

(Anti)racism and Pedagogy Conference

Abstracts and Bio statements

CONFERENCE PROVOCATION

Our lives are increasingly affected by technologies of power and knowledge that operate globally. There are major shifts in global realities and sensibilities, exemplified by the events of September 2001 and the global flow of displaced people. As a result, fear and suspicion of ethnic, racial and religious difference has intensified in recent years and threatens to damage the fragile network of relationships that holds societies together. Such events indicate that security cannot be maintained solely through military and police powers, no matter how technologically sophisticated. There also needs to be skilful pedagogical work conducted in social institutions, including schools. This work needs to be aware of the new complexities and provide resources for reconciling ethnic, racial, and religious differences in ways that foster understanding social justice and co-existence.

Recent work on antiracist education is now working with two propositions that are significant. Firstly, despite our efforts 'racism has not stopped growing' (Flecha, 1999) and antiracist pedagogies 'might actually foster racism rather than overcome it' (p. 169). As well, 'racism continues to manifest itself in new and alarming ways' (p. 150) that demand new educational tools. As Flecha argues, recent manifestations of racism no longer stress the ideas of inequality among races but instead assert cultural differences among ethnicities. We need antiracist pedagogies that pursue ways of strengthening or making the network of social relationships more durable and hence build trust, reciprocity, mutuality, civic responsibility, solidarity and integrity.

In this conference, we want to reflect on the pedagogical challenges presented by 'new forms' of racism that are distorting our societies. The papers and the discussion will be providing new theorizations of racism and proposing pedagogical tactics as a skilful response. This meeting takes up the issue of political-pedagogical work within/against 'critical pedagogy' which is understood as a significant educational movement that is neither homogeneous nor coherent, and one that is open to ongoing reflexivity. 'Critical pedagogy' provides an 'emancipatory' social vision for pedagogical work that rejects views of pedagogy that are ahistorical, depoliticized, and positivist. Against critical pedagogy, there is still much to do to properly elaborate how we might learn to live together in societies of ever increasing cultural complexity. It is important to also acknowledge that these efforts are being dominated by an ideology of 'backlash politics'. Backlash politics is an assault on thought, fears diversity, suffers amnesia, blames victims, and enshrines the status quo. Backlash pedagogies appear to be contributing to an intensification of divisiveness rather than providing the resources for living with differences that foster understanding, social justice and co-existence.

Flecha, R. (1999) Modern and postmodern racism in Europe: Dialogic approach and antiracist pedagogies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 69(2): 150-171.



Thinking Beyond Race

Professor **Pal Ahluwalia**, University of South Australia

Abstract

TBA

Professor Pal Ahluwalia is presently the Pro Vice Chancellor: Division of Education Arts and Social Sciences, University of South Australia, and also holds the UNESCO Chair for Diasporic Studies and Reconciliation. He is the Co-Editor of the Journals: *Social Identities*; *African Identities* and *Sikh Formations*. Recent publications include the books: *Violence and Non-Violence: African Perspectives*, (With Louise Bethelam and Ruth Ginio), *Politics and Post-colonial Theory: African Inflections*, (London: Routledge, 2001), and *Edward Said*, (with Bill Ashcroft).



It's more hopeful to talk about 'our own stuff' than to talk about racism

Professor **Linda Tuhiwai Smith**, University of Waikato University New Zealand

Abstract

This paper examines my reasons or excuses for not talking about racism, for not being as enthusiastic for anti-racist projects as I am for community based initiatives, for not being engaged in analyses of new racism as I am in the development of students, for not wanting to revisit discussions about racism as I am to visit with people who are working at the flax roots of indigenous development. The paper tracks through changes in my intellectual orientation from the academy towards 'home'; home in the sense of identity, home in the sense of place and home in the sense of a different site of struggle.

