INTRODUCTION

Becoming a white anti-racist scholar and **doing** anti-racist scholarship is what this book is about. I will be using my own scholarship, of several different sorts, the work I have co-authored with several others, and my own experiences to try to help other whites, particularly "new"/"young" white scholars, become anti-racist scholars. However, it should be clearly understood that my approach, my views, and my experiences are only one partial, fragmented, ambiguous possibility. There are many others, and anyone who decides to become an anti-racist scholar should investigate several possibilities and then invent her or his own. It should also be clearly understood that this book is not about helping people of color become anti-racist scholars. While this book may have some uses for scholars of color, for a person of color to be an anti-racist scholar is a very different enterprise, an enterprise of which I have little knowledge, experience, or understanding—and certainly no advice.

Though the study of white racism by whites has a decent history (e.g., Silberman, 1964), white racism studies or critical white studies by whites have recently gained more attention (e.g., *Critical White Studies,* edited by Delgado & Stefancic, 1997). This is a significant development, especially if it is able to be sustained (white attention to white racism definitely waxes and wanes historically, with much more waning than waxing, unfortunately). However, I prefer the label of "anti-racism" for this book because this label has a powerful history in the fight against white racism and because its use indicates, to me and I hope to others, a much more aggressive, outspoken stand against white racism.

Another marking of this book is that it is both "within" and "against" the academy. By this marking I mean that my anti-racist scholarship occurs *both* "within" the university environment *and* "against" the white racism of the university, though the university should not be seen as a singular, totalized environment. Instead, it is a shifting, dynamic, complex, conflictual multiplicity. Thus, in relationship to anti-racist scholarship, the university is "both/and," that is, the university is a space of "both" racism "and" anti-racism. There are, in fact, only a few other environments within the white dominated world in which *explicit* anti-racist work is possible. This possibility, though, does not mean that anti-racism is widely supported in all universities or in any particular university. This means that in some spaces within some universities, it is possible to survive and even succeed as a white anti-racist scholar, as witness my own career and that of other white anti-racist scholars, like Ruth Frankenberg (1993, 1997), though this surviving and succeeding by white anti-racist scholars is itself, to some significant degree, a function of white

racism itself. That is, my white skin privilege provides some protection for my white anti-racist work. Scholars of color correctly contend (see, for example, Cynthia Tyson's response in chapter 2 in this book) that their anti-racist work is seen and treated much differently—much more negatively—within the university.

The main reason, in my view, for this difference in treatment of anti-racism scholarship is that the university is fundamentally a white racist institution, consciously or not, as are most mainstream institutions in the United States. And this is why the other term I use, "against," is so salient. The white anti-racist scholarship that I advocate is *also* against the white racism of the university. U.S. universities historically and contemporarily play a crucial role, in many complex ways, in the reproduction of white racism. This book, nonetheless, will not include an indepth analysis of this reproduction, and unfortunately, I am not familiar with any book that does so, though such work is definitely needed.

Why Become an Anti-Racist Scholar?

Because I don't have any other choice. This Really Is My Answer.

In fact, in answering this question and addressing white racism, I find that I cannot contain my thoughts and feelings within the traditional academic use of words and sentences. Instead, the horror of my focus—white racism—and the threat to the status quo of anti-racism requires a somewhat disruptive or transgressive textual practice.

Why become an anti-racist scholar? Because I don't have any other choice.

If I believe that all human beings are equal and they are not being treated that way, then I don't have choice.

If I believe that democracy requires racial equity and yet this equity does not exist throughout democracy, then I don't have a choice.

If I believe that racism is ethically wrong and I see that it is happening constantly, then I don't have a choice.

If I believe that schools ought to treat every child equitably, but they persistently do not, then I don't have a choice.

If I believe that we are all God's children and I see that people of color are not being treated fairly, then I don't have a choice.

If I believe in any kind of spirituality that values all people and I see some not being valued or even some being disvalued, then I don't have a choice.

For me anti-racism is most fundamentally spiritual. I cannot imagine that it is spiritually acceptable for there to be racial inequalities, particularly patterns of racial inequalities,
of any kind
to any extent
anywhere.

In addition, from an ethical, political, and democratic viewpoint, I cannot accept racism. Actually, I cannot imagine any contemporary morality or ethics in which any kind or form of racism is acceptable. I also cannot imagine that any theory of democracy would support any version of racism.

Thus, I think that if racism exists, anyone, **everyone** should be **compelled — spiritually, morally, ethically, and democratically —** to work to remove it.

I think most citizens of the United States, and certainly most educators and researchers, would agree that if there is significant or even substantial racism in any aspect of social life, especially public social life, it should be removed. I even think that most U.S. citizens, educators, and researchers would agree that there *is* significant racism in public social life, including schools and research, and that they would agree that this racism ought to be removed.

But most U.S. citizens, particularly most white citizens, are not anti-racist activists. In fact, most white citizens, educators, and researchers do not believe that racism is a sufficiently large problem such that they might be **compelled — spiritually, ethically, morally, politically, democratically — to become anti-racists**.

Why?

The answer, in my view, is white racism itself, its nature, and the way it works.

