

“How Do I Live in This Strange Place?”

Samantha Vice

This paper is an attempt to critically reflect upon what it is to be white in a country like South Africa. Despite the efforts of politicians and public relation officials to persuade its citizens otherwise, South Africa is still a visibly divided and suspicious land. All South Africans are required to feel pride in their country, and expats are urged to return to build the nation and participate in the miracle that the early post-Apartheid days made not impossible to believe in. At the same time, our equally famous history of stupefying injustice and inhumanity feels still with us: its effects press around us every day, in the visible poverty, the crime that has affected everyone, the child beggars on the pavements, the *de facto* racial segregation of living spaces, in who is serving whom in restaurants and shops and in homes.

South Africa is a strange and morally tangled place to live in. My title is taken from Bernoldus Niemand's song "Reggae Vibes is Cool," off the album *Wie is Bernoldus Niemand?* Rian Malan uses this as the motto for his book, *My Traitor's Heart* (London: Vintage, 1991). And there are many ways of being white, here or elsewhere; I talk from a personal, but what I hope is still a fairly representative position. While I am not an Afrikaner¹ and so have escaped the taint that identity brings with it, I am a white South African, undeniably a product of the Apartheid system and undeniably still benefiting from it. In an influential paper, Linda Martín Alcoff asked, "What Should White People Do?"²; I want to ask how white people can *be* and live well in such a land, with such a legacy. What is it like to live here as a white person? What is the morally appropriate reaction to one's situation of privilege? Is it possible to live well? And more broadly, in such a context how can we understand—*can* we understand—a conception of the moral life as a private and inward-directed process guided by an ideal of the good? For despite our context, no life and no self is only political; no one can think of herself as *only* a citizen or as only and essentially constituted by factors external to her. The concern with the quality of the self that is so central in the origins of the western philosophical tradition seems even more important in a land that has denied the privacy and nonpolitical reality of individual lives. Part of eradicating racism would be to eradicate the forced identification of oneself as a particular public and political product. But how is this realization to be lived and justified in a strange place like South Africa, in which the self is so thoroughly saturated by histories of oppression or privilege? For whites in South Africa, now that at least *de jure* power has been removed from them, the personal project might be the most exigent and the most

difficult. If *we* are a problem, we should perhaps concentrate on recovering and rehabilitating our selves. I shall suggest that because of peculiarities of the South African situation, this personal, inward-directed project should be cultivated with humility and in (a certain kind of) silence.

Of course, an interest in the project of caring for the self is not necessarily tied to matters of race and politics. But in a country like South Africa, in which to be a good person is often identified with taking an active and public part in politics or the struggle against racial injustice and oppression, there is certainly a question as to how the private project of care of the self can get a grip. So while I concentrate on whiteness in this paper, this is not because I feel that whiteness demands further and ongoing study; that we need, for instance, a discipline called “whiteness studies.” I do not.³ Rather, my experience as a white South African raises starkly some questions about the nature of the self and the place of self-concern in a context in which injustice is the norm. Although these questions have plenty to do with a notion of the *constructed* self, they have nothing essentially to do with race, although, again, race raises them in a stark fashion. On the other hand, however, this paper can indeed be seen as being about race insofar as it is my attempt to make good on a possible responsibility that I incur as a philosopher. Ward Jones has argued that philosophers have duties *qua* philosophers to engage with their context; in South Africa, this must be to engage with race and oppression.⁴ Although an honest and sincere public dialogue about race has not yet happened in South Africa—the subject is too close to the bone for many and too much is at stake and too confused—race is the unacknowledged elephant in the room that affects pretty much everything, in and outside academia.⁵ This paper is therefore my attempt at exploring some moral issues from a direction grounded very much in my context.

I.

South African whiteness might have unique features, as I shall suggest later, but it should be understood against the theoretical context of whiteness in general. It is by now standard, for instance, to think of whiteness as consisting in the occupation of “a social location of structural privilege in the right kind of racialized society,”⁶ as well as the occupation of the epistemic position of seeing the world “whitely.” “Whiteness,” Paul Taylor writes, “tends to involve a commitment to the centrality of white people and their perspectives”: “The way they [whites] see the world just is the way the world is, and the way they get around in the world just is the right way to get around.”⁷ The political, social and economic advantages that accrue to being white are then “normalized, and rendered unremarkable.”⁸ One of the key ways of theorizing whiteness is as a global norm that is invisible, working in the background as a standard, not of one particular way of being in the world, but as normalcy, as universalizability, of just being “the way things are.”⁹ Within this system, whites are advantaged in ways that seem “just the way things are,” that are invisible to themselves and so not seen as advantages at all. Although I think the situation is more complex in South

Africa—and I return briefly to this point later—I accept the thesis of invisibility as at least one explanatorily powerful tool in theorizing whiteness. The advantages that accrue to whiteness are usually termed “privileges” in the literature and I will use the term although it does not strike me as altogether appropriate. Privileges, for instance, often refer to goods that one cannot expect as one’s due, that one has not got a right to, and it is clear that many ways in which whites are advantaged are, in fact, ways that all people should be able to expect as their due. But I retain the term for it does, at least, suggest the sense of unearned, unshared, nonuniversal advantages.

I take it that some account of white privilege as habitual must be correct and I propose to accept the broad account given by Shannon Sullivan in *Revealing Whiteness*. We may disagree with the particular way that she understands the genesis of these habits, but the broad project of understanding patterns of white privilege in terms of habit is plausible. Sullivan thinks of white privilege as unconscious psychical and somatic habits, constituted by “mental and physical patterns of engagement with the world that operate without conscious attention or reflection”; our very identities are constituted by these patterns of behavior.¹⁰ White privilege therefore “comes to constitute ways of ‘bodying’ as well as ways of thinking” that mutually implicate each other.¹¹ It is important to see that privilege in this sense is nonvoluntary in its origins, although of course later on it may be more or less consciously embraced or rejected. In an essay written decades earlier, the South African activist and black consciousness leader, Steve Biko, emphasized this when assessing the role of well-meaning white liberals in Apartheid South Africa:

It is not as if whites are allowed to enjoy privilege only when they declare their solidarity with the ruling party. They are born into privilege and are nourished by and nurtured in the system of ruthless exploitation of black energy.¹²

