This is a repository copy of *The challenges that race and coloniality present to the teaching of sociology: gender, class and migration*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/205756/

Version: Submitted Version

## Book Section:

Demir, Ipek (in press 2023) '**The Challenge that Race and Coloniality Present to the Teaching of Sociology: A Discussion of Coloniality of Gender, Coloniality of Class and Coloniality of Migration**' in *Teaching Political Sociology*, William Outhwaite and Larry Ray (eds.), Elgar.

This chapter thinks through the challenge race and coloniality present to sociology teaching, curricula and canons. European colonialism has been largely absent from research and the teaching of sociology and indeed from the political awareness of many European populations. Such absences from mainstream sociology have, at times, locked sociology into a bounded way of understanding and presenting not just its Others but Europe itself. They have constrained the way in which we conceptualise, develop, apply and teach mainstream sociological concepts. Even before the recent 'decolonial awakening' in many disciplines, postcolonial and decolonial scholarship, of course, had made serious interventions, questioning the Eurocentric assumptions of academia (e.g. Said 1978, Sayyid 1997, Chakrabarty 2000, Quijano 2000, Bhambra 2007) for decades. Following movements such as Rhodes Must Fall and Black Lives Matter and the killing of George Floyd in 2020, there is a growing willingness to reckon with race and coloniality in academia, including the decolonisation (understood as an ongoing process of identifying and challenging the legacy of colonial structures and associated inherited prejudices) of research and teaching in many disciplines. What is important is that race and decolonisation in sociology should not merely introduce a new column, become an add on, a 'colourant', next to the existing sociological canon and conceptualisations. The aim should not be simply to add race and decolonial perspectives, leaving untouched and unexamined the existing canon and curricula. If race and colonialism matter, then they need to shift our understanding and conceptualisation of mainstream sociological categories rather than merely be treated as condiments which add 'diversity' to our teaching and research.

The chapter will start from a discussion of Eurocentrism and unpack how decoloniality has begun to not only open up new ways to examine and rethink existing ideas about race and colonialism, but also intervene in our understanding and teaching of other central sociological concepts. Focusing on various sociological categories relevant for contemporary political sociology such as modernity/coloniality, gender, class and migration, and highlighting sociological research which has already begun such a journey, I will provide a discussion and brief examples of how our central sociological categories and concepts can be decolonised and the further rigour this can bring to the sociological canon and curricula. I will also argue that the sociological curriculum should prevent the deployment of decolonisation and race as 'condiments' to existing sociological theories and concepts. We should resist their instrumentalisation and co-option.

**Modernity/Coloniality Nexus**

One of the central challenges for sociology is to rethink modernity, a central concept in sociology. Eurocentric (Western-centric) assumptions have long shaped knowledge production in the Global North, including in sociology. Eurocentrism is a narcissistic view of self which sees Europe (and Europeans), understood here as also incorporating White settler colonies (e.g., the US, Australia, Canada), as a *miracle* (Jones 2003 [1981]). Eurocentric

assumptions claim modernity as a European project, situating the rise of modernity with European states and its people. Europe, its people and modernity get not only inextricably intertwined but in fact co-constituted. The sources and origins of the three temporal breaks which are claimed to have brought about the 'great transformation' from pre-modernity to modernity, namely the political (e.g. French Revolution), economic (e.g. Industrial Revolution), and cultural revolutions (e.g. European Enlightenment, Renaissance and Reformation), are typically situated within Europe rather than making the examination of European empires, together with their colonies, the unit of analysis (Bhambra 2007). In standard understandings of modernity and political revolutions, the French Revolution of 1789, the US Bill of Rights of 1791 and the English Reform Act of 1867, for example, arise as political interventions which interrupted and revolutionised the political landscape, re-ordering power relationships between citizens and their rulers and the state, expanding rights, equality, liberty, freedom and dignity. This understanding of the political revolutions is seen as underpinning the modern age we live in. It, however, leaves out the many revolts and rebellions demanding equality, freedom and liberty that took place 'elsewhere'. These were often *against* Europe or European oppression, and range from revolts by indigenous groups in Latin America, Māori and Aboriginal movements in Australia and New Zealand, the many indigenous uprisings and rebellions in Asia (e.g. Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Iraq), the decolonisation and freedom struggles of colonised terrains in the 1960s, the ongoing struggles of people of colour in the Global North (e.g. the civil rights movement, Bristol Bus Boycott), all the way through to today's indigenous movements, Black Lives Matter and anti-racist struggles.

Such revolts and rebellions were fundamental to how freedom and equality were understood in the colonies but also in the imperial centres: 'enslaved and colonial subjects were not merely victims of this nation's [Britain] imperial history and subsequent beneficiaries of its crises of conscience, but rather agents whose resistance not only contributed to their own freedom but also put pressure on and reshaped British ideas about freedom.' (Gopal 2016: 24). In the US alone there were 150 revolts against slavery (James 1994 [1939]). Eurocentric approaches, however, do not include such rebellions, revolts and uprisings in mainstream understandings of modernity. They overlook such discussion in central political sociological concepts such as democracy, state, citizenship, freedom, human rights, sovereignty and equality. These concepts, central to political sociology, need a fundamental reconsideration taking such revolutions, rebellions and revolts into account. They need to intervene and challenge the Eurocentric telling of what counts as a political revolution and rebellion. Trivialisation of such uprisings and rebellions unfortunately remains. We must ask: can the interventions of non-Europe be discussed as foundational for our understanding of modernity and also of today? Can central concepts of political sociology, for example freedom, equality and sovereignty, be reconsidered through a serious engagement with an important part of modern history, namely colonisation, appropriation, slavery, exploitation and dispossession? How can these make an impact on not just what we deem as central to research but also what we see as core to what we teach?

