



Racialization and Muslims: Situating the Muslim Experience in Race Scholarship

Saher Selod^{1*} and David G. Embrick²

¹*Simmons College*

²*Loyola University Chicago*

Abstract

This article reviews how racialization enables an understanding of Muslim and Muslim American experience as racial. Race scholarship in the United States has historically been a Black/White paradigm. As a result, the experiences of many racial and ethnic groups who have become a part of the American landscape due to the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 have largely been ignored in race scholarship. By reviewing racialization and its application to Arabs and Muslims, it is apparent that scholars must continuously explore newer theories and languages of race. Racialization not only provides a way to understand the fluidity of race and racism but it also contributes to the advancement of race scholarship by reflecting on the current contextual influences on race.

Introduction

The US race scholarship within sociology has yet to critically engage with issues surrounding immigration. As the American landscape has changed, newer theories of race are required in order to reflect these changes. While the field of race and ethnicity has made strong advances in some areas, other areas remain underdeveloped. For example, race scholars need to theoretically explain how some cultural traits, like religious identity, have become essentialized and thus impact individual experiences with discrimination. Our aim in this review is to advocate for research that explores Muslim and Muslim Americans within race scholarship. We suggest that the concept of “racialization” is a useful theoretical tool which allows scholars the needed language to talk about the Muslim or Muslim American experience as racial.

Antiquated theories of race were primarily concerned with biological explanations for differences between Blacks and Whites in the United States (Turner 1978). As African-American sociologists, such as W.E.B. DuBois (1989) and Frazier (1968a, 1968b), began to theorize about race, they debunked many of the racist theories used to justify the oppression of African-Americans. Assimilation theories became popular after Robert Park (1950) introduced the stages in the cycle of race relations. Assimilationists were interested in how White ethnic immigrants were able to become a part of the mainstream, while Blacks were still economically, politically, and socially disempowered. The majority of race scholarship in the early- to mid-20th century derived from a need to understand the experiences of African-Americans in society primarily because of their history with slavery and segregation in the United States. Although Native Americans were living in the United States at the time, their racialized experiences have not garnered the same amount of attention in sociology race scholarship as African-Americans.

In the middle of the 20th century, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 lifted restrictions on immigration from non-European countries such as those from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East resulting in a new racial, ethnic, and religious landscape. As a

consequence of this, current race scholarship has begun to look at the ways new racial paradigms can explain the experiences of these newer immigrant groups in the United States by understanding the social construction of race. One theory that has become influential is racial formation (Omi and Winant 1994), which argues racial categories laden with racial meaning are the result of the social, political, and economic influences of the time. Thus, racial and ethnic categories are constantly forming, evolving, and being maintained in society at the institutional and individual level of society. In the same vein, race theories such as the Latin Americanization Thesis (Bonilla-Silva 2004) attempt to racially classify American society into three (or more) strata determined primarily (although not necessarily) by skin tone, phenotype, hair texture, eye color, culture, education, class, and pigmentocracy: Whites, honorary Whites, and collective Blacks. These new classifications were created with the intent to move beyond binary racial theories that explained only Black/White relationships to ones that could include the racial experiences of newer racial and ethnic groups who migrated to the United States after the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. There are a few contributions these newer racial paradigms produced: a new language to explain how groups acquire racial meaning when they migrate to the United States and space to understand how racial meanings change due to political, economic, and social contextual shifts. Additionally, race scholarship is moving toward incorporating other types of racism, moving beyond skin tone. For example, ethnoracism (Arando and Gil 2004) is a concept that incorporates cultural markers, such as clothing, language, and beliefs, as the basis for racism. Thus, cultural racism has become more prominent in understanding the complexity of racism for newer immigrant populations both in the United States and Europe (Modood 2005; Bonilla-Silva 2010). Modood (2005) argues that cultural traits are subjected to “othering” explaining how Muslims have become racialized, while Bonilla-Silva (2010) found newer forms of racism include essentializing cultures of minorities. Although there are differences in the way the two define cultural racism, both highlight the need for the examination of the importance of cultural traits in understanding race and racism.

This movement in race theory away from what often were phenotypical explanations of race creates space for a discussion of Muslim experiences within race scholarship. Rana (2011) relies on racial formation to examine the racialization of Muslims. He uncovers how historically religion was once used to differentiate Muslims and Jews from Christians into second-class citizens (Rana 2011). Muslims were once excluded from membership in European societies because they were viewed as inherently different from Christians because of their religious identity. This ideology justified colonization and imperialism against Muslim populations. It is important to revisit this history in order to understand the similarities between the past and the present in the current racialization of Muslims.

