I. Course Scope and Focus

The 2010 Brazilian national census shows 97.2 million Afro-Brazilians and 90.6 million Whites, being 51 percent and 48 percent of the national total, respectively. These two ethnic nationalities have developed unequally since the establishment of colonial Brazil by Portugal in the sixteenth century. The contemporary dimensions (magnitude) of the inequality can be seen in the 2010 census: the average income of Afro-Brazilians was less than half that of White Brazilians; in Rio de Janeiro (like several other cities), Afro-Brazilians constituted the vast majority of the people in the shanty towns (favelas or slums) and only 7 percent of the people in the richer districts. Similar unequal development between African-Americans and White Americans can be observed in the United States. Currently, there are 42 million African-Americans, being 14 percent of the national total (the three main ethnic nationalities are whites, Latinos, and African-Americans). Recently published data show the current dimensions of the inequality between Whites and African-Americans: 20 percent of Black Americans ages 25 and above have a college degree or better, compared with the national average of 30 percent; Black Americans constitute 7 percent of Americans with a doctoral degree and Whites, 74 percent; in 2009, the wealth gap between White and Black American families was $236,500; the recent US census shows 28 percent of African-Americans live at or below the national poverty line, compared with 10 percent of White Americans. The most populous African nation, Nigeria, shows similar inequality among its major ethnic nationalities. On the eve of political independence in 1959, Yoruba students in the only university in the country at the time, University College, Ibadan (a College of London University), were 43 percent of the total, Igbo students, 35 percent, Fulani students, 0.6 percent, and Hausa students, 0.3 percent. In 1995/96, almost four decades after independence, the Northeast (Kanuri and Hausa-Fulani) had 6 percent of the national university enrollment, the Northwest (Hausa-Fulani) 2.84 percent, the Southeast (Igbo) 23.34 percent, the Southwest (Yoruba) 27 percent, the South-South (Southern ethnic minorities and some Igbo) 30.71 percent. To put these figures in perspective, the population of the Northeast and Northwest together is much larger than the combined population of the Southeast and Southwest. In 1996, 34.4 percent of the people in the Northeast and 37.3 percent in the Northwest were extremely poor; the comparative figures for the Southeast and Southwest are 18.2 percent and 27.5 percent, respectively.

This magnitude of inequality among ethnic nationalities has given rise to serious problems in inter-group relations in the three countries over the years. The Boko Haram
menace in Northeastern Nigeria is probably the most serious currently. This course aims to trace, comparatively, the historical origins of the phenomenon, examine the political and economic consequences, and discuss the politics and economics of state policy designed to address it.

In some important sense, the problem of inequality in these three countries mirrors a somewhat similar problem in the current global system that has been a major threat to world peace. The problem became so pressing in the last decades of the twentieth century that an independent commission, the Willy Brandt Commission, was set up in 1977 to study it and propose solutions. As the chairman of the commission, Willy Brandt of Germany, observed in its report,

When we first met near Bonn in December 1977, we regarded it as our task (as we said in our terms of reference) 'to study the grave global issues arising from the economic and social disparities of the world community'....When we came to discuss our conclusions, there was an even stronger feeling that reshaping worldwide North-South relations had become a crucial commitment to the future of mankind. Equal in importance to counteracting the dangers of the arms race, we believed this to be the greatest challenge to mankind for the remainder of this century [North-South, 1980:8].

It is generally believed the September 11, 2001, attack on the United States was the unfortunate fulfillment of this prophetic declaration. It may be said the problem on which this course is focused is a microcosm of the larger global problem. We intend to have this as a backdrop to our discussion of the central issues in the course.

II. Course Requirements

Apart from the introductory discussion in the first meeting of the class, the course is divided into three sub-themes: the dimensions of inequality in contemporary times; the historical origins; and the politics and economics of state policy. Each country will be discussed in a number of classes under the sub-themes, including comparisons. Each student will have the opportunity to lead discussions in each of the sub-themes, a responsibility that will be shared out well in advance. At the end of each sub-theme, questions will be drawn up by the professor and students will write a one-page essay on their chosen question. Thus, there will be three one-page essays altogether, each carrying 10 percent of the total marks in the course. There will be a Take-Home Mid-Term in March; the questions will be distributed on March 26 and the answers will be submitted in class on March 28, 2018. It carries 20 percent of the marks in the course. A major element of the course is a term paper of 12-15 pages, which carries 40 percent of the total marks in the course. The paper will be written on a question chosen from a list of questions drawn up by the professor. It is expected to be thoroughly researched, formally written in a flowing prose, and logically argued, with references to sources of information and ideas. The paper is due in class on April 30, 2018. Students must attend all classes punctually. Students’ attendance will be recorded; it carries 10 percent of the marks in the course. Students are encouraged to take advantage of the weekly office hours to discuss
with the professor all issues concerning the course, especially in preparing their term papers. The office hours’ slots will be made available in class for students to select their convenient slots each week. There is no final examination in the course. The long term paper takes the place of the final examination.

