

Introduction

Frankie Condon and Vershawn Ashanti Young

I

We have the somewhat inchoate idea that we are not destined to be harassed with great social questions, and that even if we are, and fail to answer them, the fault is with the question and not with us. Consequently we often congratulate ourselves more on getting rid of a problem than on solving it.

—W. E. B. DuBois

The great American racial wound is periodically hidden from our view, covered over by civil rights legislation, by the economic success of a few people of color who are held up as evidence of its suture, and by the widespread denial of its existence by white Americans. Now, as the number of Black men and boys shot down by the police or by armed white citizens mounts, as anti-immigration rhetoric increases in stridency and Band-Aid solutions by “progressives” are offered in response, as income inequality deepens, the scab is torn away. Structural inequality seems more entrenched than ever and the denial of white Americans both more inexplicable and more intractable. However, the evidence of ongoing racism seems insufficient either to convince white Americans that racism is both real and matters or to compel them to address racism in any systemic way.

For as long as we have been thinking, talking, working at antiracist activism within and beyond the bounds of the academy, we have encountered denials and scapegoating for the most blatant racist incidents, and roadblocks in pursuing anti-racist discussions and pedagogies. We have been asked to justify that work—to explain to our colleagues, our students and to our readers why such work is necessary. We admit our frustration at the question. We should also admit that the answers seem obvious and commonsensical to us. We might similarly admit that the fact we are still questioned about the necessity for the work represents evidence that the work is still necessary and urgent. And we should admit that, in some regard, we feel despair because it seems that no amount of responding to the question provides a sufficient and compelling answer to those who continue to ask us to justify

antiracist work. In short, understanding that racism exists and operates beyond the academy is foundational to the work many of us engage as scholars in our fields. In our experience, however, even those of us who make the study of racial injustice our life's work struggle to acknowledge and address those forms of racism in which we participate, however unintentionally, within the academy.

We sense that some part of the resistance we encounter from our colleagues centers around a collective yearning to believe and have our belief affirmed that a fully realized multi-racial American democracy is possible. We are too often struck by the refusal of our best-intentioned colleagues to recognize and acknowledge the degree to which we have not realized this vision, however: not in society at large and not in our universities, our departments, our classrooms. We have not meaningfully addressed the perniciousness and ubiquity of structural racism and the rhetorics of racism (however coded) that sustain its everyday reproduction within the academy. It's hard to look around—in our classrooms, departments and committee meetings, in residence halls and cafeterias on our campuses, in our communities, our states, our nation—and not conclude that American idealism, if that's the explanation for why we are continually asked to provide a rationale for talking about race and racism, requires a rather high degree of obtuseness.

We have been traveling to colleges and universities across the country for years to talk about race matters. And we have learned through these travels—even more than through our studies—that there are many scholars whose research interests and political commitments coincide with the work of antiracism. It is difficult, however, for even the most committed of us to perceive, name and contend with the ways in which racism winds its way to our classrooms—through unexamined curricula, careless, ill-considered or unreflective teaching practice, or talk to and about our students. We think of this phenomenon as a form of what Joyce E. King has termed “dysconscious racism.” She writes, “[d]ysconscious racism is a form of racism that tacitly accepts dominant White norms and privileges. It is not the *absence* of consciousness (that is, not unconsciousness) but an *impaired* consciousness or distorted way of thinking about race.” King argues that “[d]ysconsciousness is an uncritical habit of mind . . . that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given” (1991, p. 135). Even for those of us who work against racism daily, the racism that is closest to us, that we unknowingly and without intention participate in is most difficult to perceive and resist.