White racism is the DEEP, implicit, taken-for-granted dominance of whites and white cultural norms, standards, assumptions, philosophies, etc. as *the "natural" nature of "reality" itself.* As such, white racism positions people of color, their cultural norms, standards, assumptions, languages and dialects, philosophies, etc. as less, as negative, as weak, as uncivilized, as undeveloped, as less meaningful, as less important. As less.

However, white racism is not primarily individual acts or beliefs; those are only social effects. White racism is Onto-Logical; it is built into the very nature of the social reality. It is Epistemo-Logical; it is built into the very nature of accepted and legitimated assumptions about how we come to know reality. It is *institutional, societal, and civilizational.* U.S. institutions from the government to the schools are white racist ones. U.S. society is fundamentally white racist. Western Civilization is fundamentally white racist. But not so much in an intentional sense, but interwoven throughout.

White racism is like the oxygen molecule; it is a primary aspect in a vast range of the Semiotic Categories that compose social reality. But it is not only omnipresent, it is endemically dependent on the subjugation of the racial other, as with Hegel's dualistic master and slave. Whites and white racism literally **NEED** the racial other as a subjugated, lessor other, particularly one upon which it can project its own *hard cruelty* and upon which to play out whites' own Rejected Desires and Fantasies of Violence, such as that of the big, black, or dark, dangerous man. Again, though this NEED is not held in center consciousness, it is dispersed, deployed within movies, news reports, novels, schools, home choices, television programs, employment, retailing, law enforcement, etc.

But I know that for most whites, this above judgment will seem Too Harsh, Too ExTreme, ImPossible. It can't be this bad; we can't be this terrible. The way, though, that white racism works for Us White People, including educators and researchers, is that we can deeply and comfortably believe that we are (mostly) a good, ethical, fair, upstanding people—certainly not racists, while, at the same time, we hide white racism and its consequences from our direct, central consciousness. It is true. We white U.S. citizens, including we white researchers, overwhelmingly believe we are, for the most part, a Good ethical, Fair, upstanding, Likable people, and certainly not racists, *certainly not badly or seriously racists,* anyway.

The Fascinating fact is that we Ignore a whole pattern of Evidence that is repeatedly and literally right BEFORE OUR EYES.

<div align="center">This IS the crux of the matter.</div>

The evidence of *deep and pervasive patterns* of white racism is Unquestionable and fairly obvious, while, simultaneously, white people do not seem to "see" it in anything other than a minimized version. Because of this, white people are Very Defensive about racism, having developed a range of tactics to Avoid the topic (see, for example, Frankenburg, 1993, among many others). Thus, white people believe themselves to be basically good while ignoring the repeated instances of highly visible patterns of **WHITE** RACISM and while resisting, avoiding, any talk of racism. What does this mean? Why does it work this way? First, though, the pattern.

<div align="center">The almost_wholly_ignored pattern patterned</div>

patterning

White people ignore Racialized Job Patterns that are *constantly before their eyes.* There is a racial employment hierarchy. It is like a Color Chart. As you start at the Bottom with those earning the least and doing the Least Desired work—like those who clean our hotel rooms or those who pick up our garbage—the color is more brown and black. As you Work Your Way Up the hierarchy toward the better paid and more satisfying jobs, the color slowly turns lighter, until by the time you get to the top, it is Almost ALL **WHITE**. This is not hidden. It is constantly apparent wherever you go.

White people Ignore that they choose the Location of their Housing to avoid living with people of color. White people ignore that the Housing Pattern of our towns and cities is Overwhelmingly Racially Segregated, with African American and Hispanic Americans being largely relegated to the worst housing stock. Quite simply, our housing is *highly racially segregated.*

Our schools are equally Highly Se-Gre-Gated. Overwhelmingly children of color attend school with other children of color. However, even if children of color and whites are in the same school, segregation is maintained through academic tracking, special education, and discipline policies, among other means—a kind of

RACIAL PROFILING, a kind of *APARTHEID.* The highest track classes, just like the highest level jobs and the best neighborhoods, are dominated (have dominion, territory controlled by a sovereign) by white children. The lowest track classes, just like the lowest, worst paid jobs and the worst housing stock, are dominated by children of color. All whites know this. This is not hidden from them. We White People choose our housing, our schools, and the classes within our schools on this basis.

In addition, many other patterns of racism regularly appear in the newspaper. I always feel compelled to save them and cut them out, to put them in their own stack. The evidence stacks up, overwhelms doubt; it accumulates; it continuously murmurs to me. Almost once a week I find data about racism explicitly and directly presented in the newspaper. I am overwhelmed by how much there actually is, but white people Seemingly Don't Get The Message, seeminglydon'tgetit.

Racism in the Law (dominion) Enforcement system is constantly in the newspaper and on television. There is considerable evidence that local to federal law enforcement officers do racial profiling. Even expensively dressed (or because they are expensively dressed) men of color get regularly stopped by the police, as they also do if they drive expensive cars. In fact, especially in urban areas, OUTRAGEOUS PERCENTAGES of African American and Hispanic American men, sometimes nearing 50%, are involved in some way with the legal justice system — arrested and in jail, in prisons or on parole.

Regularly the newspaper stories indicate that your chances of Being Convicted after an arrest Increase Considerably if you are an African American or Hispanic American rather than white. If you are convicted as a man of color, you are more likely to *go to jail.* If you go to jail, you will spend more time there. If you commit a death penalty crime, you are **more likely to die** if you are not white. Data and stories on all of this are constantly in the newspaper and other media. It is NOT hidden or difficult data to get, to see, to believe.