III. Required Textbooks

(A) Textbooks to be purchased by Students


(B) Required Textbooks to be placed on print reserve


Electronic Reserve for Required Readings


IV. Course Outline

1. **January 17, 2018:**
   *Introductory class* — the general problem of inequality in the current global system: inequality between countries and between major regions (in particular, the West and the Rest, and the North and the South); inequality within countries (class, race, regions); socio-political and economic consequences → Difference between global inequality and inequality within countries → Course requirements and mode of operation (see II, above) → Course Outline → Course Texts: preparation for classes; writing one-page essays; answering the mid-term questions; writing the long term paper → Discussion leaders for *The Dimensions of Inequality in Contemporary Times*:
   i) January 24, 2018 (Brazil)
   ii) January 31, 2018 (United States)
   iii) February 7, 2018 (Nigeria)

2. **January 22 & 24, 2018:**
   The Dimensions of Inequality between Afro-Brazilians and White Brazilians in Brazil in Contemporary Times.
   **Readings** → i) Bucciferro, “Racial Inequality in Brazil from Independence to Present;”
   iii) Reid, *Brazil: The Troubled Rise of a Global Power*, pp. 164-191 (pp. 181-185, in particular);

3. **January 29 & 31, 2018:**
   The Dimensions of Inequality in the United States in Contemporary Times.
   **Readings** → i) Morris, *Black Stats: African Americans by the Numbers in the Twenty-First Century*;

4. **February 5 & 7, 2018:**
   The Dimensions of Inequality in Nigeria in Contemporary Times:
   **Readings** → i) Ukiwo, “Education, Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnic Relations in Nigeria,”
5. **February 12, 14, 19 & 21, 2018:**
   The Historical Origins of Inequality in Brazil:
   **Readings** → i) Bucciferro, “Racial Inequality in Brazil from Independence to Present;”
   iii) Skidmore, “Towards a Comparative Analysis of Race Relations since Abolition in Brazil and the United States.”

6. **February 26, 28, March 5 & 7, 2018:**
   The Historical Origins of Inequality in the United States:
   **Readings** → i) SenGupta, *From Slavery to Poverty*;
       Childs, *Slaves of the State*;
   iv) Karlin, “Capitalism, Slavery, Racism and Imprisonment of People of Color Cannot be Separated.”

   **Spring Recess, March 10-18, 2018**

7. **March 19, 21, 26 & 28, 2018:**
   The Historical Origins of Inequality in Nigeria:
   **Readings** → i) Report of the Presidential Implementation Committee for the Recommendations of the National Seminar on the National Question;

8. **April 2, 4 & 9, 2018:**
   The Politics and Economics of State Policy Addressing Inequality in Brazil:
   **Readings** → i) Brainard and Martinez-Diaz (eds.), *Brazil as an Economic Superpower?* Pp. 221-269;
       iv) Bucciferro, “Racial Inequality in Brazil from Independence to Present.”

9. **April 11, 16 & 18, 2018:**
   The Politics and Economics of State Policy Addressing Inequality in the United States:
   **Readings** → i) Royce, *Poverty and Power: The Problem of Structural Inequality* (This book is both theoretical and empirical. It deals with all groups and classes. It offers a solid conceptual foundation for dealing with the main issue of inequality between Black and White Americans. All students must read the entire book and pay particular attention to pp. **
1-25, p. 73 [gender and Race/Ethnicity], pp. 128-129 [The politics of Race], and pp. 197-258.


v) Darity, “From Here to Full Employment,”


10. **April 23, 25 & 30, 2018**:

The Politics and Economics of State Policy Addressing Inequality in Nigeria:

**Readings** → i) *Report of the Presidential Implementation Committee for the Recommendations of the National Seminar on the National Question*;

ii) Inikori, “Inequality among Ethno-Religious Groups and Long-Run Development.”