We're being deliberately direct here because racism didn't die down in 1963 and resurface in the first decade of the twenty-first century. Expressions of surprise and shock each time some new example of racism in the academy comes to light grow wearisome. For instance, on October 1, 2012 *Inside Higher Ed* (IHE) published an article by Alexandra Tilsley about university blogs designed to expose racism and other forms of hate on campus by republishing student tweets and Facebook status

posts. “The blogs have brought to light,” Tilsley writes, “the surprising willingness of students to mock and make negative comments about various groups, especially Asian students, who have notoriously been the subject of cruel jokes and racist comments on campuses in recent years.” Given not only the frequency, but the long history of American racism, we wonder why folks continue to be surprised by the exposure of racism at work among us. We wonder why each new exposure of the ubiquity of everyday forms of racism is attended by claims of innocence and ignorance (“I had no idea!”). The fact of these ongoing expressions of shock, we think, is less evidence of genuine ignorance than of the extent to which many academics labor to preserve their insulation from those quite regular conditions that compose the everyday lives of students, faculty, administrators and support staff of color on and off campus.

Commentators on Tilsley’s article appear to be invested in reframing the racism exposed by the haters’ blogs as something other than racism: as rudeness or insensitivity—as almost anything other than racism. The prevailing concern among the commentators is whether or not the posts from OSU and UNL are examples of hate speech. “Dan” writes,

The comments described are discourteous to be sure, but are they really hate speech? They threaten no violence, nor even non-violence. I think they’re squarely protected under the First Amendment, and no official organ of any university has any right to prosecute them. I may not agree with what you say, but I’ll defend to the death your right to say it. But I do like Indian food . . .

While the comment about Indian food in this post debating whether discourteous racial comments is hate speech might seem like an obvious non sequitur, it points up precisely the kind of unintentional racism that is committed by folks who believe themselves to be non-racist. If “Dan” defends folks who publicly make discourteous racial comments, what do you think would be his reaction to someone pointing out that his own comment “But I do like Indian food” is itself discourteous, culturally reductive, and an example of what is theorized as Racism 2.0, a version that in effect says “call me on it and I’ll tell you that you’re the reverse racist or the hyper vigilant, hyper sensitive activist who can’t see a compliment when it’s given.” Commentator “steverankin” writes,

A notable use of terms in this article. Consider the impact of the word “derogatory” to describe the offensive posts. Now consider the use of “hate” or “hateful.” “Hate speech” has become a staple term in public rhetoric. I hate hate speech, but I’m beginning to worry that we use the label too indiscriminately.

Another commentator counters calling the posts examples of “insensitivity” and argues that “sensitivity training” should be a required element of first-year orientation programs. “We live in a global culture,” he writes, “and if these issues aren’t understood BEFORE American students leave college, it’s an injustice because it places them behind other global students in learning and understanding cultural differences in the workplace.”

Although the debate among the commentators is neither heated nor long-winded (only nine comments appear beneath the article in question), its focus seems typical to us—in the sense of being both ordinary and frustrating. Emphasis on the legalities of hate versus discriminatory speech and what forms of speech might be protected by the First Amendment contains the dialogue about racism within the sphere of individual action and intent. The question of whether to ignore, punish, train or educate the writers of the original tweets and status posts displaces recognition and acknowledgement of the long term and cumulative effects of being the subject of and subjected to everyday racisms. Such a discussion frames racism as the product of individual actions that deviate from the *normal, non-racist* actions of *most of us* or from the *sensitive* practice of suppressing our racism. The injustice of conditions of racism within which students of color are forced to study go unremarked. Instead, injustice is characterized by the failure of colleges and universities to prepare (white?) students to succeed in the global marketplace by not teaching them to be sensitive in their representations of difference.

The tweets posted on OSU- and UNL-Haters are all ostensibly written by students. But on the bulletin board in Frankie’s office hangs a Post-It note. Scribbled on it is this quotation, recorded during a break in an interminably long committee meeting when two colleagues were speaking rather unguardedly about their students: “So I say ‘oh sure that English you’re using might be just fine where you come from, but around here we speak white English.’” Frankie has kept this Post-It note for years. It has traveled with her from academic post to academic post. This is evidence, she thinks: evidence that she isn’t crazy—that racism is real and right here/right now, not merely an effect of rural poor and working class miseducation and not merely the irrational outpouring of an armed survivalist, white supremacist militia or cult. Frankie knows that the utterance of the word “white” was a *slip* of the tongue. This colleague wasn’t thinking, wasn’t guarding her speech. But Frankie also knows, she knows, that even if her colleague has used the word “formal” or “professional” or “academic” beneath the surface of these other words would have roiled the truth: in the context of a predominantly white university and a predominantly white department (in which nearly every faculty person of color has left or struggled to achieve tenure and promotion), to an audience composed of either one or a few students of color or a white colleague—*white* is what she meant to say. But we live in a post-racial America and work in post-racial universities where we have

learned (unless we slip up) to substitute words like “professional” for white so that any racism that might be revealed is semantically concealed.