Indeed, the extreme racial bias

in who gets the death penalty,
that is, who gets **killed** murdered
through the use of legitimized state power,
is
so hideous hideous hideous
all by itself, it alone
makes you question
the RACIAL SANITY of the U.S.

Racial bias in the entire legal system from racial profiling to who spends time in prison and gets the death penalty is so Extreme So extreme SO Extreme that when you look at it, you would swear there is a RACE war a race WAR a race

war GOING ON. Go to a prison. Go to a prison. We are overwhelmingly *impris-oning men of color.* That is almost exclusively what the prison system is about—except for serial killers and race-oriented killers, who are overwhelmingly white.

Another good example of readily available data: A recent newspaper account indicates that for every one dollar ($1) of family wealth the median white family had in 1999, the median African American family held barely 9 cents. While most white researchers, including myself, are likely to be above the median for whites, just think, for every $100 dollars you have, an African American family has $9 dollars, and I doubt that the wealth of Hispanic families is much different than the latter.

$9 for families of color; $100 for white families; the 1100% advantage of white racism. Hip! Hip! Hooray!

All of these Patterns
All of these Patterns
All of these Patterns
    are either known by whites or are readily available to them in the media—
       all right *before our eyes*
         all right before *our eyes*
all right before our *eyes*.
             the white eyes

In addition, there are other patterns that are not so readily available to the public, but we in education, we researchers know them. In fact, the pattern is so overwhelming and systematic that Schooling in the U.S. is White Racism Personified.

Assignment to special education is disproportionately children of color, even though scholars of special education say this is not defensible.

Boys of color receive a disproportionately higher rate and level of discipline.

Zero tolerance discipline policies can easily be argued to be a code for discipline and control of boys of color.

Zero tolerance policies can easily be argued to be a code for discipline and control of boys of color.

Children of color get the worst buildings,
the worst and least supplies,
more outdated technology or none,
the least experienced and least educated teachers,
more teachers assigned outside their areas of expertise.

They typically get the least funded schools.

Schools filled with children of color are overwhelmingly less successful academically than schools filled with white children.

Teachers and administrators, who are overwhelmingly white, typically do not believe children of color can or will do as well academically as white children.

Children of color are disproportionately located in the lowest academic tracks.

They are typically given a dumbed-down, informal curriculum in the classroom (often beyond the apparent conscious awareness of the apparently colorblind teacher).

Children of color are often treated negatively in the classroom.

Teachers and administrators often have low expectations toward them, do not believe in them, do not believe in them, and CERTAINLY CANNOT NON-PATERNALISTICALLY, NON-PITYINGLY LOVE THEM LOVE THEM LOVE THEM.

And then, and then, and then, the dominant discourse in schools is that the children of color are themselves—or their parents, their neighborhood, their race, their culture, their language, their genes—to blame.

Blame them!!! Blame them!!!

It is their fault that they are not succeeding. It is their fault. *But never us whites.* **Never us.** Never OUR system of schooling, never our White Racism.

Never, never, never, never us.

In addition, as we move up the educational hierarchy, where most of us white researchers live, the differences become even more extreme. The Elite, Research Universities in each state, the ones where the most influential researchers live and work, the ones where the faculty think they Are Better, Know More than faculty at lessor universities and know more than lowly "practitioners," the typical path to higher paid, more powerful positions, are thoroughly white, while students of color largely attend the community colleges or don't attend any. We The Most Powerful, Elite White University Professors—we live steeped in whiteness, but who among us respects community college professors, practitioners, and students as our equals, who are much more likely NOT to be white. We look down our white noses at All of them. THIS IS RACIALIZED.

The racialization of the higher education hierarchy is also a racialization of research, epistemology, ontology.

If we could simply look at these various patterns—in employment, housing, economics, and education, they are staggering and unquestionable. They are a HORROR. We take for granted a HORROR. We sleep comfortably within a HORROR.

There is a monumental racial inequality throughout U.S. social life. White racism rules.

Anti-Racist Scholarship

Because white racism is ontological and because I am white, I can never totally escape white racism and white privilege. The very constructions through which I experience my life, including my subjectivity, are deeply interlaced with white racism. The categories I think with are interlaced with and constructed in terms of

the shapes and contours of white racism. Every day I experience white privilege through uncountable semiotic circulations and from the treatment I receive from clerks to scrutiny by law enforcement, and the ways this privilege becomes embedded within me, within my subjectivity and my "reality" over time. Thus, I am never and can never be free of white racism, including in the writing of this book (i.e., it is inevitably racist in many ways).

One of the ways this racism works among white scholars who are critical of racism is that they want a way to be in the world so that they can regard themselves as not being a white racist. They also want to create "new" subjectivities and subject positions that are not interfused with white racism. It cannot be done. Even being a race traitor is insufficient. Trying to find or construct these "outs" is an indication of a misunderstanding and an underestimating of the ontological nature of white racism.

What then, in my view, is our choice as whites? That we as whites are at our very core white racists no matter how hard we work against racism must be accepted, said, repeated. We must always carry and speak this explicitly in our understanding, in our publications, and in our actions. This means that everything we do will have white racism in it for the present historical moment.