In the rest of this article, we do the following: First, we examine how religion was once used as a way to place individuals into social hierarchies prior to a system of race based on biological differences. The historical relationship of religion to race informs current discussions of the inclusion of Muslims in contemporary race dialog. Next, we unpack the concept of “racialization” and discuss why we believe it to be a useful (and more accurate) tool for understanding Muslim and Muslim American identity in America. Third, we provide an extended review of how racialization has been used by scholars to theorize about Arabs and Muslims in the United States. These scholars examined the impact of 9/11 on an Arab racial identity and argue that Arabs are no longer an invisible minority but are rather a visible one (Naber 2008; Shyrock 2008; Tehranian 2008). As a result, much of the scholarship on 9/11 that incorporates a racial paradigm focused on the Arab experience. Thus, it is important to first understand how racialization has been used to talk about Arabs and race before exploring its application

to Muslims. We also demonstrate how applying racialization to Muslims requires an analysis of gender. Too often, gender and race are treated as separate entities, even though our identities of gender, class, race, and sexuality intersect. We show that Muslim men and women are racialized differently. Finally, we conclude with suggestions as to how researchers might address some of the shortcomings we outlined above.

Religious discrimination: creating social hierarchies based on religious differences

Prior to imperialist classifications of race, religious identities were used to organize people into social, economic, and political hierarchies. Religious discrimination toward non-Christians was prevalent in Europe; non-Christians were seen as inferior to Christians, which justified imperialism, and in many instances genocide. In Europe, after the expulsion of the Ummayyad dynasty (a Muslim population) from Spain, non-Christian society was differentiated into two types of people – those who were viewed as godless and those with the “wrong” religion. African slaves and Native Americans fell into the former category (Grosfoguel and Mielants 2006). Debate circulated about whether the indigenous people who were seen as godless were also without a soul. One school of thought perpetuated the belief that people without a soul could be enslaved since they were not human, while another view posited that these were humans who, rather than be enslaved, should be converted to Christianity (Wallerstein 2006). Thus, groups without a god were exposed to harsher forms of discrimination, such as violence and enslavement. Those with the wrong god were treated as if they could be saved, although they were still treated as less than human because of their religious differences. Religion was used to create a hierarchy very similar to a racial one, where some groups were seen as potentially assimilable, and others were treated as if they are incapable of being part of the human race.

Muslims, along with Jews, were placed in the latter category as individuals with the wrong religion and were deemed biologically inferior to Christians (Grosfoguel and Mielants 2006; Rana 2011). The term “purity of blood” was used to differentiate Jews, Muslims, and Christian converts from true Christians (Goldschmidt 2004). The prevailing ideology was that in order to be considered a “real” Christian, one had to have pure Christian blood. Religious identity had a biological component to it and was not simply based on cultural differences. It was believed that Muslims were inherently and innately inferior to Christians due to perceived biological differences. Consequently, Christians were placed at the top of the hierarchy in society, while Jews and Muslims were given second-class status.

Even though Muslims have been denied basic rights because of their religious identity for hundreds of years (especially in Europe), anti-Muslim discrimination has been largely ignored or minimized within academic scholarship. Rana (2007) argues prominent race theorists like Omi and Winant (1994) affirm anti-Semitism as a form of racism but ignore anti-Muslim prejudices that have been prominent in European history. For example, the term *Muselmann* was used during World War II to refer to Jews in concentration camps close to dying from starvation and exhaustion, whose listlessness and lack of expression were likened to that of a prostrate Muslim in prayer.

This final description attempts to undo the entanglement of Jews and Muslims in their history of shared racialization by referring to Muslims as Orientals and supplicants with a rigid disposition. This is itself an older description of Muslims that relies on European stereotypes of the Turk and Moor in terms of bodily comportment. Hence this conflation of the Jew-as-Muslim refers to a projection of a racialized mutability of a religious state that is not only a religious practice but somehow an essential character (Rana 2007:158).

Here, Jews are further dehumanized through an association with Muslims. Anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic sentiments have been closely connected to anti-Semitism, even though this has been largely ignored in research on race (Kalmar 2009).