At this point, we should admit that rage tempts us. Can this really be the highest caliber of conversation of which folks who are scholars are capable? But we re-center ourselves, pull ourselves back together and reach toward some more measured entrance into yet another discussion of both the problem, racism, by exposing it, and what we promote to counter it, antiracism. And we recognize in our efforts that the enabling conditions for impoverished and unproductive conversations about race and racism, antiracism, and antiracist pedagogy extend far beyond the bounds of colleges and universities and into the broad and deep mire of American public discourse on race.

If you have picked up this book, in all likelihood, you are thinking carefully and critically about race, racism, and pedagogy. We guess you understand that racism is real and already have some grasp of its impacts on the lives of people of color. We imagine that you already have some investment in action from where you are to teach for racial justice. We are thankful that you are with us and many other American educators in this struggle. We hope that you are here—at the beginning of this book—because you have already begun or are ready to begin to engage critically and reflectively with the work of antiracism not only out-there, beyond the academy, but also in-here, within our classrooms, within the logics that shape our course design, content, and pedagogical practice.

II

The writers whose work composes this collection write from a variety of perspectives about addressing the problem of racism in our institutions, our classrooms, among our colleagues, our students, ourselves. They are teachers and scholars who recognize, acknowledge, and actively engage in resistance against the material realities of structural, symbolic, and institutional racism. Chapters included in the volume are organized in sections by theme. The first section, Actionable Commitments, addresses from a variety of perspectives the relationship between the stories we tell about race, racism, and writing (and the frames shaping those stories) and our engagement with antiracism within and beyond the classroom.

In their chapter, “Making Commitments to Racial Justice Actionable,” Rasha Diab, Thomas Ferrel, Beth Godbee, and Neil Simpkins move between antiracist principles and practice to articulate ways of thinking, speaking, and acting against racism/for social justice. In contrast to the shock/amnesia responses to everyday racism we critique above, these writers argue that in order to work effectively against the “ongoing micro-aggressions and micro-inequities” of institutional racism we all

need to learn to engage in self-work, but not to mistake that labor for the whole of an actionable commitment to racial justice. Diab et al. examine the ways in which individual and institutional narratives about racism take the form of the confessional. Rather than dismissing the form altogether, however, the authors call upon readers to push through the confessional narrative to an articulation of actionable principles in service of creating conditions of accountability for change. Central to these principles, they suggest, is the attending practice of work within the dialectic between “self-work and work-with-others” as we allow ourselves to be disturbed by racism even as we engage reflectively, critically, and actively in everyday labor for racial justice.

In his chapter, “Teaching African American Discourse: Confessions of a Recovering Segregationist,” Calvin Logue begins with the teaching of Black Rhetoric and African American Discourse at the University of Georgia during the 1970s narrating in reverse chronological order a personal and professional journey from unexamined acceptance of a segregationist racial order to active pedagogical engagement in the transformation of that order and the racist logics that inform it. In the chapter that follows, Aja Martinez discusses the application of critical race theory, in general, and the resisting practice of counterstory, in particular, to the teaching of writing. Finally, in Section One, Mya Poe explores the racial frames shaping institutional discourse about race and writing. While Poe acknowledges some use-value in common existing frames (e.g., the multicultural frame, the achievement gap frame, the post-racial frame), she argues for recognizing the ways in which race accrues meaning within our local institutions and classrooms, shaping our understanding, our expectations, and our responses to students as speakers and writers. Poe suggests re-framing received, but largely generalized and thus unhelpful accounts of race in service of teaching writing across the disciplines.

