

Here are my thoughts based on your video:

I'm not even going to assess the credibility of PragerU as an organization, but focus mainly on the arguments in the video and then share with you things to think about to make you reflect on your claim that "the USA is not racist" and the claim in the video that "Police are not racist". In the bottom of my response I cite a website that measures bias in organization like Prager U as well as MSM media outlets.

The two main arguments on the video

It's not true that blacks are shot at more than other races because of racism

The video states that cops are less likely to shoot unarmed black suspects based on Lois James' study. However, if you read the Abstract of that research, they do mention that there was 240 millisecond difference in the time it took to fire a weapon under the simulation between blacks and non-blacks (meaning there was a bias favoring blacks). However, their methodology is confusing because the way they measured the threat reaction (through measuring "Alpha waves"), was not used on law enforcement or military participants. This leads the author to state **"results from this sample are not generalizable to sworn officers."** They argue that there may be a counter-bias in shooting black suspects because "the social and legal consequences of shooting a member of a historically oppressed racial or ethnic group" (Mind you that based on their statement, they are not questioning whether certain communities were oppressed, or if racism exists in America").

<https://news.wsu.edu/2014/09/02/deadly-force-lab-finds-racial-disparities-in-shootings/>

The Harvard study they cite is referred to inaccurately as well. The video claims that there is zero evidence of racial bias in police shootings...that's not quite what the study said. The PragerU video claims "In Houston, [Fryer] found that blacks were 24 percent less likely than whites to be shot by officers even though the suspects were armed or violent". The actual number is actually 27.4. But *in the very next sentence* the study states: *"This coefficient is measured with considerable error and not statistically significant. This result is remarkably robust across alternative empirical specifications and subsets of the data. Partitioning the data in myriad ways, we find no evidence of racial discrimination in officer-involved shootings. Investigating the intensive margin – the timing of shootings or how many bullets were discharged in the endeavor – there are no detectable racial differences."*

So what they are saying in that part of the study is...well the number we got has a bunch of errors and not statistically significant, but we are still going to make the statement since there are other empirical subsets of data back that up (allegedly).

Furthermore, the next paragraphs in this study outline the caveats with the data they gathered. The mentioned that they gathered the data from police departments...which the study even compares to a private firm giving their HR data to someone studying labor market

discrimination. If you think police departments are going to provide unbiased data, that would be a naive notion at best. Even the study talks about misreporting bias with a footnote that actually illustrates it (read footnote #5).

Interestingly enough, the study does find in its results that particularly for non-lethal police activities that there are significant differences across races...you don't have to look at killings to make the judgement of whether the police is racist or whether racism exists in the United States (your original claim that prompted my response). Just as an example, the study cites:

*"Interestingly, as the intensity of force increases (e.g. handcuffing civilians without arrest, drawing or pointing a weapon, or using pepper spray or a baton), the probability that any civilian is subjected to such treatment is small, but the racial difference remains surprisingly constant. For instance, 0.26 percent of interactions between police and civilians involve an officer drawing a weapon; 0.02 percent involve using a baton. These are rare events. Yet, the results indicate that they are **significantly more rare for whites than blacks**. With all controls, blacks are 21 percent more likely than whites to be involved in an interaction with police in which at least a weapon is drawn and the difference is statistically significant. Across all non-lethal uses of force, the odds-ratio of the black coefficient ranges from 1.175 (0.036) to 1.275 (0.131)."*

I suggest skipping to Page 39 and reading the conclusion:

https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/fryer/files/empirical_analysis_tables_figures.pdf

Black on black crime is really the problem

The final argument I want to mention is the red herring ([logical fallacy](#)) of black on black crime (an excellent transition to my larger points about structural racism) they cite statistics from NY and Chicago. I looked at [Chicago's homicide victims by race](#) and it is correct that the majority of homicide victims were black (78%). But by saying cop killings are not the problem, black on black crime is the problem it's creating a false equivalency ([logical fallacy](#)). If you talk to community leaders in black communities they will speak to you at length at the violence problems within the black community (and while there are a multitude of variables, a lot of those problems in those communities are rooted in systemic racism, but I'll get to that part in a second). But black communities have felt the disproportional use of policing through their entire existence in the North American continent. This distrust is further validated by how disproportionate police and law enforcement have impacted black people and black communities. It's the same as the false equivalency of the "All Lives Matter" vs. "Black Lives Matter". No one is saying JUST black lives matter. The statement is made because for too long in the United States and its history black people have mattered less (The [% compromise](#) was literally in the Constitution until the 14th amendment).

Let's talk about black on black crime and how it is related to racism (with the claim you made being "The US is not racist").

Quick thoughts on systemic racism...

A lot of black on black crimes happen in largely black communities. The next question you should think about is why are these communities largely black in the first place (if we were all equal today we wouldn't have neighborhoods that are so segregated, right?).

Well it turns out that in cities like Chicago, these neighborhoods came to be segregated by something called Redlining ([Definition from Investopedia](#)...trying to find non-MSM or perceived biased sources). A report from [Chicago Magazine](#) in 2017 explained it (and I suggest you read it), but in essence it boils down to figuring out the creditworthiness of properties in US cities and segmenting the cities into areas. The mere presence of non-whites affected the creditworthiness negatively, which created the incentives to move (by either force or through more subtle means) blacks into neighborhoods that had poor ratings, and thus creating a vicious cycle.