This history is important to revisit because it incorporates the complexities of how individuals were historically situated as the “other.” Religion was one of the many factors used to differentiate between groups of people based on biological differences, relying on the notion that you could have Christian or non-Christian blood. Parallels between the “one-drop” rule and this can be drawn. For example, imperialists created imagined racial and religious differences between populations in order to justify the genocide and colonization of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. In a post-9/11 society, imperialism is once again being sold to the American public under the guise of the “war on terror.” Wide acceptance of socially constructed notions of Muslims and Arabs as terrorists who are inherently opposed to democracy, freedom, and Western values attracts public support and allows for justification of illegal or irrational wars such as the US invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan (Razack 2008, Cainkar 2009; Rana 2011). This creation of the Muslim as the “other” is a racial project and should be situated within race scholarship. Racialization is a theoretical tool scholars can use to understand the creation, maintenance, and changing nature of racial meanings and experiences. In the next section, we review this theoretical approach.

Racialization

Racialization is not a new concept. European scholars have been defining and redefining racialization for the past few decades.¹ For example, Fanon (2004) used the term to talk about the “racialization of thought” in order to describe the way Africans who were colonized by Europeans adopted a colonized way of thinking about their national identities (Murji and Solomos 2005). Banton (1977) wrote about racialization as the process where European imperialists applied racial categories to individuals from colonized nations. According to Banton, this process is tied to race-making which is a product of misclassifications of humans based on imagined biological difference. In the United States, Omi and Winant (1986) employ the term to talk about shifting and changing meanings associated with race within the United States. “The concept of racialization signifies the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group” (Omi and Winant 1986:64).² Their definition of racialization is largely tied to racial classifications as they employ racialization as a process of racial formation, the process where racial categories are formed, occupied, transformed, and dismantled. While Banton (1977) and Omi and Winant (1986) view racialization as tied to an actual race, Miles (1993) argues that racial meaning can be given to various forms of difference such as ideological and cultural traits allowing for a discussion of the racialization of some groups without relying on phenotypical differences. By using Miles’ application of the concept, “racialization” can be used to better understand how racial meanings are assigned to groups that were racially classified as White but were not afforded the privileges associated with whiteness, such as Jews and Irish (Kushner 2005; Garner 2009). Scholars can use racialization to identify how cultural traits of White ethnics were assigned racial meaning resulting in their rejection from a White identity, even if their skin tone was white. This framework has created some debate and controversy because of its capability of moving beyond discussions of phenotypical differences in a discussion of race and racism. Cohen (1994) contends it is impossible to talk about racial experiences without racial classification based on phenotypical differences. Another major critique of racialization is that as a concept, it becomes too broad and can incorporate a myriad of differences, such as gender or sexuality, that are not inherently racial (Barot and Bird 2001; Goldberg 2005).

The critiques of racialization are problematic for a few reasons. First, it privileges biological definitions of race. Race scholars who insist race has to be tied to phenotype or pigmentation ignore the nuances of racism by reducing it to skin tone. Scholars can use racialization to understand how African immigrants who migrate to the United States acquire a new racial classification of Black or African-American due to their shared pigmentation, but they can also employ it to explain how signifiers such as language, religion, clothing, etc. acquire racial meanings. Racialization as a concept reflects the changing meanings of race within different political, social, and economic contexts producing a more expansive and complex discussion of race. Applying racialization provides a more complex analysis of how Irish and Jews in the United States experienced *de facto* racism and were denied the privileges associated with whiteness (Ignatiev 1996; Brodtkin 1998). It also explains how some White ethnic groups were able to vacillate in and out of whiteness. Scholars' use of racialization would provide a multifaceted and accurate understanding of White ethnic experiences situating it within the appropriate social, political, and cultural contexts as opposed trying to make sense of their experiences by comparing them with Blacks in the United States, a contextually incomparable comparison.

