-White immigrant populations via proximity to “whiteness” is considered by them evident in Caucasian traits, evident in Caucasian attributes and Caucasian characteristics when compared to darker-skinned African-Americans and other non-White people of color. The most dramatic illustration of light supremacy is brought by victimization of dark-skinned African-Americans because they represent the ultimate contrast to racial Whiteness and thereby ultimate threat to the ideology of White supremacy. In deed whiteness as in supremacy owes its very existence to blackness. As a consequence of this dynamic light-skinned non-White immigrants, as are all non-White populations absent conscious effort submit to the dictates of white supremacy thereby insuring the existence of racism currently and well into the foreseeable future. Dedicating their allegiance to the preferred status quo light-skinned non-white immigrants as light supremacists then profess their superiority as justified politically, economically and socially in their passive and often covert subjugation and stigmatization of African and other darker-skinned, non-White peoples. Therefore currently and into the 21st century racism previously designated as “White” is subjugated and then sustained in proximity as “light” (Bery, 2014).

Conclusion

Light supremacy by light-skinned non-White immigrants who sustain racism in the 21st century is no mere political abstraction or futuristic fantasy reflected passively by culture, nationality, or race. Nor is light supremacy representative of some nefarious immigrant plot to exploit dark-skinned people for racist purposes of denying their access to democracy. It is rather a distribution of racial traditions and a lack of sensitivity to what it ultimately implies. It is an elaboration not only of a racist distinction but a racist perspective (Kass, 1997). By such a perspective, Sociology and Social Work

accordingly ransack their philosophical ethos of objective science and social justice. Such failings are a discourse that is by no means in a conspiracy relationship with political factions in the raw; but rather is generated by an uneven exchange with various sources of power including race power, including political power, including intellectual power, including cultural power, and moral power. Indeed, light supremacy does not represent light-skinned non-White immigrants, on the whole and as such has ultimately less to do with racism than with worldly human co-existence (Urrutia, 1994).

Because light supremacy in the denigration of dark skin is a cultural and statistical fact of daily life, it exists not in some current or future fantasy. Quite to the contrary, light supremacy is the current reality that has already laid claim to humanity's future. It is evidenced by racism once perpetuated by race but in the aftermath of light-skinned non-White immigration is increasingly sustained by skin color. Thus, most Americans convinced of a post-racial society ignore the reality that African-Americans and others noted by dark complexions remain hostages in a racist context (Mathews & Johnson, 2015). They overlook the explicit connection between overt racism by race in the past and covert racism by skin color in the current that has corrupted the present and claimed the future absent plausible notice. Any effort at all to address the subject has been rejected by the mainstream as exotic, nuanced, or simply too toxic for polite discussion. But there is no negating the fact that those less given to the acknowledgement of light supremacy have avoided the effort of seriously assessing the quality of life gap between light-skinned and dark-skinned peoples.

The inability to acknowledge the advantages of light skin suggests that light supremacy does not rise to the level of necessary consciousness. Light-skinned non-White immigrants on some level as are their darker-skinned counterparts are astutely aware of the racism attributable to the status quo. The result is an intellectual chasm that has rendered objection to light supremacy all but totally irrelevant to the consciousness of light-skinned non-White immigrants. Extended from the denial of light supremacy is thus ignorance of oppression and the larger super-culture from which it extends (Ray & Rosow, 2012). Morality and contribution to oppression is measured by overt individual effort by race, which allows those so inclined to light supremacy to sustain themselves morally despite their oppressing actions. Absent acknowledgement of light supremacy as a product of White supremacy will then sustain racism well into the 21st century and beyond if not immediately and effectively challenged for its complexion connection.

References:

1. Bery, S. (2014). Multiculturalism, teaching slavery, and White supremacy. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(3), 334-352.
2. Cohn, D. & Passel, J. (2009). Pew Hispanic Center Research Report: A portrait of unauthorized immigrants in the United States. Retrieved on July 26, 2016 from <http://immigration.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=000845>
3. Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2013). Latest Hate Crime Statistics Report Released: Publication Includes New Data Collected Under Shepard/Byrd Act. Retrieved on July 26, 2016 from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/latest-hate-crime-statistics-report-released>
4. Federal Bureau of Investigation (1999). *Crime in the United States 1998*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
5. Felix v. Marquez, 78-2314, (U.S. Dist. CT. Dist. of Columbia, 1981).
6. Fey, W. (2012). Census Projects New “Majority Minority” Tipping Points. Retrieved on 7/29/16 from <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/12/13-census-race-projections-frey>
7. Gaborro, A. (2008). *The Psychology of Skin Color*. Filipinas, 17(191), 47.
8. Gardiner, W. (2009). Reflections on the history of White supremacy in the United States. Retrieved on July 25, 2016 from http://www.uua.org/sites/live-new.uua.org/files/documents/gardinerwilliam/whiteness/white_supremacy_us.pdf
9. Hall, R. (2001). *Filipina Eurogamy: Skin color as vehicle of psychological colonization*. Quezon City, Philippines: Giraffe Books.
10. Glasker, W. (2014). Color matters: skin tone bias and the myth of a post-racial America. *Choice*, 52(1), 143.
11. Kass, L. (1997). The end of courtship. *Public Interest*, 126, 39-63.
12. Malcomsen, S. (2000). *The American Misadventure of Race*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
13. Mathews, T. J., & Johnson, G. S. (2015). Skin complexion in the twenty-first century: The impact of colorism on African American women. *Race, Gender & Class*, 22(1/2), 248–274.
14. Miller, S. (1996). America in European consciousness, 1493-1750/ceremonies of possession in Europe’s conquest of the New World. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 53(4), 797-801.

15. Moore, W. (2014). The legal alchemy of white domination: Embedding white logic in equal protection law. *Humanity & Society*, 38(1), 7-24.
16. Nogueira, S. (2013). Ideology of white racial supremacy: colonization and decolonization processes. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 25(1), 23-32.
17. Ogle, G. (2003). 'The Eternal Power of Reason' and 'The Superiority of Whites': Hilliard d'Auberteuil's Colonial Enlightenment. *French Colonial History*, 3, 35-50.
18. Owen, D. (2007). Towards a critical theory of whiteness. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 33(2), 203-222.
19. Polikeit, G. (2004). The European constitution and dreams of world domination. *Marxistische Blätter*, 42(1), 36-42.
20. Ray, R. & Rosow, J. A. (2012). The two different worlds of Black and White fraternity men: Visibility and accountability as mechanisms of privilege. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 41(1), 66–94.
21. Stoddard, E. (1973). *Mexican Americans*. New York: Random House.
22. Sullivan, S. (2013). Inheriting racial disparities in health: Epigenetics and the transgenerational effects of white racism. *Critical Philosophy of Race*, 1(2), 190-218.
23. Thomas, D. (2016). Niggers and Japs: the formula behind Japanese hip-hop's racism. *Social Identities*, 22(2), 210-225.
24. Urrutia, A. (1994). The development of black feminism. *Human Mosaic*, 28(1), 26-35.
25. Van Landingham, M. (2014). On the hard and soft sciences in public health. *Public Health Reports*, 129(2), 124.
26. Washington, R. (1990). Brown Racism and the Formation of a World System of Racial Stratification. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 4(2), pp. 209-227.