Section Two, *Identity Matters* includes chapters examining the implications of racial identifications, privilege, and disenfranchisement on teachers and learners. Like Poe, Charise Pimentel, Octavio Pimentel, and John Dean examine framing practices shaping stories we tell about race and racism. “The Myth of the Colorblind Classroom” focuses, however, on the “diversity” frame and, in particular, on the ways in which “polycultural” approaches are grounded on maintaining the myth that colorblindness is a necessary condition for racial justice. In contrast to this frame, Pimentel et al. argue for antiracist pedagogies that acknowledge the ubiquity of racialism within and beyond the classroom and critically address implicitly and explicitly forms of race privilege that accrue to white teachers. Using teacher narratives braided with theoretical analyses grounded in critical whiteness studies, the writers suggest both the necessity for and the inevitable incompleteness of antiracist pedagogy. Rather than using this incompleteness as a reason to disengage with antiracism, however, Pimentel et al. argue ultimately that the aim

of antiracist work is not the achievement of non-racism in one's students or one's self, but is rather to sustain and extend antiracist engagement with and in service of student learning.

Authors Bobbi Olson and Dae-Joong Kim examine the powerful work of whiteness—the rhetorical performance of white privilege—in the construction of teacherly authority. Writing from distinct subject positions—white, American-born, and native English speaking on one hand and Korean-born, international, and multilingual on the other—Olson and Kim narrate and theorize the ways and degrees to which each has variously engaged whiteness in service of establishing authority. The authors narrate also their encounters with whiteness among students who are resistant to teacherly (or linguistic) authority. Finally, Olson and Kim argue for productive engagement with dissensus in the writing classroom as a means of making rhetorical enactments of whiteness visible and available for ongoing reflection, analysis, and critique.

In her chapter, “Why Am I So Damaged?,” Deatra Sullivan has composed a narrative anthem even as she questions ideological and material conditions that create the need of an African American woman in the professoriate for an anthem. Sullivan acknowledges the pain and fear she experiences as a Black woman in the academy even as she strives for an enactment of self as teacher/scholar who no longer feels the need to strive toward a racially other identification.

The third section, *In the Classroom* includes chapters focusing on antiracist pedagogical performativity and enactment. In her chapter, “Whiteboys,” Sophia Bell explores the evolving racial rhetorics and silences of two young men of color in a gateway writing course. Of particular concern to Bell is the internalized racism she reads in narratives composed by students who have navigated racial identity in predominantly white academic contexts. Bell notes the ways and degrees to which both students complicate the idea of whiteness generally as well as their own racial identifications and dis-identifications. But Bell also examines the ways in which her assignment construction (personal narrative) and expectations for that assignment reveal her own racialized frames for reading student performances of identification and dis-identification. Like many of the writers included in this volume, Bell concludes not with prescriptions, but with conviction about the necessity of carrying on with antiracist pedagogy as well as with ongoing critical reflection about the pedagogical performances of antiracism as they are enacted in assignment design, class facilitation, and in feedback.

In her chapter, “Writing and Un-writing Race: . . .” Jessica Parker discuss the use of hip-hop as a vehicle for opening and enriching discussions about race and class. Parker argues that the study of hip-hop helps students to engage deeply and critically with identity matters including the continuing prevalence of racism, practices of cultural appropriation, and the historical intertwinement of race and class in American Society. In a drama that, like Aja Martinez' work in Section One of

this volume, pursues the literary tradition within critical race studies of playing with genre in service of braiding storytelling (narrative or parable, for example) with theory and critique, the co-authors of “Dangerous Play,” use theatrical conventions to dramatize the complexity of identity, affiliation, and antiracist pedagogy in a graduate classroom. Chiara Bacigalupa, Susan Leigh Brooks, Timothy Lensmire, Rebecca Nathan, and Nathan Snaza describe experimentation and associated risk in a classroom setting around language, identity and the performance of and resistance to socially assigned racial roles and rules of racial standing.

The authors whose work comprises this volume have each focused their work in the dynamic interplay between theoretical analyses and grounded teaching practices. From multiple identities, the writers offer readers theoretical support and pedagogical models for acting on or making real individual and shared commitments to the advancement of racial justice through the teaching of writing. Although we might wish the truth to be otherwise, we remain convinced that so long as the material force of racism persists in the US, those of us who teach will be called upon to pursue our commitments to social justice in our classrooms.