However, simply turning then to despair is just one more example of white racism. People of color do not get to escape white racism no matter what they do. Why should we whites think we can somehow escape white racism or despair about our lack of escape. Our actions and efforts, our directions, our anti-racist practices must be constructed both within and against the constructions of white racism in which we are embedded and which are embedded throughout our very beings.

Playing off Derrida, you cannot escape a fundamental binary by simply choosing the dominated side (the racial other) over the dominating, privileged side (the white side). Nor can we simply step outside of it. It is too deep and pervasive, embedded, interlaced, interwoven, sewn throughout the whole semiotic schema we know as reality. As Stuart Hall might suggest, we must use the tools from within white racism to work against white racism.

Consequently, we must refuse suggestions that somehow there is a right path for whites that is not woven with white racism. All white paths are thus woven; in fact, all paths period in our society are ladened with white racism. That is just a condition of our contemporary social "reality." We must thus refuse all suggested possibilities, no matter how radical, that we whites can somehow not be sewn within and of white racism; we all are always already within and of white racism.

We also must understand that we cannot displace white racism as advocated by some white scholars (e.g., Frankenburg, 1997). In addition, claims that white racism is interrupted and complexed by sexism, classism, heterosexism, while true to a certain extent, are also easily used to dilute white racism and its effects. Certainly, it is true that our positionality is a complex intersection of multiple axes of power patterned in various ways, as by gender, for one. Nonetheless, it is also dan-

gerous if we use this "complexing" to dilute or undermine the pervasiveness of white racism. What we can do, instead, is to remain strongly focused on white racism and to disrupt and interrupt current arrangements, current assumptions, and current practices in a thousand different ways. The same is true of sexism, heterosexism, etc. Complexing them can dilute them. Not complexing can distort them. We must do both complexing and not complexing at the same time in each and every area. It is not an either/or choice; it is both/and.

Consequently, the first step for we whites who want to do anti-racist scholarship is that we must always keep in the forefront that we are white racists and we are continuously priviledged by white racism. We must include this understanding as central to our scholarship, our teaching, and our service. An example of this in this book is "Toward a White Discourse on White Racism." In this, my first published anti-racist piece, I tried to make clear my own white racism, my white skin privilege, and my inevitable historical and positional connection to all whites through white racism. In fact, the purpose of this piece when it appeared as an article in 1993 in *Educational Researcher* was to promote a discourse among white scholars on our own white racism.

Second, we must be profoundly open to criticisms of our white racism from scholars of color and other white anti-racist scholars. Being defensive and closed to criticisms of our anti-racist work is destructive. Given our historical location and positionality, no white anti-racist scholar can claim the true or right or best position, and no white anti-racist scholar can claim that by their words or their actions that they can somehow escape white racism and are thus the true and perfect anti-racist. We are all corrupted by white racism and intermeshed in its contradictions and ambiguities as we try to do anti-racist work.

An example of this in this book is the rejoinder, "In the United States of America, in Both Our Souls and Our Sciences, We Are Avoiding White Racism," of Michelle D. Young and I to Cynthia A. Tyson's critique of our "Coloring Epistemology," which itself is in chapter 2 of this book. Michelle and I tried to respond to Cynthia's criticisms in a positive, nondefensive way. Cynthia said that our article and its publication were in several ways another example of white racism at work, and we agreed with her. She was right, and her critique was helpful to us in strengthening our own understanding.

Another example in this book is the reprinting of perspectives that are highly critical of mine. W. B. Allen, an African American, is deeply critical of "Toward a White Discourse." Steven Miller is strongly critical of "Coloring Epistemology," though in different ways than Allen. While I do not agree with their critiques, it is singularly important to anti-racism work that we always leave ourselves open to any critique whatsoever from anyone, no matter what their perspective. It is just extremely important that no one assume they have THE answer to white racism.

Third, we white anti-racist scholars must understand that all scholars of color will not agree with our view of white racism. In my view, we must make no

judgment of this. We whites do not have to live as people of color within white racist society. We cannot know what this is like nor judge what directions a person of color might take to survive within or to understand this environment. In my view, as white anti-racists, it is none of our business to judge or evaluate the position of persons of color on white racism. An example of this approach in this book is in my rejoinder to W. B. Allen's critique of "Toward a White Discourse." He is what would be considered a conservative African American, but that he advocates this position should not be a focus of critique for me. My acceptance of his criticism and my effort to respond positively to his critique is my attempt to respect him and his perspective.

Fourth, we white anti-racist scholars need to be deeply steeped in the critique of white racism by scholars of color. Furthermore, it is particularly critical that we use our white positionality to help communicate this critique to other whites, scholars and students. To a certain extent, this was one of the purposes of "Coloring Epistemology." Michelle and I wanted to show in this piece that we understood what scholars of color were saying about the white racism embedded in the dominant research epistemologies, and then we wanted to stand up and loudly express this understanding to other whites.

