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From the Editors

We, the editors of *Dialogues in Social Justice*, extend our thanks to the authors who contributed to the White Supremacy and Privilege Part II issue. We appreciate your patience and understanding as we worked through hurdles in the publication process. We also thank the various reviewers who sacrificed their time and talents to help develop the high quality articles presented in this issue.

Recently, I read an opinion piece by Elizabeth Leiba (2020). In the article Leiba shared an experience from when they were an undergrad. They went into a drugstore not realizing they had a new unopened pack of batteries in their backpack. When they attempted to leave the store, the battery pack tripped the security alarm and they were taken to a back room for questioning. They frantically looked for the receipt showing that the item had been purchased days earlier, but in the overwhelming swell of panic and fear, they could not find it. They implored security to just look at the security footage but were refused, the store manager insisted on pressing charges. They were subsequently arrested, taken to jail, booked, and detained for over four hours in a cage. Their mother who lived five hours away arrived and posted bail. In the car with their mother, Leiba found the receipt which was subsequently presented to the state attorney who immediately dropped the charges. One has to wonder why the dogged pursuit, why the infliction of so much trauma, why not the benefit of doubt over batteries that cost $2.49.

Their account stands in stark contrast to a young man who raised a $2 million bail from the support of celebrities and others, rich, and poor, who was identified by witnesses to the police as a person who shot and killed two people, injuring a third, who calmly walked past police under the cover of darkness carrying an AR-15 style rifle across his chest before driving over 15 miles to his home in a neighboring state, who police watched walk by them with his hands up. One has to wonder, why not the dogged pursuit, why the sparing of trauma, and why the benefit of doubt.

In 1989, Dr. Peggy McIntosh wrote about the invisible knapsack of white privilege that invisibilized the systems conferring power to some while issuing subjugation to others. McIntosh included things like not having to speak for her racial group and having bandages that matched her skin tone. In 2020, that knapsack of white privilege would include being able to say and become president of the United States "Grab 'em by the pussy. You can do anything" or "I could stand in the middle of Fifth Avenue and shoot somebody and I wouldn't lose any voters" or being able to walk past police with a rifle while being accused of killing two people without even being stopped or questioned.

As adult educators, we must pause and consider, what does this thing called white privilege look like in today's adult education environments? Authors in this issue peel back the covers to reveal the underbelly of the adult education, the ugly side of whiteness. From book reviews and course descriptions to reflections and research based articles, authors tackle this disconcerting topic. Additionally, a transcript of a powerful talk implicating whiteness highlights how language matters and must be harnessed to create a more equitable, just, and liberated society.

We look forward to sharing our upcoming issues on COVID-19 and adult education and the Black experience and adult education in 2021.
We hope you will find this assemblage of writing informative and useful as you courageously move through your journey toward social justice through adult education and toward greater understanding of what white privilege looks like in your practice and theory.

Moving toward liberation one Dialogue at a time  
Lisa R. Merriweather, Joni Schwartz, Rodney Maiden, Edith Gnanadass, Stephanie Lynch, Bryndle L. Bottoms
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We, too, are America: The Erasure of Racialized Faculty in Higher Education

Dianne Ramdeholl

SUNY – Empire State College, New York City

“We, too, sing America”  
By Langston Hughes

We are the darker brothers.  
They send us to eat in the kitchen  
When company comes,  
But we laugh,  
And eat well,  
And grow strong.

Tomorrow,  
We’ll be at the table  
When company comes.  
Nobody’ll dare  
Say to us,  
“Eat in the kitchen,”  
Then.

Besides,  
They’ll see how beautiful we Are  
And be ashamed—

We, too, are America.

Langston Hughes
Erasure (2019), according to the Webster Dictionary, is defined as the removal of all traces of matter; in essence, its obliteration. One becomes invisible and, when this occurs, one does not take up space in people’s minds, hearts, nor economic, historical, political or social concerns (Sissel & Sheared, 2001). Almost twenty years ago, Guy (2002) pointed out the need for culturally relevant education in adult education programs, unpacking ways in which white culture was consistently privileged in higher education. Unfortunately, not much has changed. Erasure of racialized faculty and students continue on a number of levels and ways in universities. In this article, I describe my own story of erasure as a racialized faculty member moving through the tenure and promotion process and address how emblematic this is of the ways in which whiteness gets manifested in adult higher educational spaces.

Chronicling this story is an effort to contribute to a sustainable dialogue centered on fostering racially just democratic spaces and practices. In addition, this narrative aims to support activism and resistance in racial justice struggles. The goal is to contribute to a collective conversation grounded in deconstructing regimes of truth, to engage in resisting and contesting sacred truths around whiteness, and to challenge higher education culture in an effort to transform the word and the world. By remapping my tenure and everyday lived reality, I situate my experiences within a larger framework of race and gender within higher education in order to explore the landmines that face racialized faculty within the academy. The study unpacks barriers (visible and not) that can undermine all newer faculty, but especially newer racialized faculty.

WHITENESS AND THE UNIVERSITY

Frankenberg (1997) describes Whiteness as multidimensional: It is a location of structural advantage, of race privilege; a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed. “To name Whiteness is to refer to a set of relations that are historically, socially, politically, and culturally produced and intrinsically linked to dynamic relations of White racial domination” (Frankenberg, 1997). This is important in this study because higher education institutions in North America are essentially white spaces with faculty and students of color continuing to be interlopers.

Bonilla Silva (2015) reminds us that white oriented and led institutions reproduce whiteness through their symbols and traditions, while simultaneously passing as neutral spaces free of race or color. Because diversity initiatives do not address the underlying fundamental whiteness of university policies and practices, the everyday grammar of whiteness remains unaddressed and intact (Bonilla-Silva, 2015). In institutions with overwhelmingly white faculty, there is a perpetuation of pedagogies rooted in white liberal frameworks in which the radical remains untouched (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). Universities cannot claim to value diverse faculty without changing fundamental processes. In the absence of change, such claims are meaningless and insidious. This continues to support the erasure of racialized faculty.

Whiteness continues to be deeply worshipped in the academy (Lazos, 2012). In 2013, 84% of full time professors were White with 58% being male and 26% female, 4% Black, 3% Hispanic, and 9% Asian or Pacific Islander (NCES, 2015). Universities continue to have predominately White leadership teams at 73%. When faculty of color find themselves in the academy according to Johnson-Bailey (2012), it is often in an environment that is filled with microaggressions, unspoken hostility, and a landscape where the odds are stacked against them.

Because of the weight of histories of structural racism and legacies and manifestations of those histories, faculty of color bear heavier burdens (Brookfield, 2018; Johnson-Bailey, 2012; Ramdeholl & Jones, 2018).
In addition to the profoundly heavy teaching load at teaching institutions (such as mine), there are also the invisible aspects of workload which never get considered. This includes the emotional caretaking and labor regarding students who are in crisis. The demographic who makes up the majority of students at the SUNY institution in which I work are marginalized with many living in various states of precarity. Their crises usually require more or less immediate responses. This work is not seen, acknowledged, or credited anywhere on any workload checklist.

Much has been written about ways in which different standards exist for racialized and non-racialized faculty and also how racialized faculty have their credibility questioned on a daily basis. For faculty of color, this culture is daunting, toxic, and traumatizing and informed by whiteness. From students accusing these faculty of "sounding" angry, to being mistaken for a secretary (because you do not look like the professor), to being questioned by security when leaving campus with a computer (J. Johnson–Bailey, personal communication, 2012) or to be asked by a student (as I was over summer) “why I would want to see her, a white woman, fail”? “What exactly did I have against her personally”? The list of psychic assaults is virtually endless. At the institution in which I work, the number of racialized tenured faculty is abysmal but this is no different from other academic institutions. This means, writings by racialized scholars often get analyzed through frameworks of whiteness (Cooper, 2018). Martin (2019) points out that white male centered scholarship being valued over and above non-white scholars is only one reason why people of color do not see their future within the academy. The unspoken norm is often a Eurocentric canon with theorists of color placed alongside non-Eurocentric, Indigenous, and other scholars of color, which ensures these theorists remain in a position of “other…in other words, the exotic version placed next to “legitimate” bodies of knowledge. With certain bodies of knowledge being privileged, those who teach and research from those “more legitimized” perspectives are tacitly approved thus ensuring replication for hiring, pedagogical decisions, etc. (Brookfield, 2018; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017) For people of color to stay is to move forward in an environment that was not created with them in mind (Ahmed, 2012; J. Johnson–Bailey, personal communication, 2012). This piece is not intended to portray all experiences of people of color as monolithic but recognizes that the academy is situated in a history of white male privilege and continues to be a space where brown and black faculty face numerous microaggressions every day (Brookfield, 2018; J. Johnson–Bailey, personal communication, 2012).

MY JOURNEY

In 2009, I began my current position at a public state university in a tenure track position. Before joining the academy, I was a community based adult literacy practitioner for nearly two decades where naming/speaking truth to power and working in solidarity with others were the foundations that shaped my everyday reality. One of the first things I noticed was how few faculty of color worked at the institution. I had read about the low number of racialized faculty in higher education but had not expected to notice it so immediately. In the last eight years, all of the faculty in my Center who did not receive tenure have been racialized faculty. Though discussions centering race do not occur in overt ways at my Center, it could be argued that expressions like, "he/she just doesn't fit in" might be a veiled way of alluding to race. There is also a certain false color blindness which operates, serving to preserve dominant interests.

Tenure

Soon after I began my position, I was asked to be part of a team developing a new graduate degree and then to coordinate that program. I did not realize at the time that when junior faculty are appointed to leadership positions, some senior faculty members become increasingly threatened. I taught four courses at that time and I was up until after midnight most evenings responding to student work. It is fairly unusual for a junior
faculty member to teach so much. In addition, I was charged with coordinating and staffing the new program, developing courses, and responding to program queries from prospective students, etc. These are significant responsibilities for any new faculty. Without realizing it, I was being set up to fail. I brought it up repeatedly with my Chair and while she was sympathetic, no extra supports or resources were allocated. At the time, the program was completely undeveloped.

I heard repeated murmurs from certain senior faculty that one needed to be part of the institution for at least 10 years in order to understand how it really worked. The subtext was I did not have the experience required to be the program coordinator. One senior faculty member even said to me that she would coordinate the program for 10 years and keep the seat warm for me. On another occasion, after asking a senior faculty member to complete a simple program related task, I instead received an email with 15 questions that had nothing to do with the task. I ended up completing the task myself. It was a classic case of bullying a vulnerable faculty member without tenure.

The former dean who appointed me had been fired and was replaced by a dean who had never been a faculty member. For idiosyncratic and arbitrary reasons such as the focus of my scholarship being too narrow, the new dean did not recommend me for tenure. This dean was also closely aligned with one of the senior faculty members most antagonistic towards me. The dean’s recommendation went against the faculty vote. Usually the two are in alignment. One aspect of the process in the institution in which I work is that the candidate up for review leaves the room while others discuss their work after having read the candidate’s file. It could either be a lovefest or a verbal slaying. I had witnessed both. After various people speak in favor or against the particular candidate’s request for reappointment or continuing appointment, each faculty member votes. After which, the candidate returns to the room. In many cases, faculty only meet at annual or center meetings yet they vote on colleagues whose work they hardly know.

In my situation, as reported by colleagues, during my absence the one senior faculty who was most antagonistic towards me spoke for 15 minutes about why I should not receive tenure. One of the reasons was that this was a teaching university and I should have had fewer publications (somehow implying my focus was not on teaching instead of realizing that my scholarship grew out of my practice). Despite this, the majority of faculty voted in my favor. As I walked back into the room, no one would meet my eye but a few friends patted me on the shoulder. Everyone looked drained. I felt weary from the inside out and disconnected from my body. I spent much of that weekend trying to regain some sense of re-centering. I wrote a response to the dean’s recommendation. Other faculty rallied around me, writing letters of support. This all then went to the Academic Personnel Committee (APC), a college wide committee, who voted in my favor. I also contacted the union who while very supportive was unable to do much.

Ultimately, the provost and president overturned the dean's recommendation and I received tenure but was denied promotion (which I have since applied for and received). However, the process had taken its toll. The support of my allies was invaluable throughout and I could not have walked this journey without their comradeship and solidarity. Finding allies in this process is necessary. I also sought the support of faculty of color in other institutions since I am the only faculty of color in the program in which I am teaching. These conversations allowed me to gain a deeper understanding of my reality. Many of the faculty of color with whom I spoke were engaged in some variation of the same script I was experiencing at their own universities.
Some points of my narrative have implications for other faculty of color worth mentioning. For example, after not supporting my tenure, my then dean burst into tears at one of our meetings. Much has been written about ways in which tears of white women are used to distract and deflect harm inflicted on people of color (Ahmed, 2012, Cooper, 2018; Hamad, 2018). Emotions of some groups are constantly privileged, and given space (Taylor, 2018) while other groups are not allowed to display vulnerability or fear. For women of color, much of the time, there is no space to express feelings. This ensures our humanity is never fully seen or felt. Also, as human beings, we are denied the freedom to access/demonstrate emotions such as apprehension, fragility, or vulnerability. The trope of anger and black women has been a powerful tool to dehumanize and silence black women (but also other women of color) for decades (Cooper, 2018; Hamad, 2018). For decades racialized women have been expected to caretake the emotions of dominant groups, even though those groups have inflicted damage upon their psyches/bodies (Hamad, 2018). In that moment, in my meeting with my then dean, I was no exception, being expected to forgive and caretake.

Another point worth noting is the ways in which senior white faculty who bully faculty of color often are supported by certain administrators. Academic bullying is a daily issue for many racialized faculty (Ahmed, 2012). Often if one attempts to complain or explain their situation, they are met with silence. This is one way of silencing others. One might choose to drop the complaint because they feel vulnerable and unprotected. The problems continue and get reproduced through the maintenance of silence (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). The injured party is asked to move on and get over what for them is not over. For me, maintaining distance from this senior faculty member was the only way I could go forward. This was not a conscious decision but one made out of self-preservation. For this decision, I was perceived by some as refusing to move forward. Ahmed (2012) points out that not supporting those who have complained about racism can lead to being rewarded by the academy. So faculty always need to look at what is being promoted and for whom, and at what cost to whom? Oluo (2018) reminds us, racism is not necessarily an intention or feeling but a system that benefits some and erases others.

Student Evaluations and Tenure

Student evaluations represent part of that system. For those outside and inside of academia, tenure and promotion are mysterious processes, arbitrary and deeply politicized. Many who have navigated this process speak about how psychically drained they felt during and after it was all over. In the institution where I work, in order to receive tenure, five requirements by which all faculty must succeed are: university service, mastery of subject matter, scholarship, teaching effectiveness, and continuing growth. These requirements are all subjective to the extent that they are interpreted differently by different deans and administrators and the standards are not applied the same to each faculty. Some faculty’s journey through tenure receive little to no critical scrutiny, while for others it is the equivalent of facing a gauntlet. Though literature (Lazos, 2012; Sensoy & Di Angelo, 2017) warned against the very limited nature of student evaluations, this is the way teaching effectiveness is mainly assessed in many teaching institutions. For example, one dean might place heavy emphasis on student evaluations, considering anything less than 4 out of 5 problematic. To another dean, this is a non-issue. Lazos (2012) discusses ways student evaluations can be potentially retaliatory, inaccurate snapshots of one's practice. Universities can use these lower scores as a tool to discipline and punish.
Further Tagamori and Bishop (1995) determined that the questions on evaluations are too ambiguous so one cannot determine exactly what is being asked. They found that 76% of the questions contained subjective terms and over 90% of them did not correlate with classroom teaching behavior. These evaluations, in other words, measure students' subjective reactions at the particular moment they are polled (Feldman, 1989). In addition, Williams and Ceci (1997) determined that charisma or likeability also impacted student ratings and ratings were impacted by what students believe they are learning from a professor but not what they actually learn. In various studies, being described as an extrovert (McCroskey, Valenic, & Richmond, 2004) positively impacted student evaluations leading to a concern that student perceptions of teaching effectiveness are basically a personality contest. Hamermesh and Parker (2003) found that measures of perceived beauty matter in student evaluations of minority women professors and faculty with accents were generally penalized. In spite of what is known about the nature of student evaluations, these subjective measures are used in the tenure process to determine teaching effectiveness, making or breaking faculty members’ careers. This is especially true at teaching institutions where student evaluations are weighed heavily and often used in punitive ways as ammunition against vulnerable faculty. It is important to actually consider what student evaluations exactly measure. There has been much critique on over-reliance of standardized assessments both of students and of faculty.

In addition, unconscious bias, stereotypes, and assumptions impact the ways women and minority faculty are perceived. Bonilla-Silva (2015) explains, white-oriented institutions reproduce whiteness in a vast array of ways; curriculum, readings, culture, etc. It is not questioned but is the order of the day; the "correct" way of doing things. These assumptions have an impact on student evaluations, which impact faculty during evaluations and the tenure process. Racialized faculty tend to get lower scores than non-racialized faculty for a variety of complex reasons (Lazos, 2013; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017) and courses that are focused on race are rated more negatively (Ahmed, 2012; Lazos, 2013). In addition, there is a wide belief that faculty of color are less qualified or can only teach courses about race (Cooper, 2018). Interestingly, though not surprisingly, when faculty of color mention race their student evaluations are negatively impacted (Lazos, 2012).

Also, for women faculty of color who labor in roles that are perceived as male, they counter stereotypical assumptions that they are not competent, authoritative, or charismatic leaders (Valian, 1998). However, the double-edged sword is that when women attempt to make up for these perceptions, they can be viewed as more incompetent or insecure (Lazos, 2012). Research shows that minorities and women are presumed incompetent from the minute they enter the space/place (Lazos, 2012). Women have to navigate within narrow boundaries set by cultural stenotopic expectations. In workplace settings, they must be sufficiently assertive but not too much so or their evaluations will suffer (Lazos, 2012). Students also tend to challenge their female and minority instructors more. According to Statham, Richardson, and Cook (1991) students have less fear of and respect for women of color faculty. In a study conducted by Harlow (2003), minority faculty face racial performance burdens in the classroom that white professors do not encounter. Because minority professors fear their competence will be undermined, 69% of black women and 44% of black men choose an authoritative demeanor, which in turn, may turn off students who reward likeable professors. In addition, the study found that white students are not able to accurately perceive the emotions behind the facial expressions of minorities, so misunderstandings about intentions, emotional warmth, etc. are very likely to occur. Troublingly, white students perceive faculty with African American features as less attractive, which in turn negatively impacts student evaluations (Lazos, 2012).
RECOMMENDATIONS

Newer faculty can be better supported in the tenure and evaluation process. Below I offer recommendations informed by my experiences and the extant literature.

• Colleges and universities should proactively protect new faculty through policy and practices if they do not want to set these faculty up for failure. Newer faculty should not be expected to assume significant responsibilities such as coordinating new programs and organizing entire conferences. If they are, they should be given adequate support and the option to not take on or step away from such responsibilities if they interfere with aspects of the position evaluated for tenure and promotion.
• Colleges and university should proactively protect the academic freedom of faculty. This requires creating an environment that values equally all ways of knowing. Doing so would reduce the incidence of newer faculty being penalized covertly or unconsciously for valuing ways of knowing and paradigms that differ from powerful senior faculty.
• The role and importance of student evaluations should be reassessed and safeguards at the university and college level need to be put in place to ensure that student evaluations are not used as weapons. Multiple sources must be taken into account when assessing teaching effectiveness (testimonials from students, research with students, etc.).
• Universities and colleges should be more transparent in the tenure and promotion process by making tenure requirements explicit and clear with uniformity across the institution. This could involve listing a specific number of publications instead of employing vague open ended language which creates confusion and opportunity for personal biases/vendettas to play out against candidates up for tenure. When racialized faculty are hired and then left to flounder, there needs to be language and visibility around these landmines. Mentoring of newer faculty and faculty of color should be the norm at universities and colleges. Self-care, communities of support and a network of allies including other people of color networks, and practitioner networks are essential if faculty of color are to survive the tenure process. It is critical that the academy put more supports in place to create more fairness and equity around the tenure process for racialized faculty. It is also important for newer, racialized faculty to come together and struggle collectively outside of institutional constraints and think about developing new ways of building a more egalitarian discourse that subverts hierarchical, competitive ways of being rooted in traditional academia.
• I have managed to survive largely through the support of other faculty of color and non-institutionalized groups to which I have connected. Mentoring programs which involve helping newer faculty and faculty of color to find a mentor and/or peer group and training senior faculty to be better mentors should be developed. Such programming could help protect newer faculty and faculty of color from the toxicity and opaque nature of academia. As skewed as the rules are, it is still important for untenured faculty to know, understand, and follow processes in place by their institution.
• Respecting the significance of the research, teaching, and service contributions by members of underrepresented groups is critical. Universities and colleges should have mechanisms in place for ensuring fair and equitable review of dossiers especially when evaluating research productivity. This will help prevent research from being marginalized and diminished. Often research such as what some faculty of color choose to write about: race, poverty, and other institutionalized inequities is dismissed as “not serious scholarship.”, reflecting “angry people of color” and being too narrow. This was the case in my situation when my field: adult education/adult literacy education was referred to as too narrow (even though it was what I was hired by the university to teach).
• Counseling services and other appropriate supports need to be in place for students and faculty. This is especially true if the student body is mainly comprised of poor/working class students who are precariously situated on a number of fronts. This inevitably takes a psychological toll on the students. Often, faculty become informal counselors, which in turn takes a psychic toll on them yet they often have no supports of their own in place.
Universities and colleges should address at all levels the privilege and entitlement that is prevalent within the academy. Climate surveys should be conducted to identify institutionalized barriers that work against faculty of color within the academy and reinforce de facto preferences for white males and females. This is especially important because faculty members continue to perceive women of color through their own biased lenses because covert, overt, and unconscious racism among colleagues remains an enormous issue. Good intentions are not sufficient to guarantee that equal opportunity will insure equal treatment. There is a price for being silent on issues of inequity and for not being silent on those very same issues. A self-study should be undertaken to create an accurate historical and contemporary account of the racialized and gendered nature of the academy. Collective historical memory impacts our constructed realities in ways which we are mostly unaware. A self-study would highlight what professors have historically looked like and a task force dedicated to eradicating inequities should be created. There is an urgent need to deconstruct those images and implications of those images of who is or is not a professor in our consciousness, our lives, and our practice.

CONCLUSIONS

To the extent that higher education can be one of society’s critics and conscience, then extensive measures must be implemented in order to shift the culture, making it less toxic to newer scholars of color. This involves the decolonization of higher education. Unfortunately, decolonization has become a buzzword, removed from social justice and more radical roots to something insipid and sterile such as adjustment in some course content or perhaps some diversification of curricula. But the actual pedagogy and institutional culture remain intact allowing the university to thrive as a space where profound inequalities continue to get perpetuated. Instead, I would argue decolonizing academia needs to be an all-consuming, all-encompassing project which calls for each and all of us to reckon with our individual and collective complicity in privileging the dominance of western knowledge production in a quest to dismantle oppressive power structures. Including more modules on race or scholars of color does not address core structures of disparities and racism within academia. Most modules on black history, colonialism, etc. have become synonymous with black/brown pain and brutalization of those bodies but the majority of these people researching and teaching this subject are white. Given the deeply racist structures that faculty of color continue to encounter within academia (and that are already embedded in its culture as part of the air we inhale). Too often these efforts to decolonize end up recolonizing and centering whiteness (Cooper, 2018). Diversifying is not the same as decolonizing. Diversifying does not address institutional racism, structural inequality or embedded hierarchies in academia. If we are committed to dismantling, reimagining, and truly decolonizing our institutions to truly effect change, then we must be willing to tackle the structures that marginalize black and brown intellectuals while collectively supporting their work as important knowledge producers.

Erasure through colonization is commonplace within the academy. The scholarship of theorists of color are read, studied, and analyzed through a lens of whiteness by Caucasian faculty, which is distinctly extractivist. A box is checked answering the question of whether the work of faculty of color is studied in the program but it must be asked in what depth and through whose analysis? Faculty of color’s knowledge may get circulated but without any sense of their lived experiences or histories, or legacies of the histories of racialized groups. Blackness analyzed from a white perspective. This may not be intentional but, ultimately, for faculty of color the impact is that their work and intellectual capital is used without them. hooks (1994) cautions us that when people do not tell their own stories, others do it for them. hooks adds,
there is no need to hear your voice when we can talk about you better than you can speak about yourself. I want to know your story. And I will tell it back to you in a new way. Tell it back to you in such a way that it has become my own. Re-writing you, I write myself anew. I am still author, authority. I am still the colonizer, the speaking subject, and you are now at the center of my talk. Stop. (pp. 151 – 152).