Professor Smith is the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) at the University of Waikato. Professor Smith and holds a Chair in Education at The University of Auckland and is joint director of Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga (Horizons of Insight), the National Institute of Research Excellence in Māori Development and Advancement. Professor Smith has a strong interdisciplinary research and teaching background, primarily in the field of education, including Māori and indigenous education, and the sociology and history of education. Her book, "Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples", received international attention and is now used as a text across a range of disciplines and institutions. It has been translated into Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Italian and Bhasa Indonesian.



What's Anger Got to Do With It? A Post-Indignation Pedagogy for Communities in Conflict

Assistant Professor **Michalinos Zembylas**, Open University of Cyprus

Abstract

This paper (written with Robert Hattam) builds on previous educational research into reconciliation pedagogies in Australia and Cyprus. Both of these studies highlight the importance of the affective economies of communities in conflict. Of particular importance in this terrain of affect is anger; the terrain is saturated with anger. This paper opens up a reflexive space in analyzing the efficacy of anger in political and pedagogical work. We argue that anger tends to be naturalized and normalized in social and educational theory; hence, our goal is to problematize the too easy justification of indignation as an emotional resource (see Freire, 2004). Instead we wish to propose the broad contours of a *post-indignation pedagogy* as a frame for rethinking racism and redefining antiracist and dialogic pedagogy. In the first part of the paper, we offer a genealogy of anger in conflict communities; in particular, our analysis explores the emotionally saturated discourses of anger in relationships of indigenous and non-indigenous people in Australia (Lane West-Newman, 2004). While the 'justifiable anger' of indigenous people is grounded in their 'otherness' compared to the colonizer and experienced through trauma and memory of exclusion, the anger of the settler majority is framed in the denial of indigenous rights claims to justice and fears of indigenous success. Within each community anger has been naturalized as a justifiable mechanism of responding to conflict; anger is saturated within each community and constitutes a powerful affective economy of relating to the 'other' community. The 'iterability' of anger reproduces this affective economy, impedes the conditions for necessary dialogue (Venn, 2005) and perpetuates the cycle of indignation.

However, it is important to emphasize that there are members of communities in conflict that are struggling to move beyond the dominant economies of anger. In our analysis we draw on figures such as Plutarch, Seneca, Christian and Buddhist reframings of anger as well as significant contemporary figures such as Nelson Mandela and Thich Nhat Hahn; in addition, similar reframing of anger extend in Australian indigenous communities. Borrowing from Thurman's (2005) meditation on anger, there are two extreme views of anger: resignation to anger and resignation from anger. The first extreme view is that there is nothing you can do about anger, except perhaps modulate it a bit; the second extreme view is that anger can be totally eradicated. The reframe we are proposing interrogates both extremes and proposes a 'middle way' between these extremes.

In rejecting these two extremes, the paper speculates on possible resources that elaborate possibilities of this 'middle way' [... dialogic space]. The paper draws on Derrida's notion of 'ethico-politics' and particularly the idea of 'hospitality' as well as on Gilroy's notion of 'conviviality'. What we are mostly interested is how these ideas are provocation for rethinking the pedagogical; for imagining a post-indignation pedagogy.

Short Biography

Michalinos Zembylas is Assistant Professor of Education at the Open University of Cyprus. His research interests are in the areas educational philosophy and curriculum theory, and his work focuses on exploring the role of emotion and affect in curriculum and pedagogy. He is particularly interested in how affective politics intersect with issues of social justice pedagogies, intercultural and peace education, and citizenship education. He is currently involved in a longitudinal ethnographic project (funded by the UNDP-ACT and the Open University of Cyprus) on the emotions of peace and reconciliation education in divided Cyprus. Zembylas is the author of numerous articles in international refereed journals as well as the books, *Teaching With Emotion: A Postmodern Enactment* (Information Age Publishing, 2005), *Five Pedagogies, a Thousand Possibilities: Struggling for Hope and Transformation* (Rotterdam, The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 2007), and *The Politics of Trauma in Education* (New York, Macmillan Palgrave, 2008).