The special issue of *Across the Disciplines* that was the source of this volume and this book, itself, have been several years in the making. During that time, we have followed innumerable stories of celebrities appearing in black-face at public and private events, the exclusion of models and designers of color in the fashion industry, the political gerrymandering of voting districts across the US to disempower voters of color, and the justification and exoneration of white gun owners in the executions of young Black men and women on the street. A professor in Minnesota has been disciplined by her institution for creating discomfort among white students during a classroom discussion of structural racism. The bar in Louisville, Kentucky where we sat talking about our work together on this project has been accused of denying service to a party of Black men. And, following the publication of the UNL Haters blog and a series of racist incidents in the fall of 2013 the University of Nebraska–Lincoln has begun an antiracism campaign they are calling “Not Here Not Now.” As powerful as the collective desire of Americans may be to achieve a post-racial democracy, we have not arrived. The necessity of acknowledging and resisting the historical force of racism by teaching about racism and by developing pedagogical approaches that enact and model antiracist engagement remains pressing.

So long as racism persists in any form—from the micro-aggressions of racism 2.0 to implicit and explicit structural forms of disenfranchisement—those of us who teach and who are committed to the creation of an increasingly just society will need to choose whether and how we address racism in our classrooms. Our hope is that the chapters included in this volume will assist faculty across the disciplines in seeing the choice to engage in such addresses as both possible and pedagogically viable. We hope readers will recognize the teaching of writing across the

disciplines as a vehicle for engaging students in resistance to racism in their own lives and that the chapters included here, which are theoretically informed and practical will assist readers in making their own commitments actionable.

III

I think that the hard work of a nonracist sensibility is the boundary crossing, from safe circle into wilderness: the testing of boundary, the consecration of sacrilege. It is the willingness to spoil a good party and break an encompassing circle, to travel from the safe to the unsafe.

—Patricia Williams

The special issue of *Across the Disciplines* on the theme “Antiracist Activism: Teaching Rhetoric and Writing” that preceded the publication of this edited collection was first conceived in the midst of and, in some ways, as a result of a contradictory and still circulating rhetorical phenomena: the widely touted pronouncements of the death of racism that surrounded and followed the historic campaign and election of the first U.S. president of African descent.

These claims were and are still uttered by two different constituencies, who, interestingly enough, rarely agree on other matters. We read and heard sentiments expressed by perhaps too-hopeful liberals, acquiescing to the hype that racism is only a problem for those who unreasonably perceive themselves to be victims of a time long gone. The other group might be called the staunch conservatives (and these are definitely not limited to political categories)—the Rush Limbaugh types—who attempted to de-trope race, to unlink remarks, policies, perceptions, and practices clearly designed to stigmatize, berate, and oppress people of color from the perpetuating legacies of white privilege. For both groups, President Barack Obama was and still is a poster child, because as Senator Harry Reid (D–Nevada) put it once, he is read by many as a non-threatening “light-skinned African American with no Negro dialect, unless he wanted to have one” (Cillizza, 2010). Thus he can be Black enough to represent the liberal agenda for minorities to reach the upper echelon of politics and American society, but not Black enough to stoke the prejudices that conservatives hold against Black cultural forms of speech and behavior. The only racial barrier might be the look of his skin, but as Reid intimates, even that’s light enough not to offend.

But the notion that the US has achieved post-racial status did not begin with the election of President Obama. In a weekly radio address delivered in 1986, President Ronald Reagan, claiming affiliation with Dr. Martin Luther King, argued

that the American approximation of racial equality, while not perfect, was sufficient enough that the structural address of social and economic inequality through programs like Affirmative Action was a) no longer necessary, and b) would, if pursued, have the effect of producing imbalance in the other direction—advantaging people of color who had attained an acceptable degree of equality over and against whites (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=37302>).