When certain groups can talk about you better than you can talk about yourself, your existence is no longer necessary; you are erased. Antwi (2018) points out, as an instrument of capitalism, the university consumes that which is meant to help faculty of color survive, taking it and claiming it as its own.

Ahmed (2012) points out that when we, faculty and university workers of color, speak out about racism, we (not the institution) are seen as responsible for the damage and we become labeled as damaged and in need of containment. Often, there is a pathologizing of our presence in that space. Whiteness is also seen as an image problem instead of an institutional systemic one for which the answer is using faces of color on public relations. For those of us who embody diversity (or to be frank, color) we must present happy images, uncomplaining and smiling (at least for the brochures). We must smile on the outside regardless of our inner feelings and emotions. The problem is not treated as institutional because to do so would mean it is systemic; instead it becomes about punishing the individual. The culture that promotes this must be urgently changed. The university must engage in the project of decolonizing.

For myself and other activists who have found ourselves in academia, our commitment is to continue to find ways to bridge the divide between the academy and communities and to work with marginalized communities to co-create a critical body of work that would honor knowledges, voices, and perspectives that have been historically marginalized. This remains my commitment. Other scholars of color have and continue to support me in protecting my energy, labor, and peace. These are critical if we are to survive and maintain mental health, which can be eroded in such a corrosive culture. Embracing new ways of knowing and being can support academia in learning how to better serve the communities in which they exist, to honor knowledges that have been silenced or stolen, and to access different, important conversations rooted in change that offer a more equitable vision of the world. At present, this vision is largely absent.

Currently, I am an active member in a recently formed racialized faculty caucus and am involved in other anti-racist organizing within the institution. These spaces are intended to support racialized faculty in struggle as well as newer faculty. It is too soon to know whether gains have been made but there is power and strength in collective organizing as well as a dire need. We may be the darker brothers in Hughes’ (1994) poem but we refuse to be the dirty secret that is forced to stay and eat in the kitchen. Risam (2019) points out, scholars of color challenge, reimagine, and reinvent scholarly practices to survive, and in doing so, transform universities. We, as insurgent academics, draw upon a long history of practices by scholars of color that form the unrecognized basis of strategies for saving higher education. As racialized scholars we have and continue to resist erasure on a daily basis and we continue to demand recognition for our valuable contributions to struggling for justice within the academy.
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Racial discrimination in the United States dates to the earliest periods of colonial history. Thompson (1993) wrote “Slavery was an institution based upon widely held assumptions regarding the relationship between whites and blacks” (p. 333) and at the turn of the 18th century, the African slave trade displaced indentured servitude for farm labor in southern colonies (Snyder, 2007). The institution of slavery included slave codes regulating every aspect of the lives of slaves, including their right to education.

Slavery officially came to an end in 1865, removing those macro-legal barriers to educational access. However, educational inequalities persisted and were reflected in multiple ways in spite of the legislation established for Black access to education (Mwachofi, 2008). Racial discrimination is a source of educational inequalities and is veiled in the micro-context of classroom, curriculum, policy, etc. (e.g. Nurenberg, 2011; Parker, 2012; Ridley & Kwon, 2010). Such discrimination is often covert in education. It has been examined in the context of support of White privilege (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Dennis, 2001), denying the presence of injustice (Nurenberg, 2011), impacting immigrant student success (Orozco & López, 2015), persisting stereotypes in bilingual classrooms (Kleyn, 2008), court support of the racial hierarchy (Byrd-Chichester, 2000), failure to recognize White racial identity (Lund, 2010), and the dominance of Eurocentric pedagogy in adult education (Brookfield, 2003; Guy, 1999).

In this paper, we examine through genealogical analysis how racial discrimination in education shifted focus in different periods of time. Unveiling the presence of this persistent, yet covert form of discrimination is important to address barriers to full equity in education for minoritized ethnic and racial groups, particularly Black learners. These barriers have been described in a number of different ways including disproportionate outcomes/minority presence in remedial education (Davis et al., 2016; Parker, 2012), inequities in funding (Kujovich, 1993), postsecondary institutional access (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013), and standardized placement testing that ignores differences in the experiences of students of color (Clark, 2004).
Genealogical analysis is used to examine nuanced racial discrimination in education and its focus in different periods of time. Rather than a total historical account seeking “overarching principles which govern the development of an epoch” (Kendall & Wickham, 2000, p. 24) and “a system of homogenous relations: a network of causality that makes it possible to derive each of them” (Foucault, 1972, p. 9), Foucault’s (1998) genealogy is situated in deconstruction theory. It attempts to record narratives and events that extend beyond the dialectic description of binary worlds (e.g., black/white, right/wrong, men/women, and world/system) defined in the dominant narrative. It concentrates on the things which are meticulous and accidental rather than transcendental, the things which are missing and absent from dominant history. It is not to abandon or refuse the things that are in the sight of history; rather, it requires us to peer through the surface and expose things hidden from our vision. This approach illuminates the experiences absent from the dominant narrative, revealing the tacit power of the dominant to obscure those beyond its limited binary definition. Genealogy reminds us to pay attention to existing unnoticed truth which is ignored, unrealized, unacknowledged, and absent in our historical knowledge asset (Foucault, 1998).

Foucault’s genealogical analysis emphasizes the role of power in the structure of discourse (McPhail, n.d.). In other words, it focuses on “how power is exercised in a particular context” (Kearins & Hooper, 2002, p. 752). By analyzing the discursive formation of a certain event/history (Foucault, 1980), hidden meaning behind the discourse is revealed. Discourse is understood according to Foucault (1972) as “a written or spoken object” (p. 216) whose production “is at once controlled, selected, organised [sic] and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers” (p. 216). Through this approach we attempt “to discover the chain of causes which lead to particular historical events” (McPhail, n.d., p. 21).

Foucault’s genealogy focuses on local illegitimate knowledge of struggles not broadly acknowledged or institutionalized into official archives. It looks at particular situations indicating how various power strategies are used to produce self-disciplining subjects; how certain statements are more favored than others; and how legislative mechanisms are used to normalize and legitimize unfair statements. Kearins and Hooper (2002) suggest “Central to genealogical research is an interest in how power is exercised and sustained through the use of disciplinary discourses and through associated administrative normalisation [sic]” (p. 736). For example, how do powerful groups use discourse, policy, norms, etc. to bring a minority people into obedient subservience (Foucault, 1976/1978)?

Genealogical analysis identifies ways certain historical events/policies favored powerful groups and controlled people. It looks for the ‘hidden agendas’ used by powerful groups to benefit their group. To reveal these ‘hidden agendas’, through genealogical analysis, we collected documents, which reveal the hidden meanings easily ignored by the public, seeking local knowledge (e.g., stories from the struggles) instead of the knowledge communicated through official policies. We looked for documents representing the stories and
voices of the struggles. Genealogists do not reject official knowledge but appreciate that official documents also provide the missing context of events and reveal the decision making process (Kearins & Hooper, 2002).

Using the genealogical method, three distinct time periods of racial discrimination in education are examined in this paper. The Antebellum period, the post-Civil War period, and the postwar period from 1945 to the present. The first period was selected because it was a period when full legal restrictions were imposed preventing Black access to education. This examination identifies structural tools such as laws and regulations used to prevent participation in education on racial grounds. The second period is the post-Civil war era, in which a radical change from the discourse in the first period appears. In our examination a discourse of racial control exercised through educational opportunities designed to normalize freed slaves into dominant culture is revealed. Finally, the present period reveals covert and hidden racial discrimination within the larger mainstream discourse. Examining this period reveals how the micro-learning environment and hidden norms operate in the mainstream discourse to marginalize students based on race, limiting full access to education.

We selected three independent historical eras with three distinct racial discourses to paint a picture of how racial discrimination in education changed its appearance in different periods of time. By examining these three time periods, we revealed differences in the conduct of education for Black students. We also identified ways powerful groups used policies, norms, and discourses to normalize racially disadvantaged students into the mainstream agenda through the institution of education. We focused on documents/stories about minoritized people, and crucial events that led to important changes. We collected documents such as transcriptions of oral history interviews from the Avery Institute and articles describing experiences and understandings of the periods, which may not be included in the dominant narrative. These documents and articles reveal power relationship governing the education of black students. Our search for articles in the antebellum period focused on slave codes and structural prohibition of educating slaves. In the post-civil war period, we sought journal articles and documents describing efforts to educate liberated slaves through the stated positions of White educators, alongside the relatively few Black educators of the period. In the current period, we found articles, stories and reports which considered questions of diversity in education, issues related to minority serving institutions, and policies enacted through the legislative process.

The Antebellum Period—Denying the Slaves’ Access to the Locus of Power (Education) through Structural Barriers (1781 to 1860)

The Antebellum period followed the colonial period and ended with the beginning of the US Civil War in 1861. In this period, the locus of power shifted from learning to knowledge, introducing an era when education moved toward the practical and away from a classical education. This shift away from the classical and toward the practical and scientific revealed a change in the locus of power (Nicoll & Fejes, 2011), making knowledge economically empowering. This shift resulted in a growth of educational opportunity for White middle class students focused on practical and military education (Green, 2005; Slotten, 1991). This change in the function of education clarified the discourse and revealed the exercise of power by the dominant group to deny slaves access to education. This move revealed a conflict between the pedagogy of White slave owners in the south and the covert and subversive
pedagogy of slaves in their family and religious life. The antebellum period is known for the legalized existence of slavery, and a growing separation of educational ideas between north and south (Green, 2005). The existence of slave codes in Florida (Thompson, 1993) and New Orleans (Ingersoll, 1995) made it a crime to teach slaves to read and write. Black students resorted to secretive methods to obtain adult basic education through the formation of clandestine schools that were often hidden, nomadic, and nocturnal (Freedman, 1999). Furthermore, educational efforts for free Black students in the North were hampered by the Nat Turner rebellion in Virginia when the African church became the central institution for Black education (Moss, 2006). The Black struggle to gain access to education reveals the locus of power in knowledge (Nicoll & Fejes, 2011), the growing economic value of education in this period (Green, 2005), and the prohibition of slaves’ participation in economic activity (Thompson, 1993). Thompson (1993) observed: “A clear line of distinction between the two races was needed in order to maintain Black subordination and race control” (p. 324). Education became that line.

During this period of time, discordant configurations in education were evident. In the South, growing isolationism through systematic promotion of southern education for White southerners fueled the growth of educational institutions for members of the dominant culture. In the North, schools were established in Boston for Black children. However, questions and issues remained related to the equality of education between Black and White schools (Moss, 2006; White, 1973).

Growth in educational opportunities were available for the dominant White middle class, including popular lectures and presentations of scientific concepts and ideas, along with the development of regionalized education institutions (e.g., military academies) promoting practical and scientific studies. This shifted the emphasis in education from classical studies to a more practical understanding of education. During this period access to learning, and which educational opportunities were available to whom revealed the locus of power embedded in education (Green, 2005).

This power revealed how the disparity of educational opportunities available was connected with racial ethnicity. Education for slaves in the Antebellum South was available only through covert means (Freedman, 1999), while education for the White middle class experienced rapid growth (Green, 2005). For instance, academies for White southerners in the South grew, focusing on a ‘practical’ form of education. This change was not restricted to the South alone, but illustrated a growing trend promoted by national leaders (Slotten, 1991). Green (2005) observed “the practical curriculum and interest in progress benefited non-elite young men,…Enrollment in military institutes, then, expanded the opportunity for advanced education to middle-class Southerners in the late antebellum period” (p. 364).

While members of the dominant southern culture enjoyed growing access to higher education, Black students struggled to obtain adult basic education. The conduct of an owner toward his or her slaves was dictated by ‘slave codes’ enacted on a state by state basis. Many of these codes contained strict penalties that included whipping or mutilating slaves learning to read or write or possessing reading material (Thompson, 1993). Given the general opposition to educating slaves, any hopes of education for Blacks resided in the Antebellum African church, which became the prominent source for Black education. During the 1820s, the availability of primary education to Blacks began to improve but higher education remained out of reach (Moss, 2006).

This power also negatively impacted the education of dominant Whites. Flynt (1968) wrote “pressure was applied to keep southern students in the region, textbooks were censored, and professors were dismissed because of their political views” (p. 211). Not only were students pressured to remain in the South, but professors’ regional loyalties were questioned. Flynt (1968) described such practices through the story of Milford Butler, a professor of ancient languages at East Tennessee University, who was born in Ohio. His life was threatened after his mail had been opened to reveal he was a northern sympathizer. At another southern institution of higher education, a professor expressing reservations about the institution of slavery
was forced to resign his position. Additionally, at Southern University, a committee was appointed by the
trustees to examine the curriculum and ensure it met the needs of “loyal southern men”, while pressuring
faculty to adopt ‘southern textbooks’ to replace those labeled “undesirable” (Flynt, 1968).

The resistance to educating Black students was also evident in the north. For example, there was a
cooperative effort between a Black and a White minister who desired to establish a Black institution of
higher learning in New Haven, Connecticut (Moss, 2006). The proposed educational institution was
planned and announced in the fall of 1831. Unfortunately, this coincided with news of the Nat Turner
rebellion in Virginia on August 22, 1831 (Moss, 2006). While the proposal for such an institution would
have been controversial before, following the uprising northern Whites considered it subversive. As Moss
insofar as it applied to African Americans” (p.18). The proposal for the school was voted down in a city
meeting by a margin of 700 to 4 (Moss, 2006). This was not the end of the unrest, as the citizens of the
town took out their anger on “a black-owned hotel, a black-owned home, and an abolitionist’s summer
residence” (Moss, 2006, p. 18). This reaction was not isolated to Connecticut, as White reaction in other
free states undermined education following this uprising (Thompson, 1993).

During the Antebellum period, the White middle class gained power with the growth of accessible, practical
education and knowledge. All the while, Black slaves were denied access to basic adult education, much
less higher education. This was illustrated in the way the growing educational opportunities for Whites
noted above (Green, 2005; Slotten, 1991) starkly contrasted with the punitive measures that repressed the
education of slaves (Thompson, 1993). Denying Black slaves access to this knowledge demonstrated both
the power of the White dominant class, and the importance of practical knowledge to engage in economic
participation. The limited education slaves obtained was affected through covert means (Freedman, 1999).
Following the Civil War, the former slaves found access to practical education for economic participation
with important limits, and designed to produce docile, subservient workers.

The Post-Civil War Era—Training Blacks to be Efficient and Subordinate Workers
(1865-1914)

In the post-civil war era, the ruling White class transposed denial of education into paternalistic
domination of African Americans. Through higher education, they believed Blacks could be taught
to obey, and the social order of racial subordination could be protected (Dennis, 2001). Charles
Dabney, who became president of the University of Tennessee in 1887, argued that the Black race
was “at least 2,000 years behind the Anglo-Saxon in its development” (as cited in Dennis, 2001, p. 116).
Such a viewpoint understood former slaves as primitive and in need of supervision by White superiors. The
dominant White class then “allowed” the education of former slaves. However, educational content was
limited to roles deemed suitable for former slaves by dominant Whites (Dennis, 2001). Dennis (2001) noted
“Paradoxically, while university progressives advocated education for social improvement, they also
propagated a pedagogical scheme that fit conveniently into a scheme for racial submission” (p. 115).

Southern educational leaders Samuel Mitchell and Charles Dabney regarded that education of Blacks
should align with the values of the White ruling class laborers to be efficient workers and good citizens.
Dennis (2001) argued,

The proper curriculum would equip blacks with the rudimentary skills needed by the new economic
order. It would also inculcate them in the middle-class virtues needed for social stability. Thus
educated, blacks would quietly assume their subservient but productive place in southern society.
(p. 115)
William Broun, president of Auburn University (1882-1883 and 1884-1899), argued that Blacks were an ‘inferior race’ (Cox, 2008), asserting the abolition of slavery created a gap in educational leadership which could only be filled by White paternalism (Cox, 2008). This view relegated African Americans to a subservient role in society embracing predetermined values supporting the social stability of the dominant group (Dennis, 2001). This repressive effort defined a suitable education for acceptable roles for Blacks defined by the dominant White culture, while appearing to assist them with educational goals.

In the debate over the content of education available for former slaves, the focus was on curriculum. Dennis (2001) argued “theorists of industrial education held that practical training in the skills needed by southern agriculture and industry was best suited to the educational needs of blacks” (p. 117). This approach was modeled in the Hampton Institute founded by Samuel Chapman Armstrong (a northern White man) in 1868 (Dennis, 2001). Booker T. Washington, a Black graduate of the Hampton Institute became a proponent of this approach. A classical liberal arts education, on the other hand, was seen as a disservice because it led to Black individuals considered unfit for any kind of useful work. In the New South and among many in the North, a general consensus developed that defined educating the former slaves based on the dominant White view of differences between the races. The dominant White view argued that Black former slaves needed White paternal oversight (Cox, 2008) to learn a skill suitable for their subordinate role in society that supported White middle-class values (Dennis, 2001). Instead of structural exclusionism, this resulted in paternalistic condescension.

The availability of limited education for former slaves was considered progressive (Dennis, 2001), and was not a universal understanding in the post-Civil War South. Educating African Americans in the post-Civil War South was difficult and the debate continued to determine its nature. This debate included challenges to the content of curriculum available to Black students, but also extended to the way these efforts were funded, including tax policy and the use of tax proceeds. Early educational efforts following the emancipation of Blacks in the South included the work of Northern missionaries through the American Missionary Association (AMA) (Richardson, 1965). While this brought White resistance, a change in state legislation reflected the emergence of a new strategy for the White dominant group. Former slaves faced a subtler tactic to deprive them of any education whatsoever. Howard (1977) described Kentucky as one southern state that educated slaves prior to the Civil War. Subsequent to the war, the oversight of the Federal Government through the Freedman’s Bureau worked to ensure the provision of education to all former slaves. However, the state desired to rid itself of Federal oversight, and passed legislation whose stated purpose was to fund African American education, albeit entirely by a tax charged solely to former slaves (Howard, 1977).

The irony of the situation resulted in the insistence that education for Blacks be funded by Blacks even if they were the poorest residents in the state (Howard, 1977). Amid other problems, this tax was never actually used to educate anyone. Instead the funds were diverted to provide relief for paupers, allowing county courts and trustees to oversee their use (Howard, 1977). Howard (1977) indicated that the preservation of local control of the resources responded to “the demands of local prejudice which insisted that whites in each county control black education even when sustained by taxes levied entirely on black citizens. In most counties, public opinion was determined to have no black schools” (p. 308).

This meant that education for Blacks in the state was heavily reliant on the presence of the Freedman’s Bureau along with benevolent societies who sent teachers to provide education to Black students, many of the teachers faced serious threats of assassination and social isolation (Howard, 1977) for teaching Black students. For example, the AMA focused on the task of providing basic education to freed slaves ranging in age from children to the elderly (Richardson, 1965). Not only did these educators teach, but they provided
assistance with the needs of daily living. Even though many of these northern benevolent societies like the AMA operated schools at great personal risk, there were critiques of their motivations.

Taylor (2005) described one criticism of the AMA effort. Taylor stated, “this educational scheme was vocational/technical in nature and not intended by Whites that Blacks attain economic or class equality” (p. 126). Other critiques included the failure to recognize the distinctive nature of Black culture and African American self-determination (Taylor, 2005). These were crucial because effective education of African Americans had to address changing the social realities of the Black experience and the struggle against the collective loss of cultural and historical identity characteristic of the oppression of slavery (Apple, 2013). These considerations sparked debates within Black communities about educational purpose.

African American responses were characterized by two distinctive leading voices. Booker T. Washington, a leading advocate of education for Blacks which gave them more efficient agricultural skills, pursued a pragmatic approach adopting a slower pace for change that was considered less threatening to White power holders (Peterson, 1999). From a different perspective, W. E. B. DuBois, influenced by Marxist theory, realized the contributions of the structural system and politics of stratification on racial inequality. He criticized not only the formal structures of education, but the dominant interpretive frameworks formed in the discourses of imperialism and whiteness (Apple, 2013). Fearing that public schooling for Black people would result in danger, the dominant White group chose to “provide segregated (limited) public schooling, but to do so in a way that was meant to ensure that the content and ideological orientations rendered black people subservient” (Apple, 2013, p. 36). Du Bois criticized capitalism that depended on an underclass to work in menial and subservient roles, and marginalized African Americans (Guy & Brookfield, 2009). Dubois (1999) observed that “It is a peculiar sensation . . . this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eye of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity” (p. 11). He emphasized the need for African Americans to be able to function on their own, rising above typical menial labor offered (Peterson, 1999) and advocated “transforming the educational and social conditions by changing the consciousness of dominant groups” (Apple, 2013, p. 38).

The Current Period—Racism and Inequality Being Subtle, Hidden and Unspoken (1945-Present)

In this current period, diversity is a part of daily life, basic education is available to everyone, and there are examples of highly successful individuals from every ethnic and racial background, including the first U.S. African American President. However, racism and inequity are embedded deeply in a micro-educational context and are subtle, hidden and unspoken. Many White people do not see racism, while many people of color struggle to understand how their White colleagues could miss it. According to Baumgartner and Johnson-Bailey (2008) “The demographics on college campuses are increasingly diverse. . . . In short we are dealing with a rapidly growing diverse society” (p. 46). Living in a reality of a rapidly changing demographic cogently emphasizes the need to address the disparity.

Guy (1999) observed that the dominance of an Anglo-Western-European cultural values persists. This macro-culture of dominance has seeped into the seams of society and infused expectations of normalcy. When cultural norms of individuality and competitiveness dominate the classroom environment, they effectively dismiss people of color in educational environments (Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey, 2008). The resulting impact is to marginalize groups outside of the dominant one, since their cultural experiences do not mesh with the assumed norm.
One educational avenue for Black students was reflected in the Avery Institute, located in Charleston, South Carolina (Drago & Hunt, 1991). In an archived oral history interview, Kelly (1984) described her personal educational journey to become a Black educator, which was heavily reliant on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HCBUs) but began at the Avery Institute, a secondary educational institution focused on educating Black students. Her description of the teaching environment following her secondary school graduation was spartan, situated in one or two room schools. She also described her difficulty working with a White YWCA organization she referred to only as central. She detailed a reluctance to permit her attendance at Highlander Folk School and subsequent refusal to approve the development of an integrated program.

In another interview, Mouzon (1980) described a degree of tension between the people of the community and Avery, “but there was an unkind feeling manifest sometimes by the people of the community. It wasn’t widespread, however it was in a subtle sort of way” (p. 8). Additionally, Moultrie (1982) reflected on these sentiments when describing the reaction of the White community to the Avery Institute, “I think they were afraid. I think they were afraid of what they thought was going to happen. We got no support at that time” (p. 11). While Mouzon was not willing to openly state this was racism, she suggested the events took place in a different era, noting that they occurred a long time ago. In all of these recordings, the participants described the role of the Avery Institute as an institution providing secondary education that served to prepare the majority of Black teachers for South Carolina schools (Mouzon, 1980). These participants described the subtle tension that existed between the dominant White community and the institution in this era.

This subtlety represents a metamorphosis in approach though less obvious. Ridley and Kwon (2010) argued that the more overt forms of racism have been banned, while a more subtle and covert form stubbornly persists. These unspoken and covert racial undertones are revealed in measured outcomes of implemented policies that impact the access and success of minority students (Parker, 2012), raising the question of undeclared motives.

For instance, Parker (2012) found that Black students in Arkansas and Kentucky were enrolled in postsecondary developmental education disproportionately, reporting 85.1% and 73.8% respectively for Black students and 42.8% and 41.1% for their White counterparts. Davis, Stephan, Lindsay, and Park (2016) queried the Indiana Student Information System to identify early college success for students defined by three measures (a) enrolling in only nonremedial courses in the first semester; (b) earning all attempted credits in the first semester; and (c) continuing on to a second year of college. Among other findings, they concluded:

fifty-three percent of students first entering a two- or four-year college who were classified as White/other demonstrated early success on the composite of all three indicators, compared with 26 percent of those who were classified as Black and 40 percent of those who were classified as Hispanic. (p. 3)

These findings are consistent with Parker (2012) when comparing White and Black participation in developmental education as a predictor of educational success.

Peterson (1999) argued “African American students are more often placed in remedial courses that do not adequately prepare them to compete with whites either in academic settings or in the workplace” (p. 86). These remedial courses are designed to address deficiencies identified through standardized testing.

Curriculum, instruction and assessments however have been historically skewed toward the dominant culture (Clark, 2004; Dennis, 2001), and the content and expectations are contextualized toward a
Eurocentric orientation, rather than addressing context that students understand (Clark, 2004). Furthermore, standardized admission testing (e.g. Accuplacer) is often used as a restrictive tool, “That is, what was designed as an evaluation instrument is now used as an admission criterion” (Clark, 2004, p. 51). She argued that these tests are a gate keeping system restricting access to different types of education. Such testing often leads to a second restriction for many adult students, developmental education. Based on these tests, a significant number of Black students are required to enter developmental education before gaining access to college level courses. The practice and policy limits the availability of college education to disproportionate numbers of Black students.