Globalization as the “New” Colonization: Indigenizing Resistance

Associate Professor **Sandy Grande**, Connecticut College

Abstract

Presently the phrase “American Empire” solicits over one million hits on Google.com, over 10,000 book titles on Amazon.com and over 300 articles in *The New York Times*. In general sources indicate that the new “American Empire” has arisen from the synchronistic coupling of neoliberalism with neoconservative politics. Specifically, ever since 9-11 policies such as deregulation, unrestricted access to consumer markets, downsizing, outsourcing, flexible arrangements of labor, intensification of competition among transnational corporations, increasing centralization of economic political power and divestment from environmental protection and general dismemberment of the public sector (i.e. education, health and social welfare) have been deployed with abandon (McLaren & Farahmandphur, 2005 and Hursh, 2003). The end goal is to dismantle the constellation of existing economic and social structures that have any potential to obstruct the so-called “logic of the pure market” (Hursh, 2003). In sum, sociologist Ali Mirsepassi (2006), defines empire by its systematic character, and the manner in which it posits global hierarchies through the introduction of “new strategies of power,” that extend beyond those deployed in the imperialist phase of global capitalism.

In the U.S this played out through the extension of such “new strategies” as the Homeland Security Act, the pre-emptive strike, the Patriot Act, the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) and the Military Commissions Act, all of which the administration executed under the carefully cultivated climate of “either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.” While 9/11 undoubtedly represents a watershed moment in the nations history, I argue that the deliberate and excessive undertheorizing of this and other catastrophic events as unparalleled moments of crisis by hegemonic powers and by counter-hegemonic forces as the naked expressions of empire, to be deeply insufficient. Instead I argue that these analyses constitute a *rebranding* of history, or a marketing of historic events as unparalleled and therefore disconnected from the past.

On the contrary, I argue that recent events represent *an extension of and not departure from* the historical project that began in 1492. As such, in this paper, I argue that it is critically important to resist the rebranding of colonization (i.e. as globalization, the rise of the authoritarian state, empire, McWorld) as it not only promotes the false notion of American exceptionalism but also deracinates the American experience, sending it adrift from history and leaving behind a profound sense of displacement, including the erasure of indigenous peoples. In the end, I argue that the failure to name and resist the colonialist project as such not only threatens the vitality of Native peoples but also the viability of the democratic project, ultimately inhibiting our ability to envision a socially and environmentally sustainable future.

Short Biography

Sandy Grande is a professor in the education department at Connecticut College. Professor Grande received a prestigious post-doctoral fellowship from the Ford Foundation in 2000-01. As a Ford Fellow, she worked with graduate students and faculty in the American Indian Leadership program at Pennsylvania State University. Professor Grande is also currently serving as a member of the Executive Board of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) and as an educational consultant for John Marshall High School in Cleveland, Ohio. Her current research examines the intersections between critical theory and American Indian Intellectualism. Her approach is profoundly inter- and cross-disciplinary, and has included the integration of critical, feminist and Marxist theories of education with the concerns of American Indian and environmental education. Professor Grande has written several articles including "Beyond the Ecologically Noble Savage: Deconstructing the White Man's Indian," *Journal of Environmental Ethics*; "Critical Theory and American Indian Identity and Intellectualism," *The International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, and "American Indian Geographies of Identity and Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje," *Harvard Educational Review*. In addition, she is featured as an "up and coming scholar" in an interview with acclaimed critical scholar Peter McLaren in an issue of the *International Journal of Educational Reform*. She published a book, *Red Pedagogy: Critical Theory and American Indian Education*, in 2004.