I want to put this thesis about white privilege as habit together with a thesis from Lisa Tessman, on the moral damage that happens under oppression. Tessman is concerned with “the way in which the devastating conditions [of oppression] confronted by . . . selves both limit and burden their moral goodness.”¹³ Under conditions of oppression, both the oppressed and the oppressors are morally damaged, although of course in different ways, and even if this damage is not their responsibility. In this paper, I will focus on the moral damage done to the oppressors’ character by habitual white privilege. I will argue that in spite of the nonvoluntary origins of these habits, they are our responsibility and they call for appropriate moral responses. However, given the entrenched nature of habits, eradicating or changing them will be very difficult, needing more than argument and rational persuasion, and more than structural and institutional change.¹⁴ And the oppressed’s recognition of this justifies their suspicion of well-meaning attempts on the part of those entrenched in a system of privilege—Biko again:

For the 20-year-old white liberal to expect to be accepted with open arms is surely to overestimate the powers of forgiveness of the black people. No matter how genuine a liberal's motivations may be, he has to accept that, although he did not choose to be born into privilege, the blacks cannot but be suspicious of his motives.¹⁵

The theses of habitual white privilege and moral damage are especially helpful in thinking about how it is to be white in South Africa. While it is no longer common for whites to be openly and obviously racist, it is impossibly optimistic to think that the ways of whites who grew up and were educated in this country are not in some way still whitely. Because of the brute facts of birth, few white people, however well-meaning and morally conscientious, will escape the habits of white privilege; their characters and modes of interaction with the world just will be constituted in ways that are morally damaging. According to Sullivan, habits of white privilege “currently are a historical necessity; they cannot be totally avoided given the white-privileged world that exists.”¹⁶ And in South Africa, the working and effects of privilege are starkly apparent; one cannot in good faith pretend they do not exist. Deciding how to live decently with this recognition is one of the main moral tasks facing all white people and the task I explore in this paper.

How then is one to *be* a good person and live well under these morally dubious conditions? One way in which South Africa perhaps differs from the standard account mentioned above is that it is impossible for anyone not to be aware of his or her race. As Melissa Steyn writes, the “particular historical and political configuration in South Africa has meant that whites have never experienced their whiteness and the advantage it afforded them as invisible.”¹⁷ While one's whiteness might still constitute the unacknowledged norm, as the invisibility thesis claims, *that one is* white rather than black is always present to oneself and others, barring an impressive feat of willed self-deception. My interest, then, is in white South Africans who are aware of their whiteness and, in a nice inversion of Du Bois's words, see themselves as a problem, because they know their selves to be constituted by habits of white privilege.¹⁸ In the rest of the paper, I have these people in mind when I refer to whites, not those who are blatantly and proudly racist. Alcoff asks, “what is it to acknowledge one's whiteness? Is it to acknowledge that one is inherently tied to structures of domination and oppression, that one is irrevocably on the wrong side?”¹⁹ I think the answer to Alcoff's question in South Africa is fairly obviously “yes.” Whites in South Africa ought to see themselves as a problem. How does one live knowing this, among the very visible effects of one's moral offenses?

Life for conscientious white South Africans is at any rate richly infused with the moral emotions. There is perhaps some justice, along with much that is morally puzzling, in the fact that feeling uncomfortable is an ineradicable part of white life. I want to now explore the appropriateness in this situation of the emotions of guilt, shame, and what Bernard Williams calls “agent-regret.” While much of what I say about their appropriateness could apply to whites in other parts of the world, I am interested in the particular way these emotions play out in the

South African context. White South Africans seem to be in the peculiar position of being morally required to feel certain emotions that indicate they are not meeting their moral requirements. If they experience these emotions they are therefore both fulfilling and failing to fulfill their moral duties. And this seems the morally best state they can be in.

II.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) raised the question of white South Africans' mundane complicity in the Apartheid regime, even though it did not adequately explore it (and probably could not, given its remit). The focus on certain key figures in Apartheid atrocities allowed some whites to escape feelings of guilt—the crimes of Apartheid were performed not by them, but by certain figures of apparently inhuman evil (perhaps the most infamous example is Eugene de Kock, commander of the government's death squad, "Vlakplaas"²⁰). Whites could insist with some degree of sincerity—however naïve—that they knew nothing of the violence taking place daily and routinely at the hands of the security police.

Despite this focus on serious individual wrongdoing in the TRC, issues of collective guilt certainly arose, and there is in South Africa much talk, usually dismissive, of "white guilt." These issues are complex, but there is always the risk of disingenuously absolving oneself from blame, and so guilt, by ignoring the other ways in which one, as a white person, participated in and upheld violent and demeaning structures. There are many ways of being unjust, and it is too easy to jump off the moral hook by focusing on the obvious crimes of the apartheid death squads. I am not denying that whites here acted reprehensibly, and that some still do, but I am more interested in ways of being and acting that at least do not look obviously unjust and are not intended to be discriminatory and harmful. As Tessman reminds us, "in many cases it takes having some vicious characteristics in order to maintain oneself in a position of dominance."²¹ Even if we put aside blatant discrimination and cruelty, there are still obvious vices like indifference or callousness, cowardice or dishonesty, the failure of imagination and empathy, or just plain laziness. I take it that these vices would be the kinds of psychological habits that Sullivan would think constitute and maintain white privilege all over the world, not only here. Once recognized, we can try to eradicate them, or learn to mistrust their verdicts or evaluations if we cannot rid ourselves of their insidious and automatic presence. There are also, however, less obvious pernicious character traits, which even whites who are critical of their position may have. Those who are trying to change themselves might be burdened precisely by "unmalleable characters"²² that are themselves the unwilling and unwanted effects of white privilege. Tessman gives as an example an experience that is uncomfortably familiar to me: "The white raised as a racist may later learn not to actually cross the street or clutch tightly to her/his belongings upon seeing a black person approach, but still be unable to rehabilitate her/himself to not feel fearful."²³ These

kinds of traits are those, it seems, from which one approaches the world: an attitude of automatic, unwilld distrust or fear, that is, in Sullivan's terms now, as somatic as it is psychic. Neither Sullivan nor Tessman wants to deny us any control at all; that would be to render their liberatory ethics absurd (although how to retain responsibility and control under these conditions is a major theoretical task). But they do insist on the difficulty, the continuing self-vigilance, the ironic kind of "double-thinking" and double consciousness²⁴ that is now required of well-intentioned whites in order for control to be possible.