Parker (2012) argued “National data point to the high proportion of students, many of whom are Black or Latino, who begin their postsecondary careers in developmental education courses” (p. 2). Forty-six states have rules related to developmental education, of these 14 (half of which are in the south) have moved to prohibit or eliminate state funding at public colleges (Parker, 2012) for developmental courses. Minority Serving Institutions, which educate over 43% of students of color in postsecondary education are disproportionately impacted by proposals to limit developmental education. Such a funding change erects barriers to all students, but impacts minority students disproportionally. Parker (2012) observed, “critics of developmental education often argue that states spend excessive amounts of money on teaching underprepared students with mixed results” (p. 8). When developmental education is eliminated from many four-year institutional offerings, including those who serve primarily minority students, these students have only one other option for public higher education, which is community college. However, the students who are not able to pass placement examinations to enter, for example, the City University of New York (CUNY), are unable to enroll (Parker, 2012). Removing developmental education effectively erects barriers to students who benefit from opportunities presented in Minority Serving Institutions. Additionally, Mumper (2003) observed that beginning in the 1980s, it was increasingly difficult for low-income and disadvantaged students to access to public higher education due to a series of forces such as rising tuition, changes in the federal student aid programs, and the decline of affirmative action. The consequences of such disparities in education result in fewer resources to address student needs forcing a decline in educational quality for minority students. The reality of large numbers of Black students in developmental education have a similar impact to the post-Civil War restrictions limiting access to specific types of curriculum. While the use of standardized testing and developmental education is not racialized, they are defined by dominant White culture.

Rather than suggesting these are overt acts of racism, it would be more appropriate to say that these relate to assumptions of White privilege that result in the default White frame of reference being unexamined. Lund (2010) observed that “It is the invisibility and silence of racism that renders us unable to see it, unable to name it, unable to take action against it” (p. 16). The invisibility of racism is possible because those “who have white privilege have tremendous power; they never have to think about race or challenge racism” (Lund, 2010, p. 16). Such a ‘color blind’ perspective, denies uncomfortable cultural differences and perspectives, perpetuating silence and forcing it below the surface of perception. Nurenegb (2011) observed that in an affluent white high school, teaching a social justice perspective was met with resistance, accompanied by the comment that such a perspective was ‘irrelevant’ to their lives. Nurenegb further observed that those from this dominant group tended to believe, “that only people of color or those who live in poverty are harmed by systems of oppression” (Nurenegb, 2011, p. 57). This is illustrative of the dominant White narrative that for many Whites is not clearly visible. Brookfield (2003) reminded us to recognize that one’s “lifeworld, positionality, and sense of cultural identity comprise a set of preconscious filters and assumptions that frame how one’s life is felt and lived” (p. 499). Intentionally tracing the racial framing of the dominant discourse of white privilege reveals how...
White people distance themselves from racial privilege, using certain strategies to deny its presence (Brookfield, 2003). These preconscious filters and assumptions are present in all people, but for those in the dominant White culture they align with the dominant White narrative. Because of this, many assumptions remain unexamined. While progressive Whites reject overt racial discrimination, the persistence of White privilege and the dominant White discourse limits access disproportionately for Black students, albeit through approaches that are subtle and covert.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Three periods of historical time show that the following tools/tactics were used to perpetuate this built-in discourse of white privilege and its hidden agenda: using pressure, threat, isolation and segmentation to impact the education of the minoritized group; controlling the contents and ideological orientations in the curriculum; using policies, norms, and discourses to normalize the mainstream agenda; using standardized tests and evaluation; changing the way programs were funded, and increasing tuition to limit the chances of the minority group from accessing to higher education; abandoning classical education in favor of more practical, and vocational/technical education for the non-dominant groups to create a pedagogical scheme of racial submission. Though racial issues related to access in education have improved in the present time, racial discrimination has not disappeared, but has penetrated into the micro-educational context.

Examining the historical shift of racialism, which is “the positive recognition of how his or her lifeworld, positionality, and sense of cultural identity comprise a set of preconscious filters and assumptions” (Brookfield, 2003, p. 499) in different educational eras is meaningful because it informs our understanding of structural barriers and the promotion of the full engagement of students in education. Changing laws and policies on the macro level guaranteed that people of color have the right to access to education; however, racialism is hidden in a micro-educational context. Racism cannot be eliminated solely through judicial and legislative processes; it requires new strategies that acknowledge these realities (e.g. Critical Race Theory) (Bell, 1992; Peterson, 1999).

It is important for adult educators to understand the importance of caring and that “building a more positive, inclusive society requires passion, love, and a variety of actions” (Amstutz, 1999, p. 29). It is important to examine racial issues that appear in the micro-context of curriculum, instructional methods, funding, assessments, and in the macro-context of the dominant Eurocentric culture (Peterson, 1999). Racial discrimination is much more subtle, varied, and complicated than in prior historical eras. Jackson (2011) argued “when racial progress is achieved through convergence with white interests, we must disaggregate ‘interest’ to reach a more nuanced understanding of how racism simultaneously serves and undermines the multiple interests of whites” (p.439) and how “racial progress panders to particular white interests while at the same time undercutting others in a somewhat contradictory fashion” (p. 439). This common thread extends across all three periods and persists to promote the dominance of Anglo-Western European cultural values, norms and racial inequities.

When we examine discrimination in education, we should peer through the surface to look for the hidden and ignored (Foucault, 1998). It is necessary to examine the official documents and well-accepted data in outcomes and funding, since they provide the context of events and the overall direction of decision making processes (Kearins & Hooper, 2002). However, Jackson (2011) also suggests looking for the stories and voices of the struggles, examining the issues uncovered in the unofficial data, such as family support, social connections, transportation, and within “unspoken cultural norms favoring whites” (Jackson, 2011, p. 440). In our examination, we explored the narratives and stories that are below the service, serving as a counter-narrative to the dominant narrative. In our study we revealed the way the descriptions of racial
discrimination have changed over time, but also the way its practice has persisted through subtle assumptions that maintained White privilege while problematizing education for Black students in different eras. Rather, this genealogical analysis illuminates the oppressive nature of an unexamined Eurocentric view that maintains White supremacy. This paper shows how legislative mechanisms can be used to normalize perceptions and legitimate assumptions. In this paper, we also identified the way tacit power reinforced such assumptions through the use of the associated administrative techniques/tools such as taxation and funding tactics, standardized placement testing, normalization, physical spaces, policies, and the body of legitimated knowledge (e.g., Foucault, 1976/1978). In each of the three eras, tactics changed from the structural exclusion of the Antebellum period to paternal condescension in the post-Civil War era, and finally to the covert tactics of limiting funding for education impacting disproportionate numbers of Black students. These tactics are emblematic of the power in the discourse of the dominant White culture and reveal the shifting face of racial discrimination.
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INTRODUCTION

Adult education practice is informed by the geographic spaces in which learning centers are located and in which outreach activities take place. Throughout American history practices such as redlining, lynching, zoning, and police brutality have been used to enforce racial segregation (Loewen, 2005; Rothstein, 2018). Thus, segregated spaces are products of white supremacy that continue to complicate the work of adult education. Such racialized spaces can create fear and unease for People of Color (POC) while fostering environments where whites remain ignorant regarding others because they have little to no authentic engagement across the color line. This dynamic exacerbates a variety of social problems related to employment, politics, and education. The purpose of this paper is to explore how white supremacy’s shaping of spaces in the Midwest affects adult educators working for social justice. While racialized spaces have been established across the entire United States (Rothstein, 2018), each region has a unique history that creates variations on how contemporary spaces remain racialized. This paper specifically looks at racialized spaces within central Indiana, not to argue that it is an especially racist area in need of special attention, but to provide an example of how racialized spaces affect adult education in one area. Additionally, studies on race and space bounded within other U.S. geographical contexts, as well as around the world, are encouraged and would provide vital points for regional comparison.

This paper combines autoethnography and critical race spatial analysis (CRSA) to explore Anderson’s (2015) concepts of white, Black, and cosmopolitan spaces, and how the interaction between race and space affect adult educators. In the discussion of white spaces, the first author narrates his experience as a white adult educator when his employer relocated to a reputed sundown town, and how members of the host
community communicated hostility to adult educators of color. The discussion of Black spaces begins with the first author’s reflection on socializing forces which contribute to white people’s fears of predominantly Black neighborhoods, and continues with the second author’s reflections on white adult educators’ problematic behaviors while visiting Black spaces. Finally, this paper explores the second author’s efforts, as a Black adult educator, to build consciousness to counter traditional approaches to community engagement established by white supremacy and deficit understandings within the Black population of a diverse, low-income neighborhood.

Before presenting the autoethnographic writing, we will describe recent innovations in the practices of Critical Race Spatial Analyses and Autoethnography. We will also provide a brief review of historical literature regarding how white supremacy has affected the construction of space in the Midwest. After presentations of autoethnographic evidence and analysis, we will discuss conclusions and implications for adult education and human resource development.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY AND CRITICAL WHITENESS STUDIES

A grounding in critical race theory (CRT) informs this project. As such the researchers proceed from the understanding that racism is a normal part of the Americans social fabric that affects people’s daily lives in innumerable ways (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). We place a special emphasis on critical white studies (CWS) which derives from CRT and places a distinct emphasis on the role of whiteness in sustaining racial oppression (Bohonos, 2019a; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Yosso, 2006). In particular, we draw on the notion of whiteness as property (Harris, 1993) and the concept of white spaces (Anderson, 2015).

Harris (1993) argues that whiteness functions as property as its possession confers a range of benefits, both material and immaterial. These benefits include free access to public spaces and attending abilities to enjoy education, commerce, employment, and leisure associated with these areas. Whiteness also affords its owners the right to exclude POC through the creation of segregated spaces. Historically this right to exclude was often enforced through law and policy, while in the contemporary era, exclusion continues through the social constitution of white spaces.

White spaces consist of overwhelmingly white areas in which Black people generally perceive themselves as unwelcome. Geographically speaking, white spaces dominate the American landscape and stand in contrast to both Black spaces—which whites tend to view with fear—and cosmopolitan spaces where amicable race mixing is most likely to take place (Anderson, 2015). White relationships to Black spaces tend to be characterized by avoidance and derision, while Black people must frequently navigate white spaces if they wish to access educational and employment opportunities, as well as other vital goods and services. The historical legacy of formal segregation combines with informal practices of exclusion to make Black access to white spaces frequently exhausting, painful, humiliating, and dangerous. This paper explores the experiences of adult educators who must navigate white and Black spaces, and also suggests that a key aspiration of adult education praxis should be the cultivation of cosmopolitan spaces of integration (Anderson, 2015). Following the example of influential critical race theorists (Harris, 1993; Gotanda, 1991; Vélez & Solórzano, 2017), we capitalize names of marginalized racial or ethnic groups while leaving white uncapitalized throughout the paper. This practice is rooted in the assumption that whiteness’ privilege and property functions are at least as important as its standing as a racial label, and un-capitalizing white is intended to be a counter-hegemonic practice that highlights these aspects of whiteness.
In discussing the history of racism in Indiana, there are four threads of the state’s history that must be addressed: its deep association with the Ku Klux Klan (KKK), the state’s last recorded lynching that transpired in Marion in 1930, the lasting effects of sundown communities, and practice of redlining in urban areas such as Indianapolis. The tapestry woven from these threads provides the backdrop to our explanation of contemporary racial division and segregation in central Indiana and the greater Indianapolis metro area. To orient the reader to the racial climate in central Indiana, this paper will combine references to literature with autoethnographic notes and personal reflections about the spaces in which we worked. It is important to orient the reader to the prevalence of racism in Indiana’s past and present because it informs the larger cultural context influencing the norms within which adult educators work. We will start by discussing the impact of the KKK and lynching on Indiana’s history and culture. Next, we will introduce the reader to the concept of the Midwestern sundown town and the historical practice of redlining.

Lynching and the Klan in Indiana History

In the 1920s, Indiana had the densest Klan membership of any state in the union with an estimated membership ranging between 20% and 30% among eligible whites (Carr, 2006; Moore, 1991). Membership represented a cross-section of the white protestant male population of the state and included most of the state’s political elite. Members included sheriffs, judges, mayors, prosecutors, and school board officials. Additionally, for most of the 1920s, the Klan controlled the governor’s office, state senate, and the house. Many women and children participated as members of parallel women’s groups that supported Klan activity (Carr, 2006; Moore, 1991).

In the 1920s, Klan Grand Wizard D.C. Stephenson exerted a massive influence on state politics and on the Klan nationwide, but he was eventually discredited by a rape/murder scandal at the height of his power. His fall led the majority of the state’s Klan members to leave the organization. Carr (2006), however, argued that it is dangerous to associate exodus from the Klan as evidence of changed opinions regarding race and exclusion of others. It merely reflects a loss of faith in the organization and its leader.

Marion, Indiana, was the site of one of America’s most well-known lynchings on August 7, 1930. In this act of racial terror, a group of between 25 and 50 active white participants murdered two Black men while between 10,000 and 15,000 people enjoyed the carnival-like atmosphere surrounding the event. Eyewitnesses reported that the two Black men accused of raping a white woman were killed and mutilated even before the nooses were tied around their necks and their corpses were hung. Many in the town sought souvenirs from the event, including strips of clothes ripped off the deceased men’s backs and short segments of rope cut from the nooses used in the hangings (Carr, 2006). No one was ever arrested or tried in connection with the crime. In her work about the legacy of the hanging in Marion and surrounding Indiana communities, Carr (2006) noted the continued prevalence of the Klan, skinheads, and other hardcore white supremacist groups in Indiana. She also explained that some who remember the lynching continue to brag about it in circles where they feel safe to do so. Carr also noted that Marion is not an atypical central Indiana town, and it does not appear to be any more racist than similar towns in the region. It is just one example of the many sundown communities in the Midwest where Black people and others were made to feel unsafe and unwelcome. Additionally, she explained that many in younger generations are blind to the racist history of the region or even their own families. She cited herself as an example by relating a personal narrative about finding her grandfather’s KKK membership card.
Sundown Communities

The homogeneity of most Hoosier communities, many of which have only gotten whiter since the high point of the Indiana Klan, serves to protect the traditions, history, and culture of that period. While Indiana was not a slave state, it should be remembered that many whites opposed slavery in Indiana, not because they were opposed to whites holding Black people as chattel but rather because they did not want Black people entering the state at all or because they feared economic competition from slave labor. After the Civil War, many of the Black people who had previously lived in Indiana were expelled as more and more Hoosier communities became sundown towns (Loewen, 2005).

Loewen (2005) defined “sundown communities” as communities that are all-white or majority-white and actively discouraged Black people and other minority groups from residing in their town, city, or suburb. Exclusion could be enforced through violence, including lynching in the early 20th century, mob violence and threats in the middle 20th century, community-wide obstruction of investigations of white on Black violence as recently as the 1990s, and police harassment and unequal enforcement of laws into the present day. Other non-physically violent techniques such as restrictive covenants, thinly veiled threats, careful cultivation of racist reputations, semi-sanctioned schoolyard bullying of minority children, posting of signs demanding that all Black people be out of the town by sundown, extra-legal ordinances enforced by police and local businesses, and a host of other measures were or are used to exclude Black people and other minorities from sundown towns (Loewen, 2005). The name “sundown town” is derived from the aforementioned signs, some of which remained posted into the 1970s, that contained variations on phrases like “whites only after sundown” or “Nigger, Don’t Let The Sun Set on You in This County” (Loewen, 2005, p. 195).

In the present era, sundown towns continue to rely on their reputations to exclude Black people and reinforce them by taunting Black athletes who enter the town to compete in high school athletics, supporting police departments with differential arrest rates that target minorities, using questionable real-estate practices, and socially shunning outsiders. Indirect methods of discouraging outsiders from entering the area include refusing to maintain public roads and maintaining private drives for residents only, making areas difficult to navigate through such tactics as refusing to post street signs and refusing to give directions to strangers, restricting access to parks and other public spaces to residents of the county, and refusing to zone areas for low-income or government-assisted housing. Hiring practices are also used to keep outsiders away. Some of these are formal, such as only allowing residents of the municipality to apply for jobs in the fire department, police force, or local civil service. Others are informal, such as giving preference to students from the local high school when filling customer service positions rather than giving jobs to outsiders.

Black people are not the only group who have faced exclusion from sundown communities. To varying degrees, other people groups such as Jews, American Indians, Asians, religious minorities, immigrants, lower-class whites, hippies, individuals who are considered cultural deviants, homosexuals, and “swarthy whites” have also faced hostility when entering these areas (Loewen, 2005). Loewen (2005) estimated that more than half of Indiana towns either are or at one time were sundown communities. Carr (2006) explained that her interest in writing about Marion, Indiana, stemmed from fond childhood memories of visiting her grandparents in this historic town. While she had long been aware that a lynching had taken place in the town, it was not typically discussed around her. It was not until she found her grandfather’s Klan membership card that she questioned the supposed quaintness of the community’s history. She questioned the quietness or apathy with which many white Indiana residents related to their own communities’ history of racism and wondered if this behavior is not “another hood to wear” (Carr, 2006, p. 78) that perpetuates racism by failing to confront it. Carr argued that the ignorance and apathy among moderate and liberal
whites are exploited by white supremacists who work tirelessly in central Indiana to advance their aims and who are paying attention when other whites are not.

**Black Spaces Within The City Of Indianapolis**

By the 1930s, a significant Black population called Indianapolis home. As in much of the country, in urban areas white and Black spaces were created through government interventions at federal, state and local levels including inequitable access to mortgage subsidies or outright barring of Black people from buying homes or acquiring mortgages in restricted areas (Rothstein, 2018). Local real-estate and banking practices complimented governmental initiatives. One of the dominant agencies engaged in this work in the 1930s and 1940s was the homeowners loan corporation (HOLC). This organization restructured elements of the home mortgage market while working to provide guidance and education to people involved in real estate transactions. Its maps infamously used red ink to shade areas described as being “infiltrated” or “occupied” by “Negros” and labeling them as “Hazardous.” Map 1 depicts a HOLC rendering of Indianapolis (Map 1, courtesy of Nelson, Winling, Marciano, Connolly, et al., Accessed April 20, 2019). The HOLC’s negative depictions of Black neighborhoods contributed to stagnating or declining housing values for Black homeowners and combined with other racist practices contributed to turning these areas into economically impoverished Black spaces that most whites in the area continue to regard as dangerous ghettos.

The search for employment in the North during the Depression and Second World War drew many Black people to the North in events known as the Great Migration. The resulting increase in the Indianapolis population strained established Black neighborhoods. Contrary to popular white supremacist opinions that assume that cultural or moral deficiencies among Black people caused the economic hardships in these communities, Black communities decline resulted from the unfair landlord tactics, overcrowding due to limitations placed on where Black people could live, and the unavailability of homes that met reasonable living conditions (Pierce, 2005). This reflected a nation-wide trend where authorities created slum-like conditions in formally respectable Black neighborhoods (Rothstein, 2018). In such efforts, forced overcrowding led to higher rates of double occupancy and artificially inflated housing costs in Black areas, which left residents with less disposable income to maintain properties. Additionally, municipalities frequently created hardship in Black areas by taxing residents at proportionally higher rates compared to white areas, and by enforcing zoning restrictions in ways that located disproportionate numbers of polluting industries, strip clubs, and liquor stores in or near Black areas. According to Mullins (2006), such marginalizing practices make racism “seem appropriate or at least utterly distant from the present” (p. 70). When these histories go unmentioned or are sanitized, it hides the enormous impact that race-based practices have played in carrying out white supremacy. For example, in Indianapolis, many white families facilitated the detrimental practice of blockbusting (Capps, 2015) by moving out of the Loving Neighborhood (pseudonym) toward the greener pastures of more affluent suburbs in the city. According to Capps (2015), blockbusting is the racist practice used by whites in real estate to prevent marginalized communities from renting or purchasing property in particular neighborhoods. Through the creation of fear, real estate agents entice whites to sell their homes at a loss and then hike the price at above-market prices to sell to Black people. This occurred right after Black people were allowed into restricted and segregated areas of the neighborhood. This forced more rental properties for the area and emptied homes which further contributed to the decline of the Loving Neighborhood (The Polis Center, 2001).

Later in this paper, the discussion of Black and cosmopolitan spaces explores contemporary white socialization into fear of these Black areas, and cross-racial social interactions of adult educators who navigated redline areas in Map 1.
Critical Race Spatial Analysis
Critical race spatial analysis (CRSA) seeks to expand interrogations of the historical and social constructions of race and racism by foregrounding spatial dimensions of injustice. This work builds on a tradition of critiquing the ideological and racialized implications of space that date back to Du Bois (1903/2017) and embraces Soja’s (2009, 2010) concept of spatial justice. Soja argues for geographers to move away from seeing space as a “container or stage of human activity or merely the physical dimensions of fixed form, to an active force shaping human life” (p. 2) and promotes the notion that physical and social aspects of space shape one another in a socio-spatial dialectic. Pratt (1991) has similarly encouraged anthropologists to move away from neutral representations of space and to pay attention to the ways the cultures meet, share, and clash in different spaces. Work in this tradition emphasizes the asymmetry of power relations in spaces whose history have been shaped by slavery, colonialism, or other oppressive forces. CRSA applies these critical approaches to the study of space in educational contexts by advancing scholarship dedicated to “foregrounding the color-line, underscoring the relationship among race, racism, history, and space” and “challenging race-neutral representations of space” (Vélez & Solórzano, 2017, Kindle location 502) while exposing and resisting oppressive spaces instantiated by white supremacy.

Educational researchers have used this method to explore ideological implications of mapping (Annamma, 2017), classroom spaces (Blaisdell, 2017), economic exclusion (Hidalgo, 2017), redlining (Solorzano, 2017), and school reform (Waitoller & Radinsky, 2017), and have called for this method’s application to other areas of education. Our paper applies CRSA to adult education by exploring racialized histories and current perceptions of geographical spaces that surround adult learning centers.

CRSA embraces a multiscale approach to understanding space which recognizes the connection between global, regional, and local constructions of space (Vélez & Solórzano, 2017). This paper uses historical literature to provide the Midwestern regional context before employing autoethnography and ethnographic mapping (Murchison, 2010) to craft cartographic narratives (Knigge & Cope, 2006) that animate lived experiences within local spaces where adult educators work. Qualitative mapping is a departure from much of the CRSA literature which focuses on the lived experiences of students. This paper focuses on the experiences of adult educators as they navigate racialized spaces surrounding their workplaces.

Autoethnography

Narrative researchers use autoethnography to relate personal accounts from the perspective of lived experience (Creswell, 2013) allowing everyday phenomena to contribute to the development of theory (Grenier, 2015). Many researchers have applied this method to the study of adult education. These include research relating to teaching undergraduate organizational diversity courses (Collins, 2015), the effect of parenthood on academic workplaces (Riad, 2007), feminist resistance to oppressive forms of masculinity in the workplace (Haynes, 2013; Katila & Meriläinen, 2002), coping with vicarious trauma in adult education (Nikischer, 2019, and the deployment of bigoted humor in white male-dominated workplaces (Bohonos, 2019b).

While autoethnography is often conceived of as an individual exercise, research teams have demonstrated the value of combining perspectives on lived experiences through collaborative forms of autoethnography (Bohonos & Otchere, 2018; Ellison & Langhout, 2016; Grenier & Collins, 2016; Katila & Meriläinen, 2002). Ellison and Langhout (2016) argue for the particular insights coauthored autoethnographies can
provide when addressing whiteness and racisms. Following their approach, this paper presents autoethnographic writings of each of the coauthors to allow for more nuanced depictions of social spaces they shared. In this paper, we use multi-positional autoethnography (Bohonos & Otchere, 2017) which is the practice of integrating reflexive writing from researchers with diverging positionalities. This approach allows us to combine Black and white men’s perspectives on how white supremacy affects adult education spaces.