Fifth, we white anti-racist scholars need to critique the work of whites in ways that continuously highlight the ways that white racism is embedded in white scholarship. One example of this in this book is Michelle Young's and my rejoinder to Steven Miller's response to "Coloring Epistemology" in the first section of this book. Michelle and I critiqued how Miller's response to "Coloring" was itself an example of white racism. Another example is Julie Laible's and my response to the knowledge-base project in educational administration. In this example, Julie and I were critiquing the white racism of the knowledge-base project itself. A third example is my critique of Carl Glickman's promotion of democracy as the underlying value for schools. In this example, I discuss how the white majority often uses its numerical majority to support white racism and thus use "democracy" as a cover behind which to hide white racism. A fourth example is my criticisms of the new *Handbook of Educational Administration* (1999). My critique in this case is but one part of a dialogue among several colleagues about the *Handbook*. A fifth example here is my criticism of Harry Wolcott's seemingly "apolitical" approach to research methodology.

Sixth, we white anti-racist scholars must address and devise ways to provide scholarship on students of color in our educational system, but this scholarship needs to work against white racism. For me, I do not trust that I can do this alone as a white person. I do not trust that I will not inevitably embed my white racism in the research, no matter how strong my conscious anti-racism is. In fact, I do not trust *any* white scholar in this regard. I, somewhat similarly to Julie Laible (2000), think that white scholars should *not by themselves* or *just with other white scholars* do research on people of color.

The history of such research is so hideous, so destructive, beyond whites' al-

most always good intentions, that I think we should have at least a temporary ban or lockout, a quarantine, on such research for the present historical moment. Richard Valencia's work (1997) with others on "deficit thinking" and Angela Valenzuela's work (1999) on "subtractive schooling" show how we whites continue to embed white racism in our research and scholarship on students of color and the ways we educators continue to embed white racism in schooling at all levels.

What I have currently worked out, rather than doing research and scholarship on students and adults of color on my own or just with other whites, is always, at a minimum, to work *equally as colleagues* with persons of color to do this kind of research. I have not always done this, though. I wrote chapter 7 by myself— "Highly Successful and Loving. . . ." This chapter is highly appreciative and respectful of school leaders of color. Please look at it; few would judge it as racist, and many would judge it as anti-racist. Nonetheless, it is highly dangerous. It is a white person, me, working alone, working inevitably out of my own positionality and privilege, to define the work of administrators of color.

This was a mistake. Colleagues had told me that my tenure file would be much stronger if I had one more research-based article, which was what this was. I did not have the understanding of white racism that I do today, but, regardless, this is an example of the use of research on people of color, no matter how respectful, for the benefit of a white person by a white person, me. That I did not have the understanding of white racism that I have today is not a legitimate or sufficient excuse. It remains simultaneously an example of white racism and an example of an article that may be judged to be useful and valuable to anti-racist struggles. This, though, is the nature of white anti-racist scholarship—both within and against.

My subsequent response to this problem is, as I suggested above, to work with colleagues of color as equals from the beginning to the ending of such research. Two examples and a description of this approach are provided in chapters 8, 9, and 10. All of these examples are based on a research project, led by my colleagues Pedro Reyes, Lonnie Wagstaff, and Jay Scribner, on education for children of migrant agricultural workers. In the first example, chapter 8, Gerardo López (previously one of our students and now a professor at the University of Missouri at Columbia), Miguel Guajardo (a community activist and one of our students), and I did research on students who were the children of migrant parents, and together we wrote an article for a special postmodern issue of *Educational Administration Quarterly*. A second example, in chapter 9, is a script that the same three of us used for a presentation at several conferences, including the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting (1998). Key to me in both of these examples was the leadership of Gerardo and Miguel as Latinos and the participation of Miguel, who himself grew up as a child in a family of migrant agricultural workers.

Miguel is also central to the third example, in chapter 10. This example is a video documentary, so while I provide a description here, I do not provide the documentary. However, anyone can obtain a copy of this documentary by mailing

a blank 90-minute or 120-minute video to me, Educational Administration, Sanchez 310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712 and $10 for handling and mailing costs. Its title is *Labores de la Vida/The Labors of Life,* and it was produced in 1998–1999.

This documentary was made in its entirety by four people, and all four participated fairly equally in all decisions. When I was given this project, I set out to find an activist who had grown up in a family that had been migrant agricultural workers. I was highly pleased to find Miguel Guajardo, who agreed to participate as a colleague on this project. I also found Elissa Fineman, a doctoral student who had some film experience (none of the rest of us had any). Finally, Miguel found Patricia Sanchez, who did not migrate with her family to do agricultural work, though her father migrated as an adult to do this kind of work. The four of us, with the help of Carlos Colon on technical editing issues, constructed this documentary. Together, we decided the focus, developed the questions we used to interview our participants, did the interviewing and the filming, and edited the film. However, Miguel, his experiences, his history, and his connections to many of our participants, were central to the documentary. Thus, this was not primarily my documentary; it was a truly collective effort. And, Miguel, for me, sits at the center of it. To me, he makes it a documentary that largely belongs to those who have worked as migrant agricultural workers, a documentary that, to a great extent, is for and by them, and it is certainly one that is all in their words.

Nonetheless, and this is critically important, Francisco, who was one of the participants in the documentary, was critical of the project in personal communication with me. He said that in his view we brought this equipment and expertise into his community; got his friends, students, and his colleagues on the documentary; left the community with our expertise and equipment; and completed the documentary. While he and the other participants thought the documentary was well done and did "represent" the participants in a way they approved, when we left, no member of his community had learned new expertise that they could then use to support and empower their own community. He thought we should have done it in such a way that members of his community, particularly the students in his community, could have had new expertise that they could then use for the benefit of their community. In this way, he thought we had been exploitive.