In other words, Reagan was saying that in a society in which *sufficient* racial equality has been achieved, systemic and institutional racism are no longer of concern. What prejudice remains accrues to and is reproduced by individual actors. According to this worldview, like the Wicked Witch of the West, those actors have no power here; in the political sense, in a post-racial America, they are unable to enforce their prejudices using structural means. Therefore, the work before the rest of us is to train them in the practices of what we now understand as civil speech in order that they, too, may profit from post-racialism. The effect of this racial “color-blindness” lauded by President Reagan doesn’t eliminate the problem but creates an obstacle for those who speak of race and racism, suggesting it is they who have the regressive understanding: if you’re still seeing race, still experiencing racism and still talking about race and racism, then you’re the racist. But this strategy is not new.

Consider this: Co-editor Vershawn Ashanti Young used the now infamous 2011 video of former UCLA student Alexandria Wallace mocking Asians on *YouTube* and the chancellor’s criticism of such parody in a lecture to illustrate how to analyze the rhetoric of a digital media controversy. After class, he was approached by one of his two African American students, both females. She said that showing the videos were a waste of class time and that race was not an appropriate topic for a rhetoric class. Because of his previous experiences discussing race, even in classes such as African American literature and African American studies, Vershawn has backed off from discussing race in general education courses. That was the case in this freshman writing class, where these videos were the only instance where race was discussed, and this time in a unit designed to examine controversies in digital media.

As a result of this and sundry other experiences, Vershawn often wonders what makes students, even students of color, so skittish about analyzing race. What makes students believe that race is something that resides outside of college? If even in ethnic studies classes some students are race shy, then in what classes and in what forms should race be considered in curricula? And what would be the result if there were no discussions of race at all? Would the campus be more peaceful? Would racism die? On the other hand, what might happen if more colleagues engaged rigorous examinations of racial politics? Would race raise from taboo to understanding, to increased racial consciousness?

DuBois’ words, with which our introduction begins, seem not only apt in his time but also prescient. We may all be tired—worn past the point of exhaustion by the necessity of addressing powerfully and productively the systemic problem of

American racism. There is, in fact, no compelling evidence that as a nation we have resolved the great question of how to create and sustain a robust and just multiracial democracy. We may have gotten better at developing strategies to “git rid of the problem” by obscuring it, but we have not solved it. With the authors whose work is collected here, we have not abandoned hope, but rather, as Cornel West suggests, work to actualize an increasingly just world by continuing to engage resolutely against racism and its effects in our homes, our communities, and our workplaces.

Over the years, as we have traveled to give talks, workshops or to consult with faculty, staff and students across the US, as we have written or co-written with one another or other colleagues, and as we have talked together over coffees, lunches, and dinners, we have developed and continue to evolve a conceptual framework and vocabulary for the work we do. We don’t believe that it is necessary for all of us who work at antiracism to employ either conforming conceptual frames or language in this work. We have not, therefore, attempted to police the terms writers choose in this volume. We do believe it is useful to be both conscious of and critically reflective about how well our words are working, whether our conceptual frames at any given moment help us to deepen and extend our analysis of racism in all its forms, and how aptly those frames and the terms we employ describe and help us to study and intervene in what we see. We offer the following, then, not as a key to concepts and terms we have insisted that writers in this volume adopt, but as an example of tools we continue both to use in our work and to adapt as our understandings grow. We offer them with the hope that others will find them useful, but also that others will contribute to the development of them, helping all of us to both understand the work that needs to be done more clearly and do the work more effectively. A version of this list has previously been published in the volume co-authored by Anne Ellen Geller, Michele Eodice, Frankie Condon, Meg Carroll and Elizabeth Boquet, *The Everyday Writing Center: A Community of Practice*, published by Utah State University Press.

Working Definitions and Key Concepts

Race: A social construct. A historical concept rather than a set of “natural” categories that orients around the classification and ordering of human beings in service of domination. While race is an *imaginary*, the idea of race continues to have material consequences and to condition the lived experiences of both whites and people of color.

Racial Prejudice: Dislike, distrust, or fear of others based on perceived racial differences. Individual racial prejudice is learned and, at the early stages or antiracist awareness, is often unconscious.

Racism: Racial prejudice coextensive with the unequal distribution of power within communities, institutions, and/or systems. In other words, or framed as an equation: race prejudice + power = racism.