The theses of habitual white privilege and moral damage accept that our ways of being in the world might not be directly open to our control, and that their origins certainly were not. Whether guilt is appropriate or not in that context is difficult to decide. I do not wish to settle the issue here, and I begin with guilt only because it is where most discussions in this country begin. I would, however, be willing to disentangle guilt from any direct relation to actions one has performed. In this country it is difficult to avoid thinking of oneself as guilty just by being white, irrespective of directly racist actions, and irrespective of whether one was responsible for acquiring whitely habits. One is—even if unavoidably—a continuing product of white privilege and benefiting from it, implicated in and enacting injustice in many subtle ways; it seems to me that feelings of guilt are appropriate. The consequence of claiming this is that some version of the principle of "ought implies can" needs to be rejected or revised. Whether or not I have control over every aspect of my character, habits and actions, still I ought to behave differently. That this is an uncomfortable position to be in does not make it impossible to find oneself in it, and it does not seem to me to be absurd—self-contradictory—to consider it. "Oughts" and thus moral imperatives remain even if they cannot be fulfilled. The continuing insistence that it is, if not impossible, an unfair or perhaps supererogatory position to be in, depends on not taking seriously enough how one's sense of self can be infected by one's recognition of continuing privilege.

However, I accept that the issue of guilt is complex and that there are good reasons to tie guilt to actions. In any case, my suggestion that guilt is an appropriate emotion for white South Africans to feel depends on a conception of the self as implicated and stained by white privilege. It is this claim that most interests me, and to explore it further it will be helpful to put guilt aside and concentrate on shame. In South Africa it is common to hear proud declarations from whites that they "refuse to feel ashamed for being white;" perhaps even more than guilt, the suggestion that shame might be appropriate cuts very close to the bone.

In standard accounts of the moral emotions, shame differs from guilt in being essentially directed toward the self, rather than outwards toward a harm one brought about.²⁵ Shame is a response to having fallen below the standards one sets for oneself, whether moral or not. One's very self is implicated in a way that need not be the case with guilt, which is a reaction to what one has *done*, not primarily to who one *is*. (In many instances of moral wrongdoing, one

will rightly feel both shame and guilt.) Shame is the recognition that one ought not to be as one is, and it does not, I think, depend on the claim that one could be different to how one is.

Now, shame seems an appropriate response to the recognition of one's unavoidable privilege. For white privilege does not attach merely to what one does or how one benefits, but, more fundamentally, to who one is. And one does not wish to be a person whose welfare is dependent upon harm to others. One does not wish to be a person with vicious traits that are helping, however passively, to sustain privilege and oppression. There is nothing about one's particular self that makes one deserve special treatment and that ease of moving about the world that comes with being white. When one discovers that one *is*, after all, such a person, however unavoidably, and insofar as one is morally aware and rational, one can only feel shame. Considering how powerfully shame can be felt about minor transgressions, it is to be expected that in this context shame would be particularly unpleasant.

However, the moral implications of shame here are difficult fully to understand. For shame is both an indication of something having gone wrong and, it seems, also appropriate and so in some sense morally good. On the first aspect, that shame is the sign of something wrong, Aristotle writes:

shame is not the emotion of a good man, if it is felt for doing bad actions, because such actions ought not to be done . . . so the emotion ought not to be felt. . . . Although shamelessness, that is, not being ashamed to do what is disgraceful, is a bad thing, it does not follow any the more from this that to be ashamed if one behaves disgracefully is a good thing.²⁶

We need not be misled by Aristotle's talking in terms of actions. Shame is felt for doing actions that are disgraceful, which a virtuous person would not do. Feeling shame means that one has behaved disgracefully in a way that undermines one's sense of being fundamentally decent or having integrity. If Aristotle is correct, then one avenue of feeling better about ourselves is taken from us. We can hardly take solace in the thought that at least we are sensitive and caring enough to feel shame. That we feel shame is an indication that *we* are not as we should be and there is nothing there to take solace in.

That is one aspect of shame: we are not as we ought to be. But on the other hand, having a desire to respond appropriately to the world is one mark of a morally conscientious person. If we are as bad as the thesis of white privilege suggests, then any white person should feel shame, and our obeying this imperative means we are responding as we should, fulfilling at least a moral emotional duty. It is morally appropriate to accept and live with shame, aware of oneself always as privileged and existing in a world that accommodates one at the expense of others. It would be morally worse if one did not feel and know these things.

So in this context—of unwanted, nonvoluntary white privilege—some might feel that accusing a white person of being morally bad because they feel

shame, as Aristotle seems to say, is therefore unfair or just too quick. When white privilege is unwanted but inescapable, it is the *world* that is not how it should be. The self is responding in a fitting manner to this situation, and insisting that the self is morally wrong or damaged is just to insist that the world is not as it is. Even if not in every instance of shame, certainly in this context where the self is constituted by injustices it cannot avoid and does not accept voluntarily, Aristotle's denial that shame is ever compatible with virtue cannot be correct.²⁷

It is perhaps perverse to insist that one really is bad in the face of comforting evidence to the contrary, but I do not think this rehabilitation of shame can work. More than any other emotion, shame reveals our painful distance from our own standards of excellence or perfection. Just because the distance between self and world in the shame of white privilege is so small, the self is infected with the state of the world; the world that one is inescapably and unjustly benefiting from affects the quality of the self. That the genesis of that state of affairs is not always one's direct responsibility (although its continuation may be) cannot in this context exhaust one's self-assessment. Regardless of the reason, one is failing to live up to standards that one reflectively endorses, that are powerful moral guides and that one acknowledges as part of one's (better) self. This ideal self-conception is often the morally most illuminating and motivating part of one's self-conception. Given that we have to live with the recognition of both the failed and ideal aspects of the self, we bear the burden of not being as we should be.