Such omissions have already begun to be addressed through rethinking of political rebellions and revolutions, for example the Haitian Revolution of the late 1700s (e.g. James 1989 [1938]), Trouillot 1995, Bhambra 2014, Gopal 2019, Hazareesingh 2020). In and around the time when the French Revolution and American Independence occurred, another revolution

was taking place in Saint-Domingue, a jewel in the crown of the French empire (today's Haiti) as the world's largest producer of sugar and coffee alongside many other products. Toussaint Louverture, the grandson of slaves and a freed Black man, led an intellectual and military uprising, uniting White, Black and mixed-race populations in Saint-Domingue. The revolution not only fought off the colonial army of France and out-manoeuvred Spain and Britain, and thus was a military triumph confronting the might of European imperialism, but it also abolished racial hierarchies and recognised that Black and mixed-race citizens shared the same political and social rights, setting up a new republican constitution which granted equal rights. Black and mixed-race people were appointed to public offices in local government, tax offices and the army – the 'new municipality of Santiago, for example, was made up of three full members: a white person, a mixed-race official and a black military officer' (Hazareesingh 2020: 232).

James (1989 [1938]) argued that this revolution made emancipation the act of the enslaved, and significantly contributed to abolishing the West-Indian slave trade. It established the first Black republic outside of Africa, and offered liberty, equality and fraternity, and a view of citizenship, beyond what the French Revolution could envisage. Its impact was global as not only did it influence anti-slavery mobilisations and revolts in the Caribbean and the Americas, and worry slave-owners, but it did so far afield too, even amongst the Māori communities in New Zealand. At the time, the Haitian revolutionaries also sent a delegation to convince the then French revolutionaries to outlaw slavery. In 1794, only a couple of years after the slave rebellion, the French were forced to abolish slavery, reminding us of the global impact of this revolution and also the need to tell the story of the French revolution outside of the boundaries of today's French state, that is in relation to the French empire and its colonies.

There is, however, a conspicuous absence of the conceptualisation of this revolution as one of the major political revolutions of human history. It is 'rarely accorded a similar status of being considered a foundational event of world history' (Bhambra 2014). Anti-colonial resistance, rebellion and movements like the Haitian revolution are still excluded from the mainstream modernity story we tell. In France, there is now public memorialisation of the Haitian revolution, a central uprising against French colonialism – though many of these memorialisations reflect 'the inability of the French republication tradition to go beyond its self-serving accounts of slavery and its abolition', and the often told idea that:

> slavery was a product of the *ancient regime*, which was excised from the body politic of the [French] revolution; that this outcome was the result of enlightened French intervention, rather than revolutionary action by the black slaves themselves; and that colonial authorities generally acted in the best interests of the black populations living under imperial dominion. (Hazareesingh 2020: 367)

After much campaigning by anti-racist organisations, Toussaint Louverture entered the Pantheon in 1998. Yet the Haitian revolution is not taught in France except in some of the vocational schools attended by racialised immigrants in France and in schools in French overseas territories (previously colonised lands). It is not part of the general high school (lycée) curriculum:

A future pipe fitter in Paris will thus know that enslaved Black people in a French colony sought and secured their own freedom, but an aspiring politician, having done all her homework at lycée, may understand emancipation simply as a right granted in 1848, by decree of the Second Republic. (Collins, 2020)

Modernity's core rupture story of political revolutions, with its great transformations, erases Others and places Europeans as the main, if not the sole, instigators of modernity, of political equality, freedom, dignity and progress. Such erasures also prevent us from understanding inequality and coloniality around the world today. Napoleon's armies forcefully reinstated slavery in Haiti, and from 1825 onwards Haiti was forced to pay reparations to France for over a century for loss of property, compensating French slave owners. The reparations were paid for by six generations of Haitians and finally settled in 1947, bankrupting Haiti in the long run. Haiti thus arises as one of the many examples of how today's global inequalities have deep colonial historical roots.

Eurocentric constructions have brought spatial and temporal limitations to our understanding of modernity in sociology. They have brought spatial limitations as they have locked the rise of modernity within the physical boundaries of Europe; they have brought temporal limitations as they have hemmed modernity into the birth and history of European states, the continent, and its people. It is epistemologically avoidant if not ignorant as it fails to acknowledge that the modern world we inhabit today is largely shaped by colonialism and empires, and therefore also through the material and intellectual contributions of Others. This absence is striking as the birth of sociology coincides with European empires. The neglect of empire and colonialism in the theorisations and articulations of central sociological categories, for example class, gender and migration and globalisation, is increasingly being interrogated. How is it that the sociological canon and curricula, proud of its analytical, historical and critical approaches, could have taken for granted Europe (and Europeans) as the sole instigator of modernity? How could it deny the importance of the impact of European colonies given the birth of sociology in the period of the late 1800s and early 1900s? As we are reminded by Seidman, this was the highpoint of imperialism, when 85 per cent of the world lived under the dominance of Europe. Asia, Africa, America and Oceania were dominated by European empires. 'It is curious then that "empire", or the dynamics of colonialism, imperialism [and racism] were *untheorized* by classical sociologists.' (Seidman 1996: 313). What was going on? Were Durkheim and Weber unaware of imperialism? Were they unaware of the racialised hierarchies which dominated the world, underpinned by European race science? Was Durkheim unaware that he was living in an empire? Could Marx not see how slavery was central to the beginning of capitalist accumulation? Could he not see how colonialism and empires set off and intensified capital accumulation and underpinned the birth of modern capitalism? Why did he limit his understanding to reductive discussions of the 'Asiatic mode of production' rather than develop a relational and global understanding of capitalism, colonialism and empires? Of course, classical and mainstream sociologists have acknowledged that empires and colonialism existed and had a large role to play in world history. Yet my argument here highlights, echoing Seidman (1996), Bhambra and Holmwood (2021) and others, that the mainstream sociological canon has largely left the legacy of empire, colonialism and racism untouched in core sociological theorisations and conceptualisations.