Procedures for Study

Bohonos (2020; 2019b) originally collected data that forms the empirical foundation of this paper to be background information for a study about workplace racism in central Indiana. The original purpose was to provide readers of this study with an introduction to the social, historical, and spatial dimensions of Indiana’s culture that would facilitate a deep understanding of workplace racism in the region. Early readers of that study suggested these representations of space would be better utilized if conceived of as data related to the socio-spatial environment of the region, rather than as simple background. Following this advice, Bohonos began exploring the literature around Spatial Justice (Soja, 2008), CRSA (Vélez & Solórzano, 2017) and Contact Zones (Pratt, 1991) and reconceptualizing his writing about space in more analytical terms. Serendipitous discussions with the Duff led to the realization that his years of ethnographic work in the same region would allow him to contribute additional layers of both narrative data and analysis. So, data was collected in two stages. In stage one, the Bohonos wrote detailed accounts related to spatial dimensions of racism in central Indiana. In stage two, the Duff contributed narrative data that complimented or complicated Bohonos’ original representations of the space. Both authors wrote autoethnographically regarding their personal experiences with racialized spaces which were based on either headnotes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011) or personal journals. Excerpts from the Bohonos’ writing were purposefully selected from a larger body of autoethnographic journals to give readers a visceral feel for racialized dynamics related to space in central Indiana. The Duff’s autoethnographic accounts were written as a response to and engagement with the Bohonos’ outline and draft manuscript. Owing to the authors' different positionalities, this allowed for elements of interracial dialogue to develop in the text which created spaces for both Black and white perceptions of spaces in central Indiana to form complementary evidentiary bases.

EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS

The autoethnographic analysis below presents accounts related to the racialization of space and its effect on adult education. The first describes ways in which communities surrounding adult education centers can constitute white spaces and, in the process, create hostile work environments for Black adult educators. The second explores the socialization which pushed a white adult educator towards attitudes of deficit and fear regarding predominantly Black residential communities. The third explores the possibility that adult education praxis can create spaces for cosmopolitan spaces of integration and attending difficulties.

White Spaces: Relocating an Adult Education Center to a Suspected Sundown Town

In this section, we use CRSA to explore the role that white supremacy plays in shaping rural and small urban spaces typically perceived as “safe” by white Americans. It highlights how race and space mutually constitute each other (Delaney, 2002; Vélez & Solórzano, 2017) with white-dominated spaces shaping the
expression of bigotry and the social actions of the dominant racial group marking locations as white (Anderson, 2015; Kobayashi & Peak, 2000). The following autoethnographic excerpts demonstrate how micro- and macroaggressions combine with historical legacies and community reputations to create spaces that are hostile to African American adult educators who enter them.

Autoethnography. In his online database of suspected sundown towns, Loewen (2016) listed 249 in Indiana alone. However, I consider Loewen’s list incomplete. An example of one town left off his list is Knightsville (pseudonym). The following autoethnographic writing explains how Knightsville intersected with my work at an adult education center that bussed many learners of color to our residential facility where they took GED classes and the hostility the community-directed toward Black people. This center served a racially diverse group of learners from across the state and had originally been located on a military base outside of Indianapolis where students would sleep in old barracks at night while taking classes during the day.

When it was announced that a residential GED center I worked for would be relocating to Knightsville, it kicked off a fury of discussion among Black employees who were aware of the city’s reputation and historic connection to white supremacy. Some believed the past was in the past, others argued that the rural area we had been working in was already pretty racist and didn’t expect things to be much worse in Knightsville, and others immediately began applying for new jobs out of fear. Most of the Black employees ultimately made the move with the organization. When we arrived, our center, which served large numbers of minority clients, was not greeted kindly by most of the residents. Conversations with community members revealed that many assumed that students taking GED classes through our organization were convicts. One way that Knightsville residents made our Black employees feel unwelcome was by refusing to give directions to local establishments.

In one incident that I witnessed, a Black man stopped at the local gas station to ask for directions to a diner. The two cashiers as well as several customers all insisted that there was no diner in town. When I realized what had just happened, I followed him out to his car to explain that he was only a block from the local diner. And that everyone in town knew where it was. He looked nervous and apprehensive. I tried to put him at ease by engaging in a little small talk, and found out that he was in town interviewing for a job with my organization. I wished him luck, and we parted ways. (Bohonos)

While the effort to make this man feel uncomfortable and unwelcome was rather subtle, other examples are much more lurid.

One day, shortly after the move to Knightsville, a group of coworkers and I went for lunch at the town’s only diner. Heads turned when I walked in accompanied by six or eight Black coworkers. We ordered and ate our lunch. When the meal was finished, I got up to go to the restroom. When I returned to the table, my coworkers told me we had to leave and nervously rushed out of the restaurant. After we left, one of my coworkers explained that a 20-something-year-old white man wearing camo and chains had walked into the restaurant, sat down at my vacated seat, and asked if he could serenade the table with a song he wrote. My coworkers could not remember the verses, but the chorus was, “All dogs go to heaven, but all niggers go to hell.” (Bohonos)
Analysis. Anderson (2015) argued that whites often experience cognitive dissidence when they encounter Black bodies in white spaces leading to a variety of actions that work to put them “in their place.” This can include the use of racial slurs, admonitions to “go home” (Anderson, 2015), and refusing to give directions (Loewen, 2005). Many Black people consider microaggressive sanctions for entering white spaces as the cost of doing business essential to their lives, but when caught off guard, the overt enforcements can be disorienting and highly distressing. The proceeding excerpts demonstrate that both subtle and overt forms of discrimination affected Black employees of this education center. Their need to traverse and navigate hostile white spaces that surrounded our workplace could have only caused pain and apprehension during their commutes and on their lunch breaks.

Black Spaces and White Socialization into Fear

CRSA uses qualitative data to connect everyday experiences with broad social phenomena, infuse maps with nuanced meanings, and can explore contemporary effects of historical redlining practices on education (Vélez & Solórzano, 2017). The following section uses autoethnography and map editing to explore how contemporary whites work to socialize each other into fears regarding Black spaces in ways white liberals often prefer to imagine as only occurring in the historical past. This analysis also compares contemporary white fears of certain urban neighborhoods, represented in hand-drawn edits to Google maps, to contemporary maps of racial segregation. This process produces a cartographic narrative (Knigge & Cope, 2006) which connects the autoethnographer’s lived experiences to contemporary and historical maps.

Autoethnography. Previous to starting my career in adult education, I worked in an almost exclusively white organization, which provided services in mostly white residential areas but occasionally served more diverse areas in the city of Indianapolis. My workmates and other whites instilled in me a mental map of which areas of Indianapolis were dangerous and should generally not be visited by whites. This mental map was developed based on admonitions from white coworkers who would say things like, “What the hell were you doing there, trying to get killed?” after I had mentioned that I had visited some friends who lived on 42nd Street and N. Spinder Avenue. Or when former colleagues would hear that I bought a house near 28th and Outlong (pseudonyms) and asked if I was sure the area was safe for white people. My mental map was also developed through casual references to things like high crime rates and low-quality schools. To give the reader a general feel for where the boundaries of perceived safety are among whites, we produced map 2 by downloading a Google Map of Indianapolis and using Microsoft Paint to blackout areas of the map that the Bohonos was taught to avoid. We used solid black shading to indicate areas that whites regarded as highly dangerous and to be avoided at all costs. The gray areas were still considered sketchy by many whites, especially upper-class whites. Working-class whites were more likely to speak fondly of childhood memories in the gray areas while representing them as currently being “in decline.” Construction of these ethnographic maps follows the recommendation of Murchison (2010) that maps can be used to show human movement (or in this case, aversion to movement) and demonstrate how people conceptualize space.
Map 2. After drawing this map, we were sure that any long-time resident of Indianapolis would see the racial implication of the shaded areas. But in order to make these implications clear to outsiders, we decided to include map 3 and map 4. Map 3 was created as part of a University of Wisconsin project to raise awareness about residential segregation in large U.S. cities (Maps of the African American and white Populations in the Indianapolis, IN MSA, 2002). In this map, blacked-out areas represent spaces that are 80% or more Black, while red spaces are at least 20% Black. All other spaces are less than 20% Black. Map 3 is a cropping of map 2 to bring it into roughly the same viewing area as map 1. By comparing our freehand representation of areas generally regarded as dangerous by whites to the statistical representations from the University of Wisconsin, it is easy to see that the 80% Black areas of Indianapolis were all considered dangerous and that many of the areas with 20% Black residents or more were also regarded as dangerous. Similarly, comparisons of Maps 2-4 to Map 1 clearly shows the contemporary effects of historical redlining practices.
Map 1. Racial Mix of Block Groups in the Indianapolis, IN MSA

Map 1. Racial Mix of Block Groups in the Indianapolis, IN MSA. IN Maps of the African American and White Populations in the Indianapolis, IN MSA, Employment and Training Institute, School of Continuing Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (2002).

The official legend for map 3 designates it as a map of racial mixing in Indianapolis. To Bohonos, this map represents the opposite. Living and working in the 80% white areas, he learned that many of the red areas and all the black areas were to be driven over, not stopped in, and ideally not thought about. Residents of Black areas were treated as if they did not exist or at least as if they should not matter to the lives of whites. In the rare times when whites planned trips into Black areas, their imaginations transformed residents of these areas into objects of fear and danger.

Generally, white residents of the white areas only entered Black areas a few times a year (or less) to visit certain attractions such as the State Fair Grounds or a Museum. Visits to attractions in Black areas were often accompanied by speeches about the “danger” or “seediness” of the area, and warnings about the importance of sticking together, keeping the car doors locked, not wandering off, and moving directly from the parking lot to the attraction without delay or deviation. (Bohonos)

When whites visit these neighborhoods to do work related to adult education, they often bring their fear and stereotypes with them in ways that undermine their credibility. The following reflection captures Duff’s observations of white visitors to poor prominently POC areas.

What I noticed about many of my white colleagues is how they rarely attend evening and weekend events in the Loving Neighborhood. When they do, I find it humorous at times watching them engage this foreign world, and how surprised they seem to be when they realize that there are white residents who live in the neighborhood. I sometimes wonder about their motives during the occasions when they do attend these meetings and hurry to leave instead of hanging around afterward to try and connect with and learn about the residents and their community. (Duff)

Analysis. The discussion of the Bohonos’ socialization into fear of Black neighborhoods and the autoethnographic mapping project shows the continued legacy of attitudes developed in the Jim Crow era. As the majority of professional adult educators are white, such fears and prejudice inevitably affect adult education efforts. The effect may be especially poignant when white adult educators enter spaces, they have been socialized into seeing as “ghetto,” dangerous, and otherwise deficit. In addition, Anderson (2015) argues that Black people are often seen as taking the ghetto with them into white spaces; such prejudice undoubtedly shows up when Black learners seek services in white spaces. The observations of Duff underscore the importance of training aimed at defusing stereotypes and developing community engagement skills for adult education before they seek to partner alongside a community, particularly if the
residents represent a marginalized population. Unfortunately, white privilege, power, and supremacy drive many adult educators’ assumptions that they and other community partners already know what they need to know to help the neighborhood. This disposition serves as a hindrance to their adult education efforts and further oppresses the community they claim to serve. When white “allies” refuse to invest time in Black communities they wish to “help,” they reflect a white liberal tradition that pervaded reconstruction, Jim Crow and civil rights era educational efforts (Anderson, 1998; Charron, 2009). Given that Woodson (1933) clearly warned whites against such behavior nearly 100 years ago, these oppressive iterations of well-intentioned liberalism provoke frustration in community members and others who take the time to learn the lessons of history.

Cosmopolitan Spaces of Integration: Potential and Thwarting

Anderson (2015) argued that cosmopolitan spaces where people mix amicably across racial lines provide venues for integration. When this type of race mixing breaks down stereotypes and fosters interracial collaborations, communities have a reason for optimism regarding racial progress in their areas. Cosmopolitan spaces can include schools, parks, farmers' markets and virtually any other places where people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds can find common cause. In this paper’s final autoethnographic episode, the Duff describes how problematic white behaviors undermine adult educators' attempts to foster such cosmopolitan spaces.

Autoethnography. The following account describes events during and after a community meeting in the Loving Neighborhood that was previously predominantly white, but has gradually shifted towards greater diversity. This area has been the target of many revitalization campaigns over the years. For example, the Building Better Neighborhoods programs, developed by then-mayor Stephen Goldsmith, invested $190,000.00 into the community in the form of a planning grant where community leaders would be trained, and a social service program would be developed. A year later, Operation Weed and Seed, which included a 16.3 million dollar investment was enacted to help diminish the increasing crime in the community and support efforts of economic development (Polis Center, 2001). To date, almost thirty years later, almost no evidence of either program exists within the Loving Neighborhood. Residents could benefit from adult education that would inform them about ways to build capacity within their community and build on their assets and interests (Simpson, Wood, & Daws, 2003) so that they can more effectively advocate for and develop sustainable programs for community development that do not depend on external partners (Chaskin, 2001). Efforts to encourage a mindset of capacity building have been met with great resistance by many of the residents, external partners, and stakeholders who still seem to believe that projects conceived by outsiders and the money that comes with them are the most effective means for improving the neighborhood’s quality of life.

Loving is currently one of the more racially integrated areas of the city with a population that is about 1/3 Black, 1/3 white, and 1/3 Latinx (Green & Gooden, 2014). This demographic mixing suggests the possibility that adult education efforts could develop cosmopolitan spaces of integration. However, the following account demonstrates how white privilege and white supremacy can undermine such efforts turning potentially egalitarian spaces into spaces of racial marginalization and oppression.

My goal as an adult educator in this community has been less of encouraging adults to participate in traditional programs such as workforce development and degree-granting opportunities, and more on informing them of the inequities that have historically,
currently, and pervasively contributed to their marginalization. I adopted this approach when I realized early on that residents and business owners were facing a threat to their community at a fundamental level that needed to be addressed. This neighborhood experienced a regular cycle of outsiders pouring money into the community (Polis Center, 2001) assuming approaches based on their preconceived notions would spur on economic development and neighborhood revitalization. Instead, this community was left with little if any evidence that money had been invested. I quickly began to realize that this “duping” and “hoodwinking” consistently occurred because many of the people who lived and worked in this community were unaware of systemic cycles of oppression which contributed to the blight in their communities for decades.

In addition to the external challenges in this neighborhood, internal challenges also existed which hindered neighborhood progress. One example of this occurred in a particular neighborhood meeting where an intense conversation was brewing, and an adult Black male resident attempted to speak three times. After about the fourth attempt to make his claim, the gentleman, who is very soft-spoken, decided to voice his frustration about being cut off whenever he was given the floor. It is important to note that as this gentleman was sharing, he never raised his voice. He simply stated his concerns about being interrupted on this particular evening every time he shared his thoughts. The matter of his concern became more intense when he pointed out the person who continually chopped his words. Despite the fact that this woman was white, immediately denied the accusation, and became incensed, the gentleman stood his ground. Finally, as a last-ditch effort and in the traditional spirit of white fragility (DiAngelo, 2018), the white woman and her fellow community resident, who was also a white woman, left the meeting. As this conversation diverted the meeting into a discussion on respecting others, I pointed out to the group that encounters such as what this gentleman experienced is what POC face on an ongoing, daily basis.

Although the group listened and presented understanding dispositions, an email that followed the next day generated by the secretary who is also a white woman made it clear that there was a lack of understanding of the undergirded reality of racism. The email was couched as a list of rules about respect during neighborhood meetings, but read as an attempt to insulate whites from uncomfortable discussions about race while diminishing the voices of Black participants. What was needed was a reckoning with racism, but the ‘rules’ sent in this email virtually ensured that no such discourse would occur. Thus, adult education was hindered as two neighbors left when they were confronted about their role in racism and when the group perceived the issues as a lack of respect as opposed to considering that the meeting privileged whites and marginalized nonwhites. (Duff)

**Analysis.** This narration demonstrates several ways that various dimensions of racism can disrupt the efforts of organizers and adult educators to instantiate spaces of integration. These included repeated racial microaggression, defensive emotional displays intended to mute conversations about racism, and an inequitable deployment of rules to maintain white authority.

Racial microaggressions frequently pervade formal meetings spaces and serve to marginalize POC (Brookfield, 2014). In the example provided, a white woman enacted microaggressions (Solorzano, 2000) by repeatedly interrupting a Black community member. Left unchecked, this behavior could limit or even silence the voices of Black participants thus undermining any potential to cultivate spaces of integration. Additionally, traditional white discourses of addressing racism framed in phrases such as “respecting one another” and “culturally insensitive behaviors” were used in an email by a white woman with the attempt to thwart future incidents from occurring. Instead of educating the white residents about the reality of racism
in this community space, an email was instead sent out which helped them to feel comfortable. This allowed whites to side-step an opportunity to reflect on their privilege and their potential to be complicit in marginalizing acts (Fanon, 1963).

Defensive emotional displays are a frequent tactic employed by whites when they become uncomfortable with discourse about racism (DiAngelo, 2018; Giles, 2010; Matias, 2016). By crying or making other theatrical emotional displays they effectively draw attention away from POC who are attempting to engage them with dialogue. In this case, the white woman engaged this strategy but was thwarted by the Black man’s gentle persistence. The emotional fragility demonstrated by this woman—as highlighted by her dramatic exit from the meeting—sought to undercut a necessary discussion about racism. To foster spaces of integration, adult educators and other activists must be prepared to confront invocations of white privilege and educate participants about diverse ways racism can enter into integrated spaces.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR ADULT EDUCATION PRACTICE AND RESEARCH**

Adult educators need to carefully consider the spaces in which their workplaces are located and the spaces created while they work. To be effective in their roles, they need to study local and regional histories while paying special attention to patterns of oppression and marginalization that affect communities they aspire to serve.

Given the frequency with which federal agencies such as the Department of Labor (DOL) or the Military sponsor educational programs housed in residential facilities in white-dominated rural areas like Knightsville, future research should explore the effect of living in white spaces on residential learners of color who are often bused to these facilities from inner-city areas.

When operating learning centers in Black spaces, adult educators should maintain awareness of the biases community outsiders may bring with them, and develop strategies to disrupt negative dominant discourses about the area. Adult educators should also strive to foster spaces of integration while being mindful that such efforts can be derailed by racism and are often coopted by the force of gentrification (Anderson, 2015).

The conceptual division of space into Black, white, and cosmopolitan, while useful for some forms of research, needs to be expanded to better account for the experiences of other POC. In certain locations, particularly within with Midwest and old South, the historical significance of Black-white racial segregation will require research to extend beyond an understanding of the binary. This may be much less the case in locations within regions such as the Southwest and West Coast whose racial/ethnic segregation hinged more strongly on divisions between white and Latinx or Asian groups. In either case, continued demographic shifts will require researchers to trouble the Black-white binary while grappling with its continued effect on the way racism is structured and conceived in the United States. One effective strategy for troubling the binary will be for researchers to cultivate deep understandings of their local histories and cultures of discrimination, and to explain to readers how the local situation informs the construction of racialized spaces at the micro- and meso- levels. Such locally situated research on race and racism will allow for cross-regional and cross-national comparisons of racism, which can in turn lead to more effective organization and advocacy among geographically separated people who labor against oppressive and marginalizing conditions.
Future Research for Human Resource Development

As a subfield of adult education which has a legacy of focusing on learning-related employment and situated in traditional corporate, governmental, and nonprofit environments, human resource development (HRD) needs to further explore how white spaces affect people’s experiences at work. Given that most employers in America are white enough to constitute white spaces regardless of location, the movement of jobs to suburban white spaces, and the development of research, technology, and innovations “parks” which tend to be constituted as white spaces, Black people and other POC may not have equal access to employment. The cultivation of cosmopolitan spaces of integration (Anderson, 2015), therefore, should be considered a key objective of efforts to combat inequities in employment. Future research should consider how organizational norms and the general ordering of our society compels Black people to enter or traverse hostile spaces to earn a paycheck, it is likely that continued prevalence of occupational white spaces will contribute to the continued tilting of the labor market in favor of whites (Bohonos, 2020). Research should also include assessments of how thoroughly social justice issues, including racism, are being taught in HRD training programs (Bohonos, Otchere, & Pak, 2019).

CONCLUSIONS

From central Indiana’s history of racial violence to contemporary forms of exclusion and segregation, racism permeates every aspect of our culture. With patterns of racial division so deeply ingrained into our daily lives, it is a near inevitability that such patterns would evidence themselves in all workplaces, including adult education. Adult educators need to develop strategies for successfully navigating white and Black spaces while working to foster integration in cosmopolitan spaces. Part of this strategy should include a willingness of white adult educators to recognize and decenter their privilege in a way that challenges white supremacy in all spaces they encounter. This includes the development of a heightened sensitivity towards and a willingness to address microaggressions and other forms of racism that POC face on an ongoing basis.
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Intergroup dialogue is one of the andragogical strategies used to mediate differences in cultural realities and perspectives among variable cultural groups (Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, Cytron-Walker, 2007). The dialogue consists of an exploration of a given topic using knowledge from scholarly resources, shared individual experiences and perspectives, and queries for clarification and understanding. Facilitators of discussions on race, white privilege, and institutional racism often utilize intergroup dialogue. This work describes such an experience.

At the beginning of fall 2018, faculty, staff, and students, at a predominantly white midwestern university, embarked upon a reading group, using Robin DiAngelo’s (2016) *What Does it Mean to Be White? Developing White Racial Literacy*. The authors represent a subset of those participating in two separate reading groups. A synergy emerged as the discussion of the book was interwoven with cultural identity awareness activities and the sharing of perspectives on key themes. This article describes this year-long journey autobiographical inquiry by the authors who participated.

**METHOD**

In order to better understand our experience, we chose *currere*, a method of curriculum inquiry which employs critical reflection and autobiographical inquiry to investigate and make meaning of one’s own lived curriculum within social, political, and educational structures (Grumet, 1976) and determines how to move forward with this new understanding (Pinar, 2004). *Currere* is often described as a four-phase process: the ‘regressive’ phase in which one returns to the past and relives the experience by “observ[ing]
oneself in the past” (Pinar, 1975) to develop an internal dialogue with the former self (Baszile, 2017); the ‘progressive’ wherein one imagines future possibilities; the ‘analytic’ in which one reconciles past experiences and future possibilities; and, the ‘synthetic’ wherein one determines how new understandings will be lived and expressed. While described linearly above, *currere* itself is not necessarily a linear process because the process of *currere* is dynamic and the phases themselves may become inextricably interwoven. This is especially true given the nature of this three-way *currere*, in which the authors embarked on their individual *currere* journey and came together to share and reflect, creating a collective point of understanding. While *currere* often is an individual journey, recent articles showcase the potential of duo-*currere* (i.e., Porter & Gallagher, 2017; Wallace & Byers, 2018), which we have adapted for three authors—i.e., trio-*currere*. To distinguish between our voices, we have noted Rogers, Cain, and Messineo.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK – THE CYCLE OF OPPRESSION**

An overarching theme emerged in the authors’ reflections: the relevance of the cycle of oppression within our own experiences. In the book, DiAngelo (2016) presents her version of this cycle graphically and textually. The authors were unable to locate the originator of the concept as it is widely used and adapted, but found earlier variations by social justice scholars, including the cycle of socialization (Harro, 2000a, p. 15). Harro posits that we are all born into a culture of institutional oppression with the institutional sanctions to maintain the status quo. Depending upon which side of the cultural divide we are, the result is unearned privilege (McIntosh, 1990) or unearned institutional oppression. Harro (2000b) subsequently developed the cycle of liberation to describe the mental, physical, and psychological processes and actions leading to efforts of systemic change. She refers to this process as critical transformation, which is the impetus that is needed to move beyond indifference or acceptance of the status quo to active participation in social action/justice (Harro, 2000b).

DiAngelo’s version of the cycle includes: the generation of misinformation, social acceptance of the mistreatment of the minoritized group, internalized oppression, internalized dominance, perpetuation and enforcement by institutions, justification for further mistreatment. The result of this cycle is systematic mistreatment of a minoritized group. We came to learn about how each of our colleagues experienced the cycle in their daily lives. Three themes from the cycle emerged from our reflection and analysis: *internalized oppression, internalized dominance, perpetuation and enforcement by institutions*.

*Internalized oppression* is the perception that the norms, customs, characteristics typically attributed to the majority culture are of higher value and should be emulated instead of those of your minoritized culture (Brookfield, 2019; Jones, 2000; Watts-Jones, 2002). It is the attempt to assimilate, figuratively or literally. *Internalized dominance* is the perception in the majority culture that the norms, customs, characteristics typically attributed to them are the standard by which all should adhere (Tappan, 2006). This involves seeing others, not as they are, but through the majority culture’s lens. *Perpetuation and enforcement by institutions* occur as policies and systems are developed, implemented, and enforced from the majority cultural lens (Freire, 1970; DiAngelo, 2016; Tappan, 2006).

We, the authors, recognize that our intersectional identities (Crenshaw, 1989) and positions affect not only the meaning we make of the events we experienced, but also the very selection of the experiences we share. This creates an opportunity for a counter-narrative, or counter-storytelling, wherein the story of an individual, often from a non-dominant group, serves to counter the accepted objectivity of the dominant
narrative and reveal the deficit thinking undergirding the prevailing dominant discourse (Clark, Fasching-Varner, & Brimhall-Vargas, 2012). As such, we seek to highlight the inherent conflict in our experiences. Our aim is not debate; rather we seek to develop an appreciation of one another’s lived experiences for transformative growth.