Before settling on the appropriateness of shame, however, another possibility should be considered. One way of admitting the appropriateness of feeling bad in this situation without going so far as to endorse shame would be to say that what the morally conscientious person should feel is *agent-regret*, to use Bernard Williams's phrase.²⁸ Regret is a more forgiving verdict; it occurs when one was causally responsible for something bad, despite having no control over the situation. Williams's example is of a careful driver knocking over a child who runs unexpectedly into the road. The driver is causally implicated and his involvement in something bad causes him, quite rightly, to feel very bad indeed. Insisting that regret is irrational in such cases would not have much force and we do not expect it to.

Luck often plays a part in your finding yourself in these situations. Considerations of luck can then be expanded: the kind of temperament and character you have, perhaps, is not of your doing. Here, you might regret the person you are, not just your action.²⁹ Further, there is what Tessman calls "systemic" luck: the luck that comes from "circumstances that are systematically arranged and that tend to affect people as members of social groups."³⁰ Tessman is in fact most interested in "systemic, constitutive moral luck," the luck that systemic forces can have on character development.³¹ As we have seen, if Sullivan and Tessman are correct, whites are also beset by this kind of luck; they have become certain kinds of people through a luck that works systemically to affect

people of different racial groups in different, patterned ways. How then should one react to this element of luck? Perhaps, it might be thought, whites are entitled to other emotions alongside their shame or regret: anger, resentment or annoyance that they had the misfortune to be born privileged. But although feeling ashamed or regretful certainly wouldn't exhaust one's responses, they cannot be replaced by anger or resentment. By themselves, those responses seem misdirected—essentially, we should be worrying not about our own bad luck, but about the damage to self and others that the bad luck has caused or sustained.³²

Agent-regret is an appropriate emotion for whites to feel. We would look askance at a white person who admitted to no feelings of agent-regret about benefiting accidentally from her historically privileged position. There is something particularly callow about pronouncements of indifference here, as if a person played *no* role, not even accidentally, in the maintenance of injustice, and certainly this sense of a historical innocence is often self-serving and not merely ignorant. But once we admit the possibility and appropriateness of *self*-regret, we are back in the realm of shame: once we regret *who we are*, regret seems to collapse into shame. Responding only with regret at one's privileged situational luck fails again to realize the saturation of the self by such a situation, and it fails, too, to recognize just how brutally defined one is by the human and natural landscape of one's country. One need not be especially patriotic to recognize this—in the sense of feeling pride in one's nationality, having a personal stake in one's country's prestige, identifying oneself deeply with its culture or history and feeling personally harmed when it is beaten or belittled. I, for instance, am not patriotic in any of these ways. However, part of being of a certain nationality is fitting into the landscape, knowing how things work and what to expect. In South Africa this very landscape is defined racially, and so one's "fitting into it" can only have a racial dimension too. Feeling comfortable in this way can itself be a sign of privilege and indicate, once again, that something is wrong with who one *is*, not just with what one has or has not done.

Situational, systemic, and constitutive luck, of course, is a feature of white life everywhere. That whiteness is a problem all over the world does not however fully explain the problem that whiteness is here, nor does it fully capture the nuances of our moral experience. The problem in white South Africa is not just with being *white*, but being white *South African*. What then is it about South Africa that makes whiteness here feel morally different—or at least more charged—to whiteness elsewhere? For one, whites are a very small minority and one's moral instincts recoil from the fact that wealth and privilege are distributed in so drastically skewed a way. For another, we are planted on one continent but brought up on the cultural influences and narratives of another; many older white South Africans still identify in some way with their English and European roots.³³ At the same time, we have lived here for generations; we identify as South African at least because we "fit" the landscape and have a history here. The fact that some feel the need to assert that they are "African"

is an indication of their uncomfortable position, although perhaps younger generations will (appropriately) escape the kind of perplexity I am exploring here. Furthermore, the injustice and inhumanity of Apartheid is part of the experience and memory of most adults, rather than belonging to a distant past to which they are only symbolically related. The lives of most adults are embedded in Apartheid; their narrative is shaped by that legacy as much as nonwhites. *We*, not our parents, participated in injustice.

More important, however, is the fact that South Africans live in a land that has, by a kind of popular and political declaration, been reconciled, in which whites are officially welcome. At the same time we are faced daily with the stark evidence that we should not feel welcome, that materially nothing much has changed for anyone, black or white. We were supposed to be part of the declared solution to the problem simply by being here. The moral authority of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and of Nelson Mandela's original conciliatory approach to whites when he came into power depended partly on whites being prepared to take up the burden of reparation and moral rejuvenation. This has not really happened, and it is interesting to study the hostile reactions of white South Africans to public gestures from those who did attempt to make economically effective reparation.³⁴ In short, white South Africans cannot unproblematically see themselves as fitting into or contributing much to the post-Apartheid narrative. There is a sense that we need to earn our place in a country and continent that is not simply ours. And feeling ashamed seems a recognition of a failure to earn this.

I have argued that while the emotions of guilt, regret and shame are appropriate emotions for white South Africans to feel, shame better captures the identity and phenomenology of the white South African self than the others. Given the present inescapability of white privilege (barring enormous structural and psychological change), and given the peculiarities of the South African situation, it is unlikely that a white South African will be in a situation in which shame is not called for. It might be thought, however, that the other aspect of all these emotions—that as well as being signs that one is in the wrong, they are also appropriate—has not fully been captured. After all, one is feeling as one ought to, and there is something to be said for this. If we want to accommodate this, perhaps the disposition to feel these emotions in this context could be understood in terms of the character traits that Tessman calls “burdened virtues.” These are traits that are necessary for a person to cultivate if some liberatory project is to progress, but which do not contribute to the person's flourishing in the way the Aristotelian tradition standardly takes virtues to do. Her examples are from the perspective of the oppressed who are trying to cultivate a character that can fight injustice: anger, a hard resolve against the oppressor, indifference to any suffering of the oppressors, loyalty and self-criticism, the welcoming of personal loss and sacrifice.³⁵ Tessman takes these to be virtues because they are effective in achieving liberatory ends and thus eventually flourishing for all, and because

resisting oppression is praiseworthy, but at the same time, they are “mixed” traits: “apart from the terrible circumstances, [they] would never be endorsed” because they “disable a good life for their bearers.”³⁶

