



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 14, 2020

After Instituting WHITES-ONLY Fee, Georgia Store Issues Non-apology “Apology”

“Sorry that you were too unevolved to grasp our sublime wisdom.” This seems to be the message from a Georgia clothing store doing damage control after levying a booking fee on whites, while offering a “waiver” to “people of color.”

The *New York Post* [reported](#) on the story Wednesday:



A vintage clothing store in Georgia is getting backlash online for a promotion blasted as “racist” that waived a \$20 fee for non-white shoppers.

In a since-deleted Facebook post, Civvies on Broughton in Savannah said it would require a \$20 refundable deposit to book an appointment at the boutique, while people of color would be exempt from the new policy.

“As a mostly white staff with white ownership, we do not feel comfortable upholding a digital and financial barrier which could prevent BIPOC from shopping at our store at this time on top of the limitations already made by online booking,” the store announced last week.

The shop, which sells new and “recycled” clothing, told potential white customers that they could decline to pay the deposit, but would be contacted by a booking manager to “discuss other options,” the post read.

“If you are white and refuse to put down a deposit because you believe our policy is unethical you will not be accepted for an appointment,” the store’s now-deleted post read.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Relating the criticism the policy inspired, WJCL [told us Monday](#):

“Most of the feedback about our decision to waive this refundable deposit is racist because it favors Black people, indigenous people and people of color,” said store manager, Raine Blunk.

Some of the comments threaten lawsuits and boycotts but Blunk says the promotion does not discriminate against anyone.

“Obviously it is unfortunate to have thousands of people commenting and messaging us saying that they are going to sue us and have contacted the department of labor because this is a violation of their rights, we believe that what we are doing is within the confines of the law,” they said.

Blunk says the businesses main goal is to bring about equality to people of color.

The business, of course, can adopt any goal it wishes, but it is notable that its main goal isn’t to make money.

But having your own goals doesn’t mean you can have your own facts. By definition, Civvies’ policy



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 14, 2020

discriminated against someone — a whole group, in fact.

Don't tell the owners, though. They [wrote](#) on Facebook, "It was not our intention to act in any way that might be perceived as discriminatory and for that we apologize." Many respondents noted this statement's spirit, writing comments such as, "I'm sorry you interpreted what I did negatively' is not an apology. You have only demonstrated that you have learned nothing from this."

This was demonstrated further by manager Blunk, who, under the name Rainé Eliza (photo below), issued his own apology on Facebook. (Article continues below image.)



"This post is to acknowledge harm caused by Civvies' booking/fee waiver," Blunk [wrote](#), explaining, "Phrasing about our booking policy in both the original concept of the fee waiver and the clarifying post about our booking policy was insulting to some Black people, People of Color and Indigenous people."

"People in my community were and are generally harmed by poorly constructed narratives written by white people about their own racial inequities," he continued.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 14, 2020

Blunk went on to say that the policy “felt like white saviorism” and that it “insulted” non-whites. “Additionally, some of the post was alienating” to some white people, he wrote, “especially those who responded very negatively, for whom a different conversation or platform about racial inequities could have been more educational or informative.”

Translation: It’s the critics who are guilty — of ignorance — and Blunk’s only mistake was not choosing the best way to enlighten them.

He then continued, “Phrasing of the post ... could contribute to white readers reinternalizing false narratives about their experiences of ‘racial discrimination against white people.’” So after discriminating against white people, Blunk insists that such discrimination is entirely imaginary (full statement below; article continues below screen-grab).



Rainé Eliza

1d · 🌐

This post is to acknowledge harm caused by Civvies’ booking/fee waiver: Phrasing about our booking policy in both the original concept of the fee waiver and the clarifying post about our booking policy was insulting to some Black people, People of Color and Indigenous people.

- People in my community were and are generally harmed by poorly constructed narratives written by white people about their own racial inequities.
- People in my community are chastised by the implication that they needed the "charity" of a fee waiver just for being Black, Indigenous, or a Person of Color in a way that felt like white saviorism.
- People in my community are insulted by the insinuation that an online \$20 refundable deposit would be a legitimate barrier for BIPOC, and
- Stating that the waiver was only for Black people, Indigenous People and People of Color and not for anyone who couldn't afford it regardless of race, especially if it was always our intention to do so anyways, is virtue signaling.