POSITIONALITY STATEMENT

To help the reader engage with the following *currere* fragments, we offer positionality statements for the three authors. During the reading group experience, Rodgers was a PhD candidate in Educational Studies. She identifies as a cis-gender, white female who grew up in a working class neighborhood. She has 16 years of experience as an educator in secondary and postsecondary education. Prior to beginning her PhD studies, she taught in a Title I high school in the Bronx and was the recipient of multiple international teacher fellowships. Within higher education, she has taught preservice teachers enrolled in professional education courses. These experiences have greatly influenced her understanding of the cycle of oppression.

Cain is an African American female associate professor of practice, adult and community education. She has over 22 years of experience at predominantly white institutions (PWIs), ranging from adjunct to contract faculty positions and formerly, program administrator. Her entry into the academy occurred after having a highly successful information technology career. She has served nine years in her current position. She has over 20 years of experience in facilitating intergroup racial dialogues. Cain identifies as working class, in contrast to the majority of her peers who identify as middle class. Her minoritized status is race (African American), gender (female), age (later in life entry into the academy), and socio-economic status (working class).

Messineo is a professor of sociology. She identifies as a U.S. born, cis-gender white female, first generation college attendee, and has over 25 years higher education experience. She participates in grassroots antipoverty, and antiracism community-based learning with her students and conducts implicit bias training. At the time of the intergroup dialogue she was serving as the campus’ interim associate vice president for diversity. In this role, Messineo saw first-hand the extreme suffering that the cycle of oppression creates, and she struggled against the inertia that keeps the cycle in place.

THE BEGINNING – THE FORMATION OF THE BOOK GROUP

DiAngelo’s (2016) accessible and engaging work introduces the concepts of socialization and the cycle of oppression, and explores definitions of race and racism and reflections on the “common patterns of well-meaning white people.” DiAngelo explores the concepts of “white fragility” and “white silence,” and cautions against the dangerous discourse around race and the white racial frame (Feagin, 2013). The book closes with a call for antiracist education and offers next steps. Participants found the book to be an excellent synthesis of the major topics on white racial literacy and felt they could use this work in future workshops and classes. The following section describes the authors’ experiences at the start of the intergroup dialogue.

Messineo Reflections

This group emerged as a result of conversations around how the campus culture could be shifted beyond initial awareness regarding diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI). Donna (Black female) and I (white female) first connected over ideas of critical race theory, and we were looking for professional development
opportunities to bring to campus. Donna has a doctorate in higher education, is well versed in DEI literature, and she was especially energized by Robin DiAngelo’s book, *What Does It Mean to Be White?* (2016) Donna said that it was the first book by a white author that she had read that was not afraid to be honest about the white experience, and she saw her own experience in every chapter. Her excitement made me eager to see the book. Within a few weeks, we decided to do a reading group.

While this planning was taking place during the summer, the campus was engaging in a struggle over whether or not the campus should break ties with an alumnus who had been linked to the use of racially charged, hateful language. The initial campus response was to not cut ties; but after public protest, the campus leadership reversed the decision. The need for discussion groups around this topic seemed even more important.

**THE CALL**

Once the intergroup dialogue planning was completed, an invitation was sent campus-wide to generate participation. Below are the reflections of the authors upon receiving the call.

**Rodgers**

I saw the email entitled Diversity this Week, and near the bottom is a call for participants in a faculty reading group. The book is *What Does It Mean to be White?* I had never heard of the book although having taught in teacher education for the past six years. I have repeatedly heard my students, preservice teachers, remark that race is no longer a problem in America. Their sentiment that race no longer matters is an example of color-blind racism that is prevalent in what some deem as a post-racial society (Bonilla-Silva, 2014). The ideology that race is insignificant in this era ignores the impact that racism has on people of color every day. My students see color-blindedness as a good thing. Well, so did I—before I knew any better—because the state of color-blindness is what I had been taught was the right way to be as a white teacher.

My students are overwhelmingly white, female, and lower-middle class. Like a majority of pre-service teachers, many of my students, coming from rural communities, have never met and shook the hand of a person from another racial or ethnic background (Kincheloe, 2018). I rarely have more than one person of color in my class.

However, I also knew that I was not entirely comfortable with the realities of white privilege (McIntosh, 1988) or my place within the hierarchy of unearned privilege. I still struggled to articulate white privilege and racism when they came up in discussion, so I felt I needed to continue to learn, with the goal of actually being able to educate for social justice both in my classroom and in daily life.

**Cain**

The reading group was an excellent opportunity to provide additional resources and activities to my community engagement graduate course. The book provided a collection of concepts addressed by numerous social justice scholars and included narratives and stories of lived experiences. I was eager to engage in discussion regarding teaching about white cultural identities, privilege, and power with white
students. This was an opportunity to increase collaborative partnerships and identify additional resources to assist white students in critical reflection and analysis of these themes. One major course activity is the affinity group breakout session. White students work with white facilitators to discuss white cultural identities, power, and privilege. Engaging in dialogue with all white participants provides a sense of security and feeling that experiences discussed will be understood and not criticized, minimized, or ridiculed (Titler, 2017).

At our university, the majority of the students are from small white communities. I am often the first and only African American faculty member they encounter. Similar to most PWIs, faculty are predominantly white and not representative of the diversity of the student population. Within the mission of our department are the words, social justice, and faculty include applicable content within their curricula to address it. I anticipated some faculty would participate in the reading group. None of them came. Our department has a high percentage of ethnic diversity, which is mostly international faculty. I am the only full-time African American faculty member. I spoke to many of my colleagues regarding the reading group. Most indicated the lack of availability to participate or knowledge of the invitation. One expressed interest in attending, but never came. I was not surprised that most of the faculty with whom I inquired about their intent to attend were not going. However, I did think there would be a few more in attendance than came. I was taken aback by the low numbers. I learned that more had registered but did not come. My experiences in engaging in cross-cultural racial dialogue is that the majority of the white participants, in intergroup dialogues that I facilitate, are unaware of their privilege and do not believe there is a white cultural identity and reality (Tatum, 1992). I wondered if this impacted the lower attendance. At the end of the session, I inquired, “Where are all of the white people?” To what extent is this work valued, affirmed, and rewarded in the academy? We showcase and reward individual faculty and programs for inclusive excellence in pedagogy/andragogy for student/community impact. To what extent does this impact the dismantling of institutional enforcement of internalized dominance at the university?

Messineo

Some questioned whether the campus should be focusing on whiteness. For some it seemed self-centered and personally indulgent and exactly the type of reading group white people would put together. I think there are compelling arguments to be made around this concern; however, we found that understanding whiteness as the source of the cycle of oppression was an important place to start. Internalized dominance occurs in parallel with the internalized oppression that may be experienced by the group with less power. Our goal was to question the concept of white as default, the norm, regular, and introduce the idea that it is a construct.

THE EXPERIENCE

This section consists of currere fragments that offer insights into our experiences in the intergroup dialogue. These elements provide analysis of our reflections as they relate to the three themes from the cycle of oppression.

Rodgers

Taking a deep breath, I walked into the room for the first meeting, and there were a handful of faces, familiar faces, the same familiar faces, I see at every faculty ‘diversity’ shindig. Surprisingly, there are only a handful of people in the room—three with whom I have had prior experience working as part of interdepartmental and cross-campus diversity initiative and professional development workshops. Next to
me sits a faculty member from my own department (Cain) with whom I have explored racial identity
development while assisting several semesters as a co-facilitator in her course. There is the interim
director of the office of institutional diversity (Messineo) who is co-facilitating the intergroup dialogue, and one
male faculty member known for leading inclusive pedagogy workshops. The three new faces included two
white female faculty members I had encountered a few times and the other co-facilitator who I soon learned
was the co-creator of the experience.

After we all shared about our own identities, I realized that every participant discussed or at least mentioned
race as part of their identity. That is, every single person, except me. How could I dismiss one of the most
obvious and salient features of my identity—my whiteness? I sat there, realizing that I did not have to
consider my own whiteness, and that in and of itself was a privilege, a privilege that my colleagues of color
could not ignore and my white colleagues chose to at least acknowledge. I had joined this reading group to
be challenged as an educator so that I could confront my pre-service teachers’ hegemonic assumptions and
help them begin to develop a cognitive dissonance. But in my efforts to change my students’ mindset, I
became aware that my inadvertent, but natural, tendency to “move beyond race” was an act of white
internalized dominance (DiAngelo, 2011).

Racism in the academy is, as DiAngelo (2016) explicated, “ultimately a white problem, and the burden for
interrupting it belongs to white people” (p. 66). As a white instructor teaching at a PWI, I wield considerable
power in my classroom to guide my white students in acknowledging their own fragility. What they learn will impact how they interact
with their future students, colleagues, and the community. By projecting the problem of racism onto my students who, while unwittingly participating in the cycle of oppression, cannot yet comprehend the full
impact of their actions in maintaining their internalized white dominance, I am avoiding dealing with my
own fragility (Behm Cross, 2017). I must acknowledge that I am also complicit in this cycle.

The group was getting progressively smaller. There were various reasons offered including scheduling
conflicts and increased workloads. I questioned the value of participating, asking myself “what I was getting
out of it” because I ‘knew’ concepts in the book. Did I need this? Did I need to take on the additional
emotional labor of being an ‘ally’ when I had my own frustrations with the academy? Did I need to spend
time engaging in difficult conversations?

Week after week, the answer to all three questions was unequivocally “yes.” As the size of the group shrank, the
depth of conversations became more profound, yet less directly attached to the book. The weekly
meeting became a support group of sorts, as participants shared and discussed the latest in local and
academy politics, as well as the latest transgressions both experienced and witnessed. This included
academic mobbing against minoritized individuals, defined as the “insidious, non-violent and sophisticated
kind of psychological bullying that predominantly takes place in college and university campuses” (Khoo,
2010, p. 65). Through these ongoing conversations, we witnessed the cycle of oppression in each of the
participant’s lives.

Cain

The cycle of oppression is a regular occurrence in my life. I and other African American participants shared
many experiences with the reading group. To write and talk about these experiences is traumatic and
therapeutic. Researching and discovering that these experiences are pervasive in the academy provides a
slight level of reassurance that the microaggressions, institutional racism, and internalized dominance are
real and not imagined. Experiences included: being the one dissenting voice on an issue and a colleague announces, “well, we have consensus on that topic;” providing a recommendation and documentation to justify it during a brainstorming session that is ignored and the next meeting someone else says the same thing and it is adopted; being falsely accused of advising students, in error, and having to explain, over and over, in meetings that it is not true; assuming that I came to the academy, devoid of skills; removing a stack of handouts from the table, asking about it, and assuming I do not have the original to make additional copies; having a supervisor take exclusive credit for a project I planned, developed, implemented, and administered with a committee of partners; assuming an ideological difference of opinion is an affront to professional reputation, worthy of expressions of anger and retaliation.

**Messineo**

As a person in the dominant group I must constantly confront my internalized dominance. Even my idea of how book discussions are run had to be tempered by the needs of the group. It was difficult to know how to balance my roles as group administrator and member. It was freeing to say, “This may not be how I would do this task and it is important for me to let go.” But even having the opportunity to exercise that choice of ‘letting go’ is an example of dominance. People without that position do not have the choice to relinquish power. It was a powerful learning moment. Looking back, we can see how the collaborative experience pulled uncovered misinformation about targeted groups and created a context where internalized dominance could be revealed.

This experience has been helpful for me as a facilitator and while the content is not new, having it pulled together this way with this language was helpful. One of the core concepts in the book is white fragility which DiAngelo (2016) describes as “the state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves” (p. 247). These behaviors re-establish white position and privilege. It was easy for me to identify white fragility and this identification allowed the group to step back and see people on a journey that can potentially lead to greater understanding, ultimately breaking the cycle. We saw how fragility leads to the perpetuation and enforcement of the norms by institutions that keep the cycle in place. Even choosing to stay in the group was for some of us an act of defiance against the institutional norms that devalue these types of experiences.

The most challenging part was dealing with the sense that this was yet another example of people of color educating the majority about oppression. Our most informed colleagues were Black women and the burden of emotional and instructional labor was primarily on them. As DiAngelo and other scholars of white racial literacy (2016) point out, the majority bears the responsibility of educating itself. We found ourselves navigating our own group differences about how best to address systemic oppression. The debates over different opinions and issues helped us clarify our own positions. One quote from Cain that really resonated with me was that “Conflict is inevitable—our goal is not to manage conflict but instead to transform conflict.” We worked to find a way to transform the conflict and break the cycle.

**WHAT WE ARE TAKING AWAY FROM OUR EXPERIENCE**

While the group attrition was troubling, there was agreement among the members that the reading group and intergroup dialogue was a valuable experience. The most immediate benefit was the networking. The time together combatted the limited networking and mentoring opportunities available to Black female scholars (Agosto & Kar anxha, 2011; Stanley, 2006) in two ways. First, our
meetings provided younger scholars of color with mentoring provided by Cain, whose experience, not only as a scholar of color but also as a community organizer and former corporate professional was invaluable. Second, the experience provided networking opportunities for all participants. Third, the experience helped identify valuable resources and strategies for workshops and classes. Fourth, we experienced increased awareness about the cycle of oppression in our own lives that has been transformative. The following excerpts reflect on the key take-aways.

Rodgers

The confidential environment allowed me to share my own experiences confronting the dominant order (Windschitl & Joseph, 2011) with colleagues. This group recognized and validated me without engaging in some of the bullying-practices so prevalent in the academy that leads to long-term silencing and departure of high-achieving minoritized faculty members (Martin & Beese, 2018).

Through sustained interactions with faculty, like Messineo, I came to see that in many ways the scholars of color were, almost by default, teaching us white folks about our white privilege. While they did not sign up to be de facto spokespersons for the experiences of all faculty (and persons) of color, there seemed to be an invisible force in every meeting. They explained, analyzed, or annotated the references from the book to their own interactions so that we could grasp the extent of oppression they confronted daily. I realized this was not their job and I must actively seek out works written by scholars of color. Then I must include these works in my own course syllabi and research without appropriating their work. Credit needed to be given to their experiences and perspectives in the same way that I would do for white scholars without even thinking about it.

The insidiousness of white privilege exists not in that it is unknown to whites, but rather because it is all too familiar to us, inextricably woven into the very fabric of our professed democratic values (DiAngelo, 2016). Sitting in my first PhD curriculum course, I remember the professor explaining, “A fish cannot see water” in reference to a quotation attributed to the anthropologist Margaret Mead, “If a fish were to become an anthropologist, the last thing it would discover would be water” (Spindler, 1982, p. 24, as cited in Joseph, 2011, p. 25). So too, is white privilege because: “When privilege is the air that you breathe from the very first moment you’re born, it can be really hard to see how your footsteps have been part of the storm” (italics added, Voxfeminista, 2009). To see my own footprints, I must accept that the life-long process of conscientization (Freire, 2000) is one which requires that I engage in the ‘primal setting at a distance’ from my own understanding of culture, thereby transforming culture into an ‘other self,’ a being which I may observe, and with which I may develop a relationship (Buber, 1972). It is only then that I may be able to recognize how I have been “part of the storm” (Voxfeminista, 2009).

Cain

The book group exceeded my expectations and was highly valuable, professionally and personally. Although I knew all of the participants, I had the opportunity to engage in lively weekly discussion. There were times when we talked about personal and professional issues. In many cases those issues correlated with the themes in the book. I sensed that some may have felt we were veering off course. I was comfortable
with what occurred. Learning is personal, emotional, and physical. It happens in unexpected ways, resulting in unanticipated actions, reactions, and outcomes. I grew closer to the participants. We developed an incredible bond of trust. One of the chapters in Brookfield and Associates' (2019) book was titled, Building Trust and Negotiating Conflict When Teaching Race. One activity, naming and narrating, allows students to tell the story of who they are by their name. This could include the meaning of the name, an ancestor as their namesake, and how they feel about their name. I use a similar exercise at the beginning of class. Students learn about each other, without conflict or fear of offending. In the reading group the facilitators provided activities, similar to this. We drew our hand and wrote five cultural identities and shared the dissimilar responses then affirming each others identities. Then, we talked about the cultural identities that we held but did not list. I was surprised at one that I did not include, educator. I have always included that in describing myself. It is part of my ancestral legacy, and an integral part of who I am. It is what DiAngelo (2016) describes as socialization. She uses the graphic of the iceberg of culture to describe the majority of our socialization that is hidden from sight and awareness. At the time, I was experiencing conflict at an overwhelming level. I could not believe that subconsciously I dissociated with my identity as an educator.

In co-facilitating dialogues on internalized oppression, I am compelled to share my challenges in overcoming them. My lived experiences vary from most of my African American colleagues who came of age post school segregation. I was immersed in my culture through regular interaction with extended family, church, neighborhood, and up to ninth grade. I love and affirm my culture. I internalized oppression through efforts to prove I am worthy (“work twice as hard to get half as far”) and not assessing the negative impact I may have on someone’s self-esteem in my rush to complete a task. I share with my students and workshop attendees examples of my struggle to ensure my actions are not contributing to the enforcement and perpetuation of institutional oppression.

Messineo

This intergroup dialogue was a transformative experience for me because it was the most sustained conversation around white racial literacy that I have participated in since graduate school. The book itself is an excellent resource, and it will inform my teaching. The connections that were forged as a result of the conversations will last beyond the reading of the text and the writing of this paper. I am thankful to all of my colleagues for everything they shared and for their support through this journey. I will continue building my own white racial literacy knowing that while I will continue to fail, I will also grow. I am committed to engaging others in this conversation and breaking the institutional norms that enable the cycle to persist.

DISCUSSION

Collectively, we moved beyond our cultural lens. The use of intergroup dialogue around the book by Robin DiAngelo (2016) provided a means to explore the cycle of oppression and the implications of whiteness in the academy and created a strong professional and personal bond. The authors used the inquiry method of currere to gain a comprehensive understanding of their experiences. The book served as a valuable resource and an effective catalyst for an intergroup dialogue that shaped our understanding of oppression in higher education. We recognize DiAngelo’s book was our “explicit curriculum” (Eisner, 1994, p. 87). It served as the vehicle to begin exploring our intra- and interpersonal connections to internalized oppression, internalized dominance, and their perpetuation and enforcement by institutions and ourselves. Our experience is not unique, but rather symptomatic of the racial challenge across academe. We encourage others to create intergroup dialogues around white racial literacy with the commitment to break the cycle of oppression. Through our trio-currere journey, we identified five recommendations:

1. Commit to a long-term experience because it takes time to build community.
2. Commit to going beyond ‘the academic’ because while the book was a valuable academic resource, it was the connection with colleagues that created the most change.

3. Provide opportunities for relationship-building. These may include sharing a meal and sharing the facilitator role. Our telling of past connections was a critical link to fostering continued development of our relationship.

4. Work to integrate reflection into the process and keep growing beyond the text.

5. Become familiar with scholarship from oft-marginalized researchers. Cite their work in your own and seek to learn about the historical, social, political, cultural, and institutional forces that perpetuate the cycle.

No program is the panacea for long-standing racial bias in academia. However, sustained intergroup dialogue supported by faculty reading groups allows for faculty and staff to explore bias within their own lives and workspaces. Relationship with one another is fostered and strengthened through sustained dialogue, allowing for the development of a shared understanding and appreciation for one another and thus the creation of long-term partnerships, alliances, and coalitions that can work toward ending the cycle of oppression.
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Lifting the Veil: Reflections on Privilege and Reciprocal Pedagogy as a White Adult Educator

Julie M. Skogsbergh

University Without Walls
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

I did not always know that I wanted to be an educator, but have found a true sense of purpose and a home in my role as a lecturer in one of the nation’s oldest adult degree completion programs at a public research university in the Northeast where I engage with an incredibly diverse group of adult learners. I grew up in a white, predominately working-class community in southern Wisconsin, am First Generation, and have a deep-seated interest in the complexities of race and racism in the United States rooted in an intense desire to understand my early experience having been racialized during adolescence. All of these various components are central to my development as a life-long learner and educator.

During my middle school years I was called the “N word” in reference to my full-sized lips, and I did not begin to think about this early experience until my latter college years when I continued to have numerous other experiences where I was racialized. I was often asked about my background and “who my people were,” with others assuming I was mixed, Black, or Puerto Rican depending on the cultural, linguistic, and/or geographic context. I was deeply curious about why this kept happening to me as a young, white, female, and I found this confusing and struggled to understand not only why this continued to happen, but also what it all truly meant.

As I began to process these experiences, I became keenly aware that I had internalized these various episodes of racialization. As a white person, I simply do not, nor did I, carry the “psychic weight of race” in the world I inhabited (DiAngelo, 2018, p. 54). In fact, I had been socialized to believe that the topic of race had nothing to do with me; and more importantly, I had absolutely no awareness of my own privilege when it came to race. I did carry a heightened awareness of difference while growing up, but this difference was rooted in a feeling of “not belonging” due to my larger size as well as my family’s lower class status. DiAngelo (2018) addresses this nuance in reference to white folks when she states, “Because we are not raised to see ourselves in racial terms or to see white space as racialized space, we position ourselves as innocent of race” (p. 62). Meaning, difference and a lack of belonging where I grew up could be attributed to a myriad of reasons, but never was about race. This was true for me despite the obvious – I am white, and I had been racialized.
As I began to delve into this work further, I started to grapple with how race was, indeed, a factor in white spaces, and that I was not some anomaly. I also realized that for most of my adolescence and young adult life, despite having been racialized, I had accepted and believed that the concept of race was linked only to the non-white other. Indeed, throughout our nation’s history, race has been framed in terms of people of color, thereby making white an un-marked racial category (Frankenburg, 1997). This very notion of being un-marked was based on the racial homogeneity present within the community where I grew up; and thus, prevented me from being able to see race and subsequently recognize my own privilege because of race. As an adult, I frequently have to continue to lift the veil in the classroom as well as “come out” as white during these encounters when they happen. I am very clear that my experiences are mine alone and am very clear in that I do not equate these experiences with those of people of color.

As I continued to engage in this personal and scholarly work within higher education, I quickly realized one could talk about privilege and race without necessarily talking about or addressing racism. That key piece became an equally important part of my journey. As I started to recognize and grapple with the privileges I had, I was empowered to use in it a way that allowed me to engage in addressing these within the classroom and community to create awareness and work toward creating systemic change. My graduate education in the fields of intercultural relations and anthropology provided me with the tools to begin to understand, theorize, and analyze these experiences of being racialized as a white person. Along the way, I made the conscious choice to specifically study, teach, and critically engage in community projects where I could address and disrupt racial inequities in our society.

When I joined the adult degree completion program four years ago, I had flexibility with regard to the design of my critical thinking and degree development course. I wanted to incorporate the fundamental themes of race and racism (and other forms of oppression) that underpinned my academic work and led me on the path of personal awareness and to a career as an educator. I knew, despite the generalist nature of our core curriculum, that this was one way I could tangibly demonstrate my ongoing commitment to these particular issues in the classroom while also working to engage the larger issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in my teaching. So, I designed this course starting from the supposition that my role as teacher and that of self-defined life-long learner are not separate, but that each directly informs the other in the classroom. In fact, the combination of these roles provides the foundation for the pedagogical approach I have developed, reciprocal pedagogy. Reciprocal pedagogy is an engaged and social-justice based pedagogy built upon the principle of respect, focusing specifically “on the way respect creates symmetry, empathy, and connection in all kinds of relationships, even those, such as teacher and student, […] commonly seen as unequal” (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2000, p. 10). Additionally, it draws from the Highlander principle that everyone has something to teach and everyone has something to learn (Horton, Kohl, & Kohl, 1998).

Many may be skeptical of this as a possibility in a primarily online environment, but I have found this to work in repeated feedback from students over the past several years. I have developed this approach over a decade and a half of teaching in a variety of settings, continuing to revisit it as I continue in my current practice online and with adult learners. Reciprocal pedagogy is a foundational pedagogical philosophy that allows me to teach in any setting with a number of factors in mind – that there are different types of learning, that critical thinking and asking questions is important, and that student “success” is measured by an examination of each individual student’s effort and abilities. I tell students that their educational journey began before they entered my classroom as has mine, and that it continues beyond the classroom - that when they finish the course, or even when they finish their degree, they should continue to have more questions about themselves, their community, society, and the world we live in. I share my own story of
racialization and racial awareness that I highlighted earlier as a way to demonstrate this in practice. That is, learning through a lens of reciprocal pedagogy takes place in five different ways:

1. Students learn from the teacher and the course materials provided.
2. Students learn from one another.
3. Students learn about themselves, and the teacher learns about herself.
4. The teacher learns from the students.
5. Students and the teacher take the information, experiences, and knowledge from their learning as they engage in their daily lives with family, colleagues, and their community.