Labeling these traits as virtues at all is problematic, but I will grant it for the sake of argument.³⁷ While she does not discuss burdened virtues in relation to the oppressor, perhaps we can make a case for them in the context of the habits of white privilege. Here, we might think, guilt, regret and shame are virtues because they are appropriate responses to the situation and might go some way toward ending oppression—they will not allow their bearers to do obviously unjust things and will make them more sensitive and perhaps more active in addressing injustice. They are painful emotions to carry around and will make a person far less easy in the world than she would be without them; her flourishing might indeed be impaired. However, it is not clear that understanding them as burdened virtues in Tessman’s sense will work. First, they indicate a lack of moral virtue in the character of the person who experiences them, not just moral damage that is the result of being oppressed by the vicious. There is a significant difference between one’s soul being damaged by the viciousness of others, and one’s soul being damaged by one’s own viciousness. Second, unlike the burdened virtues of the oppressed that Tessman explores, they are indications of an already damaged self, rather than traits that could through their cultivation go on to harm the self. For Aristotle, as we have seen, they would indicate simply the absence of virtue. And finally, it does not seem that shame and guilt should be thought of in terms of *cultivating*—that would already indicate an improperly aesthetic or sentimental relation to oneself and one’s actions. They should, instead, arise appropriately from the recognition of one’s faults. Of course, one can try to come to a better understanding of a situation if one suspects one *should* feel guilt when one does not, for instance, but it is this understanding that properly should bring about the guilt, not the effort.

So, for white South Africans, the morally best situation is still a bad one. Living as a self one is ashamed of or regrets is morally more decent in this setting than living with a self one is comfortable with, but how is this self to live well? And how can one ever be a good person in South Africa if one’s best moral response is to recognize and feel one’s ongoing complicity with wrong? Being embedded in white privilege means that there is not going to come a time when one escapes the necessity of, at least, shame and regret. If a good life is gained by being both happy and virtuous, where one’s happiness is a fitting reward for one’s virtue, then it seems that it will be difficult for most of us to live good lives. If what I have said above is correct, most of us are not virtuous so would not deserve our happiness, if we had it. And in any case, living with the moral emotions that are fitting to our situation would not be conducive to happiness. The moral residue that lingers after the resolution of moral dilemmas is here too; whatever one does, some “ought” has been left untouched, and shame is its perceptible mark.

III.

In fact, I do not think it will be at all easy for this “ought” to be met. I do not think that it is possible for most well-intentioned white South Africans who grew up in the Apartheid years to fulfill their moral duties and attain a great degree of moral virtue.³⁸ We cannot after all stop being white, although we may try to minimize our whiteness, and have a duty to do so. There are the justly famous exceptions, and we probably all know people who are simply and quietly good in ways that allow them to transcend their whiteness. I am not making any universal or necessary claims about the possibility of happiness and virtue for white South Africans. For most of us, however, attaining them will be difficult, for most of us are not good enough to become exceptions. If Sullivan is correct about the entrenched nature of white privilege, even our efforts to become better might very well have limited success. That said, there are better and worse ways to respond to one’s morally best situation, and I want now to explore one kind of response.

One could of course become politically or socially active, financially supporting worthy causes, joining or working for a relevant organization to make reparations for the harm one’s whiteness expresses and maintains. Perhaps in this way the self can be refashioned through work. This approach accepts the political and public aspects of one’s identity and works to change the situation that brought about our whitely habits. This seems the best response to guilt, but perhaps it does not fully take on board the logic of shame, which has *metanoia* as a proper end. It is surely true that our selves can be changed through our actions, but I do not think this can be enough if the theses of moral damage and white habit are correct—direct work on the self is also required, and it is this I want to focus on. So I seek an appropriate way of living with white shame that is nonetheless private and does not assume that every person ought to respond only as a political animal, and that every response need be an outward action. For the very reason that every aspect of life in South Africa is so politicized, we should allow space for forms of expiation and self-improvement that do not demand a public gesture or political activity. As Iris Murdoch says, we do not want to make “[s]alvation by work” a “conceptual necessity” for moral progress or rehabilitation.³⁹

The alternative response I am interested in can be conceived in terms of the direction of our moral attention.⁴⁰ One of the tasks of white people is to engage with their selves, and if the theses of habitual white privilege and moral damage are correct there is certainly enough work to do. Our thoughts are heavy with whitely assumptions, and so they would be morally risky, at best, to utter publicly in as racially charged a space as South Africa. Given the necessary self-vigilance and double thinking imposed by knowledge of whiteness, being careful in this context does not seem cowardly or disengaged. Rather, the care stems from a recognition of the moral complexities and potential for mistakes, which would entrench the very habits from which one is trying to become disentangled. We would, instead, express our attachment to justice through a commitment to a

private project of self-improvement, recognizing the moral damage done to the self by being in the position of oppressor.

While my concern is to take the ethical primacy of individual selves seriously, it is certainly easy for this project to degenerate into a morbid egocentricity and perverse fascination with our faults. To be morally successful, a certain restraint on our parts is required, which I now suggest we think about in terms of *humility* and *silence*. This restraint is, I think, appropriate to the South African context in a way it might not be elsewhere. *Whitely* invisibility sustains white privilege, but in South Africa, where at least some aspects of whiteness are highly visible and explicitly acknowledged, reducing one’s presence through silence and humility seems right. It would indicate the recognition of one’s morally troubling situation and a determination to prevent it causing further harm.

So, recognizing their damaging presence, whites would try, in a significantly different way to the normal workings of whiteness, to make themselves invisible and unheard, concentrating rather on those damaged selves. Making pronouncements about a situation in which one is so deeply implicated seems a moral mistake—it assumes one matters politically and morally beyond the ways in which everyone matters equally. One needs to learn that one does not. One would live as quietly and decently as possible, refraining from airing one’s view on the political situation in the public realm, realizing that it is not one’s place to offer diagnoses and analyses, that blacks must be left to remake the country in their own way. Whites have too long had influence and a public voice; now they should in humility step back from expressing their thoughts or managing others.

So there is something appealing in calling for humility and silence. However, it is also difficult to articulate their demands and scope clearly. Humility seems to me clearly a virtue and a moral requirement in this—and any—situation. Whatever else it is, whiteness is surely a lack of humility. However, humility is not directly under our control; it is one of those virtues that we cannot aim for directly without undermining its achievement. So although one can hope for humility, I doubt it can be willed, and insofar as it is required for improving ourselves, improvement is not fully within our direct control either.