Additionally, some of the post was alienating and overly aggressive to some white people, especially those who responded very negatively, for whom a different conversation or platform about racial inequities could have been more educational or informative.

-Phrasing of the post created unnecessary space for white supremacists to direct violent comments and content towards Black people, Indigenous people or People of Color in general online, and amongst our community, -and could contribute to white readers reinternalizing false narratives about their experiences of "racial discrimination against white people."

-The post created unnecessary conflict for white supremacists to formulate and/or express harmful ideas about our community or anti-racism efforts as a whole, in which other BIPOC might have to do damage control or be affected directly later, and which happened when several different community members stepped in on multiple posts and by spreading calls to action to defend the shop from online harassment on our own page after posts went viral, and in various comments sections of post reshares.

-The series of events that centered us have consumed space in the cultural narrative of Savannah, especially in the media, that could have been spent on the work or business of other Black people, Indigenous people, or People of Color in Savannah, rather than white mediocrity

Additionally, I feel partially responsible for any misinformation caused by the owners decision to delete all of the posts, further confusing a series of public events that has occurred over several days and with thousands of shares.

Thank you to the BIPOC community members who have been a part of pointing out harm, checking in, and being involved in this conversation.

My two points of focus are to be accountable to people in my community who have been impacted by this, and the direct needs of the business, now at the owner's discretion. Only after I have taken time for these two can be addressed will I consider making any other kinds of general statements about my perspective or opinions of these events.

There are screenshots of most of the original comment threads from our deleted Facebook & Instagram posts in a drive below. I am also linking any media coverage on the subject below. If there are other screenshots or



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 14, 2020

comments from our community you think I should see because they relate to what's outlined above or other harm caused by Civvies at any point against BIPOC please tag me, add a screenshot here, or send it to me. I will do my best to be accountable, or be accountable on Civvies behalf.

Thanks for reading, Rainé

Ps- I will attempt to keep this statement as public as possible on my page. I will keep this up as public and share a post screenshot on Civvies last post comment section tomorrow.

As mentioned above will not be responding to any questions or random comments about us being racist or discriminatory towards white people, or the literal legalities of the policy, and would ask that those comments continue to be directed to our business page. I will attempt to block trolls on this post/my account as long as possible unless it gets out of hand (I will switch it back to friends of friends only if so)

It's easy to make fun of Blunk or merely dismiss him as tone deaf (and perhaps he is), but the reality is far more dire. It relates to why the "woke" crowd is so self-righteous: They believe they're right — and lack a Christian emphasis on humility that would temper their efforts at conversion with compassion.

What we're witnessing here is the clash of two radically different worldviews. If you're, roughly speaking, 35 and older, you likely were raised with the assumption that racial discrimination is always wrong, period (there *can be* innocuous exceptions, however, as I explain [here](#)); you accept this as dogma.

But many younger people today (and some older ones) were instilled with a different idea: that racial discrimination, by a different name, is a positive force and necessary to achieve "[equity](#)." Striving for *equitable* treatment is how the Left justifies the denial of *equal* treatment.

In fact, masters at word manipulation, the wokesters won't even agree that "discrimination" is what you assume it to be.

Of course, just as "equality" was emphasized by liberals decades ago, equity is emphasized by liberals today — though they're different liberals. It's another example of how liberalism (and conservatism) isn't an ideology as much as a process, as I explain [here](#) and [here](#).

As for Civvies on Broughton, it's tempting to say "Get woke, go broke." Do note, however, that a message on its storefront [states](#), "WE ARE SHOPPING ON STOLEN LAND" (they can always give it back, no?).

If that hasn't alienated their clientele, it's hard to imagine that some pesky little anti-white discrimination would bother them.

Image of Civvies on Broughton storefront: [Screenshot of Civvies facebook page](#)

Selwyn Duke (@SelwynDuke) has written for The New American for more than a decade. He has also written for The Hill, Observer, The American Conservative, WorldNetDaily, American Thinker, and many other print and online publications. In addition, he has contributed to college textbooks published by Gale-Cengage Learning, has appeared on television, and is a frequent guest on radio.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.