These five components along with respect are the foundation for my teaching practice. I make the conscious choice to position myself in the classroom within an anti-racist and critical feminist framework that acknowledges and emphasizes the intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability. This is an important underpinning to my pedagogical philosophy, as I believe “it is our collective responsibility to educate for critical consciousness” (hooks, 1989, p. 118). Through engaging in a self-reflexive process, I have been able to position myself both personally and professionally through my lived experiences as well as through the experiences of the adult students with whom I am honored to work. I do not pretend to have all the answers, but I do have a deep awareness of my privileges. I am not afraid to talk about my privilege or about race and racism, and I wish to draw upon my experiences and journey of racial awakening in order to work towards opening dialogue and creating change in my classroom, program, and campus. My hope is that my future work continues to draw upon knowledge created through my plethora of learning experiences both in and outside the classroom and that I always allow room for growth, engagement, and liberation.
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The Practice of Freedom

**TRANSITIONING THROUGH HISTORY: DEBUNKING THE MYTH OF AMERIKKKKA AND OTHER ALTERNATIVE FACTS**

glo merriweather

**INTRODUCTION**

In 2018, glo merriweather, a community organizer, activist, and public intellectual delivered a keynote address to UNC Asheville’s Biennial Queer Studies Conference at the University of North Carolina at Asheville. The keynote address provides insights that can be useful for adult educators seeking to reframe ideas and practices of social justice related to prisons, gender, and race. glo reminds us of the power of language, how language matters, and how it must be harnessed to create a more equitable, just, and liberated society. They also remind us of the power we have within ourselves and communally to not just create change but be change. glo’s insights provide us with opportunities to reconsider how we show up in in communities both in and outside of academia and challenge us to move from inaction to action, recognizing a system that shape shifts and seeks to maintain control by any means necessary. glo is a highly sought after public speaker who offers fresh perspectives on confronting white supremacy and prejudice, unpacking the ideology of legibility, and developing a mindset of critical resistance that we, as adult educators, can use to inform our theory and practice.

Moderator: Today is the 50th anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King. That just makes us think about the state of oppression and our speaker today is someone who is facing that right now in relation to radical political work. glo is a Black non binary trans community organizer from Charlotte, North Carolina. glo has been organizing in Charlotte for the last four years, is currently facing 51 months in prison for their involvement in the Charlotte Uprising. In addition to advocating for their life and freedom in this case, they continue to organize their freedom for prisoners like Rayquan Borum and Alejandra Pablos who are currently in cages [prisons/jails]. They also collaborate with the Southeast Asian Coalition and Comunidad Colectiva to combat deportations and protect immigrants’ rights. glo is deeply engaged in prison outreach, native land sovereignty, and transformative justice initiatives. I’m really excited that glo is here to speak to us and I’m just gonna turn it to them right now, so help me to welcome glo.

glo

What an introduction, I project a lot. I really might not need this mic. But, first of all, I really would like to thank you all for being here. I feel like, taking the time, it’s almost the weekend, it’s 7:30, this weather has me wanting to nap so I’m really grateful to have y’all in these seats and to have
someone to talk to besides my mom and Scott, who we’ve been emailing together. Just thank you so much for inviting me into this space. I think it’s really important that we are unpacking settler colonialism at this time. We have to talk about indigenous bodies, we have to talk about black bodies and brown bodies and what happens when they resist the state. Just today, a woman was arrested fighting the Bayou Bridge Pipeline. We have to talk about bodies like my own. What’s happening to me as I’m resisting the state, right. So without further adieu, I guess we’ll get the thing started.

It’s really important that we start with the land acknowledgment, whenever we’re in space, whenever we are occupying space, because that’s what we are doing right now. We are occupying space, we are occupying what is the traditional territory of the Cherokee and Creek people. So the land acknowledgment says that as many of us are grandchildren of colonizers, immigrants, or the descendants of those violently brought to this land, it is our collective responsibility to pay respect and recognize this land is the traditional territory of the Creek and Cherokee Nations, and we are here because this land was stolen and occupied, forcefully. In recognizing that this space occupies colonized and native territories, and out of respect for the rights of Native and First Nations people, it is our collective responsibility to critically interrogate and reconcile with the colonial histories and present-day implications of this, and to honor, protect, and sustain this still invaded land. Because it’s still invaded, right now, 2018. There’s an invasion happening. The indigenous folx who were stewards of this land, don’t have claim to it, can’t make decisions. You see that they’re being arrested as they protect water sources, right. So, we have to be really critical in relationship with that and look at our own placement in that. Ask yourself, who are you under this? Are you the grandchild of colonizers, are you an immigrant, the grandchild of immigrants? Are you a descendant of those violently brought to this land, slaves. Position yourself for the rest of this conversation in that space. Because it’s alright to be uncomfortable. We need it. If we’re not, that means we know too much. That means you feel safe. I don’t want you to feel safe in this space and I want that to be very, very clear. This is not a safe space. This is space that’s gonna push you. It’s gonna ask you to meet me where I am. It’s gonna ask you to open up everything that you’ve ever thought and known and felt. And maybe even leave it at the door. I may not even need you to have it here. And that’s real, right? That’s something that we have to, I have to come to you with, and I have to be honest, because like Scott said, I’m facing 51 months behind bars because of these things. Because of state repression, my comrades are facing that time. And we have to fight as if that’s right now, because it is. I have trial is 33 days, so it is right now.

Acknowledgement is not enough: So, let’s go a little bit beyond even acknowledging. There is a quote and I don’t want to be disrespectful to this person’s name, but it’s at the bottom. ᐄpihtawikosisân, a Metis person from the plains, Cree speaking community of Lac St. Anne, Alberta, Canada, another colonized space. What they have to say is, “If we think of territorial acknowledgements as sites of potential disruption, they can be transformative acts that erase Indigenous erasure. I believe this is true as long as those speaking and hearing the words. The fact of Indigenous presence should force non-Indigenous peoples to confront their own place on these lands. I would like to see territorial acknowledgments happening in spaces where they are currently absent, particularly in rural and remote areas and within the governance structures of settlers.” This is another thing in which we need to be unpacking. Like this is the space where Cherokee and Creek people were stewards of the land but what are we going to do with that knowledge? Where are we going to move into after that? I have some action steps following this entire thing but that’s just a place I want you to understand that I’m asking you to be in.

This isn’t a place to just listen anymore because people are dying. Water has been tainted for years. People in eastern North Carolina have been without water for years, Flint, Michigan too. Indigenous communities
are suffering, losing numbers because of anemia because of water. So, when we talk about genocide, it’s happening. It’s going on right now, in the Carolinas, in the Dakotas. We must situate ourselves in the position as people who can actually change these things as stakeholders in this really messy thing, and like be like yo, we can actually combat this and resist with, not for anyone but with them. That’s the place we need to be moving from.

**Working Terms**

**Invader:** A person or group that enters another territory, forcefully; goes into said territory with hostile intent. Often times, descendants of colonizers and current invaders will use the term settler to white-wash how the settling happened. I really, really, really want to talk about that. You know, it’s why I put that people settle into beds at night. You know what I mean, you get comfy, you chill, you smile, you’re getting ready to rest, dadadadada. That isn’t what happened here on Turtle Island, right in this colonized space. Native and Indigenous folx were living their way of life. Europeans left Europe because they felt like they were being oppressed, there’s oppression happening, right. Like the same thing that’s happening here, which I think is kind of a joke a little bit. But they were being repressed religiously, and so they came and then they stole, and then they stole some people to till the land that they stole, and then they talked about rights, and man and like humanity, all these different things and constructed this whole myth that we’re living under, right? That everyone’s like oh, Indigenous people are like this far off thing. Native people gave land. What? They gave a gift? They just packaged blocks of land for the pilgrims and said “you know what, y’all are so sweet, take all, actually, and relegate us to a small portion”. That is what a gift is. No, I think what happened was coercion. I think people didn’t want to get sick anymore. I think there was technology that colonizers were using that native folx didn’t have, and they wanted to preserve themselves. So, we have to tell that truth as well, we have to talk about who is an invader. We have to talk truthfully about that from now on. I really invite all of you to replace settler with invader, so that we can be honest. So that we can stop erasing Indigenous peoples and other nations by saying like “people settled [in a place]” because when we say that, [we erase] all the folx who died during our settling. What does settling really mean? What are we participating in?

**Abolition:** A political vision with a goal of eliminating imprisonment, native land theft, policing and surveillance, and creating lasting alternatives to punishment and policing. Critical resistance are the collection of things that I’m talking to you about right now. I want you to be in a space that when you get up out of your seat, you’re hoping to find something to do to combat and resist these things tomorrow, the next day, until it’s all gone, actually. We want it to be gone. We must eliminate borders and detention centers if we are to build a just and liberated world. This is what we are working toward.

**AmeriKKKan mythology:** So, let’s talk about debunking some AmeriKKKan mythology. Syed Khalid Hussan, who’s quoted in *Undoing Border Imperialism*, a really great text by Harsha Walia, like beautiful, beautiful work that really shows the implications of coloniality and how that affects like the different ways that people are able to move, then, now, and probably even later if we don’t finish this, said “Our fights must be rooted in experiences, in stories, and in anecdotes. People remembered these more than sterile numbers or facts. Myths are powerful magic and can turn enemies into friends. In a world where too many still tell stories that some are illegal, and that to be free we must control the movement of others. The work of making new myths is essential”.

**what can we do with positive intention?**

What can we do with intention that’s really, truly in liberation practices that are transformative?
[Making new myths] talks about our power to create the next thing, the same power that colonizers had in 1492 to create a new thing. Yes, theirs was birthed in violence, and wasn’t birthed in actually all humanity getting free, being liberated. It was selfish. It wasn’t earth centered. And we’re still dealing with that now. But we can create something new. They did it without cellphones, with some wooden ships that I don’t know if I would have got on in this time. Like I don’t know, who built that. This is not something that people may have thought was possible. But they sailed across and managed to steal people and land. So, what can we do with positive intention? What can we do with intention that’s really, truly in liberation practices that are transformative. What can we do? This is justice, I want you to play with it.

Gender Binary

The myth of the gender binary (insert eyeroll). I hope y’all saw that. What do we know about it? It is an oppressive system, used to determine legibility and eligibility. So, I want to talk about that. So, legibility, being able to be read, being able to be digested. Being read, what does that mean? Your body, your experiences, your trauma, your pain. All these different things, right? I want to take it back to, before even, not even before, but also while the gender binary was happening, when race relations were beginning. People actually didn’t believe Black folx could feel pain. It was because of the legibility of their bodies. They actually didn’t believe Black folx were even human. You (Black people) were 3/5ths of a person under slavery, right? So, when we talk about legibility, and being able to see things, being able to see experiences, it’s really important to understand the lens that you’re looking through. So, understand that it’s a constructive lens.

When we’re going into gender binary, that’s a similar thing. When we talk about the ways that different bodies are unable to be read in prisons, right? For example, when trans folx enter prisons, they’re typically in solitary confinement because the prison system, which is based out of a binary gendered system, actually doesn’t have a place for bodies don’t identify under the binary. So, what does it do? It puts you in a cage alone. What do we know about solitary? Does anybody know about Kalief Browder? A show of hands of you know about Kalief Browder. Kalief Browder was a young Black man who spent 3 years on Rikers Island for stealing a backpack, allegedly. Mind you, later found out he actually didn’t do this crime but he was there nonetheless. He stayed 3 years [most of the time in solitary]. I think from the time he was 16 to 19. Um, don’t quote me on that, Google. Um, but, long story short, he got out, and because of what the cage and the system had done to him, continually trying to force him to make plea deals and plead guilty to something he really didn’t do just to get free, which really isn’t free because you’re tied to the state with a guilty charge, right? We need to talk about that as well, but Kalief never felt safe after that, and took his life. He took his life. He never, ever, ever got a life. This is what we’re facing.

The gender binary is new. That’s some new-fangled bull. We have the Sulawesi of Indonesia, five recognized genders. The Hijras of India are a third gender that has written records dating from 400 years before the common era. The Kocek of the Ottoman Empire [1600-1800, at least], the Muxes of Mexico that date prior to Columbus’ invasion. Two-Spirit of Turtle Island. Many, many, many Native tribes recognize more than two genders. Transgender folk of colonized AmeriKKKa because we have to say that trans and Two-Spirit are two different things. Two- Spirit is a cultural connection. You know, it’s something that has to do with your people, where you come from. Transgender is also birthed out of that. It’s birthed out of many coming from invaders. Maybe descendants of slaves don’t have a connection to Two-Spirit identity but you do have a different gender. Two-spirit is definitely something that Native and Indigenous folx have coined themselves

when we talk about legibility, and being able to see things, being able to see experiences, it’s really important to understand the lens that you’re looking through
and it’s sacred. So, it’s really not ours to play with that. We also have the Ashtime of Ethiopia. Gender is a fucking universe y’all. You can see it across just this world on its own. The different spaces, we have Africa represented. We have Mexico represented. We have, you know just so many different spaces, Asia. All these things were happening. People just bending gender all before this baby of a nation, the United States, the united colonized states of AmeriKKKa. All before this [gender binary] all happened. So, what does this mean about the inception of AmeriKKKan ideology in this place, and what it meant for us when we came in and up in it, right. Gender was a weapon of mass destruction.

European colonizers had many weapons at their disposal when they entered various tribal territories: guns, diseases, religion, white supremacy, and gender. Gender is actually one of the most violent and pervasive ways that they were able to colonize spaces. When you tell a people how to relegate, and how to like, place themselves among each other in a way that actually isn’t theirs, in a way that is um, rooted in white supremacy, you create inequity. You create destabilization. You do that. And so that’s what we’re looking at. We’re looking at how western ideologies [destabilize] which are highly influenced by Christianity and Catholicism: super hella binary, y’all, like Adam and Eve. Two genders right? What was the joke in like the 90s, Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve, y’all. Like, you know, like they’re letting you know there’s only one way this thing goes and it’s this way, right. Women, defined in relation to men, subordinate, even. Power is patriarchal. These are biblical things, right. Not always does the Bible have to be used in this way but this is definitely how it was weaponized here. As colonizers destabilized various nations across the globe, they brought these violent ideologies with them, including race, gender, an extractive practices in relation to earth.

As colonizers destabilized various nations across the globe, they brought these violent ideologies with them, including race, gender, an extractive practices in relation to earth.

gender was a weapon of mass destruction

So, I want to really quickly talk about how when you talk about religion, and how we discuss how different religions and spiritual practices are practiced. When Christianity was bought here, the practice did not center earth, it actually began to center man-kind. And so, at that point, when it’s this ego-centered thing, you actually move away from earth and being able to protect her. This is why you see water protectors, Indigenous people doing this thing because their creation story actually includes protecting the water. It includes being a steward of land. Their creation story, they’re talking that way. There’re many creation stories even in Indonesia, like the last slide showed, that talk about the way the world came about not in these violent [ways], [in which] man just went around and did things, had children and tilled land. No, no, no, no, no. There were so many things at play in this space. This is a wide, vast universe that we’re in, and to think that man and woman in this binary ideology is the only and right way is really violent and has killed many, many, many, many people. And mostly, um, I would say, Indigenous folx, who were killed when colonizers first got here, and who are still being killed today. And then you have Black folx, who were killed when they were brought here and are still being killed today. And all other folx who fall in the margins. These are the people who the gender binary is coming for. This is who’s the next. Those are the next that you see on the news, right: Trans, Black, women being murdered. That’s because gender has been weaponized in correlation with race. They’re coupled. What happens when you have two White supremacist ideologies in bed with one another? Trans Black women die. You know, that’s where we are.

Oyèrónké Oyèwùmí, a Black, dope theologian, said, “the idea that biology is destiny, or better still, destiny is biology, has been a staple of western thought for centuries. Whether the issue is who is who in Aristotle’s polis, or who is poor in the late twentieth-century United States, the notion that difference and hierarchy in society are biologically determined continues to enjoy credence, even among social scientists who purport to explain human society in other genetic terms. In the west, biological explanations appear to be especially
privileged over the ways of explaining differences of gender, race, or class. Difference is expressed as degeneration.” So, I want to talk about this for a second. And that came from the Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses. So, when I read this, what this stirs up for me is, first of all it’s a reminder that gender is a constructed way under which we’re living right now. It’s constructed because when they say making an African sense of western gender discourses, first of all, it makes westernization not the centralized theme. I love that, I’m like, oh, wow, so, we can think about this from a nonwestern sense and center ideologies that happened prior to this one. And that’s cool, right. Like, let’s play with that. I mean, I wanna do that, that’s a new toy for me.

Degeneration. And so, what I wanna do is talk about how differences express degeneration. Degeneration, does that have a positive context? When you, when you create a hegemonic thing and things are othered and things are degenerate, like what does that mean for how society is able to move forward? Is it this melting pot cute little like Amerikkan story y’all got maybe in second grade? I got it. And they’re like we’re a melting pot. Everyone’s happy, have turkey, and you’re good, you know. And then like myself you’re seeing people in 2018 getting shot in the back, you know in their grandmother’s backyard. We’re seeing water protectors arrested simply for video recording. We’re seeing the state move in particular ways with particular bodies. And that’s really important, it’s really important to see that. And it’s important to choose to combat it and resist it in whatever ways that is, and whatever ways that you’re able. Sometimes it’s money, y’all. Y’all might need to be sending money to the Bayou Bridge Pipeline water defenders right now to get them out of jail. You might need to be putting money on their bail funds. You might need to be writing letters to trans prisoners, letting them know that folx on the outside are prepared to do this work with them. These are just some examples of things you can do even if you have five dollars, send it. Those people who are putting their bodies on the line for you to drink safely. Cause where’s your body, right? We can, we can talk about that. We can talk about it cause your body can go somewhere else. We can talk about where it is now and where it can go. That isn’t inherently wrong to say, yo, there’s more that we could be doing. Because there is. And that’s totally fine, I’m hoping that we will all do it.

Destabilizing ideologies. So, when we talk about European colonizers forcing the idea that race, gender and sex are biologically determined in humans, thusly, creating a stratification system that serves those who align themselves with such ideology or fall under its stipulations, we can also talk about how some people don’t, [and] some people may want to [but can’t], right. They may try to align themselves, but they don’t actually get the protections of the thing. We can talk about the people who just happen to fall under those stipulations. We can talk about how Jewish Americans were named white, at one point in time, right. They weren’t always white people in America. They were their own group, right. We can talk about who got to be and who didn’t get to be [white]. Everything else becomes other, illegible, unable to be read, and even criminalized under the new constructed system. This is what we’re talkin about when we talkin’ about trans fems of color in detention centers, in prisons, in spaces where they should never be, especially because of how violent the gender binary moves. But they’re there because stratification has put them at the bottom of this thing. Not their works, not how they move in the world, but literally a system. A thing that says you’re not gonna get this job, so, now you’re poor. Now you’re poor. Maybe you’re doing sex work. Sex work is criminalized. You’re in jail. You’re in solitary. No one’s bailing you out because they have you under your government name, right. Let’s talk about it. Let’s talk about who gets caught, violently [in these systems]. Assimilation becomes the only tool other people can use to survive. And even then, survival isn’t guaranteed. Consequently, by erasing cultural identities and separating humans from their historical practices, fractured identities are what is being created. Borders were joined where there were once none.
We can talk about how Indigenous peoples and nations, many of them were migrant nations, moving from Canada down to South America and back up, over and over again. But the difference in those practices was not going to colonize these places. When a lot of Indigenous peoples come into other space with other Indigenous folx, they have ways of greeting one another, ways to say what are your practices so I do not fuck up where you come from. And you do that, and you honor it and you move that way. That is not how this happened here. This is not what’s been going down, so that even these borders are moved from a colonizer mindset. Because that didn’t exist, it just didn’t.

Decolonizing is the only way out. Trans and gender variant folx in AmeriKKA and across the globe have been resisting these incredibly violent and toxic ideologies through rejecting assimilation and engaging in revolutionary struggle. I want to talk about rejecting assimilation and myself, you know, my own body, right. I wanna talk about how when one of my aunts found out I was coming to “keynote” speak, right, at a university, she said, “Girl, what chu gonna wear?” I said, “What chu mean, what I’m gonna wear?” She said, “You got some nice slacks, nice shirt?” I said, “Nice and slacks, What!?” I’m like, who am I gonna go talk to and why do they need that from me, right. Decolonizing also looks like showing up differently sometimes. Sometimes it looks like challenging the ways we’re supposed to show up, the legitimate ways to show up. When I go to court, for these judges, I’m aware that my body is already guilty. I’m aware that, that what they’re wanting, they have already gotten money from my bail, so if I go and I show up dressed in my Sunday best (I don’t know what that is because I haven’t gone to church, well I actually did just go to church on Sunday), but, whatever best I have, if I go dressed that way, and other black poor people who don’t have accessibility to such a wardrobe, show up to court, they are then posited against my respectable body. That’s not decolonizing. That would be me upholding the state if I show up in my best because I have accessibility to “the best.” Let’s talk about why I have it. I can tell y’all why. You know, my grandmother, she worked, and she did trade, and she did a great job. And my mother, then went to college, and she was able to get a PhD, she studied. My aunts, they do trade work. My uncle went into the military. Most of my family is not college educated, but my mother was. So, I got a little bit of accessibility along the way, right. So, like, like some of my cousins who, their main vernacular is Ebonics [could not code switch], because being able to code switch was a privilege, learning to code switch was a privilege, right. So, she might not be able to come up here and deliver this in the same way. She’ll deliver it and it will still be true, but will it be legible, because of the current thing, you know. And these are things we have, we have to talk about. I have to talk about it. I have to talk about my situation in the thing. Where am I situated?

We can talk about Marsha P. Johnson, Sylvia Rivera, these folx who put their bodies on the line during Stonewall riots, and then, were erased because of legibility. You know, Stonewall just said gays and lesbians did a thing, right. Trans folx weren’t included because after Stonewall, gays and lesbians had a movement, which said “we did Stonewall”. I’m sure there were gays and lesbians there, but it was started by trans women of color but because they weren’t able to talk about and tell it and be on those platforms with those folx, subsequent erasure [occurred]. Trans organizers from Charlotte, like Michael Johnson, Jamie Marsicano were arrested and jailed in 2016 for resisting police brutality, myself included. We were in the streets of Charlotte, and when we talk about these arrests, when we talk about who was arrested, there were thousands of people. Yet the people we were bailing out for those weeks, were black, brown and trans. The people doing the bailing out were trans, doing 24 and 36- hour shifts at the jail because no other bodies
understand bondage as well as we do. Isn’t that a shame? But isn’t it beautiful our resistance too? But it’s also a shame.

Two-spirit folx were tear-gassed and arrested at Standing Rock while resisting the continued ecological warfare taking place across AmeriKKKa. A person had their arm almost shot off by a rubber bullet, and they’ll (the police) tell you they’re not using rubber bullets. But something you should know is because AmeriKKKa is informed by Zionists practices, many of our police departments are being trained by Israeli military forces, Charlotte Uprising, right. CMPD (Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department), the reason they were able to tear-gas us and used these like really awful tactical like strategies against us, was because they were trained, trained by Israeli forces. Yeah, like yo, here’s what we are doing in Palestine. Here’s how y’all can do it here. And they did it. They did it to us for days. They arrested us for days. Beat us for days. And we went back. We’ll always go back.

I want to say really quickly more about that. Um, because I want to talk about how Standing Rock is a cannonball in North Dakota, on a reservation that was given to Indigenous people by the state, right who go over the Atlantic Ocean to Palestine in Israel. Israel is a state, created by a government, put in the middle of something that already was existing. [Palestine is] defending the same things, but because Israel is able to militarize, because of this funding as well, in a certain way, Palestine is getting hit and fucked up. There are youth in the Gaza strip being murdered, who were murdered last week. I think right now the total is like 20? more? [someone from the audience says yes), more, right. These are people defending the same things, sovereignty. Being able to say, yo being stewards of a space does mean something and you cannot effectively erase us for money, for oil, for anything. That’s what these people are saying. It’s all the same. It’s all out U.S. imperialism. We have to name that.

Inside prison walls, Marius Mason, a trans man fighting for accessibility to healthcare, informs folx like myself, and Ash and Jamie. We led a teach in where we wrote letters to Marius and other trans folx, and we talked about what are we going to do together cause folx on the inside, on the inside keep being left out of the conversation. We talk about tearing down the jails. What cho gon’ in to do, blow em up, and say screw everybody on the inside. How we gonna get em out? They have to be an integral piece. If we’re not working from the space with the most directly affected individuals, this is some liberal ass work and I don’t want that. I want radical work. I want work that changes at the root, not work that changes based on my interests, based on my current needs because as a black person, maybe three hundred years ago, my needs, I may have been advocating for something else. I might have not been talking about gender. I might have been like yo, can you get these chains off me, like, what’s the T, seriously? That’s where I would be. So, we have to talk about the current conditions and what that means too. Theses folx are decolonizing our relationships to each other and the State. I’m grateful for them. I think I finished it, yea. So, we’re gonna do a Q & A. Um, I hope y’all were able to get some info. If you didn’t get enough, hopefully you’ll be picked during the Q&A. Thank y’all so much for your time. I’m really grateful to have gotten your nods, and faces and laughs. And like, yes. Um, I appreciate that. Thank y’all.

