Critical Analysis:  
Critical Race Theory

**American policies are the backbone of everyday life from things in the public sector in the job market to law regulation and how society will function at the individual and the group levels.** *[This sentence is a bit convoluted. Consider revising for clarity and conciseness. For example: 'American policies shape our daily lives, influencing everything from employment and law enforcement to individual and societal interactions.']* Society has used policies to regulate itself and these rules are applied from the top all the way down to the bottom. They are supposed to be equal such that the benefits are made available to all areas of society. Critical Race Theory (CRT) has seen a resurgence in the media based on events both in the community and where those policies are created.

Critical Race Theory was coined by [civil rights advocate and lawyer Kimberlé Crenshaw](https://news.columbia.edu/news/what-critical-race-theory-and-why-everyone-talking-about-it-0) with its roots going back to the civil rights cases that [Derrick Albert Bell Jr.](https://www.thoughtco.com/critical-race-theory-4685094) had legislated in the 1960s. Derrick Bell argued that racism went deeper than just the local level of hate and that it had instead been defining the American law policies and society in general for a long time. Early arguments from Bell were not simply a civil rights problem of segregation but that elite white people had extreme self-interests for change.

**It became apparent to Bell that for far-reaching changes to occur the legal system would have to change in a dramatic fashion.** *[While this sentence is grammatically correct, it could be more impactful. Consider: 'Bell realized that systemic change required a radical transformation of the legal system itself.']* The law itself which had been designed by and to empower white people had created a subsection of people within higher education where it became a feedback loop. Bell would resign from his position within those elite schools because of their racist ideologies to hire only white men. The ideology for CRT has gone far beyond the original intent to expand the way the laws work for minorities, with CRT having a large impact on the education system as well.

The primary concern in current media, where CRT has seen some of its biggest criticisms, is that [for others to prosper and advance, policies must be created to discriminate against white people](https://www.edweek.org/leadership/what-is-critical-race-theory-and-why-is-it-under-attack/2021/05). It’s also argued that the change required to allow minorities to prosper is not simple and that claiming there is an easy solution is a lie. These critiques are important because it’s easy to see the substantial evidence where whites have prospered, but it’s not so simple to solve the discrepancy of how to move forward with a solution.

Although legislations have been changed in Idaho, Iowa, Tennessee, and Oklahoma to outlaw the teachings of CRT, the laws are still vague as to what can and cannot be taught. History courses are arguably in the hardest hit area with these legislations. **There are teachers who fear retaliation for trying to teach difficult topics regarding racism such as the Civil War, civil rights movement, or Trail of Tears.** *[Provide specific examples of this retaliation or link to sources that document this fear.]* While the laws may exist and be hard to enforce, some scholars may suppress their own curriculum and because the topic of racism is heated.

While CRT has a deep history in American politics and legal culture it’s also gained traction throughout recent media and educational facets. The debate has shifted from the theoretical side and into the realm of work and as a teachable subject gated towards a younger generation. In many ways CRT is vague at best and hard to understand in quick snippets on Twitter or headlines. To gain a modicum of insight requires a lengthy dive into the discussion where research, investigative journalism, and educational articles have been written.

Author Christopher F. Rufo is an investigative journalist who has written this article for the NYPost describing how Critical Race Theory (CRT) has been misused in almost every aspect of society in America. The framework for public policy, school curriculum, training programs in government, corporate, and human resource departments are all examples of how spread the topic has become. According to Rufo, CRT teaches equity instead of equality in order to mask its neo-Marxist roots. It does this to appear non-threatening and easier to accept to the general public. Neo-Marxism, or equity in his words, would mean the redistribution of everything materialistic. This claim has been proposed by one UCLA law professor in an article written over seven years ago. **While it may have been a topic of discussion back then, the context of this mass redistribution has not seen any major discussion and is a weak claim with almost zero evidence.** *[This feels a bit informal. Rephrase as: 'While this concept may have been discussed previously, the idea of mass redistribution lacks current scholarly support and is presented without sufficient evidence.']*

Mr. Rufo has documented and reported on over a thousand examples of this overreaching training which after a small google search yielded all his data. Unfortunately, his data provides no true context to why those government groups and corporations utilized the workplace for training. His groundwork data is good, and his investigation into CRT provides a few twitter threads and documents from these agencies but the reader should be wary of falling into confirmation bias. **Mr. Rufo is on a good path for why CRT has developed into a pseudoscientific discussion and why it’s important to be critical of what we are training and teaching people.** *[This sentence is unclear. Consider revising. For example: 'Rufo raises important questions about the framing of CRT and the need for critical analysis of training materials.']* Readers should be able to see how it can be a net-negative to train all employees that white people are inherently racist.