Having discussed modernity, I will provide a discussion of colonialism and race through making an intervention into three other core sociological fields and concepts: gender, class and migration. I will first focus on 'coloniality of gender', an intervention by Lugones which has not only decolonised gender but also gendered decolonisation. À la Lugones, I will also consider 'coloniality of class' and 'coloniality of migration'. As such I will provide some examples of how race and coloniality could and should shift our understanding and teaching of central sociological categories and concepts.

**Coloniality of Gender**

Research on gender and feminist approaches has examined the formation of gender through a problematisation of modernity's construction and maintenance of dualisms such as nature/culture, masculine/feminine, universal/particular, object/subject, and public/private, and the locking of women into the realm of the private sphere, culture, irrationality and particularity, while men came to be associated with objectivity, science, rationality, autonomy, universality, the public sphere, progress and so on. The philosophical challenges, for example, *Feminist Epistemologies* by Alcoff and Potter (1992), brought interventions to sociology in general, but especially to social theory and political sociology. This and other feminist interventions were significant in helping to question established epistemologies, and to destabilise dualisms which underpinned understandings of both gender and modernity. As such, we came to recognise that gender is not a biological fact but in fact historically-constituted, and imbued in social relations of power, including in knowledge production.

Decolonial feminist scholars, have taken on board these considerations, but have sought to take us further in their theorisations of gender and power (e.g. Collins 1991, Emejulu and Sobande 2019). They have also questioned our understanding of the formation of gender by showing how dominant understandings of gender today were shaped, on the whole, by colonialism. María Lugones, a leading scholar of decolonial feminism, examines how colonialism and understandings of gender are interrelated (2007; 2008). Her analysis links race, gender and colonialism. Lugones's concept of 'coloniality of gender' highlights how colonialism transformed gender roles and relationships globally. She argues that hetero-patriarchal norms and binary gender hierarchy were seen as signs of civilisation and modernity by the European colonisers. The colonised were seen as backward, abnormal or deviant if they did not have or respect binary patriarchal gender norms. Peoples with different regimes of gender and sexuality were categorised as living in an inferior state of barbarism and abnormal gender norms. In fact, only the civilised were seen as men and women – indigenous people were not granted the category of human: 'Indigenous people of the Americas and enslaved Africans were classified as not human species – as animals, uncontrollably sexual and wild' (Lugones 2010: 743).

Colonialism, Lugones argues, erased different conceptualisations of gender (and sexuality) that existed before the European colonial gender systems. European hetero-patriarchal relations with their hierarchies of gender and patriarchy, and their ideas of nuclear family, intimacy and rigid division of labour and spheres (public/private) were seen as normal and thus superior (Turner 2020). European rigid gender norms were imposed on the colonised Others:

Under the imposed gender framework, the bourgeois white Europeans were civilized; they were fully human. The hierarchical dichotomy as a mark of the human also became a normative tool to damn the colonized. The behaviours of the colonized and their personalities/souls were judged as bestial and thus non-gendered, promiscuous, grotesquely sexual, and sinful. (Lugones 2010: 743)

For Lugones, it was not just that colonial contact shaped and transformed understandings of gender, but also how such othering of different gender and sexual practices was used as a tool for colonial domination. Indigenous groups and others with different regimes of gender and sexuality were seen as inferior, justifying material conquest, violence and their dispossession. Non-binary forms of gender, different kinship and family relationships and Others' 'deviant' sexual and gender relationships and intimacy were examples of their savagery and thus justified exploitation, slavery and colonialism.

Colonialism, then, not only created racial identities and a racialised global capitalist order and worldview, but it also altered and shaped understandings of gender globally. We thus need to review our understanding of modernity and coloniality from a consciousness of race, gender and sexuality. The imposition of race by colonisers enabled the subjugation of indigenous groups, and the imposition of gender facilitated the subjugation of women. The work of other decolonial feminist scholars such as Allen (1992 [1986]), Amadiume (1987) and Oyěwùmí (1997) has also exposed colonial structures which have worked to subject Others to binary European gender categories.

Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyěwùmí (1997), whose work Lugones draws from, discusses how gender became an organising principle in Yorùbá society and culture after colonialism. In fact the main organising principle in pre-colonial Yorùbá society was age, not gender. Males and females were not positioned hierarchically, and gender identity was not strictly tied to anatomy. Gender identity was fluid. Through colonial interventions, Oyěwùmí argues that society came to define women by their anatomy, and in relation to men, subordinating women. Colonisers, collaborating with Yorùbá men, excluded women from the public space and prevented them from owning land or becoming leaders. Oyěwùmí's work discusses how European binary gender norms were institutionalised as part of colonialism and 'civilisation' and development. Paula Gunn Allen's work (1992 [1986]) focuses on gender and colonialism, this time looking at another colonised group, namely Native Americans. She traces how the more egalitarian and gender-fluid norms and structures of Native American society were annihilated, and rigid binary structures and patriarchal values were imposed by White settlers. As such she seeks to recover the feminine in American Indian traditions. Ifi Amadiume's work (1987) turns our attention to West Africa (focusing on Igbo society) and maps out how the notion of fixed gender did not exist before colonialism. She argues that during pre-colonialism, sex and gender were not co-constituted, as biological sex did not necessarily correspond to gender and gender roles were fluid and could be exchanged. Women, for example, could become men, facilitated also by the fact that Igbo grammar did not include gender pronouns:

Daughters could become sons and consequently male. Daughters and women in general could be husbands to wives and consequently males in relation to their wives. (Amadiume 1987: 15)

> In contrast, Western culture and the Christian religion, brought by colonialism, carried rigid gender ideologies which aided and supported the exclusion of women from the power hierarchy, whether in government or the church in the modern society. This rigid gender system meant that roles are strictly masculinized or feminized; breaking gender rules therefore carries a stigma. (Amadiume 1987: 185)

European patriarchal worldviews were not only imposed on the West African societies through violence, othering and reducing the economic power and status of women, but also by colonial ethnographers and researchers. Amadiume's work unpacks how Victorian gender ideology ended up producing colonial anthropological knowledges about these societies, enforcing the researchers' own, thus familiar, European patrilineal systems onto the representation and description of the societies they came across, ignoring and erasing matrilineal systems from accounts of these societies.

Here I provided a short and introductory discussion about the formation of gender vis-à-vis colonialism, and how colonial subjects were turned into gendered subjects. I provided an example of how race and decoloniality, if they are to matter to political sociology, need to shift our understanding and conceptualisations of mainstream categories rather than be treated as an additive, as a condiment. What is also central to my argument is that decolonial feminism sought to form a new feminist knowledge and thus critically engaged with both decolonial scholarship and mainstream feminist scholarship. Can the insights of decolonial scholarship be extended to rethink other central sociological concepts? In the remaining sections I return to class and migration and consider 'coloniality of class' and 'coloniality of migration'.

## Coloniality of Class

Decolonial theorist Anibal Quijano (2000) discusses power, globalisation and coloniality through elaborating his concept of 'coloniality of power'. Colonialism, according to him, not only dismantled other knowledges and other ways of life, but it also brought about discriminatory and exploitative practices and discourses. Even though formal colonies were dismantled, coloniality continues as we see such practices and discourses still reflected in the social, economic and cultural structures of contemporary societies. Colonialism classified populations around the world into races and built a system of exploitation around racialised labour, for example slavery and servitude. Quijano's work therefore attempts to address power and inequalities within the racialised colonial and capitalistic hierarchies. He brings racialisation and colonialism into a conversation with capitalist expansion and exploitation.

We need to critically engage with approaches that discuss capitalism, class, poverty and inequality from Eurocentric/Western-centric perspectives which often begin with the assumption that capitalism started in Europe and then was intensified during imperialism. We need to pay serious attention to the formation of capitalism in relation to colonialism and slavery in our rethinking of capitalist accumulation and exploitation and racial capitalism (Bhattarcharyya 2018, Virdee 2014, Robinson 1983, Williams ([1944] 2022) and challenge how 'capitalism is erroneously separated from colonialism' (Bhambra and Holmwood 2021: 25). Within this approach, we also need to unpack what I call, à la Lugones, 'the coloniality of

class', and reconsider our conceptualisation of class via colonialism and race, as we have previously done for gender. I briefly outline this below.

Sociological conceptualisations of class need to be thought through and reconceptualised in relation to slavery, colonialism and racial hierarchies. As has already been revealed by research which brings race and class analysis together, working-class formation, identity and development are linked to anxieties about White degradation vis-à-vis racialised labour. Yet mainstream understandings of class have not shifted to accommodate this. In the US, Du Bois (1998 [1935]) showed that working-class formation and consciousness arose in relation to the relative condition of the White worker against the Black worker. He considered working-class formation as being linked to slavery, that is anxieties about White degradation emerging in relation to the emancipation of slaves. Roediger's (2007 [1991]) work also illustrates how much of workers' rights in the US were won after emancipation, and how working-class consciousness grew and advanced in an effort to keep the relatively raised condition of the White worker.

Du Bois in particular discussed how Black labour was not allowed to be part of the working class and efforts were put into keeping the condition of the White worker raised and elevated. He also discusses the public and psychological 'wage' given to poor Whites following the American Civil War, a wage which kept them poor and in line but nearly always above the Black worker. Du Bois (1998 [1935]: 700-701) argued:

> It must be remembered that the white group of labourers, while they received a low wage, were compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological wage. They were given public deference and titles of courtesy because they were white. They were admitted freely with all classes of white people to public functions, public parks, and the best schools. The police were drawn from their ranks, and the courts, dependent upon their votes, treated them with such leniency as to encourage lawlessness. Their vote selected public officials, and while this had small effect upon the economic situation, it had great effect upon their personal treatment and the deference shown them.