Scholars of racialization are able to bridge the gap between scholarship on immigration and race. Because race theories in the United States were used to understand Black/White experience, attempting to apply these frameworks to groups that were socially, politically, and economically contextually distinct is irresponsible. For example, Pakistani and Indian immigrants who migrated immediately after the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 were educated professionals (Smith 1999). Their economic status requires attention when analyzing the status of each group in relation to whiteness as well as the privileges they have access to and the ones they are denied. Although Pakistani and Indian immigrants have never been considered white, their experiences are not identical to African-Americans regardless of some similarities in pigmentation. Indian and Pakistani professionals gained access into White communities due to a combination of factors. They migrated with professional degrees to the United States after segregation was legally dismantled and therefore were granted opportunities denied to Blacks. Although they were provided economic opportunities, Pakistani and Indian immigrants and their offspring have not been fully accepted as Americans due to cultural, religious, and physical differences because they are perpetually viewed as foreigners. Thus, due to reasons for migration, their experiences do not mirror African-Americans, and due to their physical appearance and cultural traits, their experiences are not comparable with White ethnics. Because race is a fluid concept and not static, it is imperative to understand that racism does not only inflict one group but also uniquely impacts racial and ethnic groups. Those who employ racialization are able to provide a space where race theory can move beyond a Black/White paradigm in order to discuss new racial meanings and new racisms experienced in new political, cultural, and economic contexts. Racialization is the needed language race scholars need to talk about the issues that are often ignored, such as immigration. The next two sections provide a review of how racialization has been used to theorize about Arabs and Muslims.

Racialization of Arabs, Arab Americans, Muslims, and Muslim Americans

Arabs and Arab Americans

After 9/11, the status of Arabs in the United States was viewed as tenuous. Many academics argued that negative attitudes and discrimination toward Arabs increased after the attacks on the World Trade Center. Notwithstanding, such arguments increasingly supported the fact that Arabs were becoming a "visible" as opposed to an "invisible" minority (Alsultany,

2012; Naber 2008; Tehranian 2008; Cainkar 2009). Because Arabs are racially classified as White, their experiences with discrimination are often overlooked or denied as racist. As a result, there was an increase in research that situated the Arab experience within race scholarship (Bayoumi, 2006; Cainkar 2008; Jamal 2008; Naber 2008). When Arab cultural traits are essentialized as inferior, barbaric, disloyal, patriarchal, and a potential terrorist, Arab bodies are rejected from whiteness regardless of their assigned racial classification. Scholars use racialization in this case to demonstrate the porous boundaries of whiteness, where the social, political, and economic contexts influence inclusion and exclusion from racial categories (Jamal 2008; Naber 2008; Shyrock, 2008). This application of racialization to Arab bodies should be questioned because it does not accurately reflect or represent all Arab experiences. It is important to clarify the specific factors, which result in an Arab population being stripped of privileges associated with whiteness and whether or not this universally impacts the entire Arab population. Thus, some Arabs are viewed and treated as White in society and enjoy the privileges associated with whiteness, while others do not. In other words, utilizing racialization to talk about Arabs in the United States requires a more thorough examination of the specific characteristics that result in differential experiences with race and racism.

Shyrock's (2008) analysis of the 2003 Detroit Area Arab Study (DAAS) revealed that religion is an important factor in whether or not Arabs self-identify as White or not. Shyrock (2008) found 73 percent of Christians identified themselves as White compared with 50 percent of Muslims, highlighting that religion influenced how Arabs racially identified themselves. Another study on Arabs and psychological stress showed Arab Muslims were more likely to experience increased levels of stress due to discrimination compared with Arab Christians (Amer and Hovey 2007). These studies demonstrate the salience of religion in the racialization of Arabs as well as its influence on Arab experiences with racism. Although a Muslim identity contributes to the exclusion from whiteness, situating anti-Muslim experiences within race scholarship has been difficult. Attempting to fit the Muslim experience into the existing paradigms of race becomes hard to do because Muslims are not a monolithic group racially, ethnically, or economically. Thus, they do not comprise one racial category but are members of many existing racial groups. Rather than abandon efforts to situate Muslim experiences within a racial framework, race scholars need to find newer tools and paradigms that accurately reflect the changing nature of race and racism.

More race scholars are finding the concept of racialization useful in analyzing the Muslim experience in the US context (Kibria 2011; Rana 2011). As the result of increased levels of discrimination and prejudice against Muslims in the United States (Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (2009)), there has been an elevated interest in anti-Muslim racism and Islamophobia. This requires investigating how religious signifiers acquire racial meaning. The next section summarizes this newer trend of applying racialization to Muslim experiences.

Muslims and Muslim Americans

The term Islamophobia is frequently used to describe the negative images and feelings that exist toward Islam. Runnymede Trust Commission's report, *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All* (1997), defines Islamophobia as the view of Islam as a separate, aggressive, violent, sexist political ideology promoting military advancement. Halliday (1999) problematizes the utilization of Islamophobia as a framework because of its overreliance on attitudes toward a religion rather than acts toward individuals. Islamophobia and racism are not mutually inclusive terms. Rather, Islamophobia is conceptualized as a form of phobia toward a religion rather than a label for discriminatory actions against Muslims. In a post-9/11 society, however, a new framework is necessary that allows for an examination of the experiences of people with anti-Muslim racism.

