(E)Racing the Citizen: The Contradictions of Citizenship


Bernal asserts that much of ancient Greek society was highly influenced by Egypt, including mathematics, science, and philosophy. He challenges the mainstream notion that Greek Civilization (as well as the Western Civilizations that derive from Greece) is a unique phenomenon. Rather, as Bernal argues, Greece was not a cultural vacuum but was highly influenced by African civilization. Volume 1 draws attention to 18th Century development of the “Aryan model,” in which Western countries draw Greece as the center of Western traditions and civilizations. In, volume 2, Bernal concentrates on providing evidence of Egyptian influence on Greece.


This book takes up the conditions slaves faced under Roman rule from approximately 200 BC to 200 AD. Bradley tries to convey the slaves’ perspectives rather than glorifying Roman civilization. He also describes how slavery affected Roman society. At both the cultural and institutional level, he examines the laws, policies, and ideologies that shaped slavery and that were shaped by slavery. Bradley also conveys how slaves were acquired (both domestically and abroad), the various types of labor they had to perform, as well as the challenges slaves made against Roman society.

D’Arms criticizes the fact that recent discussions of urban domestic slaves have not critically addressed the conditions that household slaves faced. He states that they were reduced to merely objects and suffered many indignities as they performed services in the dining rooms for upper-class Romans comforts. He compares how these servants shared similar conditions to slaves in the antebellum south. In doing so, he conveys that the difference in relationship is still predicated on a master who has ultimate power over the life of his slaves; the power to privilege or punish is still in control of the master.


This work examines the “discursive strategies” (4) ancient Greeks used to justify colonization of foreign lands. Dougherty looks at the discursive practices that produce the land and the people in ways that justify colonization. She ties some of these tactics to the ways in which European settlers created stories and myths of the Americas to justify its colonization. By exploring the colonial narratives of ancient Greek society, the stories they told, the metaphors they used, and the rituals they performed, Dougherty establishes what the Greeks thought of themselves as well as their colonies.


This book constitutes a collection of essays that look at democracy in both the United States context as well as Athenian context. The editors call for a more complex look—beyond glorification or denigration—at the process of creating a democratic citizenry. The first part of
the book deals with how Athenians framed democracy, from the constitution to the imperial conquests. It also examines how that democracy informed later democracies. The next part of the work deals with the limitations of Athenian democracy. The last third of the book confronts the differences and similarities between Athenian and US democracy, ranging from exclusion to citizen participation, from citizen disillusionment to political education. The essays offer a wide spectrum of perspectives on Athenian and US democracy.


Hannaford traces how the understanding of race in Western ideology drew upon classical Greek notions of the political citizen. While the notion of “race” as we know it does not appear until much later (beginning in the 14th Century and reinforced in the 18th Century), the notion of “natural” leaders and citizens were carried out throughout European history through racial understandings. Hence, whites were thought of as “naturally” superior. Drawing from Aristotelian and Ciceronian ideas of citizenship, whites scholars deemed that whites were “citizens” while those who were not participating (or could not participate) or were outside the public and political sphere—i.e. civilization—were “idiots.”


This work focuses on “direct” and “indirect” democracies. Hansen notes that Athens had (although not always) direct forms of democracy, as opposed to representative (i.e., indirect) democracies. Hansen provides a very detailed description of how democracy functioned in Athens including rights and duties of citizens, the constitutions and laws, the organization of the Assembly of the People, the court system, the Magistrate’s function, Council of Five Hundred, etc. Hansen notes that one of the ways Athenian citizens kept democracy in check was to refer
to the *patrios politeia* (297), the ancestral constitution, as the ideal democracy. This was their nostalgic “golden age.” Ultimately, Hansen notes, the Athenian *polis* revered a “democratic lifestyle,” a *demotikon ethos* (320).


Challenging conventional notions that slaves played an insignificant role in warfare, Hunt discusses how slaves (as well as the Helots of Sparta) played an integral role in Greek warfare as well as society. According to Hunt, slaves often played decisive roles during battles—including the Persian Wars, Peloponnesian Wars—as soldiers and rowers. They were also used to incite rebellions. Slaves were recruited by the hope of advancement in their position. The Greeks were perhaps the most effective in enlisting slaves because many saw their chance for certain freedoms—at least more freedom than they already had.


The article examines the way slaves were configured into Athenian democracy. Dyrtatas asserts that the myths—of manumission, of war, of upward social mobility—often kept not only the slaves complacent but also reassured citizens. During crisis, slaves sometimes were called upon to fight with the Athenians in exchange for their freedom. A hard-working slave *might be* freed. And certainly, to be a slave in Athens was better than a slave anywhere else, especially Sparta. These myths and social conditions kept the structure of slavery intact.


Parenti discusses how capitalism is contradictory to the means of democracy in the US. Parenti’s systematic analysis offers a stark view of the American political framework that
produces and reproduces ideologies that benefit the few—the wealthy elite. He notes that a functioning democracy necessitates an informed citizenry that can recognize the contradictions in that very democracy as well as making changes. Not only does Parenti critique the system which limits peoples’ freedoms, but he also offers ways insights into how citizens can participate. According to Parenti, in order to get rid of an oppressive system, people must not only recognize how that system works but they must also be offered alternatives.


San Juan examines the ways in which race and racism becomes constructed through “sociohistorical field of forces”—i.e., relationship of power by social, political, and economic determinants—and offers insights on approaches to race. He criticizes the universalistic approaches of multiculturalism, cultural pluralism, and identity politics as reducing the possibilities of political action and eliding differences in power relations. He sees a need for a critical citizenry, informed and praxis-oriented, capable of understanding and contending with differences in political and social power, and able to recognize the against a dominant capitalist hegemony and form a counterhegemony. In essence, a citizenry “actively participating in shaping and governing a democratic society” (40).


In discussing rhetoric, Swartz explains that rhetoric is tied with political action. At a time when citizenship participation in that very politics has become increasingly difficult, Swartz observes that the current US democratic system tends to alienate people by limiting their understanding of the role of citizen as well as by providing little room for political intervention.
Throughout his book, Swartz draws parallels between Classic Greece and current social, political, and economic situations within the US. By looking at the Greek democracy, its attributes, as well as its contradictions, Swartz hopes that we can learn see how our democracy functions, or more significantly, how it might function.


Yuval-Davis argues that the construction of nation and nationalism also constructs gender. Because much of the discussion of nationhood centers on the “public political sphere” (2), the absence of gender—more specifically of women—in that discussion is problematic in the sense that it participates in continuing a male dominated hegemony. Furthermore, the absence is an indicator of the very exclusion or marginalization of women as citizens. Yet, the absence is not that women are not present in the formation of a nation, but rather, gender becomes configured in certain manifestations. Yuval-Davis sees a “multi-tier construction of citizenship,” one that takes into account the various relations of power in terms of race, class, gender, among other differences, as vital to working against states controlling citizenship’s rights. She refers to a “transversal politics” as an alternative to the universal/relativism dichotomy. As she notes, Etienne Balibar has pointed out that the notion of “universalism” is inherently racist and ethnocentric by ignoring difference. Hence, a transversal politics, in which power shifts and moves and becomes heterogenous, is a necessary step against social, political, and economic exclusion.