This is what Roediger later called the 'wages of Whiteness' in his work examining the dynamics of race and class in the US. Continuing the analysis Du Bois started, Roediger unpacked how 'the "white worker" developed as a self-conscious social category mainly by comparing himself to Blacks' (Roediger 2007 [1991]: 23). Ignatiev's work (2009) highlights the material advances accrued in addition to the psychosocial benefits, and examines how some of the privileges and workers' rights acquired were due to 'sweet deals' agreed between the bosses and the White workers. In the 1960s the civil rights movement in the US was approached with caution as it was perceived as risking losing the privileges the White workers had won. Perceived competition from racial minorities and the view that 'Whites are entitled to have more' continued to intensify even in the 1990s (Bobo and Hutchings 1996). Discourses of 'What about poor White people?' (Allen 2009) contributed to class solidarity and consciousness amongst White workers throughout the 20th century. As such there is much historical, sociological and political work which has made important interventions, highlighting the dynamics of class consciousness and the co-constitution of race and class and

revealing how ideas and suggestions about White neglect and White degradation played an important part in working-class formation and identity in the US.

The racialised nature of class identity formation and development is also evident in other countries, for example in the UK. Bonnett (1998) examined how and why the working class in Britain 'became White', that is came to adopt and mobilise around a White identity and actively employ Whiteness after the 1950s. Bonnett argues that investment in White identity occurred not just in response to the arrival of postcolonial 'immigrants' from South Asia and the Caribbean to Britain, but also through the reformation of British capitalism and the racial appropriation of the welfare state by the working class who were White: 'Welfare came wrapped in the Union Jack' (Bonnett 1998: 329), demanding that social benefits, health, housing, and education be limited to 'our own people'. Anxieties about White degradation also accompanied the Commonwealth immigrations in the 1960s (Shilliam 2018: 156) and African Asians in the 1970s. Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of blood' speech was concerned with Commonwealth citizens gaining an upper hand: 'In this country in 15- or 20-years' time the black man will have the whip hand over the white man.' Powell, however, additionally posited the welfare state as belonging to Whites: 'the existing population… found themselves made strangers in their own country, they found their wives unable to obtain hospital beds in childbirth, their children unable to obtain school places'. Narratives of 'our' welfare state were not exclusive to Britain, and as Bonnett argues, could be identified in other European countries. They could also be identified in union movements for example in France where North Africans faced discrimination and exclusions not just from their bosses, but also in the union movement (Bracke 2008).

Struggles and movements such as the Grunwick Dispute (1976-1978) and the Bristol Bus Boycott (1963) led by diasporas of colour in the UK challenged the narrative of the British working class as being White (and male). They revealed the racial diversity of the working class as 'the colonised continued to come to the motherland'. Additionally, these struggles demonstrated how the British unions, while speaking for the 'universal' working classes were in fact reticent about, if not blatantly opposed to, supporting working-class people of colour and women. In the case of the Bristol Bus Boycott, the trade unions resisted the employment of Black workers, and 'like the poor white southerner in the American south of the 1950s, even the poorest Bristolian could feel he or she was at least "a cut above"' the Black labourers (Dresser 1986: 57). As in the US, the working class also created anti-racist solidarities and movements in Britain. However, mobilisations around Whiteness shaped working-class formation and consciousness, a discussion which should challenge not just mainstream research and teaching on race, but also that on class (Saini 2022). Divorcing class from colonialism and keeping class and race as separate categories also have other consequences – it prevents us from seeing that people of colour also hold class interests. As people of colour are not typically conceptualised as having a class, as race does not appear in our articulations of class consciousness, it typically leaves people perplexed as to how and why some people of colour (e.g. Conservative British Ministers Priti Patel, Suella Braverman, Kemi Badenoch, Kwasi Kwarteng) pursue policies which some see as enabling White upper-class interests.

Nativist sentiments of White neglect have of course re-emerged in the last decade in the Global North, in Trump and Leave (Brexit) votes and far-right political movements in Europe, couched as 'the left-behind revolt' or 'working-class revolt' (Virdee and McGeever 2018, Mutz

2018, Jardina 2019, Mondon and Winter 2019, Shilliam 2020). The notion of 'traditional' and 'ordinary' working class became a codeword in mobilising those 'forgotten' White national majorities, whether it be in the US or the UK, and now increasingly also in Sweden, Germany, France, Italy and other countries in Europe. Such tropes worked to fan the sentiment that Others (racialised migrants and people of colour) had got ahead unfairly and that they were getting a 'special deal'. Welfare nativism and welfare chauvinism, that is, the racialised appropriation of the welfare state by the White majority, also continued to signal that Others were 'cutting in' and getting too big a piece of the pie, a pie that was seen to belong to the White nationals, thus implying that White nationals should be prioritised in welfare provision (Miah *et al.* 2020). As such, racialised immigrants and people of colour were left outside of the narrative of working class. Couching the working class as 'ordinary' and 'traditional', the working class was deemed as White not just in wider social debates but also in academia (e.g. Gest 2016, Hochschild 2016). Today, White nationals are often constructed as the traditional, natural and ordinary members of the working class, despite racialised migrants and people of colour in the Global North being overrepresented in working-class and precarious jobs. In fact, compared to any other social class, the working class is increasingly defined by its racial diversity, for example in the UK (Jesse 2022: 15).

Marx left the production of this difference untheorised. I argue that our research and teaching of class in sociology should pay due attention to 'coloniality of class', examining how the formation and development of class consciousness are tied to racialised differences formed in and through colonialism and the associated anxieties about the position of the White worker, including how much of workers' rights in the Global North were won through efforts to keep the White Workers' conditions elevated. We need to continue to research and teach class formation, class consciousness and working-class rights not through colour-blind conceptualisations of class, but as having arisen within a global economic and political order which was significantly shaped by colonialism, empires and their racial legacies. As Roediger (2017) says, one thing is certain: 'the white worker will not play an effective role in a class movement as someone who sees her interests as white, or as someone who allows leaders to cater to his concerns around whiteness rather than class.'