In [this Raw Story article](https://www.rawstory.com/this-is-what-opponents-of-critical-race-theory-don-t-want-you-to-know/) the author Clyde W. Ford explains in detail the aspects of early American colony life were rife with the use of indentured servants both black and white, but how over time laws and enforcement forced Africans into a harsher reality as true slaves. It’s proven with source material from court rulings on record and laws dating back to the mid-17th century. These rulings even though they are hundreds of years old should still cause anger for any reader because of how harshly black people were treated. These are clear examples on how early white colonists set up a legal way to oppress black people and minorities.

Ford’s article compares how past laws have manifested in current format without the racist overtones such as what is known to be as ‘qualified immunity’ wherein a law enforcement officer can enact violence without fear of consequence. **It should sound as terrifying in writing as it is in real life where without any consequence a cop could commit violence in the name of them performing their duties.** *[This sentence relies too heavily on emotional appeal. Focus on presenting evidence and analysis. For example: 'The concept of qualified immunity raises concerns about accountability in cases of police misconduct.']* This is easily verifiable through a recent media search where both the Supreme Court and several cases of qualified immunity have been used to shield cops from any wrongdoing on their actions.

Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger B Taney, in 1857, handed down a verdict stating blacks had “no rights which the white man was bound to respect.” This is an example of the highest ranked officer in the U.S. federal judicial branch creating a law to specifically oppress black Americans. Being only 150 years in the past, it should be no surprise that the residual effects in oppression remain abundant in today’s culture. It creates anger at how easily the laws subverted basic human rights to black Americans and created a way for white people in power to conscientiously prosper from the foundation of the racism and oppression they created.

The writer Ryan Lessard of this [PBS article](https://nhpbs.org/raceinamerica/?resource=4180) has several differing opinions on how CRT is both good and bad but that overall, it’s a net positive. He is objective on this article by hosting both sides in the local New Hampshire area where both sides get to express their beliefs on why CRT should be more instrumental in training. This article however has only local language while CRT is a nationwide movement and not limited to the scope of a single state and may not adhere to the other states experiences. It’s still confusing why one side in the article states that teaching CRT is ‘brainwashing our children to hate America.’ Jonathan Wesley states that choosing to ignore the racist foundation created by white people is a more appropriate definition. Dr. Wesley is an online professor for Southern New Hampshire University and has the credibility of over a decade in specialized experience working for marginalized populations.

The article tries to balance the strong points for CRT deployment with an opinion from Adam Waldeck, president of the 1776 Action group. His opposition to CRT training is mainly on the surface of how it teaches immediate skin-color stereotypes. However, his views are clearly misguided because rather than have an open discussion on how something as vast and tough to explain as CRT is he would rather ban any discussion or training outright. Overall, the article has strong opinions on both sides of the argument and with supporting evidence on one side with actual investment into the future of community engagement. Unfortunately, it lacks a critical comparison to the negatives of CRT training where one side sees it as an extremism and would rather bury their head in the sand than discuss a way to engage as a future investment into their local community in New Hampshire.

In these articles it’s easy to get lost amongst the definitions and opinions on how CRT should be taught, whether it should be allowed in the public domain at all, or why it matters to anyone other than scholars and as an academic-only discussion. While it’s important to understand the intrinsic nuances of CRT, it’s also worth using it to further the advancement of race relations between how white people became unaware oppressors and how minorities deserve an equal chance at success. CRT should become a staple point in all aspects of culture throughout the legal realm, the educational areas, and the workplace but it should be an open discussion in how these trainings are developed.