A Muslim identity, although diverse, can trigger certain shared experiences regardless of one's racial or ethnic background exemplified by the public and state scrutinizing of Muslims in Europe and North America (Cole 2003; Razack 2008; Cainkar 2009; Meer and Modood 2010; Peek 2011; Rana 2011). Muslim men and women experience racialization in different ways because of their gender. Because some Muslim women wear one of the most recognizable symbols of Islam, the hijab, they are easily identifiable as a Muslim (Williams and Vashi 2007) and have become targets for verbal abuse by the public (Cainkar 2009). Muslim men, on the other hand, are viewed as potential terrorists and a threat to homeland security (Cainkar, 2009; Rana 2011). For example, immediately after the terrorist attacks, the United States waged the "war on terror" by invading Afghanistan and Iraq, and domestically through laws and policies implemented to monitor non-citizens as well as citizens. The first step in this war was to define the enemy, which resulted in the widespread acceptance of the socially constructed terrorist as a Muslim (Rana 2011). This stereotype was not a new one, but one that has been in existence for decades. This association of Muslims as a terrorist and violent has been deeply ingrained in the psyche of many Americans prior to 9/11 through Orientalist stereotypes in the media (Mandel 2001; Calvert 2007; Gottschalk and Greenberg 2007; Shaheen 2008). Thus, it was easy for Muslims to become suspects and targets of the policies and laws passed in order to protect society from the enemy living within. An example of one law passed in 2001 is the USA PATRIOT Act, Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism, which attacked the civil liberties of Muslim immigrants and citizens in the United States by making secret searches and wiretaps without probable cause legal and allowing the deportation of non-citizens for associations with unfavorable political organizations (Cole 2003). The National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS or more widely referred to as the Special Registration Program), enacted in June of 2002, required non-citizen men over the age of 16 from twenty-four Muslim countries to undergo fingerprinting and interrogations (Cainkar 2009; Maira 2009). Islam as a religion became synonymous with terrorism, and as a result, Muslim men were criminalized (Rana 2011). Thus, gender plays a significant role in how Muslims are racialized. Muslim men are targeted by the state as potential threats to national security. They become the terrorist. The combination of laws and policies in addition to the internalization of existing stereotypes created the political and social contexts for the treatment of Muslims men as the "other."

The experiences of Muslim women vary from that of Muslim men. Muslim women have not been treated as if they were a national threat but rather are viewed as if they are a cultural threat to society. Indeed, Razack (2008) demonstrates how Muslim women are viewed as imperiled by Muslim men. This rationale has then been used to justify imperialism and war against Muslim nations. In the United States, the hijab has often been associated with inequality and the subordination of women rather than evidence of women's agency (William and Williams and Vashi, 2007). Second, women who are identifiable as Muslim are viewed as a cultural threat to Western ideals of feminism and equality of the sexes (Ahmed 1992; Razack 2008). Thus, a Muslim identity racializes women as subordinate, oppressed, and powerless women in relation to violent and aggressive Muslim men.

European scholars are also employing racialization to understanding the Muslim experience in Europe. Meer and Modood (2010), for example, argue that social hierarchies of individuals were once based on religious differences. Hence, perceived differences of human bodies due to religion preceded biological racism in Europe, resulting in the horrific treatment of Muslims and Jews. They argue the ethnic cleansing of Bosnian Muslims represents a return to this ideology. Cultural racism incorporates religious difference as a way to differentiate individuals into deserving and undeserving of certain rights and privileges.

Current Muslim experiences with racism illustrate a return to essentializing religious differences to differentiate between the deserving and undeserving in America as well as in a global society. When cultural traits are racialized, this enables an understanding of how Muslim experiences with discrimination are racial in nature (Rana 2011). Muslim signifiers and symbols have become riddled with essentialized racial meanings such as foreign, violent, aggressive, and misogyny. Taken together, these stereotypes result in the belief that a Muslim body is incapable of upholding democratic or Western ideals and values. This justifies the surveillance of Muslims because they are viewed as a disloyal population that is a threat to national security. It also justifies military action against Muslim populations around the world.