In this context, it is interesting to note how certain debates on class see the focus on race as a distraction from, if not detrimental to, the real struggle, that is, class. Many other leading scholars of capitalism continue to see race and gender outside the logic of capitalism and regard them as exogenous to the functioning of capital (e.g. Harvey 2014 and 2015, Sayer 2000), or see class exploitation as formative for capitalism and insist that racial and gender inequality are not (Wood 1990). They, following Marx, see such issues as 'contingent' to capitalism (Holmwood 2001). It is hoped that 'an increased emphasis on class can only come by toning down the race and gender talk' (Roediger 2017: 6). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999) had gone further and argued that bringing race (or concepts such as racial minority or multiculturalism) into analyses of inequality was an example of cunning imperialist reasoning spreading from the US. This was repeated in 2020 when over a hundred French academics signed a manifesto and published it in *Le Monde* arguing against and seeing dangerous what they see as indigenist, racialist and decolonial ideologies emerging from the US academia (Open Democracy 2020).

Today, colonial difference is reproduced through continuing to leave race and colonialism untheorised in understandings of the formation of capitalism and class. If sociology is to take race and decoloniality seriously, it needs to revisit and continue the work of critically engaging with mainstream understandings of class which theorise class as taking European/Western (and male) subjectivity as the norm. It needs to stop overlooking the role of race, gender and colonialism in the formation and development of working-class as a racialised identity.

**Coloniality of migration:**

We need to also develop approaches which unpack the coloniality of migration. Dominant understandings of migration ignore the proper wider context of many migrations we see today. The recent decolonial turn in migration studies seeks to challenge this (e.g. Demir 2022, Mayblin 2017, Mayblin and Turner 2020, Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2018, Samaddar 2020). Colonialism and empires and their movement of people through plantations, expansions, settlements, slavery and indenture, and later the movements of peoples to the metropole as refugees, climate migrants, postcolonial diasporas or economic migrants as part of coloniality are central to migration. These should also be central for our theories and conceptualisations of migration. Instead much of this colonial angle has been displaced.

Migration studies has rightly challenged methodological nationalism, but not what I call 'methodological amnesia'. Wimmer and Glick Schiller's influential argument (2002) has shaped the field in the last twenty years by tracing methodological nationalism, that is, how the naturalisation of the nation-state had become part of not just post-war societies but also post-war social science and humanities. The work criticises how the nation-state became the primary and natural unit of analysis. While this welcome and needed intervention (and others later) criticised methodological nationalism and made us aware of the spatial limitations of migration research (hemming in its transnational scope and potential), the field and our teaching of migration have typically ignored temporal dimensions of migration, that is, the colonial and imperial axes of movements of people. Not only has the nation-state become the main unit of analysis,  but imperialism and colonialism have been displaced and erased from our conceptualisations of migration. If race and decoloniality matter, the spatial and temporal axes of movements of people need to be considered simultaneously, resisting not just methodological nationalism but also methodological amnesia in migration studies.

Eurocentric approaches have had other political and epistemological bearings on understanding migration regimes. They act as a justification for the hard and violent borders of the Global North, and also borders within the Global North, for example through hostile citizenship regimes, through the securitisation of diasporas of colour and through punitive surveillance and counter-terrorism strategies. They make it impossible to understand racial, ethnic and religious diversity within the Global North today. Due to the spatial and temporal limitations, they set 'non-Europeans'/'non-Whites' as alien to the Global North. That the latter have been central to European history, modernity and society due to colonialism and empire is overlooked. Instead, stories of migrations to the Global North are told in a methodologically nationalist and amnesic way, focusing on Others arriving at the borders of Northern states as a problem that needs to be tackled. It has also led us to the problematic view that racial, ethnic and religious diversity is something that happened *to* the Global North (be it Europe, North America or Australia), and 'exceptional' and 'record' migrations as

something recent. Migrations from South to North become 'the primary migrations of interest' (Mayblin and Turner 2020: 31) while ignoring centuries of migrations from North to South with immense and detrimental impact on the indigenous populations and their societies. Migration, examined as detached from colonial history, becomes a 'new' crisis from which the North needs to protect itself.

In order to challenge the construction of 'White/European history' against 'our racially, ethnically and religiously diverse today', we need to take into account imperialism and colonialism as analytically significant categories for investigating migration, diaspora and racial and ethnic diversity. Migration stories are, however, often told in a way which other. A White, non-colonial and hermetically sealed understanding of the Global North prevents an understanding of how the long history of colonialism and empires is linked to the presence of postcolonial migrants/diasporas in the Global North (Naidoo and Littler 2004: 335), and to poverty, coloniality and migration. Deploying these categories and stretching our understandings spatially and temporally is thus necessary when talking about present migrants, refugees and diasporas as well as racial, ethnic and religious diversity in the Global North today. Our teaching and research in sociology need to 'give in' to conceptualisations which see plurality as part and parcel of the fabric of European history and society due to colonialism. Additionally, they need to highlight the links between capitalism and colonial patterns of accumulation and dispossession in producing migration (e.g. Bhattacharyya 2018, Walia 2021), and also between capitalism and the regimes and systems which govern borders and profit from the immigration detention industrial complex. We need to 'situate the asylum-migration nexus at the juncture of the coloniality of power and racial capitalism', a process that Gutiérrez Rodríguez (2018: 18) also via Quijano and Lugones has aptly termed the 'coloniality of migration'.