Christopher Rufo has the strongest point on how discussions on CRT can divulge into extreme racial biases against white people. His view that just teaching people that all whites are racists and how everyone is always oppressed because of the history of America is important to view as a dangerous rope to walk. I believe this an important facet to the discussion because CRT should be learned and taught, but it is a balance of past and future tendencies. Understanding the magnitude of the history of racist laws and oppressive subtleties in white culture is imperative to understanding a solution to the relations in communities where opinions can vary wildly. Ryan Lessard’s PBS article and how the definition of CRT has been misappropriated towards an authoritarian Marxist movement is one aspect of where Republicans are boldly lying about how training CRT will begin to oppress white people. This shouldn’t be a concern because CRT explicitly states it only wants to begin a dialogue on where the laws and educational training need to change.

I can understand the stubborn headedness from the right, but I firmly believe they have a closed mind on what CRT means. There’s more to be gained from learning how to incorporate CRT properly and how CRT affects minorities every day than there is to ban a dialogue or to impose laws which directly stifle any discussion in education. The older generations tend to be set in their ways with little give on understanding how their past or their parents’ past may have set their implicit biases. It is still important to target and teach this generation because they tend to have the most effect on the younger generations they raise. If they are left out of the conversation, the standards they set are less likely to change for the better. The proper way forward is to teach it at the educational level where open mindedness and to break down the walls of racist undertones. It’s also important to continue teaching in workplace settings for the benefit of working professionals who are actively engaging with each other and the general public.

Overall, CRT is beneficial for any age group to learn as it is integral to unlearning inherent biases. It will invariably be a battleground in the legal field where both sides seem to think their opinion is correct, but it will also become a contention in the k-12 education system. In the past it was about how black people shouldn’t be a part of the white school system and there were only negatives when minorities were mixed in with white people. **It’s always been important to be on the correct side of history when it comes to things like racial equality, gender equality, and basic human rights.** *[This statement, while generally true, feels a bit clichéd and doesn't add much to the argument. Consider removing it or replacing it with a more specific and impactful statement. ]* Trying to apply CRT in the educational system now will ultimately encourage children to learn and progress society in a positive direction that benefits everyone involved, further reducing the residual effects of oppression in the future.

**Summary Feedback:**

This essay demonstrates a good understanding of the complexities surrounding Critical Race Theory. You effectively summarize the arguments presented in the chosen articles and attempt to synthesize these perspectives in your response. Your background section provides a solid historical overview of CRT, tracing its origins and evolution. The analysis section identifies key arguments and rhetorical strategies employed by the authors, although it occasionally veers into summary rather than in-depth analysis. The response section presents a thoughtful perspective on the debate, advocating for open dialogue and education as a path forward.

However, the essay would benefit from more precise language and stronger analytical focus. Some sentences are convoluted or unclear, and the analysis could be more nuanced, delving deeper into the rhetorical strategies and underlying assumptions of the chosen articles. Additionally, providing specific examples and evidence to support your claims would strengthen the overall argument. Be cautious of using overly strong language or emotional appeals, as these can detract from the credibility of your analysis. Remember to focus on analyzing \*how\* the authors make their arguments, rather than simply summarizing \*what\* they say.

**Rubric Feedback:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Portion | Ideal Criteria | Overall Feedback |
| Introduction | • Engaging • Shows importance of question • Indicates major parts and content | - The introduction needs a stronger hook and a clear thesis statement that directly addresses the essay's central question: What is the purpose of a mask mandate? |
| Background | • Uses credible, neutral sources • Effectively and sufficiently explains essential information • Written objectively in own words • Well organized and focused paragraphs with transitions • Minimal error | - While the background section provides a general overview of the mask mandate, it needs more specific information about the history and implementation of mask mandates. Include key dates, events, and relevant legal frameworks. Also, define the different types of masks and their effectiveness. |
| Analysis | • Smooth transition from background • Summarizes accurately and in own words two opposing answers and one objective answer to the question • Recognizes bias • Reasonable observations about how all sources make their arguments impactful • Well-organized and focused paragraphs with transitions • Minimal error | - While you summarize the articles, the analysis could be more in-depth. Focus on identifying and analyzing the rhetorical strategies used by the authors to persuade their audiences. Provide specific examples from the texts to support your claims. |
| Response | • Smooth transition from analysis • Incorporates strong points from sources • Draws a reasonable and well-supported conclusion, answering the question • Provides satisfying conclusion to the project • Good transitions between focused paragraphs • Minimal error | - The response presents a thoughtful perspective, but it would benefit from stronger support and more precise language. Avoid generalizations and clichés, and instead focus on developing a nuanced and well-supported argument. |