I am not at all clear on whether silence can be adequately defended as the correct policy; in what follows I try to give reasons in its favor, but they are far from conclusive. Silence can be a moral failing too, so we need to know which kinds would be virtuous. Certainly, virtuous silence would not be *passive*. Those who demand that whites take a public stand for the sake of reconciliation and reparation, even if it is ineffective symbolic protest,⁴¹ wrongly assume that to remain silent is necessarily a sign of inactivity. As I have said, I do not mean to rule this out; such public gestures might very well be required. But thinking of inner-directed attention as not doing anything just assumes that only outwardly observable action is action at all and this, as Iris Murdoch reminded us long ago, takes no account of the phenomenology of morality.⁴²

Neither should silence be a failure to listen and engage. We should certainly engage with other voices—read the literature of the oppressed, for example, and

actively listen to nonwhite voices. This can be a way, too, of acknowledging both our responsibility and the autonomy of the oppressed. Paul Taylor explores something like this:

Silence, on this reading, is the complement to *the other's voice*; it signals one's willingness to receive the other's struggle to find words both for his or her experiences and for the self that those experiences have conspired with the act of expression to create. Silence . . . is part of listening for a voice.⁴³

Even if we think of silence as a kind of activity, there is another problem with recommending it. As Taylor writes:

. . . claiming that there's *nothing I can say* on a matter that manifestly concerns me, if I claim this sincerely, is a way of denying my connection, and, at the same time, of refusing to examine myself closely enough to uncover and find words for the connection. . . . Participating in whiteness-as-invisibility means denying that one has a perspective on or stake in the racial terrain. It means rejecting, or ignoring, the burden of identifying—of conceptualizing, of seeing which words apply to—one's place in a system of social forces and relations. . . . And that is a paradigmatically white thing to do.⁴⁴

What are we to make of this charge, that silence is a denial of one's connection to the racial terrain and a whitey denial that one *has* a perspective? Taylor presses hard at the point that is important to my argument, noting a failure of self-examination and self-knowledge, through the failure to identify and conceptualize one's position "in a system of social forces and relations." Silence then would be a failure of the self-directed work I explored above. We can put this charge together with the claim of Ward Jones that philosophers have duties *qua* philosophers to engage with their contexts, and that failure to do this is failing as a philosopher.⁴⁵ If the objection is correct, then silence is a failure of both professional and personal duties.

There is something to this charge, but it does not yet differentiate ways of being silent. Certainly, silence as a lack of self-examination, an internal silence with oneself and one's interlocutors, or silence as a refusal to think about one's situation, are failures to acknowledge the meaning of being white, and a manifestation of whiteness. Whitey silence, we can call it, is indeed a moral failing in self-knowledge. And as Plato knew so well, self-knowledge is often reached in dialogue with others; you find your own voice and allow others to find theirs in sincere, truth-directed conversation. So silence should not rule out conversation, with those who are both familiar and, probably more importantly, unfamiliar to us. Refusing such encounters through fear of discomfort and disorientation could, as Sally Matthews perceptively remarks, itself indicate a lack of humility; introspective activity alone runs the risk of sacrificing the possibility of vulnerability and the new knowledge it could bring to the need for whitey control.⁴⁶ If Jones and Taylor are correct, silence should also not rule out engaging philosophically with one's context with colleagues and in professional settings. This is where both

self-understanding and philosophical progress on these issues can be made. My attempt in this paper to think through being white would then be a professional and personal *breaking* of pernicious whitely silence; "making strange" what was previously "just the way things are."

The relevant kind of silence is therefore a *political* silence, silence in the political realm, rather than a professional silence or the stifling of all conversation with others in which race or privilege, for instance, is the topic. For once again, shame, regret, or guilt would be the expected responses to knowledge of one's whiteness and insidious connection to injustice. This knowledge seems to recommend silence in the political realm as the morally decent policy: One would remain silent to prevent one's whitely perspective from causing further distortion in the political and public contexts, where whiteness is most problematic and charged. Thought of in these terms, silence is a response to the inevitability of going wrong and an expression of humility.

At this point, some might object that I have underplayed the attachment whites feel to what is, after all, their country. Whatever the source—the facts of birth or habitation or love, patriotism, shame—does our attachment not give us some right to make ourselves heard in a land that is, for better or worse, our home? As I have argued, we ought not underestimate the powerful nonrational attachment we have to a physical environment, to knowing how things work and look and smell and sound; to our bodies and minds "fitting" the landscape; for some, to feeling an intense love of the physical landscape.⁴⁷ We have built lives here, we have a stake in the place and so, some would insist, a right to enter public debates on policy; at any rate, some say, we pay our rates and taxes.

I do not wish to ignore the fact or intensity of this attachment. For those of us who live here, it is home. However, I do not believe that this attachment can ever, in good conscience, be entirely comfortable. Alcoff writes that

facing the reality of whites' moral culpability threatens their very ability to be moral today, because it threatens their ability to imagine themselves as having a socially coherent relation to a past and a future toward which anyone could feel an attachment.⁴⁸

I do not think that white South Africans can in good faith feel attached in a "socially coherent" way to either their pasts or their futures when they realize themselves as an ongoing problem. Our attachment cannot wipe our moral slates clean or exempt us from the appropriateness of the responses I have been exploring. Unlike many other colonial legacies, which whites should certainly feel uncomfortable about, our history of injustice is recent, part of living memory, something whites benefit from in direct, unmediated ways—and therefore something that implicates each one's sense of self now. My argument for the appropriateness of feeling shame and of responding to it with silence and humility depends not on some ancient wrong done in our name, but of our own ongoing wrongdoings and their visible effects. Once again, then, the best moral response is

to accept shame as both appropriate and troubling, and to turn one's attention to the self with silence and if possible, humility.

Living decently in this land even under these conditions will be difficult. In a country beset by continuing injustice, it will be hard sometimes to discern when it is appropriate to maintain silence, and when that would indicate, rather, an inappropriate disengagement or obsession with moral purity. Perhaps gross injustice is being done, and whatever one's race, whatever the context, one should take a stand.⁴⁹ Furthermore, one would still be compelled to make small gestures and utterances; there are demands every day for private acts, not of charity but of justice (whitely ways of thinking in this country confuse these two). But knowing how best to respond to these occasions is also difficult when whites still have economic and social power, which infects every encounter. White South Africans face daily and tenacious moral tests that show themselves up as inadequate as much as revealing the deep structural and systemic injustices of the country. However one acts, shame is never far away, for so many interactions seem charged with power or racial dynamics. It is hard to be comfortable like this and hard to resist the thought that for most white South Africans it will be almost impossible to lead a good life.