Dysconscious Racism: tacit subscription to white supremacy, domination, and/or norms that distorts one's ability and willingness to recognize or acknowledge racism or race matters.

Institutional Racism: Visible and often invisible differential and unequal treatment of constituencies based on race. Inequalities with regard to access, power, and inclusion that are sanctioned by commission or omission by an institution.

Systemic Racism: The web of ideas, institutions, individual and collective practices that, taken together, ensure the perpetuation of social, political, and economic inequality along racial lines.

Whiteness: Learned ways of knowing and doing—of thinking, speaking, and writing—characterized by a racialized sense of oneself as best equipped to judge, preach, and to suffer. This is a term coined by Minnie Bruce Pratt and taken up by Marilyn Frye to describe the ways that ideologies of white supremacy are taken up in thought and speech. She writes that “[w]hitely people generally consider themselves to be benevolent and goodwilled, fair, honest, and ethical Whately people have a staggering faith in their own rightness and goodness and that of other whitely people.” (2001, pp. 90–91; see also Condon, 2012, p. 34) Note: whiteness is not particular to white people, but can be learned and practiced by people of color as well.

Manifestations

Internalized Racial Superiority (IRS): The unconscious uptake, by whites, of the logics of white supremacy, such that one lives *as if* the idea of white supremacy is true.

Internalized Racial Inferiority (IRI): The unconscious uptake, by people of color, of the logics of white supremacy such that one lives *as if* the idea of white supremacy is true. Internalized Racial Inferiority may take the form of self-hatred, of cynicism or dismissiveness about one's own racial group, or of race prejudice toward other groups of people of color.

Whiteness: Examples: the practice of representing the needs or interests of an entire racial group; refusing to hear or take seriously the concerns of people of color unless and until those concerns are represented in a particular way;

judging or adjudicating the needs and interests of people of color according to racialized, normative standards that implicitly assert the primacy of or that privilege whiteness.

Unconscious or Unintentional Racism: Learned and deeply internalized racism that we carry with us through our days. Some part of our work as antiracists is interior work: becoming conscious of our prejudices and actively working to transform ourselves. For example: feeling nervous or uncomfortable when encountering an individual or group of people from another perceived racial group.

False Attribution: The tendency to explain the actions or inactions of individuals or groups other than our own in negative terms (while excusing our own actions or inactions). For example: assuming that a child of color is struggling academically because her parents are uneducated or un caring or conversely assuming that academic excellence among children of color is anomalous (abnormal or unusual).

Triangulation: Assuming prejudices are shared among majority peoples: For example: expressing negative, derogatory, or racist views to other whites and assuming that they will all agree.

Unsolicited Nominations: Expecting or asking members of a marginalized or oppressed group to speak for that group.

Neglect: Providing unequal and inferior service, support, communication, and/or care to people of color or other members of marginalized, excluded or oppressed groups. For example: calling on, praising, or offering academic enhancement opportunities to white children in a classroom with more frequency than children of color.

Gatekeeping: Actively or implicitly preventing or obstructing people of color or other members of marginalized, excluded or oppressed groups from obtaining services, benefits, or privileges that are normally or regularly available to majority peoples. For example: regular tracking of students of color into remedial courses or programs. Or making exceptions to regular practices or procedures for whites, but not for people of color.

Individual Physical Racial Violence: Physical assault motivated by race hatred.

Symbolic Violence: Verbal assault motivated by racism, homophobia, or another form of oppression communicated and reproduced through signs and symbols. For example: the association of Black men with violence and hyper-sexuality through media representations in film, television, and print.

Group or Community Sanctioned Violence: Physical and/or symbolic assault motivated by hate and participated in or sanctioned by a group or community.

References

- Cillizza, C. (January 10, 2010). Post politics. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/09/AR2010010902141.html>.
- Geller, A., Eodice, M., Condon, F., Carroll, M. & Boquet, E. (2007). *The everyday writing center: A community of practice*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 60 (2), 133–146.
- Reagan, R. (1986) Weekly Radio Address. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=37302>.
- Tilsley, A. (2012). Spotlighting hate. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/01blogs-aim-bring-light-hateful-speech-online>.