A decolonial approach in sociology would also force us to teach migrations from the Global South differently. The reductionist Eurocentric miracle view fails to recognise those from the Global South as originators and sources of concepts and ideas. Political sociology has come a long way to recognise ideas about equality, freedom, justice and dignity as being also won through the struggles of women's movements and working-class movements, for example. The struggles of racialised Others and how they have also contributed to and expanded understanding of equality, freedom, justice and dignity also need to be told (Demir 2022 and forthcoming 2023). As such we need to construe them as authors of modernity and globalisation, and allow the narrative of Europe and progress we have often told to be challenged. Such debates about decolonising our understanding of diaspora, migration and racial, ethnic and religious diversity can help us engage with contemporary political issues of migration and integration more effectively, showing that even though formal colonialism has withered, the effects of coloniality endure through the very racialised way migration is experienced, and reacted to, today.

In conclusion, this chapter discussed how four core sociological concepts - modernity, class, gender and migration - can be decolonised, that is, revised and rectified by engaging in, and bringing to our attention, some of the interventions and challenges which emerge from existing scholarship on race and colonialism. There is thus an implicit invitation for other core sociological concepts and different fields of sociology to be thought through not just in our research but also in our teaching, sociological canon and curricula. In particular, the chapter

attempted to show that if race and decoloniality matter, then they need to force us to re-examine central sociological concepts rather than consider race and decoloniality merely as 'add on' categories, leaving core sociological concepts, theories and understandings untouched.

Of course, the debates are not new. Nor can I pretend that I have covered the extensive debates on these central sociological concepts and categories. However, through showing examples of how a decolonised sociological theory challenges us to rethink the sociological mainstream, including some its core concepts such as modernity, gender, class and migration, I have demonstrated the opportunities but also the challenges race and decolonial thinking present to mainstream sociological thinking. Our journey to rectify the way in which race and colonialism have typically been written out of sociology continues.

**REFERENCES:**

Alcoff, Linda Martín and Potter, Elizabeth (eds.) (1992) *Feminist Epistemologies*, New York: Routledge.

Allen, Paula Gunn (1992 [1986]) *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Allen, Ricky Lee (2009) What About Poor White People?, in *Handbook of Social Justice in Education*, William Ayers, Therese Quinn and David Stovall (eds.), pp. 209–30. New York: Routledge.

Amadiume, Ifi (1987) *Male Daughters, Female Husbands: Gender and Sex in an African Society,* London: Zed Books.

Bhattacharyya, Gargi (2018) *Rethinking Racial Capitalism*, London: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. (2007) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, Gurminder K. (2014) What does the Haitian Revolution Tell us about the Society of Equals, *Theory, Culture and Society, Think Piece.* https://www.theoryculturesociety.org/blog/gurminder-bhambra-what-does-the-haitian-revolution-tell-us-about-the-society-of-equals (accessed 5 September 2022)

Bhambra, Gurminder K. and Holmwood, John (2021) *Colonialism and Modern Social Theory*, Cambridge: Polity.

Bhattacharyya, Gargi (2018) *Rethinking Racial Capitalism,* London: Rowman & Littlefield

Bobo, Lawrence D. and Hutchings, Vincent, L. (1996) Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context, *American Sociological Review*, 61(6), 951–72.

Bonnett, Alastair (1998) How the British Working Class Became White: The Symbolic (Re)Formation of Racialized Capitalism, *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 11(3), 316–40.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Wacquant, Loic (1999) On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16(1), 41-58.

Bracke, Maud A. (2008) May 1968 and Algerian immigrants in France: Trajectories of mobilization and encounter, in *1968 in retrospect: History, theory, alterity*, Gurminder K. Bhambra and Ipek Demir (eds.), pp. 115-130. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Collins, Lauren (2020) The Haitian Revolution and the Hole in French High-School History, *The New Yorker* https://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/the-haitian-revolution-and-the-hole-in-french-high-school-history (accessed 5 September 2022)

Collins, Patricia Hill (1991) *Black Feminist Thought*, London: Routledge.

Demir, Ipek (2022) *Diaspora as Translation and Decolonisation*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Demir, Ipek (forthcoming 2023) Decolonizing Diaspora Studies: Accounting for the Transnational and Intersectional Interventions of "Striking" Diasporas, in *Immigrant Lives: Intersectionality, Transnationality, and Global Perspectives*, Edward Makwarimba and Edward Shizha (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dresser, Madge (1986) *Black and White on the Buses: The 1963 Colour Bar Dispute in Bristol*, Bristol: Bristol Broadsides.

Du Bois, W.E. Burghardt (1998 [1935]) *Black Reconstruction in America 1860– 1880*, New York: The Free Press.

Emejulu, Akwugo and Sobande, Francesca (eds.) (2019) *To Exist is to Resist: Black Feminism in Europe*, London: Pluto Press.

Gest, Justin (2016) *The New Minority: White Working Class Politics in an Age of Immigration and Inequality*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Gopal, Priyamvada (2016) Redressing Anti-imperial Amnesia, *Race and Class*, 57(3), 18–30.

Gopal, Priyamvada (2019) *Insurgent Empire: Anticolonial Resistance and British Dissent*, London: Verso.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación (2018) The Coloniality of Migration and the 'Refugee Crisis': On the Asylum–Migration Nexus, the Transatlantic White European Settler Colonialism-Migration and Racial Capitalism, *Refuge*, 34(1),

Harvey, David (2014) *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*, London: Profile Books.