IV.

I want to conclude by noting some questions that arise naturally at this point and that return us to the broader concerns that I noted at the start. First, how, in a country in which politics is so present, in which every dimension of life and self is politicized, is the internal, very personal moral project that I'm interested in even possible? A related second question is whether there is room in thought and practice for a conception of "the soul alone and by itself," as Plato puts it in the *Phaedo*.⁵⁰ Or: How is the essentially private project I recommend above compatible with the notion of a self constituted by habits of white privilege, and with a notion of a self constituted racially and politically at all? For it might be thought that I have talked myself into a corner. My starting-point was a conception of a morally damaged white self, constituted by psychological and somatic habits of privilege. I accepted that the white privileged self is the product of its history and situation. If this is all the self is, or at any rate what it is essentially for moral purposes, how can the project of inward-directed, nonpolitical moral progress, let alone a notion of the private self, at all get a grip? While I will continue to concentrate on the white self, this question can be generalized to the constitution of any self, whether by oppression or privilege or anything else. Sullivan does not discuss the habits of the repressed self, but I take it that if privilege can form patterns of character and action, so can being oppressed.

There is of course a tremendous amount that needs to be explored here, and much of it has been—for instance, in the debate between liberals and communitarians over conceptions of the self, and in feminists debates about autonomy, to

name only a very few. I will make my own start by repeating Iris Murdoch's words, in a not too dissimilar context, that this is one of those "exasperating moments in philosophy when one seems to be being relentlessly prevented from saying something which one is irresistibly impelled to say."⁵¹ I feel irresistibly impelled to make some claims about the essentially private self, some core, which it is the very concern of all political and social philosophies to protect. Ethics is interested fundamentally in *this* self, in liberating it, improving it or restraining it. This *is* the moral project, and political concerns must not be allowed to theorize away either the self or the project. In conclusion, I want now to suggest that the experience of the moral emotions in this context—and I continue to focus on shame—gives us the space we need to conceptualize both the private self and the project of self-concern.⁵²

If the self were only defined by its context, the experience and moral work of shame would not make sense. As we saw above, one objection to the moral disvalue of white shame is that insisting on the appropriateness of shame is finally just to insist on the badness of the situation, not of the self. I think this collapse from self to world is probably correct if the self is subsumed entirely by its context. But then I also think that shame would not be the best way of describing the situation. To be ashamed is precisely to sense the distance between who (and how) one is and who one wants to be, and shame works in that gap. If the self were only constituted by habits of white privilege there would be nowhere for shame to get a grip. Shame works with a concept of a self that is oriented toward some vision of the good and which it acknowledges itself to have fallen short of. The orientation, the notion of some good (however humble), the falling short of, the pain that is the result—all these elements of this moral experience only make sense in light of a self not already exhausted by its context. In the case of appropriately felt shame, then, I want to say, not that the self is subsumed in the situation, but that the self takes a critical distance *from* the situation and evaluates it negatively. However, because the self is also partially defined by that situation, the negative appraisal will also be directed at itself. Insofar as it is appropriate to talk about shame in this context—insofar as calling the phenomenon "shame" is the *best explanation* of it—we have another reason to reject the complete collapse of the self into its context. Once we have this conclusion about the self, it is no longer too difficult to allow the possibility of the inward moral project I explored earlier.

Much work needs to be done here, of course; I have only hoped to gesture toward one direction it could profitably take. But the direction and the suggestions are important in a context like South Africa. For here, and in most countries recovering from years of injustice, the morally relevant aspect of lives and people is assumed to be public: your choices and interactions in the public sphere, the stands you take, whether you are politically active or not and, crucially, who you vote for. It is also as this public person that shame and guilt first get a grip, because they are responses to one's very visible presence in the polity. It is therefore tempting but, I hope to have shown, still wrong, to assume

that it is only in the public and political domain that reparation or apology or personal transformation is possible.

For white South Africans, work on the self, done in humility and silence, might indicate the recognition that any voice in the public sphere would inevitably be tainted by the vicious features of whiteness. It might also be one way of saying that I am not merely a product of what is worst about me and a refusal, finally, to be fully defined by it.

This has been a very difficult paper to write and I am particularly grateful to the following people who offered me support and advice throughout its progress: Ward E. Jones, Tom Martin, Sally Matthews, Deborah Seddon, Pedro Tabensky, and Paul Taylor. Thanks too, to Lucy Allais, Thad Metz, Vasti Roodt, and an anonymous reader for this journal for helpful comments on an earlier draft.

Notes

¹ Afrikaners are descendants of seventeenth century Dutch settlers. When they came into power in 1948, the Afrikaner Nationalist party notoriously systematized and legalized Apartheid. While the identity of Afrikaner certainly brings moral perplexity peculiar to it, nothing I say in this paper should hang on whether the white South African identity I discuss is Afrikaner or not.

² Linda Martín Alcoff, "What Should White People Do?" *Hypatia* 13, no. 3 (1998): 6–26

³ I share Paul Taylor's worries about whiteness studies, in his "Silence and Sympathy: Dewey's Whiteness," in *What White Looks Like*, ed. George Yancy (New York: Routledge, 2004), 227–42.

⁴ See Ward E. Jones, "Philosophers, Their Contexts, and Their Responsibilities," *Metaphilosophy* 17, no. 5 (2006): 623–45.

⁵ I do not mean to suggest that other factors are not just as morally important in this—and any—context as race. Class and gender, at least, need to be analyzed for any complete account. One day it will be plausible to add species to this list too.

⁶ Taylor, "Silence and Sympathy," 229.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 230.

⁸ Melissa Steyn, "'White Talk': White South Africans and the management of diasporic Whiteness," in *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, ed. Alfred J. Lopez (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 121.

⁹ See, for example, Richard Dyer, *White* (New York: Routledge, 1997), and the essays in Birgit Rasmussen et al., ed., *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001).