In saying this criticism, I believe he was talking exclusively to me. He was criticizing me for my racism in my conceptualization of the project. This goes to exactly what I have been trying to explain above. White racism is always embedded in my thinking, and so I must always be open to criticisms of it from people of color or from other anti-racist scholars. I will continually make racist "mistakes" (though this can never be used as some kind of excuse), but if I am continuously also open to critique, I can grow in my understanding and my actions. I am not claiming, though, that this approach that I am arguing for removes or totally prevents my white racism from being somehow embedded in the research project; it doesn't. However, the

participation of people of color as co-authors, as equals (though because of white racism we can never be totally equal in this society) is a much better choice than proceeding alone or just with other whites. To repeat, though, nothing—no action, no procedure, no arrangement, can give a guarantee of no white racism.

A second aspect of working with scholars of color in doing research on students and people of color is a deviation from traditional ways of representing scholarship. Due to the interests of those scholars of color whom I have worked with and due to my own interest in questioning traditional modes of representing research, in my recent anti-racist work I have attempted to find ways both to transgress traditional research presentations because of their history of racism and to make the way the research is presented fit better with the ways of the people being represented. In these regards, in this volume, "Windows/Venturas" is one such attempt, with Gerardo Lopéz and Miguel Guajardo, to represent the lives of migrant agricultural workers, their children, and the schooling of their children in a way that disrupted our typical ways of "seeing" and representation and that connected in a less distanced way to the lives of those being represented. The video documentary briefly discussed here, *Labores de la Vida/The Labors of Life,* is another example of this approach to research representations. It too deviates from traditional research in several ways, not the least of which is that it is totally in the voices of those who were migrant agricultural workers as children. Finally, there is a "script" of a multimedia presentation at a session at an annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) that involves the audience in speaking themselves the words about and by migrant agricultural workers, their children, and the schooling of their children. In all of these examples, my colleagues and I were struggling to find and create some representational forms that were disruptive to the status quo, transgressive of traditional research representations, and more emotionally connected to those being represented.

These recommendations then are my advice to white scholars about being a white scholar doing anti-racist scholarship. As I mentioned at the beginning, though, my way is only one of many, and anyone wanting to do anti-racist work should investigate several. Neither I nor anyone else has the correct or best way for white scholars to do anti-racist scholarship. What follows is a further explanation of the examples provided in the three parts of this book.

Reading This Book, Writing Anti-Racism

Each of the three parts provides examples of my own anti-racist scholarship, along with, where possible, the published reaction of others, scholars of color and whites, to the scholarship I have co-authored with others and to ones I did alone. The chapters within the parts can be used as a collection of anti-racist scholarship, read through by choosing one's own path or read sequentially as the chapters are

ordered. This book is meant to be a resource for anti-racist scholarship and used in any way that will serve that purpose.

Part I is called "Anti-Racist Critique and Dialogue." It is composed of two chapters, each with four sections. The first section in each chapter is the original work that either I did alone or with Michelle Young. The second and third sections are two responses to this original work. The fourth section in each chapter is the rejoinder to these responses.

For chapter 1, the first section is "Toward a White Discourse on White Racism," which I published in *Educational Researcher* in 1993. The two subsequent sections of chapter 1 that follow "Toward a White Discourse on White Racism" are responses to it by W. B. Allen and Christine E. Sleeter. The fourth section, following the two responses, is my rejoinder to the responses to "White Discourse." I am fairly certain that "White Discourse" was the earliest article published in an AERA journal that was focused on whites addressing white racism or, what has been called, critical white studies. It is certainly my first attempt to do explicitly anti-racist scholarship and my first opportunity to respond to the criticisms of others of this effort. Particularly important in this piece is my assertion that I too am racist and privileged by white racism and that because of the way white racism works, no white can argue that she or he is outside white racism and its privileges.

For chapter 2, which is probably the most well known piece I have published, the first part is "Coloring Epistemology: Are Our Research Epistemologies Racially Biased?," which Michelle Young and I published in 1997, also in *Educational Researcher*. The second and third sections are by Cynthia A. Tyson and Steven I. Miller, respectively. These latter two are responses to "Coloring Epistemology." The fourth section of chapter 2 is the rejoinder that Michelle and I wrote in reaction to the two responses. "Coloring," with its focus on epistemology, tries to do anti-racist scholarship at the very heart of university-based research. It is our attempt, as whites, to take seriously the criticisms of scholars of color that the white-dominated educational and social science research communities is racist, even in its epistemologies. We agree with much of this criticism, and Michelle and I, as whites, were trying to explain to other whites why we agreed.

Consequently, both "White Discourse" and "Coloring Epistemology" (chapters 1 and 2, respectively) are critiques of white racism in education and research. The second and third sections of these two chapters are critical responses to my work or my work with Michelle. The fourth sections in these two chapters are my or my and Michelle's responses to these critiques. Thus, these two chapters provide two examples of taking a public anti-racist stance and of conducting a respectful, hopefully self-critical, dialogue with others on the issues raised. My hope is that these are exemplars of anti-racist scholarship and of respectful ways to dialogue in response to others who are criticizing or supporting my work.