One of the few scholars in the United States who has thoroughly engaged with racialization of Muslims is anthropologist Junaid Rana. Rana (2011) makes the case that Muslims have become a new racial category in his study on Pakistani labor migrants. He argues this is not a new phenomenon, but one that is situated in a history of nationalism, racism, sexism, and the exploitation of migrant laborers. According to Rana, the racialization of Muslims is situated within a “global racist system.” In a post-9/11 world, the Muslim terrorist body derives from an imagined Muslim nation through the conflation of South Asian and Arab countries. “The conceptual history of Islamophobia is based in a theory of racial ascription of bodily comportment, superimposition, and dissimulation—that is the assorted ways to define ‘race’ based on visual attributes such as skin color and phenotype, as well as customs and costumes. The process of racializing Muslims involves placing biological and cultural determinism in a contradictory logic purporting that race is immutable and essential but simultaneously mutable and fluid” (Rana 2011:28). He argues the creation of the Muslim terrorist is how migrant laborers are criminalized and controlled in a global economy. When labor demands are exceeded or no longer needed, Pakistani migrants are criminalized as a threat to society and are deported or threatened with deportation. By unveiling the complex relationship of labor, immigration, racism, gender, and nationalism, Rana successfully demonstrates how a Muslim identity has become racialized as a threat to national security resulting in Pakistani labor migrants’ precarious status within a global racial system.

While Rana makes a compelling case for employing racialization as a theoretical tool to analyze Muslim experiences with racism, his research had some noteworthy limitations. Rana’s research assumes a homogenous understanding of Muslim experiences. Although Rana (2011) shows the importance of gender when Muslim immigrant men’s bodies are racialized as terrorists, his study does not include the experiences of American citizens, Muslim immigrants who do not migrate as unskilled laborers, or the impact of racialization on Muslim women’s experiences. Arguing that a Muslim is becoming a new racial category based on his study of labor migrants is interesting, but he does not address how all migrants acquire a racial category once they come to the United States. In a racialized social system, all individuals are assigned a racial identity, and resources are allocated based on race (Bonilla-Silva 2001). Thus, Muslims are already racially classified in the United States, and to argue they have moved into a new racial category assumes that religion is the only factor in one’s racialization. Rana fails to reveal how religion intersects with skin tone, gender, language, and nation of origin in further racializing individuals. Ultimately, Rana’s argument is compelling and a contribution to studies on racialization.

Discussion: the future of racialization

There is a need for race scholars to work toward further conceptualizing racialization. For example, race scholars could use racialization to understand how boundaries of whiteness

are maintained. As scholars begin to further develop this concept, it will allow for a broader understanding of race that can include immigrant experiences. Therefore, racialization should not be exclusively viewed as the process in which new racial categories are created (although it can be used to explain this process for African immigrants migrating to the United States) but should be used to understand how groups are rejected from whiteness and how race and racisms mutate and change depending on the social and historical context. In a post-9/11 society, Muslim civil liberties are not protected when their experiences with discrimination either by the state or their fellow citizen are viewed as necessary or acceptable in order to promote national security. This simply reinforces the notion that a Muslim is inherently dangerous to society. Furthermore, if the Muslim experience is divorced from racism, collective action and public outcry will be minimal. It is necessary to create race language that enables scholars to advance race scholarship. In order to make racialization a comprehensive tool, it cannot be utilized without an analysis of the intersection of other variables such as skin tone, gender, language, sexuality, and nation of origin. Racialization enables the intersection of gender and race that is so often missing from discussions of race. Racialization provides the appropriate language to talk about the details of how racial meanings are applied to Muslim men and women's bodies. It is the responsibility of race scholars to create new ways to talk about newer racial relationships in the United States. Until they do, this anti-Muslim discrimination, as well as other forms of racism, will be dismissed and ignored.

Short Biographies

Saher Selod is an assistant professor of sociology at Simmons College. She joined the Department of Sociology. Her research interests are in race and ethnicity, gender, religion, and citizenship. Her research examines how Muslim Americans experience racialization in the United States through their de-Americanization or cultural exclusion from social citizenship. She specifically focuses on how Muslim men and Muslim women experience gendered forms of racialization. At Simmons College, Dr. Selod teaches courses on principles of sociology, research methods, gender and Islam, and Islamophobia.