Harvey, David (2015) 'Response to Alex Dubilet', *Syndicate*, https://syndicate.network/symposia/theology/seventeen-contradictions-and-the-end-of-capitalism/ (accessed 5 September 2022)

Hazareesingh, Sudhir (2020) *Black Spartacus*, London: Penguin.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell (2016) *Strangers in Their Own Land*, New York: The New Press.

Holmwood, John (2001) Gender and Critical Realism: A Critique of Sayer, *Sociology*, 35(4), 947-965.

Ignatiev, Noel (2009) *How the Irish Became White*, New York: Routledge.

James, C.L.R. (1989 [1938]) *The Black Jacobins*, New York: Vintage Books.

James, C.L.R. (1994 [1939]) Revolution and the Negro, in *C.L.R. James and Revolutionary Marxism: Selected Writings 1939–49*, Scott McLemee and Paul Le Blanc (eds.), Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press. www.marxists.org/archive/james-clr/works/1939/12/negro-revolution.htm (accessed 5 September 2022).

Jardina, Ashley (2019) *White Identity Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jesse, Raquel (2022) *They Look Down on Us: Insights from the diverse working class on Race and Class in Britain Today*, London: Centre for Labour and Social Studies. http://classonline.org.uk/docs/They-Look-Down-on-Us-Report-CLASS-v18.pdf (accessed 5 September 2022).

Jones, Eric (2003 [1981]) *The European Miracle: Environments, Economies, and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lugones, María (2007) Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System, *Hypatia*, 22(1), 186–219.

Lugones, María (2008) The Coloniality of Gender, *Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise*, Spring, 1-17.

Lugones, María (2010) Toward a Decolonial Feminism, *Hypatia,* 25(4), 742-759.

Mayblin, Lucy (2017) *Asylum after Empire: Colonial Legacies in the Politics of Asylum Seeking*, London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mayblin, Lucy and Turner, Joe (2020) *Migration Studies and Colonialism*, Cambridge: Polity.

Miah, Shamim, Sanderson, Pete and Thomas, Paul (2020) *'Race', Space and Multiculturalism in Northern England: The M62 corridor of Uncertainty*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mondon, Aurelien and Winter, Aaron (2019) Whiteness, Populism and the Racialisation of the Working Class in the United Kingdom and the United States, *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 26(5), 510–28.

Mutz, Diana (2018) Status Threat, Not Economic Hardship, Explains the 2016 Presidential Vote, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,* 115(19), E4330–E4339 www.pnas.org/content/115/19/E4330 (accessed 5 September 2022).

Naidoo, Roshi and Littler, Jo (2004) White Past, Multicultural Present: Heritage and National Stories, in *History, Identity and the Question of Britain*, Helen Brocklehurst and Robert Phillips (eds.), p. 330-341. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Open Democracy (2020) Open Letter: The Threat of Academic Authoritarianism – International Solidarity with Antiracist Academics in France, https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/open-letter-the-threat-of-academic-authoritarianism-international-solidarity-with-antiracist-academics-in-france/ (accessed 5 September 2022).

Oyěwùmí, Oyèrónkẹ́ (1997) *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Quijano, Anibal (2000) Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America, *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232.

Robinson, Cedric (1983) *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Roediger, David R. (2007 [1991]) *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, London: Verso.

Roediger, David R. (2017) Who's Afraid of the White Working Class? On Joan C. Williams's 'White Working Class: Overcoming Class Cluelessness in America, *Los Angeles Review of Books*, https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/whos-afraid-of-the-white-working-class-on-joan-c-williamss-white-working-class-overcoming-class-cluelessness-in-america/ (accessed 5 September 2022).

Said, Edward (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon.

Saini, Rima (2022) 'The Racialised 'Second Existence' of Class: Class Identification and (De-/Re-)construction across the British South Asian Middle Classes', *Cultural Sociology*, 0(0).

Samaddar, Ranabir (2020) *The Postcolonial Age of Migration*, London: Routledge.

Sayer, Andrew (2000) 'System, Lifeworld and Gender: Associational versus Counterfactual Thinking', *Sociology*, 34, 707–25.

Sayyid, S. (1997) *A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism*, London: Zed Press.

Seidman, Steven (1996) `Empire and Knowledge: More Troubles, New Opportunities for Sociology', *Contemporary Sociology*, 25(3), 313—16.

Shilliam, Robbie (2018) *Race and the Undeserving Poor*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Agenda.

Shilliam, Robbie (2020) Redeeming the 'Ordinary Working Class', *Current Sociology*, 68(2), 223–40.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (1995) *Silencing the Past: Power and Production of History*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Turner, Joe (2020) *Bordering Intimacy: Postcolonial Governance and the Policing of Family*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Virdee, Satnam (2014) *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Virdee, Satnam and McGeever, Brendan (2018) Racism, Crisis, Brexit, *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 41(10), 1802–19.

Walia, Harsha (2021) *Border and Rule*, Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

Williams, Eric ([1944]2022) *Capitalism and Slavery,* London: Penguin.

Wimmer, Andreas and Glick Schiller, Nina (2002) Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences, *Global Networks*, 2(4), 301-334.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins (1990) The Uses and Abuses of 'Civil Society', *Socialist Register 1990: The Retreat of the Intellectuals*, Ralph Milliband and Leo Panitch (eds.), 26, pp. 60-85. London: Merlin Press.