Part II is called "Anti-Racist Responses to the Scholarship of Others" and is composed of four chapters. Each of these chapters is either my work or my work

with my colleagues and students that begins as a response to the work of other white scholars. Chapter 3, "The Buck Stops Here," was done with Julie Laible, an anti-racist scholar who died last year, who was my former student, and to whom I have dedicated this book. She and I were asked by the editors of the *Educational Administration Quarterly* to respond to what was called the "knowledge-base project" in educational administration. In the early 1990s there were efforts to establish a legitimized "knowledge base" for each area of education. I was a critic of this project in educational administration almost from the beginning, both because of its limited epistemological range and because of its lack of address of issues of inequity in schooling. As a result of my disagreements with this knowledge project, I was the co-author of an edited book that provided a wide range of views either that critiqued the proposed knowledge base in educational administration or that offered alternative views (Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheurich, 1995).

After the project was completed, the journal, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, decided to publish dialogue on each of its seven domains: societal and cultural influences on schooling, teaching and learning processes, organizational studies, leadership and management processes, policy and political studies, legal and ethical dimensions of schooling, and economic and financial dimensions of schooling. (See http://tiger.coe.missouri.edu/~ucea, click on "Publications," and then click on "Educational Administration: The UCEA Document Base" to see the seven domains and illustrative readings in each.) Although the journal did not follow through on this for all domains, they did, for example, address the "learning and teaching" domain in volume 31, number 1. Then, in volume 31, number 2, they addressed "social and cultural influences on schooling." As often occurs in education, and it is a racist practice, issues of race are segregated to one area, like this domain area or like a multiculture course. Consequently, while the coverage of race was good in this area, having much to do with the leadership in this domain of Kofi Lomotey, who is an Afrocentric-oriented scholar with strong scholarship on racism, issues of race were virtually nonexistent in other areas, like "learning and teaching." Given the widely available work of Luis Moll, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Etta Hollins, and Henry Trueba, all scholars whose work directly addresses the intersections of race and teaching/learning, this segregation of race to one domain was typical of white racism. Consequently, in this article, which is chapter 3 here, Julie Laible and I used this opportunity to critique the racism of the knowledge project as a whole.

Chapter 4 has three sections. In the first issue of the then new journal *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, edited by Duncan Waite, Carl Glickman was asked to contribute an article for that opening issue. His article was entitled "Educational leadership for democratic purpose: What do we mean," and it is the first section of this chapter. I was then asked to respond to Carl's piece, which I did in "The Grave Dangers in the Discourse on Democracy," which is the second section of this chapter. Carl is a friend, and in my critique of his work, I tried to be respectful, as I have argued for earlier and as I have tried to be even with

those who in my view are defending racism, because I do not believe, as I have also argued earlier, that any of us can claim the correct answer or the right stance in anti-racist work. Nonetheless, even though Carl has worked for years to improve schooling for all children, I think he seriously misunderstood how "democracy," for all of its critical importance and value to anti-racist struggles, has been used by the majority white population to maintain and provide a rationale for white racism. The third section of this chapter, then, is Carl's rejoinder to my response.

Chapter 5 is a somewhat similar situation as was the context for chapter 3. Recently, a *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration* (1999) has been published. This was largely done by the same group of scholars who did the earlier knowledge-base project in educational administration. It, also like the knowledge-base project, is a kind of current survey of knowledge in educational administration. Again, the Editors of the journal *Educational Administration Quarterly* asked various scholars to respond to different chapters in this new *Handbook*. Jay Scribner, one of my colleagues, was asked to respond to the first three chapters of the *Handbook*. He talked to me about working with him on this. We decided to have a "conversation" among ourselves and some of our doctoral students, Gerardo Lopéz, Jim Koschoreck, and Kanya Mahitivanichcha, which is this response. This chapter, then, is that conversation.

Again, similar to the knowledge project, the three chapters of the *Handbook* we responded to and the rest of the chapters in the book, except for one chapter in another part of the book, largely ignored race as it intersects with education and educational administration. Also, other than for the one chapter exception, all the authors were white. This was again the segregation of issues of race to a small, defined territory. Consequently, in my part of the conversation in the response, I tried to address the racism in the book in a way that could be heard by those being criticized. It is thus another example of me as white scholar trying to address white racism with other whites.

Chapter 6 is based on a request from Henry Trueba to respond to a paper by Harry Wolcott. However, what I did was to respond to Wolcott's work more generally. For those familiar with his extensive work on ethnographic methodology, though he has no problems with the intersection of personal or subjective issues and methodology, he is generally avowedly apolitical in his approach to methodology. As can be seen in "Coloring Epistemology" in chapter 2 of this book or in a prior book of mine, *Research Method in the Postmodern* (1997), I do not believe that it is possible for any researcher or any methodology in the social sciences to be apolitical. In my critique of Wolcott's work published here, I argue that his neutrality toward the severe white racism in society is itself an example of that racism. This, then, is a third example of my anti-racist critique of the scholarship of other white scholars.

Part III is called "Anti-Racist Representations of the Racial 'Other.'" Here I provide exemplars of my evolving research on and with people of color. The first of these is chapter 7. As I mentioned earlier, while many scholars of color have valued

this article and while I continue to think it is a valuable contribution, at the same time, I now consider it an example of white racism. By myself—as a white scholar— I assumed that I could represent well the racial "other." Given the deadly history of the representations of people of color by white scholars and given the fact that I too continue to embody white racism, acting alone as a white scholar like this is much too dangerous.