Dr. David G. Embrick is an associate professor in the Sociology Department at Loyola University Chicago. He received his PhD from Texas A&M University in 2006. Dr. Embrick has published in a number of journals including *Sociological Forum*, *Symbolic Interaction*, *Race and Society*, *Sex Roles*, *Critical Sociology*, and the *Journal of Intergroup Relations* and is the author of three books, *Globalization and America: Race, Human Rights & Inequality*, *Utopian Dreams and Apocalyptic Fantasies: Critical Approaches to Researching Video Game Play*, and *Critical Social Policy and Video Game Play: Social Exclusion, Power & Liberating Fantasy*. Dr. Embrick's publication has centered largely on the issue of the impact of contemporary forms of racism on people of color. While most of his research is specific to inequalities in the business world, he has published on race and education, the impact of schools welfare and prisons on people of color, and issues of sex discrimination. He is currently finishing three book projects due to come out between 2013 and 2014: an *International Handbook of the Demography of Race and Ethnicity* (with Rogelio Saenz and Nestor Rodriguez); a sole-author monograph of his work on diversity in corporate America titled, *The Making of an Illusion: Diversity Ideology and White Male Bonding in the Post-Racial Era*; and a textbook project with Eduardo Bonilla-Silva titled, *Can We All Just Get Along? The Problems of White Supremacy in the Modern World*. Dr. Embrick is a former American Sociological Association Minority Fellow. He is the past chair of the American Sociological Association's Section on Race and Ethnic Minorities and currently the secretary/treasurer of the American Sociological Association's Sociology of

Latino/as Section. He is also the current chair of the Society for the Study of Social Problem's Racial/Ethnic Minorities Division as well as the vice-president of publications for the Association of Humanist Sociology and the vice-president of the Southwestern Sociological Association. He has been invited to give talks on his work in a wide range of venues both academic and public to include University of Missouri at Columbia, Indiana University Purdue University at Fort Wayne, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago Commission on Human Relations, Chicago United, University of Oklahoma, Southeastern Louisiana State University, Duke University, Stonehill College, Roosevelt University, and most recently Transylvania University.

Notes

*Correspondence address: Dr. Saher Selod, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway C 205A, Boston, MA 02115. E-mail: saher.selod@simmons.edu

- ¹ See *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* by Karim Murji and John Solomos for an overview of the concept and how it is being employed. Aside from a few American contributors, the discussion appears to be taking place within European race scholarship.
- ² Although they define it in their first edition of *Racial Formation in the United States*, the term does not appear in the revised 1994 version of the book.

References

- Ahmed, Leila. 1992. *Women and Gender in Islam*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alsultany, Evelyn Azeeda. 2012. *Arabs and Muslims in the Media: Race and Representations after 9/11*. New York: New York University Press.
- Amer, Mona and Joseph Hovey. 2007. "Sociodemographic Differences in Acculturation and Mental Health for a Sample of Second Generation & Early Immigrant Arab Americans." *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 9: 335–347.
- Arando, Elizabeth, and Guillermo Ribollo-Gil. 2004. "Ethnoracism and the Sandwiched 'Minorities.'" *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(7): 910–927.
- Banton, Michael. 1977. *The Idea of Race*. London: Tavistock.
- Barot, Rohit and John Bird 2001. "Racialization: The Genealogy and Critique of a Concept." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(4): 601–18.
- Bayoumi, Moustafa. 2006. "Racing Religion." *The Centennial Review*, 6(2): 267–293.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2001. *White Supremacy & Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- . 2004. "From Bi-racial to Tri-racial: Towards a New System of Racial Stratification in the USA." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27: 931–950.
- . 2010. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Third Edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Brodin, Karen. 1998. *How Jews Became White Folks: And What That Says About Race in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Cainkar, Louise A. 2008. "Thinking Outside the Box: Arabs and Race in the United States." Pp 46–80 in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by Amaney Jamal and Nadine Naber. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- . 2009. *Homeland Insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim American Experience After 9/11*. New York City, NY: Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- Calvert, John C. M. 2007. "The Striving Shaykh: Abdullah Azzam and the Revival of Jihad." *Journal of Religion & Society* 2: 83–102.
- Cohen, Robin. 1994. *Frontiers of Identity: The British and the Others*. Harlow: Longman.
- Cole, David. 2003. *Enemy Aliens*. New York City, NY: The New Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1989. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Fanon, Franz. 2004. *Wretched of the Earth*. Reprinted version. New York: Grove Press.