In addition to this, and going back to your claim "The US is not racist", a significant issue that drives both poverty and stability in this community is the lack of both parents in a large part of many of these households. I even found an article (from [Prager U!](#)) which writes the following:

"It was President Barack Obama who said, "We all know the statistics. That children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and commit crime; nine times more likely to drop out of school and 20 times more likely to end up in prison."

The Journal of Research on Adolescence confirms that even after controlling for varying levels of household income, kids in father-absent homes are more likely to end up in jail. And kids who never had a father in the house are the most likely to wind up behind bars.

In 1960, 5 percent of America's children entered the world without a mother and father married to each other. By 1980 it was 18 percent, by 2000 it had risen to 33 percent, and fifteen years later, the number reached 41 percent."

The conclusion from the study cited is that the likelihood of going to jail increases in father-absent homes. Now where the article and I disagree is the argument that households among poor people became fatherless because of "the welfare state" since women, in effect, "[married] the government. And this makes it all too easy for men to abandon their traditional moral and financial responsibilities", the article claims. So it's basically saying, men left the house and their familial duties because of government subsidies. I find that claim laughable at best, and negligent at worst.

So why are black fathers not around? A multitude of reasons, but one you fail to acknowledge by stating “the US is not racist” is how the US consistently incarcerated black males far more than any other racial group. This [Pew Research article](#) released this month corroborates it while noting that black incarceration is down, but black Americans “remain far more likely than their Hispanic and white counterparts to be in prison”.

Your counter argument may be, well if they are being incarcerated it's because they are doing something wrong”, but that's assuming that they are being arrested with a justification. Something which is largely untrue and/or cops have found ways to arrest people because of things as petty as their rear light being broken. Let's even look at George Floyd's case. He was arrested under the suspicion that he had paid with a counterfeit \$20 bill. If he hadn't been murdered by the police officer, he would have been arrested under the suspicion he had a fake \$20 bill. Does that seem like a reasonable arrest to you? It doesn't to me. And it removes black men from their societies, leads them to lose their jobs, and develop a whole myriad of problems that even you have mentioned in your posts around mental disease, suicide, drug abuse, etc.

Therefore, we have a cycle in which black communities are segregated in neighborhoods that don't have the same luxuries as predominantly white neighborhoods. And the biased use of non-lethal force by communities who police these communities extra harshly because of the poverty and crime they find, perpetuate this cycle.

Honestly, I could go on and on...I could mention that the n-word was initially used by white people as a pejorative term based on [this article](#) which studies the etymology of that word. “white parents and teachers used the [End Page 203] word to instruct children that blacks were deficient, but also to show how their own racial status was precarious. They disciplined white children with stories of nigger boogeymen and promised a child would “have no more credit than a nigger” if she misbehaved.” And that if you look both at the world (Apartheid) and the US, the distinguishing someone by their race was something that the Anglo-saxon ruling class has done historically. So if your argument is that the minorities that identify their race are using it to engage in “victim mentality” you have to acknowledge the centuries old history of race being used as a factor to cause material harm to these minorities in the first place.

I could also mention that the broader notion that this country is perfect and that if you work hard you will get what you want is flawed (which is another of your claims). Are things in the US better than in our home countries in regards to social mobility? Absolutely yes. But let's be honest, that's not a hard line to pass. But if you look at the United States' social mobility defined as “Gains or losses in economic or social status between parents and their children are referred to as *Intergenerational Mobility*. They may consider income or earnings, but also educational attainment, occupation or health. By contrast, *Intra-generational mobility* refers to the extent to which people's social or economic situation changes over their life course (definition from this [OECD report](#)).”, the OECD found that the United States had an average of about 5 generations for the offspring of a low-income family to reach the average income. Countries that fared better include Spain, Canada, Australia and Japan, and not surprisingly countries like Brazil (deep

history of racism), South Africa (Apartheid), and Colombia (again deep history of racism) all fared significantly worse averaging 9 to 12 generations.

All that is to say that if you believe that racism doesn't exist and that the US and that after the Civil Rights Act was signed in 1964 we instantly became a post-racism society, the data on social mobility would indicate otherwise. On top of that. Black Americans in the United States were enslaved for 240 years, were not given what was promised after emancipation, and then were subjected to 100 years of segregation. You think all of that can be undone in 50 years?

Additional reading (because I'm tired of defending an argument that even white supremacists agree with):

East Austin redlining:

<https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr:e08c7244-9193-49b1-b4d8-6cb3e4c4daab/The%20Empty%20Stairs%20The%20Lost%20History%20of%20East%20Austin.pdf>

<https://projects.statesman.com/news/economic-mobility/wealth.html>

OECD report on social mobility: <https://www.oecd.org/centrodemexico/medios/44582910.pdf>

Apartheid -- The ruling party dividing people into groups

<https://www.cortland.edu/cgis/suzman/apartheid.html>

<https://www.history.com/topics/africa/apartheid>

Campaign Zero police report card: <https://policescorecard.org/about>

Bias for the institute the Prager U speaker in the video works at:

<https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/manhattan-institute-for-policy-research/>

Bias for Prager U

<https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/prageru/>

Bias for MSNBC and NYT so you can see that this site is fairly well calibrated to be objective about media bias:

<https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/msnbc/>

<https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/new-york-times/>

Pew Research (cited in my response) media bias:

<https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/pew-research/>

Difference between Racism and Discrimination:

<https://celesteheadlee.com/racism-vs-discrimination-why-the-distinction-matters/>