¹⁰ Shannon Sullivan, *Revealing Whiteness: The Unconscious Habits of Racial Privilege* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 4.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹² Steve Biko, "White Racism and Black Consciousness," in *I Write What I Like* (Oxford: Heinemann, 1987), 66.

¹³ Lisa Tessman, *Burdened Virtues: Virtue Ethics for Liberatory Struggles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 3.

¹⁴ Also see Sullivan, *Revealing Whiteness*, 4; Alcoff, "What Should White People Do?" 24.

¹⁵ Biko, "White Racism and Black Consciousness," 71–72.

¹⁶ Sullivan, *Revealing Whiteness*, 3.

¹⁷ "'White Talk,'" 122. Also see Ruth Frankenberg, "The Mirage of an Unmarked Whiteness," in Rasmussen et al., ed., *Making and Unmaking*. Lucius Outlaw is correct, I think, in his suggestion that perhaps thinking of whiteness in terms of invisibility comes from "those white folk

who are themselves the privileged offspring, later descendants, or raced inheritors of the social order of those who constructed and maintained projects of racialized White Supremacy, efforts that required constant vigilance and self-consciousness while constructing and sustaining life-worlds in which subsequent generations of folks made white could, indeed, take their whiteness for granted because normalized?” (“Rehabilitate Racial Whiteness?” in *What White Looks Like*, ed. George Yancy [New York: Routledge, 2004], 159–72). Even if this is true, however, I do not think that it is inappropriate to think of whiteness in terms of invisibility as well. Many whites South Africans think of themselves as part of a larger, international white community which they unthinkingly consider to set the norm. It is possible for different models of whiteness to be working together.

¹⁸ See the opening of W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*. Retrieved January 7, 2010, from <http://www.bartleby.com>.

¹⁹ Alcoff, “What Should White People Do?” 8.

²⁰ For a profile of de Kock, see Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela, *A Human Being Died That Night* (Claremont, CA: David Philip, 2003).

²¹ Tessman, *Burdened Virtues*, 54.

²² *Ibid.*, 55.

²³ *Ibid.*, 55.

²⁴ Taking the term from Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*.

²⁵ For example, see Gabriele Taylor, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985) and Bernard Williams, *Shame and Necessity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

²⁶ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. J. A. K. Thomson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1953), 1128b20–25.

²⁷ This objection to the Aristotelian position comes from Ward Jones. My discussion on shame benefited greatly from conversations with him.

²⁸ See Bernard Williams, *Moral Luck* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 27ff.

²⁹ Tessman, *Burdened Virtues*, 12. On moral luck, see Williams, *Moral Luck*; and Thomas Nagel, “Moral Luck,” in *Mortal Questions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 24–38.

³⁰ Tessman, *Burdened Virtues*, 13.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 15.

³² Tessman allows that anger and agent-regret are appropriate emotions to feel if “one’s bad constitutive luck is not accidental but rather a result of systemic oppression,” but she has in mind the oppressed here, not the oppressors (*Burdened Virtues*, 12–13). I do not deny that other emotions might be understandable and even appropriate, but I do not think that they are the morally essential and required responses in such cases.

³³ This is perhaps not so much the case with Afrikaners, who generations ago lost any strong identification with the Netherlands; this perhaps explains their insistence that they belong to this land.

³⁴ On one attempt to encourage white people to accept responsibility for the injustices of Apartheid and to make reparations, see Sally Matthews, “Differing Interpretations of Reconciliation in South Africa,” forthcoming in *Transformations* 74 (2010).

³⁵ For example, Tessman, *Burdened Virtues*, chap. 5.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 114 and 115.

³⁷ See her concluding chapter of *Burdened Virtues* for how her account requires a revision of the Aristotelian tradition.

³⁸ The position of white South Africans who were too young to participate in Apartheid is different: Whatever moral emotions are appropriate to whites anywhere would still apply to them, but the particular kind of shame I explore here might very well not.

³⁹ Iris Murdoch, “The Idea of Perfection,” in *The Sovereignty of Good* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 15.

⁴⁰ My position here is situated within the long tradition of “care of the self,” which so occupied the ancient philosophers, and for whom self-examination and self-perfection were essential and

primary goals of ethics. Self-concern is central in Socrates, and particularly in the Greek and Roman Stoics, who conceived of philosophy as “therapeutic,” as the necessary way of curing the self of its ills. On this, see Michel Foucault, *Care of the Self (History of Sexuality, vol. 3)* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984); Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995); Martha Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); and Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), chaps. 6 and 7.

⁴¹On symbolic protest, see Thomas E. Hill, “Symbolic Protest and Calculated Silence,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 9, no. 1 (1979): 83–102.

⁴²See her essays in *The Sovereignty of Good*.

⁴³Taylor suggests this as an explanation for why John Dewey felt able to express only “humiliated sympathy” in his introduction to Claude McKay’s *Selected Poems*. See Taylor, “Silence and Sympathy,” 239; “humiliated sympathy” is Dewey’s own phrase.

⁴⁴Taylor, “Silence and Sympathy,” 231–32.

⁴⁵See Jones, “Philosophers, Their Contexts, and Their Responsibilities.”

⁴⁶Thanks to Matthews for pressing this important point in correspondence. I do not have space to explore it in the depth it deserves.

⁴⁷A nice illustration of this kind of nonrational attachment is found in Rian Malan’s description of his yearning for home as an exile (96–97), and returning home (109) in *My Traitor’s Heart*. Afrikaner identity, in particular, is characterized by an intense connection to the land, forged through the “treks” into the interior of the country to escape British rule in the nineteenth century.

⁴⁸Alcoff, “What Should White People Do?” 19.

⁴⁹Thanks to Thad Metz and Vasti Roodt for pressing these points. My view is that morality trumps other considerations. One should not stand by in the face of injustice. Here, however, the transgression is *race-neutral*: it affects everyone as human beings, not as members of a particular race and one should respond as a human being, not a member of a particular race.

⁵⁰“*h ē psyche autē kath’ hautēn*”. See, for example, *Phaedo*, ed. C. J. Rowe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 83a–c.

⁵¹Murdoch, “The Idea of Perfection,” 21.

⁵²While I will concentrate on the shame felt by whites for their privilege, many morally complex emotions would allow us to come to the same conclusions.