Q & A

Moderator: Who wants to ask a question? Does anyone want to start?

Question: This work is super hard. How do you keep yourself going when things get extra hard?

glo: The ancestors, no I’m kidding. Definitely the ancestors. I think, um, oftentimes, I make sure to situate myself in an historical context and understand that, yes, I’m fighting State repression. My homies are fighting State repression. People are dying. But people have [always] been fighting State repression. People
have [always] been dying. And the fight must continue. I try to make sure people understand that it’s not like a conversation around martyrdom, but more a conversation around knowing your power and your ability to change things, if you just do everything you can, every time you can, whenever you can, right. And um, so, a lot of time just checking in with these two over here. It’s like “y’all, I might not be able to make it to the teach in tonight, cause like, I’m exhausted and I have court in a few days, yadayada”. And they’re like, “I know, yeah, I’m tired too, like, should we just reschedule the whole thing?” You know and then we talk about that. We talk about how capitalism teaches us a certain thing about production, and I’m trying really to unlearn that, and really understand, and like yes there is a lot to do as well. I’m doing a lot of making sure that like, I’m eating, you know like fruits, vegetables, like, I do smoothies a lot of the time. You know just doing really good things for my body. When I understand that outside forces have a lot of control over things, and like, I am powerless in some ways, making sure that I harness and use the power I do have, like put forth the things I want to see, like wellness in black bodies. So, if I want wellness in black bodies, I got a black body, so like, let me just do that with this one and then inform the next one, and like, “fruits and veggies my friend, why yes”. You know, and that’s what we do. Thank you.

Question: I am embarrassed to ask this, but this time I was fixing to go on the Birthright trip to Israel. And there into it, for various reasons opted out, but given all the parallel to geography and given the relationship between Israel and Palestine, as symbol of oppression, how do I navigate this moving forward with my influence and probably advocacy for others?

glo: Yeah, um, I think there’s definitely a ton of like, um, Muslim and Islamic groups that are like organizing against these kinds of things. Some of the ones I know are Within Our Lifetimes, it’s a group I know in New York. But some might even be closer groups. You have an answer?

Question: If Not Now, a Jewish Voice for Peace for sure are like leftie radical Jewish organizations working to end occupation from an American Jewish perspective in the next 3 to 5 years. Um, and they’re mass training, and I can totally get you hooked up into them. We do a lot of antisemitism work and other movements. My question that I want to ask you, is that I see a lot of polarizing happening in those movements, what’s your opinion on the way polarization is being weaponized in active spaces, because I think it’s killing the nuance and it’s like making it really difficult for me to be in activist spaces. I’m so tired of it and it makes me very angry and then I feel compromised because, who else is doing the work, like how much do I have to compromise to be pro Palestinian and be Jewish. You know what I’m saying? I’m curious about on your thoughts on that.

glo: Um, but what I have to say about that is, first of all is getting comfortable in your history. Right, and being like that is a thing, it is real. I am real. My people before me were real. Um, and being to be like, yo, like um, and also, me comin into this space is not inherently negative. Me being alive is not an inherently negative thing because I get to make choices about now too. You know, I think about the different ways as someone, who was once socialized, you know, in a certain way with gender. Like the ways I don’t have to weaponize like what I used to know because it made me pass, or because it made me safe. And I can name, like yo, that’s some really fucked-up shit and I’m so sorry and as the person that I am, um in this body right now, I’m gonna do everything I can. What do you need? What do your people need? And then say like, maybe it’s the accessibility. Maybe, maybe you have to start talkin’ about your accessibility to Israel, because something that I know, like Palestinians can’t go directly into Israel. They go through a really, really difficult, um, what’s it called, um process to get in, just through the border. They have to land in Jordan and then go through like 8-hour processes of just being like, checked. They can’t go straight to Televiv. So, maybe talking about that privilege, and being like, yo, as a Jewish person, this isn’t something I want to hold onto. Because, just like my people are saying they want to lay claim, there are people, bodies who also deserve to lay claim, and why is mine placed over this, and is it because of the relationship with
the United States. And you can name that too. You know, and be very real about it because right now, truth telling is one of the most amazing decolonization tools that we have. AmeriKKKa has yet to do any truth telling. It told us that that slaves, um, I don’t even want to talk about what they did to slaves, because it’s just gonna piss me off. But they told us a lot of lies, right. Like, you can look at like the McGraw Hills books and see what they’re feeding children about the way AmeriKKKa came into being, right. And we can talk about that. And say that that’s a bunch of lies and that telling truth actually brings about liberation, and if not anything, it stops erasing, really, really horrible things and it stops erasing people. But thank you for that question. I definitely want to continue to like, see how that moves in the world. And if y’all want to connect, see what y’all are doing so if other folx have questions I will know where to point them.

Moderator: Also, just to note that Saturday our film screening and keynote discussion is gonna be about Palestinian solidarity work. And we’ll screen this movie Pink Washing Exposed which is about a movement in Seattle. But we’re gonna have local people who are involved in JVP and Queer folx and talking about themselves.

Question: Thank you, you’re so smart. I’m from Canada. My grandparents were United Empire Loyalists, who ran for the hills. And it’s really nice to be down here and hear this kind of conversation. It’s very brave, it seems that you’re having it in such a lovely place, as well, a real honor. I’m interested in you talking a little bit more about not wearing a suit to court, because you miss so much these days about not being able to change something unless you’re on the inside. I’m also, I work in theater, so, it also has a double meaning, you know, because there is, life is a stage, you know, you have to play a role in order to make that change that you aspire to make and in not wearing that suit and rebelling against the role, it’s awesome, it’s cool, I like it. Tell me more about how you’re going to accomplish your goals without cow towing to that part of the system.

glo: Um, so, thank you first of all for that question. Welcome, um, to Asheville. Did you say you still live in Canada? O, yes, so, definitely welcome to the state. I’m from Charlotte, that’s a couple of hours away. Um, but I think, when I think about your question, I think about my goals, when I got caught up in this trial, right. I was like, what is my goal? Is it to not go to jail? Is it to, you know, um, have a space to talk about things? Is it, um, to, like, I don’t know, what is my goal? My goal is actually not to not go to jail because the options with that actually, some of them are like accepting plea deals, right. So, if I accept the plea from the Mecklenburg County [court] that says I incited the Charlotte Uprising that happened in response to the police killing of Keith Lamont Scott, which is actually what incited the uprising, right because killer cops are actually what incite uprisings [then I avoid jail or at least not as much prison time]. People showing up to where violent things happen is not the incitement, is not the inciting act, right. And so, we’re talkin’ about that. They’re saying the riot was incited, and in those days, um, another man was murdered, right. So, If I accept this guilty plea for inciting the Charlotte Uprising, I accept guilt for Justin Carr’s murder. I accept guilt for every black body that got into a cage. I accept guilt for pretty much everything that the police state has been able to do in Charlotte, North Carolina by saying “yes, it’s our bodies that we respond to violence that are guilty”. And I can’t be of that legacy.

If they determine me guilty, that’s on them. You know, my spirit isn’t caught up in that. Many people have done time, Mumia is still there. And he’s alive and he’s organizing and he’s legitimate. So, what I want to remove is the idea that those of us who may or may not go behind bars are now illegitimate, are now, no longer able to participate. Cause there’s work to do in there too. My people are on the inside, know that. And by my people, I mean the murderers, I mean the rapists, I mean every person who has acted out of this
state-imposed violence. Because let’s talk about people who are in there because of robbery. If private property in the state didn’t exist, and didn’t firstly rob First Nations and Indigenous people, how the hell can somebody rob anything here? When we talk about violence, when we talk about murder, especially when we talk about murder in marginalizing inner city spaces where people’s lives have already been determined as meaning this much [uses hands to show a small amount], when we talk about that, when we see life get taken in those spaces, we have to talk about the space they were placed in? Were they given humanity at any point. Did they even see themselves as being able to participate in this ever? Or, were they the animals you relegated them to be? And then manifest destiny, right. It’s really garbage, but it happens. And so, I think, for me, I show up for them. You know, I’m like dang, I bet the boy who got caught up, you know, and so when we go to court, it’s um, like a, a room of maybe 10 or 15 people who might be seen that day so, you all to get to watch each other go through. And so, a lot of times I see people in like shorts with holes. You know and like, um wearing like sandals and things, and you hear a judge say, you didn’t get dressed for this. And you’re like, and you say what? Get dressed to come have you make a judgement on their life after knowing them for 5 seconds. A, I think not, and B, do they have the resources? And so, for me when I come in and I still like, say these things to them, right, and I’m like wearing maybe this, they have to wonder like oh, wow, are only the people who can speak the King’s English, the ones who should be able to determine they should get to be free? Are the ones who dress like the king, look like the king, act like the king, are they the ones, are they the only ones that should be free? Or is it all of us? And if I go in, I’m going in in solidarity. And if I go out, I’m going out in solidarity. Nothing changes. But they will know some different things about us. They will, this case is being covered. So, more people are learning. They screwed up. They gave me a platform and a mic. And now I’m like in Asheville. Wow, what idiots, right? Like, that’s what we’re here to do. Yeah, thank you for that question.

Question: I have two questions. First, I know there was so much trauma that like, came out of the Charlotte Uprising. I’d be interested to hear, like, what practices you and folx you’re organizing with have, like to heal after all of that, like still, there. Uh, and then also, I wanted to ask, just like logistically, how do you navigate how they, um, like bringing, well, having meetings, where folx are on the inside [of prison] are the decision makers, do they like call-in?

glo: Right, so, [directs comment to co-organizer] actually do you want to talk about how we got Marius’ letter? Do you remember? When we were doing the letter writing, how did we get in contact with them?

Co-organizer: We got in contact with them from the Trans Prisoner Day of Solidarity website and then we asked for folx in our community to reach out to them directly. We reached out to them directly.

glo: Thank you. Um, so that’s one of the ways we’re navigating that. And then, to speak on your first question, for me in particular, something we haven’t said in this space, but something some of you may know, is my charges were actually placed after I witnessed the police killing of Justin Carr. And, um, I had to carry his body under the Omni Hotel, so definitely like trauma, right, literally witnessing murder on the streets of Charlotte. Um, where like the SWAT team is kind of where this row of folx is right here. And Justin’s laying right here, we’re screaming, and they did nothing. They did nothing to help us. T-shirts are just coming, flying in, [to soak up blood] actually. Um, and, yeah, he lost, he lost his life on that sidewalk, right. And, so, um, some of what I’ve been doing is telling that, right. Is letting people know that like yo, like, this happened, um, I was there and there was blood on my glasses, on my clothes. I don’t think I got more than four hours of sleep for at least a solid, yeah, at least a year, right about a year. And so, and like my comrades know
because this is who I check in with so, that’s another thing. Like, checking in and being like I am not, am not good, um, I’m being haunted by like this man’s face who, I watched some of his head get blown off, right. And so, like, that’s real. And it’s not just me. You know, sadly, youth in Palestine are seeing that, people in Standing Rock saw that. This is happening. It’s happening and we’re all becoming people who can tell now these stories of violence on the streets of these spaces that are supposed to be better and newer and free, or whatever. I don’t know. It happened right outside near Bank of America, near a movie theater where people do commercial things. Um, and so, um, outside of that I’ve really been making sure that I don’t really know how to explain it. Um, I’m trying to get more connected spiritually, you know, not even just like in terms of a god or a thing like that, but more in terms of like, knowing myself, and my body and where it is in spaces. Cause sometimes I didn’t understand why I was getting anxious or like what was going on. So, like, trying to be more grounded, um, trying to make sure that like, I’m um, drinking enough water and the thing I said about food is actually really important, making sure that I’m eating. Cause, definitely lost a bunch of weight since the Uprising. I’m probably still losing weight. I don’t know. Um, and, I’m trying to think what else. Lately I’ve been trying to connect with other people who’ve seen like, brutality in that way. It’s kind of hard because like, support group for seeing someone murdered by police, Google, no results. Then like, (makes sound), so, I’m kind of just like, checking in with like, do you know, it’s like, how do you ask that? Do you know someone who’s seen someone murdered? Like, what do you know about this? Um, but like, definitely just telling it is being, has helped a lot. But it definitely gets harder closer to court, because, for me, my court case is wrapped up in Rayquan Borum’s court case. Someone that Scott referenced earlier. Rayquan is a young Black male being framed for the murder I witnessed. Um, and it’s really important to say that my warrants came out after I talked about Justin Carr. What we found out when we looked at my discovery documents from the police, they scanned my social media, first, and foremost. And so, what they said is they saw a young Black woman saying that someone was killed by the police, they went to that news story, got my name, searched my name in police database for traffic tickets, all that, pulled my face up, sent that picture of my face to officers who responded during the uprising, asked if any of them had ever seen me. And we have all these documents now because they don’t redact anything they give you your discovery. So, I can see all the emails between like the Chief saying, “oh yeah, we’re going after glo merriweather now. We’re looking at their Facebook”. And then, “oh, and did you see glo. I didn’t see glo on this day, but I did see them leading chants on that day. And you know that kind of back and forth. There’s nothing saying that I did know, anything, um, violent. They did charge me, they’re charging me with assault on a government official as well. Though they said they never saw me throw rocks or do anything like that. Because other people were revved up by Black Lives Matter chants, I don’t know, I’m being charged with assault, right. And so, even though they’re stating they don’t have evidence that I did this, or they don’t remember me doing it, but only that I was there. And it’s also important to note that I’ve been doing organizing in Charlotte for a few years now, so some of the police, know me, right. Because like, they’ve been killing us. In 2015 they only killed Black people, who are 30% of Charlotte’s population. So, like, how does 30% of the population getting 100% of your bullets for the same crimes I’ve seen white bodies get taken to jail and released for. What happened, um, but yea, I hope that answers your question.

Question: Yeah, um, I appreciate what’s happening here today. I just got out of prison.

glo: I’m glad you’re out.

Question: But, I go back in tomorrow.

glo: No.

Question: But see, I can say that because I’m a social worker for prison. It’s just east of here. And so, the challenge is how does one enter into that kind of environment when one has a kind of role, one has to dawn
a costume to kind of be in that kind of setting. And the challenge is how to effectively raise consciousness, when one does it as a staff person or when one does it as a term offender as used in North Carolina. It is very much a challenge in terms of how you assert the rights. Women as well as men who are incarcerated. So, it’s one thing, constantly of going in and out of that place for me is the only level of comfort I live with. I’ve got a job here. I also realize that my work is right now again, I appreciate your work. I don’t know where we might connect again. Maybe I’ll see you in prison.

gm: You might, I might be at that prison. If I am, I hope you’re giving my people some letters. I think something you can do in that space, more importantly, is like make sure you outwardly reject their [the State’s] space there. Maybe that will compromise like your ability to still go in and out. But like, it’s important that people who are on the inside, and people who say that they want to be working for them are actually wanting to do that and are willing to do like the radical things. Because like wanting to do things, but then like being tied-up by systemic things, is like, I don’t really know, it doesn’t really sound like you’ll be able to achieve your goal from there, um, but I think that continuing to be like in coalition with those folx and making sure that their humanity is upheld [is important]. And I know of correctional officers, or different kinds of people in other spaces, they go on strikes with inmates. You know what I mean. And so, like there are things to do in solidarity, you know, with those folx, right. And so, just making sure you’re never speaking like for them. Maybe asking like, what do people on the outside need to know, how can I communicate that. And like maybe, we’re trying to figure out how to do bail funds and different things like that. Since you have, you know, access, maybe you know how to get things like that, but definitely like, maybe not just doing your job anymore, but having to do more in speaking and doing more.

Question: Um, so, I have a similar question about how to be a conscious, inaudible, in Charlotte and all this time we see it, and things are actively happening, but how do we be conscious about things that are not feasible to us. I think it’s really important to ask this question. Because when we are compromising our history of like oppression and we tell people of this history, there always are people who are erased through that process. How can we vocalize about our history without compromising those people who might be [in] our narratives?

glo: So, a lot of what I do and what we do, actually we had a delegation of folx in the Charlotte Uprising collective go to Standing Rock in November 2016, and um, ever since I’ve been making really intentional, moves toward being in right relationship with Indigenous and Native folx here, where we can hear their stories from them. A lot of what you heard me say today, a lot of what I had access to sharing with you, come from people I’m actually in community with, come from Native and Indigenous folx. A lot of it is actually, like, are you in community with people who are like being fucked over and that’s kind where we’re getting to when we talk about liberation. We’re talking also about community building. Um and so, in community building we actually do have to go do some time and sit with people and observe and like see what is life for different folx, and let their stories be their stories and not something that you speak of or from, but like that you can lament on and tell on your own because what I tried to do today was tell my own story and also connect it to others without telling someone else’s story. And like that is something I only am able to do because I am in community with such individuals. So maybe it’s getting in coalition with other organizations like Indigenous People’s Power Project, which is a really dope initiative and
project coming out of indigenous and native folx who are wanting to resist ecological warfare in the many different ways the state is poisoning and harming people. We also do work with the Southeast Asian Coalition in Charlotte, so we are very closely, we are actually in coalition with them. So, we know a lot and do a lot with Southeast Asian deportations and things like that, having to learn the histories of refugees and the true histories. You might have to do a little bit of research. You might have to not talk for like a year to just learn, right. Because sometimes that’s part of it too. Sometimes it’s literally just like a little bit of listening and being able to situate yourself within another person’s story. Because when I think about Palestine, I see that happening here. It’s not far off. It is the same weapons, it’s the same tools. It’s the same ideology, right. And so being able to not other, other’s, you know is something that works for me. I hope that helps.

Moderator: You got a court date coming up. You want to share that?

glo: Oh yeah, I have a court date, May 7th of this year in Charlotte. I think it’s at 9:30m, if y’all would like to come through, we have information on that, Jamie, Ash and myself will be here until Sunday. Also, there are go fund me’s for legal fees. Rayquan Borem, like we said, actually I don’t know if I said that but he’s been in a cage since those days without trial. His trial is not set until December 3rd. So, that’s two years in a cage with no trial for something the police did, right. Those of us who were witnesses were actually in communication with one another and none of us has been contacted by the police so they’re clearly not building a case otherwise, right. And so, why is he there, like what’s happening to him. He’s been in solitary many, many times. I think we raised now, 55 thousandish for him, and we still need to raise another 30ish thousand. This is still like grassroots, we’re not an organization. We’re not a 501c3. We are trans and queer people who have jobs and lives, and like, you know beds that we want to see sometimes. But, people are on the inside, right. And so, we’re really trying to push and work and make sure that he doesn’t get lost in this system that’s trying to deeply incriminate him for something that clearly wasn’t, that he didn’t do. And so yeah, so if y’all wanna link up with us about that, you can also follow Charlotte Uprising on Facebook, and then we’re available, as well.

Moderator: Thank you so much glo merriweather

glo: Thank you

Continue to unlearn and relearn how to be in right relationship with one another and the Earth
If you wish to get involved or learn more, please check out these groups/organizations and be ready to do a lot of listening.

**Mijente**
- L’eau est La Vie Camp- Water Protectors resisting the Bayou Bridge Pipeline
- Charlotte Uprising- a Collective of Trans and Non-Binary organizers
- The Southeast Asian Coalition of Charlotte
- Indigenous Peoples Power Project
- Black Youth Project 100

**Works Referenced**


---

**glo merriweather** is a Black, queer community organizer who spent two years on trial for felony protest charges, stemming from the 2016 Charlotte Uprising. Now, glo works to build healing centered communities and families, in Charlotte and globally.
Cross Cultural Dialogue on White Cultural Identity, Power, and Privilege in a Graduate Course

Ruby Cain & Kendra Lowery
Ball State University

OVERVIEW

Cross-cultural dialogues on race, traditionally, did not tend to the white cultural experience, specifically for white participants, and generally, for participants of color. The need to understand self before attempting to understand those who are culturally different serves two purposes. The first purpose is to critically reflect and analyze the significance and origin of one’s cultural lens. The second purpose is to recognize that not everyone shares your cultural perspectives. It is challenging to understand another’s point of view if you have not first analyzed the basis of your perceptions.

COURSE STRUCTURE

The course uses a blended format of synchronous (classroom) and asynchronous (virtual) engagement, assignments, and discussion. In a sixteen-week semester, students meet on five Saturdays, 9:00-4:00 pm, with a working lunch. The course begins with assignments to provide all students a foundation for understanding the social construction of race, the history of institutional racism in the United States from its inception until today, key definitions on culture, types of racism, oppression, implicit bias, social action and justice, community engagement and mobilization, etc. Resources include videos, books, journal articles, websites, discussion, research, presentations by a genealogist, community organizers, community partners, and adult education professor and students from another university. Subsequent sessions build on the knowledge and skill acquisition from prior sessions.

HISTORY OF COURSE DEVELOPMENT

Years of facilitating cross-cultural dialogues on race and racism resulted in several recurring themes. White participants and participants of color participated for different reasons. Participants of color participated with the intent of engaging in social action opportunities. White participants participated with the intent of increasing knowledge about participants of color. They wanted to know how participants of color were going to help themselves or how they could help participants of color to achieve equity with whites.
Participants of color would re-tell and relive their experiences with institutional racism and individual acts of racial prejudice. At times, the discussion would become volatile. Some would express anger, hurt, shame, or embarrassment. Some would disengage from the dialogue and subsequently stop attending. To understand these differing motivations for participation in cross-cultural dialogues on racism, it requires an understanding of the differences in experiences and knowledge. White participants and participants of color usually inhabit and navigate different spaces. Whites are the most segregated of all culture groups. They are the majority culture in their neighborhoods, schools, places of employment, places of worship, etc. They can choose whether they want to enter spaces where their culture group is in the minority. Alternately, participants of color navigate spaces where whites are the majority, every day. They are multicultural due to the need to understand their culture and the white culture.

More than sixteen years ago, workshops were developed to allow for different spaces for white participants and participants of color. Organizers expressed mixed feelings. How can we learn about cultural differences and forge alliances for social change in segregated spaces? The purpose of the segregated spaces was to provide foundational knowledge that would enable cross-cultural dialogues to be more productive. It also determined that all participants needed historical and foundational knowledge about institutional racism, power, privilege, and the social construction of race. This knowledge was acquired via videos and publications, followed by discussion. All students researched and presented on their family history. The presentation included an analysis of the positionality of race in their family history.

The class was divided into two breakout sessions. White students and white facilitators participated in a guided discussion of white cultural identities, privilege, and power. Students of color and facilitators of color participated in a guided discussion of internalized racism; how to identify it; and how to heal from it. The class came back, together and shared what was discussed in the breakout groups. Other activities included a research paper on a related topic of choice and an immersive learning project, planned, developed, and administered with the community.

The White Affinity Group Breakout session allows White students to work with White co-facilitators to explore and discuss white cultural identity, privilege, and power. The segregation of White students provides them with a safe space to discuss, question, and surmise without fear of eliciting hurt, anger, or blame from cultures of color. Below are the activities.

**ACTIVITY: WHITENESS IDENTITY**

1. Review the Peggy McIntosh article, White Privilege - Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack; White Lies video clip; and Tim Wise video, White Like Me: Race, Racism, and White Privilege in America.
2. Try Harvard Implicit Association tests on race, age, sexual orientation, etc. We will discuss your reaction to the tests, not the actual scores. Your scores will remain confidential and you will not be asked to share them.
3. What does it mean to be White? Compare/contrast your thoughts with the assignments you read/viewed.
4. Is White Privilege a reality?
5. What do you love/value about your own cultural identities that support and inspire you in your life?
6. What has determined or framed your understanding about race and racism?
7. Think of an incident when you experienced cultural oppression or bias. What was your reaction? How did you feel? What did you do? What did you learn from the experience? What do you know now that you did not know at that time?
8. What does Peggy McIntosh mean by the statement: "I was taught to see racism only in individual acts of meanness, not in invisible systems conferring dominance on my group?" (para 1)
ACTIVITY: WITHOUT SANCTUARY

1. View movie clip on Without Sanctuary at http://withoutsanctuary.org. What does the narrator attempt to portray? What is your reaction?
2. View the NPR clip (7 min) on the song “Strange Fruit” and the author of the lyrics: https://www.npr.org/2012/09/05/158933012/the-strange-story-of-the-man-behind-strange-fruit
3. Song – Strange Fruit: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Web007rzSOI

Strange Fruit Lyrics by Abel Meeropol
Southern trees bear a strange fruit,
Blood on the leaves and blood at the root,
Black bodies swinging in the southern breeze,
Strange fruit hanging from the poplar trees.