- Frazier, Franklin. 1968a. "Sociological Theory and Race Relations." pp. 30–42 in *E. Franklin Frazier on Race Relations* edited by Franklin Edwards. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1968b. "Race Contacts and Social Structure." Pp. 43–61 in *E. Franklin Frazier on Race Relations* edited by Franklin Edwards. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gamer, Steve. 2009. "Ireland: From Racism without "Race" to Racism without Racists," *Radical History Review*, 104:41–56.
- Goldberg, David Theo. 2005 "Racial Americanization." Pp 87–102 in *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* edited by Karim Murji and John Solomos. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldschmidt, Henry. 2004. "Introduction: Race, Nation, and Religion." Pp 3–34 in *Race, Nation, and Religion in the Americas* edited by Henry Goldschmidt and Elizabeth McAlister. New York City, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gottschalk, Peter, and Gabriel Greenberg. 2007. *Islamophobia: Making Muslims the Enemy*. New York City, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Grosfoguel, Ramon, and Eric Mielants. 2006. "The Long-Duree Entanglement Between Islamophobia and Racism in the Modern/Colonial Capitalist/Patriarchal World-System: An Introduction." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge* 5: 1–12.
- Halliday, Fred. 1999. "Islamophobia' Reconsidered." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(5): 892–902.
- Ignatiev, Noel. 1996. *How the Irish Became White*. New York City, NY: Routledge.
- Islamophobe Trust. 1997. *The Runnymede Trust*.
- Jamal, Amaney. 2008. "Conclusion: Arab American Racialization." Pp 318–326 in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by Amaney Jamal and Nadine Naber. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Kalmar, Ivan. 2009. "Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: The Formation of a Secret." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge* 7: 135–144.
- Kibria, Nazli. 2011. *Muslims in Motion: Islam and National Identity in the Bangladeshi Diaspora*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Kushner, Tony. 2005. "Racialization and 'White European' Immigration." Pp 207–226 in *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* edited by Karim Murji and John Solomos. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maira, Sunaina Marr. 2009. *Missing: Youth, Citizenship, and Empire after 9/11*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.
- Mandel, Daniel. 2001. "Muslims on the Silver Screen." *Middle East Quarterly* 8:19–30.
- Meer, Nasar and Tariq Modood. 2010. "The Racialization of Muslims." Pp 69–84 in *Thinking Through Islamophobia: Global Perspectives* edited by S. Sayid and Abdoolkarim Vakil. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Miles, Robert. 1993. *Racisms After 'Race Relations'*. London: Routledge.
- Modood, Tariq. 2005. *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Murji, Karim and John Solomos. 2005. "Introduction: Racialization in Theory and Practice." Pp 1–28 in *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* edited by Karim Murji and John Solomos. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Naber, Nadine. 2008. "Introduction." Pp 1–45 in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by Amaney Jamal and Nadine Naber. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960S to the 1980s*. New York City, NY: Routledge.
- . 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960S to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York City, NY: Routledge.
- Park, Robert. 1950. *Race and Culture*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Peek, Lori Anne. 2011. *Behind the Backlash: Muslim Americans After 9/11*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. Muslims Widely Seen As Facing Discrimination Views of Religious Similarities and Differences, September 9, 2009, <http://www.people-press.org/2009/09/09/muslims-widely-seen-as-facing-discrimination/> accessed on January 4, 2013.
- Rana, Junaid. 2007. "The Story of Islamophobia." *Souls* 9: 148–161.
- . 2011. *Terrifying Muslims: Race and Labor in the South Asian Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.
- Razack, Sherene. 2008. *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Shaheen, Jack G. 2008. *Guilty: Hollywood's Verdict on Arabs After 9/11*. New York City, NY: Olive Branch Press.
- Shyrock, Andrew. 2008. "The Moral Analogies of Race: Arab American Identity, Color Politics, and the Limits of Racialized Citizenship." Pp 81–113 in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by Amaney Jamal and Nadine Naber. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Smith, Jane. 1999. *Islam in America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tehrani, John. 2008. *Whitewashed: America's Invisible Middle Eastern Minority*. New York City, NY: New York University Press.

- Turner, James. 1978. "The Founding Fathers of American Sociology: An Examination of Their Sociological Theories of Race Relations" in *Journal of Black Studies*. 1 (9): 3–14.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2006. *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power*. 1st ed. New York City, NY: New Press.
- Williams, Rhys H, and Gira Vashi. 2007. "Hijab and American Muslim Women: Creating the Space for Autonomous Selves." *Sociology of Religion* 68: 269–287.