Chapters 8, 9, and 10 are examples of my *move away* from any assumption that I can rely on myself as a white researcher or rely on working with other white researchers to represent fairly people of color *and* of my *move toward* collaboration with people of color in doing research on people of color. In chapter 8, Gerardo R. Lopéz, Miguel A. Guajardo, and I developed "A postmodern re-presentation of children in migrancy" for a special postmodern issue, edited by Bill Foster, of the *Educational Administration Quarterly*. In this piece we tried to provide readers with a radically different approach to presenting academic work. It is a pastiche or collage from many different sources, from government documents to migrant children's poetry, bounded by an introduction and a conclusion. The reason we chose this form was that we hoped this radically different form disrupted traditional responses of white readers to the typical representations of migrant children. Thus, our shift in representational forms was directly connected to both our political commitments (axiology) and our epistemological commitments.

Chapter 9 is drawn from the same material and was similarly developed by Gerardo, Miguel, and myself. Although there is a repeat in chapter 9 of some of the material in chapter 8, I include it because it is an example of how we used the material in an entirely different context, and in different ways. This was a 20-minute multimedia "presentation" at a session at the AERA conference (Maricela Oliva, a former student and now a professor at the University of Texas at Pan American took my place at the presentation because I had been scheduled to present a paper at another session at the same time). We had music playing that is popular among Mexican-American migrant agricultural workers. We had a video about migrant workers playing on a television set; it was *The Wrath of Grapes,* United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 1986, Keene, California, narrated by Cesar Chavez (15 minutes). We also had a slide projector moving through a carousel full of extraordinary black-and-white photos of migrant agricultural workers shot by Allan Pogue, an ethnographic photographer who lives in Austin, Texas. What I have provided in chapter 9 is the script we handed out to various audience members. Each of those who received a copy was assigned a number as a reader, and then when we came to that point in the script, that audience member read her or his assigned part. This is a kind of audience-based readers' theater. Thus, we had three different kinds of "media" going at the same time that the audience participated with us in reading through the script. We were trying to break out of conventional epistemological strictures and to disrupt the typical academic session experience of data and research. We wanted to provide an experience for

the audience that was disruptive of common white knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about migrant workers, their children, and the education of their children.

Chapter 10 is a brief description of a research-based video documentary, called *Labores de la Vida/The Labors of Life.* Miguel Guajardo, Patricia Sánchez, Elissa Fineman, and myself collaboratively produced a video documentary of a group of adults who had been children, recently or decades ago, in migrant agricultural worker families. The four of us did everything together, from designing the research and developing the interview questions to deciding which footage to use in the final documentary and editing the footage. We worked very carefully to produce a representation that was appreciative and respectful of the people being represented and of their culture and historical experiences. We worked carefully to produce a documentary that would be valued by those represented. We worked carefully for the video to show both the destructive conditions they face, on the one hand, and the dignity and strengths they use to endure and overcome these conditions, on the other. As was mentioned before, anyone can obtain a copy of this documentary by mailing a blank 90-minute or 120-minute video to me, Educational Administration, Sanchez 310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. Please include $10 for handling and mailing costs. Once again, I was doing research on people of color in collaboration with people of color, rather than trying to do it alone or just with other whites. Also, once again, the way we represented the research data, as a documentary, was designed to disrupt racist conceptions of children who had grown up in migrant worker families. What is provided here, though, as chapter 10, is a brief description of the video documentary. However, following the description is a reflective commentary by Miguel Guajardo, one of the four who did the documentary and the one, whom I describe above, was for me the heart of the project.

Conclusion

White racism steals lives of color, destroys people, and convinces many that they are not intelligent, capable, important, valuable. At best, it constantly places barriers in the paths of people of color. At worst, it literally kills. In between, it hurts, damages, stunts, limits, contorts. Even for us whites, it corrupts our soul and devalues our lives.

White racism is complex and wily, constantly reappearing in new ways and means. It is not just where it is obvious or apparent. It is interlaced throughout virtually all of social life.

We white people hide from and ostensibly ignore white racism, act as if it doesn't exist or has little meaning or effects, and are highly defensive when it is raised directly.

We white people are deeply dependent on white racism, dependent on its

privilege, dependent on the existence of the rejected racial other, dependent on being able to push our cold cold cruelty off on the racial other and then stigmatize them as violent, inadequate, uncultured, unmannered, uneducated.

We whites are deeply cruel in our "turning away" from white racism and its effects. We reveal a frightening inhumanity in our heart of hearts.

I am white. I too am a white racist. I cannot escape this. I can, though, struggle and act into the hope of a transformed future. I can be an anti-racist in my personal life, in my community, and in my work.

It is not surprising, then, that his book has no conclusion. As argued earlier in this introduction, any conclusion that I might offer would be inappropriate and incorrect. Indeed, I deeply believe that no one has the right answer or solution to white racism, and I know that I do not. No one, in my view, should attempt closure on this deadly issue. Instead, as Miguel Guajardo says at the very end of chapter 10, the last chapter, "The answer is . . . in the critical discourse that must take place for change to happen." Given his role in important aspects of this book and given his influence on me and my thinking, it is altogether fitting that it is Miguel who has the last word in this moment and for this book.