Pastoral scene of the gallant south,
The bulging eyes and the twisted mouth,
Scent of magnolias, sweet and fresh,
Then the sudden smell of burning flesh.

Here is fruit for the crows to pluck,
For the rain to gather, for the wind to suck,
For the sun to rot, for the trees to drop,
Here is a strange and bitter crop.

ACTIVITY: COMMUNITY GRADING

(adapted from Facing Racism in a Diverse Nation, Everyday Democracy Resources - https://www.everyday-democracy.org/resources/facing-racism)

1. Read each statement on the two Report Cards regarding your community and the university.
2. Give a grade for each statement.
3. How did you decide what grade to give?
4. When you look at the card, what successes do you see?
5. When you look at the card, what are some challenges that we need to address.

ACTIVITY: EXPLORATION OF INEQUITIES

Why Do Inequities Exist and or Continue? Form groups of 3-4 individuals. Review 2-3 viewpoints and share your reactions. Do you agree/disagree? Is there another viewpoint to be considered?

SYLLABUS

Course Rationale

This course is a collaboration with community partners. It is an interactive course to foster student discussion, discover family histories, and promote community involvement. It provides a structured and critical review, reflection, and analysis of individual, collective, and organizational cultural identities, race as a social construction, historical inequalities, the history and impact of structural racism, the implications
for race relations, and strategies for promoting inclusion and civic engagement through family and history research, presentations, oral storytelling, and/or the development of traveling exhibits.

**Required Textbooks**

Other resources will be provided.

**Course Goals**

1. Increase awareness and understanding of structural and internalized racism.
2. Increase knowledge of the historical development of structural racism in America.
3. Examine the role of race within the development of family history.
4. Internalize self-pride and self-efficacy, instead of racism and oppression, via behaviors promoting physical and mental health, professional and personal development, and cooperative learning.
5. Posit self in the ongoing national discourse on race and racism in America.
6. Mobilize socially and politically for the elimination of institutional and internalized racism through the production of public exhibits that examine racism and history in our culture.
7. Examine varying cultural lenses and perspectives on key course concepts and topics.
8. Utilize critical reflection to synthesize and articulate learning throughout the course.

**Major Course Objectives**

1. Define and describe whiteness, power, privilege, and structural and internalized racism.
2. Discuss and identify at least two historical events/actions that comprise a portion of the development of structural racism in America.
3. Research family histories to discover ancestral roots, and then describe the role of race within the development of family history.
4. Discuss at least two strategies aimed at professional and personal development, promoting physical and mental health, and/or collaborative/cooperative learning, in unlearning and overcoming structural and internalized racism and oppression.
5. Develop and present an immersive learning project targeting the issues of cultural identities, historical inequalities, community mobilization, and action planning for a selected organization.
6. Discuss racial, ethnic, and cultural groups’ perspectives, contributions, inclusion, and exclusion in the applicable theoretical models and frameworks.
7. Document critical reflections on learning and application of course content.

**Major Course Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation and Discussion</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersive Learning Project Proposal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersive Learning Project Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family History Project</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Participation and Discussion

Adult learning theories govern the conduct of this class. As a student, you are an active and integral stakeholder in your and others’ learning. You are a current or aspiring adult and/or community educator or practitioner in a field where adult education is an important means of developing or maintaining core competencies, in order to be acknowledged as highly skilled.

You will be required to co-construct with the professor and class members a learning environment that will meet your and others’ individual learning needs. You will be co-learners and co-teachers with the professor and class members as you actively listen (i.e. read students’ posts) and critically reflect on the discussions and sharing of experiences of others. This means that our pace of class activities will promote inclusion of, learning, and understanding by all class participants. There may be times when you will be comfortable with the pace. In addition, there may be times when you will feel the pace is too fast or too slow. You are encouraged to continually think and reflect on the ways you learn and how they compare/contrast with your colleagues in this course. Together we will build, nurture, and sustain a community of learning and a community of learners.

Students must be self-motivated and disciplined to meet all due dates as noted, in the course syllabus. Developing a routine and time management strategy tailored to your lifestyle and learning needs, is essential for academic success.

Methods of Course Evaluation

Formal evaluation of the course is via the university’s End of Course Evaluation Instrument. Informal evaluation will take place frequently through critical reflection/analysis, online discussion posts, class discussion, observation, and feedback with the class members, and the professor.

Confidentiality Clause

This class will use students’ and professors’ experiences to illuminate points and reinforce the classroom content and objectives. Students are not required to disclose personal or private information. If they choose to do so, they assume the responsibility of their actions. The instructor has a right to cease activities or discussions deemed not appropriate for this forum. No personal medical information is to be publicly disclosed to the class.
Community of Learning (COL) Activities

Each session, you have the opportunity to nurture our Community of Learning by engaging in facilitator-led activities in class or posting to an activity listed on the Online Discussion Board. These activities allow you to get to know the other students in ways that are not easily accomplished by course assignments.

Online Discussion Forum Posts (CIPs)

Please post your critical reflections regarding your learning on the Online Discussion Board. All Critical Incident Posts (CIPs) should be added, anonymously, to maintain an honest and open atmosphere.

The process for articulating your critical reflection of your learning is based on Stephen Brookfield’s concept of the Critical Incident Questionnaire (CIQ) at http://www.stephenbrookfield.com/critical-incident-questionnaire. Brookfield, a leader in educational theory and practices, writes in Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher that:

“Critical incidents are brief descriptions of vivid happenings that for some reason people remember as being significant (Tripp, 1993; Woods, 1993). For students, every class contains such moments and teachers need to know what these are...[The CIQ] is a quick and revealing way to discover the effects your actions are having on students and to find out the emotional highs and lows of their learning” (Brookfield, 1995, p. 114).

In addition, the CIPs will provide you with appropriate opportunities for reflection and the synthesis of ideas and perspectives. Finally, use the CIPs to provide record of the developmental stages of your learning and your reaction to that learning in preparation for completing your Midterm and Final Personal Learning Journals.

Family Research Project

Your project can consist of a paper, PowerPoint, role-play, video, audio, website, or other media presentation. Project should include a minimum of four generations, including you as one generation. This means you, parents, grandparents, and great grandparents. Provide detailed accounts of the lives of the individuals you research. This can include: where they lived, if they moved, where and why they moved, occupations, siblings, children, official/unofficial adoptions, education, hobbies/interests, thematic (platitudes, dress, hairstyles, cuisine, housing, travel, family crest, name origins, etc.), faith affiliations, gender, race/ethnicity, other cultural identities, etc.

Critically reflect and analyze the positionality of race/ethnicity in your family history. Recommendations on themes and topics include (but are not limited to):
1. Your first awareness of race/ethnicity (your racial/ethnic identity and other racial/ethnic identities that differed from yours).
2. The racial/ethnic composition of your family (i.e. what races/ethnicities are represented within your family; how did your family address cross cultural dating, neighborhoods, schools, faith institutions, marriage, adoptions, etc.).
3. The racial/ethnic composition within your circle of influence (family, friends, colleagues, mentors, mentees, etc.).
4. The racial/ethnic composition of the environment (i.e. regions where family members lived/moved/immigrated/migrated; neighborhoods; educational institutions (K-18); work location and employee; travel destinations; family/social gatherings; professional/associations settings; retail institutions; etc.).
5. The racial context for you and targeted family members (How much is your/their lives impacted by race? To what extent are you/they conscious of the impact of race on your lives?).

Research Paper


Length of paper: 6-8 pages, double-spaced, Times New Roman, Arial, or Calibri, 12 pt. font, one-inch margins, with a minimum of 6 scholarly references, using APA style. Pictures, images, clip art can be included in the paper.

Midterm Personal Learning Journal

For the Midterm Personal Learning Journal, please revisit your CIPs on the Online Discussion Board to review your experiences in the course. Please synthesize your experiences and your reactions (intellectual, emotional, or even physical) to the learning activities. Draw some conclusions about your personal learning during the course, placing it in a personal context describing your journey to accomplishing the course objectives.
1. What have been the most important learning experiences (relating to course objectives), thus far in the course (name at least two) and why?
2. What has been the most surprising learning experience (relating to course objectives), and why?
3. What has been the most challenging learning experience (relating to course objectives), and why?
4. How did this learning occur (analyze how your learning was impacted by the stimulus - text, film, teacher, student, presentations, as well as your own reactions to the new knowledge)?
5. In what ways does it alter previous knowledge?
6. Next, why does this learning matter?
7. What will you do with this learning?

The Personal Learning Journal should be approximately five pages in length, double-spaced, Calibri, Times New Roman, or Arial, 12 pt. font, with one inch margins. References are not required.

Immersive Learning Project Proposal
The purpose of this project is to inform and educate the public on any of the class topics: cultural identities, institutional and structural racism, social construction of race, historical inequalities, and history of racial/ethnic groups in region. Professor and students will collectively identify community stakeholders to serve as project members, key informants, knowledge bearers, and active participants.

Students will work along with community members to develop and administer Talking Race Human Library in Muncie for school and community educators to facilitate discussions and social action plans using the Facing Racism book as a resource. The book was published in 2016. It includes writers’ portrayal of Muncie, Indiana residents’ oral narratives where they shared their experiences in facing racism.

The proposal will include:
1) An explanation of the project and why selected, include topic, rationale, and anticipated outcome.
2) List the names of the group members and community partners and participants, as well as, their roles in developing and administering the project.
3) Describe the goals and evaluation methodology.
4) Develop a work plan and timeline.

The Program Plan and Timeline will include activities, persons assigned/responsible, prerequisites, and projected dates to be completed.

**Immersive Learning Project Presentation**

Project can consist of PowerPoint, role-play, props, objects, drawings, charts, video, audio, website, and/or other media. Project Presentation can include lecture, oral storytelling, video, pictures, audio recordings, traveling exhibits, storyboards, etc. Creativity with your project is highly encouraged to engage your audience and aim for a personal connection with the members of community partner organizations. Presentation will be 25 to 30 minutes including Q&A. You may explore multimedia tools to facilitate working on your Group Presentation.

**Final Personal Learning Journal**

For the Final Personal Learning Journal, please revisit your CIPs on the Online Discussion Forum to review your experiences in the course, from the date you completed the Midterm Personal Learning Journal through the end of class. Please synthesize your experiences and your reactions (intellectual, emotional, or even physical) to the learning activities. Draw some conclusions about your personal learning during the second half of the course, placing it in a personal context describing your journey to accomplishing the course objectives.

1. What have been the most important learning experiences (relating to course objectives), thus far in the course (name at least two) and why?
2. What has been the most surprising learning experience (relating to course objectives), and why?
3. What has been the most challenging learning experience (relating to course objectives), and why?
4. How did this learning occur (analyze how your learning was impacted by the stimulus - text, film, teacher, student, presentations, as well as your own reactions to the new knowledge)?
5. In what ways does it alter previous knowledge?
6. Next, why does this learning matter?
7. What will you do with this learning?

The Personal Learning Journal should be approximately five pages in length, double spaced, Calibri, Times New Roman, or Arial, 12 pt, font, with one inch margins.
Course Schedule and Outline

This schedule provides a tentative outline for each class and the homework assignments to prepare for that class session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Session 1</td>
<td>1. Review Week 1 Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Compile family tree history (as much as possible/currently known),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>using Family Group Records and Pedigree Chart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reading &amp; Assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>1. Class Overview and Syllabus Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Community of Learners Activity (COL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cultural Identities and Dominant/Subordinate Group Memberships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Levels of Racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Courageous Conversations about Race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Family History Project Overview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Introduction to Genealogy Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Immersive Learning Project Overview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Session 2</td>
<td>1. Post Critical Incident Post (CIPs), anonymously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Race: Power of an Illusion Part 2 Viewing, Activity, and Discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reading &amp; Assignments (including Part I and II of textbook). Select a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chapter in Part I and a chapter in Part II, obtaining professor approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete a presentation on the chapters and post on Online Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>1. Community of Learners Activity (COL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Connecting Social Construction to Historical Inequalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Affinity Group Breakout Sessions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1 Whiteness/Power/Privilege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2 Internalized Racism/Oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sharing from Affinity Groups and Debriefing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Race Timeline Activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Immersive Learning Project Work Activities, including submit proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Session 3</td>
<td>1. Post Critical Incident Post (CIPs), anonymously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Work on Immersive Learning Project Plan/Timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reading &amp; Assignments (including Part III of textbook).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Race: Power of an Illusion Part 3 Viewing, Activity, and Discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Complete Family History Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>1. Community of Learners Activity (COL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Faith Diversity Panel Discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Other “Isms.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Pre-Session 4** | 1. Post Critical Incident Post (CIPs), anonymously.  
3. Submit Research to Online Discussion Board. Post comments on a minimum of three papers within seven days.  
4. Reading & Assignments (including Parts IV and V of textbook). |
| **Session 4:** | 1. Community of Learners Activity.  
2. Family History Presentations, cont.  
4. Immersive Learning Project Work Activities. |
| **Pre-Session 5** | 1. Critical Incident Post (CIPs), anonymously.  
2. Reading & Assignments.  
3. Immersive Learning Project Work Activities. |
| **Session 5** | 1. Community of Learners Activity (COL).  
2. “Is There a Culture of Poverty?” Activity.  
3. Immersive Learning Project & Presentation. |
| **Post-Session 5** | 1. Post Critical Incident Post (CIPs), anonymously.  
3. Presentation at Immersive Learning Showcase. |

**Ruby Cain** received her doctorate in Adult, Higher, and Community Education at Ball State University. Her research agenda encompasses transformative and collaborative learning, racial equity, social justice, and community mobilization. Cain has presented and published her research findings locally, regionally, and internationally. She was co-author of the Education chapter of State of Black Fort Wayne 2003, used as companion text in Educational Foundations, Sociology, and other college courses. Cain’s philosophy of education is humanism employing behaviorist strategies. Cain embodies life-long learning because “education is the key to self-enlightenment and community building: our responsibilities to ourselves and others.” She has more than fourteen years of higher education experience in curriculum development, administration, and teaching traditional, online, and hybrid courses. She holds three project management certifications and has more than 20 years of experience in developing and administering adult and continuing education programs at work and community settings.
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The socially charged issue of racism is such an emotional and polarizing subject within the higher and adult education classroom that some educators may not feel equipped or confident to address it in their curriculum. Teaching Race, edited by Stephen Brookfield, is an important assembling of educators’ journeys into the complicated idea of how race and racism impact learning in higher and adult educational settings. The book contains introductory, middle and closing chapters by Brookfield, but the bulk of the fifteen chapters are written by his fellow associates who include their experiences, techniques, and methods for introducing and guiding adult learners into a thought-provoking dialogue of the complexity of racial tensions within US society. Brookfield’s goals are clear from the preface, he desires this book not to be an academic presentation, but rather a call to action for the purpose of illuminating the pervasiveness of racist thought and white privilege within our society (p. xv). Brookfield argues that this call to action, which may challenge some student’s deeply grounded beliefs, must take place in the higher and adult education classroom. His goal is to give instructors tested methods and techniques to offer to students as an avenue to be honest about their biases, fears and assumptions regarding racism. Brookfield states that he, and the authors within the book, “view white supremacy as the philosophical foundation of racism” (p. 4) and believes that exposing this way of thinking is the key to unlocking racial justice within US culture.

In his introduction, Brookfield offers three primary pedagogical methods for educators to address the issue of fear and bias in the classroom: scaffolding, modeling, and community building. These techniques, Brookfield states, help to slowly and safely ease students into discussions of bias, race, and privilege and assist them in realizing that most thinking is biased and comes from personal perspective and experience (pp. 6-10). These useful methods are elaborated on and illustrated by Brookfield’s and give both students and educators operative methods to tackle this difficult subject and generate thought and discussion.

With the introduction priming the reader to engage and participate in a difficult yet essential journey, Brookfield invites authors and professors in the next thirteen chapters to share their experiences in teaching
race and white privilege. These associates include (but are not limited to) George Yancy, Lucia Pawlowski, Pamela E. Barnett, Talmadge C. Guy and Lisa R. Merriweather. Their powerful insights provide most of the book’s content as each author shares their struggles and successes in introducing the topic of race within classroom settings. Their examples and methods challenge the reader with understanding their own positionality regarding race and instruct them on how to guide their students to do the same.

One critique of the book would be that some of the techniques illustrated are repetitive and may cause some readers to lose interest toward the latter chapters. Similar exercises of personal identity are discussed from chapter to chapter, and several authors bring up the same trepidation felt by white students who feel frightened to speak for fear of being called a racist, and black students for fear of having to represent their entire race group.

Yet, for those educators who are truly struggling with practical ways to effectively and boldly present students with this subject matter, these redundancies can serve to strengthen the notion that concerned and engaged educators experiencing similar struggles from their students with comparable breakthroughs. These breakthroughs come when both instructor and student are willing to become vulnerable and allow other voices admittance into their way of thinking to help destroy old assumptions and build new pathways of respect and compassion for other groups. It is only when we, as educators, encourage the questioning of ideas and biases that we once believed were foundational (and perhaps not scrutinized) in our lives, that true transformation can begin to take place within our classrooms and in society.

Lt Col Kyle G. Bellue is the Deputy Chair of the Joint Warfighting Department at Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama where he teaches both Leadership and Joint Warfighting. He has a B.S. and M.S. in Meteorology from Texas A&M University and is currently working on his EdD in Higher Education from the University of Memphis where he is researching women’s ability to learn within male-dominated organizations.
Christopher J. Lebron places the social protest movement, #BlackLivesMatter, squarely in the context of civil rights movements throughout American history. Lebron makes the argument that #BlackLivesMatter is a continuation of an ongoing struggle and movement in America propelled by earlier scholars, artists, and activists such as: Ida B. Wells, Frederick Douglass, Langston Hughes, Zora Neale Hurston, James Baldwin, Alain LeRoy Locke, and Martin Luther King. Special attention is given to the Harlem Renaissance and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s because each regarded its mission as clarifying and exemplifying the value and equity of Blacks in America. They are seen as precursors to the #BlackLivesMatter movement. This book makes the case that the question of whether “Black Lives Matter” is neither a new assertion nor a new protest movement but rather is embedded in the long and oppressive history of the United States. This book is concise and relatively short at 187 pages. It is a welcome contribution to social science literature and could be an important read for adult educators and their students as well. In the book’s introduction entitled “Naming the Dead,” Lebron eloquently states that we must name the dead, call them out for the sake of the living. Therefore, he identifies by name black bodies murdered recently in America by unjustified violence – Philandro Castile, Michael Brown, Travon Martin, Tamir Rice, Sandra Bland, Eric Garner – just to name a few of the hundreds of names of individuals. Following the strong introduction, Chapter 1 begins with the black American social and political thought of Frederick Douglass and Ida B. Wells. It provides “some of the intellectual and philosophical moorings we need to fully appreciate the depth of “black lives matter” (p., xv). Chapter 2 continues this argument showing how black artistic performance has and does take a stand in social movements and progress by highlighting Zora Neale Hurston and Langston Hughes’ work during the Harlem Renaissance. Chapter 3 focuses on issues of gender and sexuality as they relate to black equality in America through the work of Audre Lorde, the self-identified - black, lesbian, social justice advocate poet; and Anna Julia Cooper, who is credited with being the first black feminist theorist. Then in the fourth chapter entitled, “Where Is the Love? The Hope for
America’s Redemption” Lebron examines James Baldwin and Martin Luther King Jr. who were powerful advocates for the role of love in confronting racism in America. The final chapter and afterword bring the struggle for racial equality and #BlackLivesMatter to the present, to C 2 Schwartz the contemporary struggle in America, by engaging with and challenging the perspectives of prominent contemporary black American academics, scholars and writers such as Randall Kennedy and his endorsement of black respectability politics, and John McWhorter’s perspective on the debilitating paradigm or mindset of many blacks in America. In his afterword called “Nobody’s Protest Essay”, Lebron states When I write at my best, I am not writing to you – I am writing to me for you. I’m sorry, but I’m too busy with the struggle to be much concerned with whether you agree with me. I sometimes don’t even agree with myself in an unqualified sense. But I am trying to save myself. The struggle of life in this country is a lot to bear.” (p. 163). He makes it personal. Once again and worth repeating, the great contribution of this book is that it links the past to the present by connecting the contemporary #BlackLivesMatter movement to previous social protests through highlighting the continuity of thought between past-day and present scholars, activists, artists and writers. This is an accessible book which introduces the reader to familiar and not so familiar black thinkers and activists while not only “naming” the dead but also remembering them by bringing them to voice. Joni Schwartz is professor in the Department of Humanities at the City University of New York - LaGuardia Community College and also teaches in the Graduate Program at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Her research interests include Critical Race Theory, communication activism, mass incarceration and adult education. Her recent co-edited book Race, Education, and Reintegrating Formerly Incarcerated Citizens: Counterstories & Counterspaces was just made available in paperback.
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Feeding the other: Whiteness, privilege, and neoliberal stigma in food pantries by Rebecca de Souza examines in detail a case study of a food pantry in Duluth, Minnesota. The book examines how individuals (volunteers, administrators, and clients/guests) and organizations participate in structural patterns of injustice within the food system. Feeding the Other is a fierce critique of the neoliberal values that underpin food access and distribution. de Souza examines ‘stigmatizing narratives’ about people experiencing food insecurity and the role of these narratives in legitimizing and perpetuating unjust systems. She argues that discourses of white privilege and neo-liberalism produce narratives and frameworks that idealize individualism, hard work, and personal responsibility while perpetuating negative stereotypes of people who are seen to be not living up to ideals related to wealth accumulation. These narratives create and/or increase the social distance between the ‘givers’ and ‘receivers’ and are stigmatizing in that those experiencing food insecurity are framed as the problem to be fixed. From a micro perspective, the ‘givers’ in food pantries are the volunteers who are typically older white women and the ‘receivers’ are individuals more diverse in backgrounds who come to collect food from the food pantries. de Souza also shows how similar dynamics play out at an organizational level where the ‘givers’ are corporations and the ‘receivers’ are the non-profit agencies. Policies and procedures, such as poverty governance procedures, are put in place to reinforce the social distance between ‘us’ and ‘them.’ Food is political and is a marker of citizenship, de Souza asserts. The same claim can be made for education.

Describing the volunteers as ‘good white women,’ de Souza presents a radical critique of charity as the way to fix problems in society. Charity, she argues, ‘results in outpourings of gratitude on the part of givers, but never quite moves in the direction of food justice’ (de Souza, 2019, p. 120). The volunteers who participated in the study were motivated by a desire to do good in the world. These motivations protect white privilege by not allowing for space to interrogate and problematize whiteness. A key finding of the study is that the stigmatizing narratives ignore the complex and nuanced nature of the lives of food pantry clients. Because of the social distance between the givers and receivers, the receivers have little room to question the giver
or the gift. These same narratives are reflected in the messaging on public-facing communication collateral for fund-raising and other public relations purposes.

Community-based adult literacy programs depend on volunteers to serve as tutors. It is estimated that volunteers make up over 43% of the adult education workforce serving in state-sponsored adult education programs (Belzer, 2006). Taking into consideration the many volunteer tutors in non-state sponsored, typically volunteer-led programs, 43% would be a conservative estimate (Sandlin & St. Clair, 2005). Especially in urban areas of the United States, volunteer tutors, like the food pantry volunteers, are often white, retired women. The learners, on the other hand, are often people of color, younger, and more diverse in cultural backgrounds. Not surprisingly, the dynamics embedded in the relationship between volunteers and clients in the food pantries would apply to the context of volunteers and learners in the context of adult basic education. While the core premise and argument of the book will not be new to anyone familiar with critical perspectives in adult education, de Souza’s analysis offers a nuanced perspective that I found refreshing. The ideas presented in the book can serve as a platform for interrogating the politics of charity in the adult education space.

I was intrigued by the title of this book because of the words ‘whiteness privilege and neoliberal stigma’ and was curious to see if and how these concepts from a food access context would apply to the context of adult basic education. While not often discussed, the dynamics of race and class are at play in adult basic education programs. Reading the book, I wondered about the stigmatizing narratives embedded in the many systems that adult learners encounter in and beyond the ABE/ESOL classroom and how that influences their experience of learning. I appreciated the author’s critique of charity as a concept that legitimizes and perpetuates unequal power relationships in any context. How do we change things? de Souza offers practical suggestions for shifting narratives. I recommend this book to adult educators who are interested in interrogating and transforming the dynamics between tutors and learners in the context of adult basic education. With its focus on volunteers, the book could potentially inform volunteer tutor training programs so the volunteers are better prepared to bridge social distances with learners.
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