Fabricating 'Pacific Islander': the pedagogy of expropriation, return and resistance and other lesson from a 'Multicultural Day'

Professor **Deborah Youdell**, University of London

Abstract

This paper takes up the need to identify and better understand the possibilities for pedagogic and institutional practices that unsettle race hierarchies and open up possibilities for minority ethnic young people to be recognised as legitimate students and learners. In moving towards such understanding this paper turns to an ethnographic account of the dance, song and musical practices of a group of 'Pacific Islander' students, their peers and their teachers at a 'Multicultural Day' event at a high school in Sydney, Australia. The paper offers an analysis of these practices which demonstrates how, even on 'Multicultural Day', race hierarchies are cited and constituted in the business as usual practices of school *and* minority ethnic young people resist these through their practices of self, community and ethnicity.

The paper shows the incomplete and fragile nature of these resistances, the collective and at least partially intentional forms that these take, and the subtle and perhaps unwitting ways that teachers' practices support institutional exclusions or students' resistances to these.

From these analyses the paper goes on to reconsider this 'Multicultural Day' scene and explore how teachers informed by a critical race pedagogy might act to undercut the race hierarchies that are constituted; contribute further to the intelligibility of the 'Pacific Islander' students' constitutions of themselves; and facilitate the creation of sustainable discursive spaces in which these young people can be understood as at once raced *and* desirable students and learners (Youdell 2006).

Short Biography

Deborah Youdell is Senior Lecturer in Sociology of Education at the Institute of Education, University of London, UK. She has published widely on issues of identity and inequality in education, including her recent book 'Impossible Bodies, Impossible Selves: Exclusions and Student Subjectivities'. She is a Regional Editor of the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.



Futuring Whiteness in Education: Between Reconstruction and Abolition

Associate Professor **Zeus Leonardo**, University of California, Berkeley

Abstract

Inseparable from the conceptualization of whiteness, whiteness studies comes with certain interventions or racial strategies. There are two significant camps regarding the uptake of whiteness: white reconstruction and white abolition. In the first, reconstructionists offer discourses – as forms of social practice – that transform whiteness, and therefore White people, into something other than an oppressive identity and ideology. Reconstruction suggests rehabilitating whiteness by resignifying it through the creation of alternative discourses. It projects hope onto whiteness by creating new racial subjects out of White people, which are not ensnared by a racist logic. On the other hand, White abolitionism is guided by Roediger's (1994) announcement that "whiteness is not only false and oppressive, it is nothing but false and oppressive" (p. 13; italics in original). In opposition to reconstructing whiteness, abolishing whiteness sees no redeeming aspects of it and as long as White people think they are White, Baldwin once opined that there is no hope for them (as cited by Roediger, 1994, p. 13). This essay will consider white reconstruction and abolition for their conceptual and political value as it concerns not only the revolution of whiteness but of race theory in general.

Neo-abolitionists argue that whiteness is the center of the "race problem." They go further than suggesting that racism is a "White problem." Rather, as long as whiteness exists, little racial progress will be made. In fact, leading abolitionists, Ignatiev and Garvey (1996), argue that multiculturalism and general race theories that accept the existence of races, are problematic for their naturalization of what are otherwise reified concepts. To Ignatiev and Garvey, races are not real in an objective and ontological sense and therefore Whites, for example, are not real either. They do not go as far as suggesting that White people do not exist, which is a different point. They exist insofar as structures recognize white bodies as "White people." But this recognition relies on the reification of a spurious

category in order simultaneously to misrecognize certain human subjects as White people. Race treason encourages Whites to disrupt this process by pledging their disallegiance to the “White club.” Race traitors are white bodies that no longer act like and as White people. The investment in whiteness (Lipsitz, 1998) is the strongest form of investment because it is the most privileged racial identification. As long as Whites invest in whiteness, the existence of non-White races will also continue. Hirschman (2004) has argued that as long as race exists, so does racism and it is anachronistic to imagine one without the other. The clarion call for abolitionists asks Whites to disidentify with whiteness, leading to the eventual abolition of whiteness. I would also add that it leads to another consequence, which is the abolition of White people, or the withering away of a racial category and its subjects. In other words, if whiteness disappears, so do White people.

By contrast, White reconstructionists disagree with abolitionists in the former’s attempt to recover whiteness. The disagreement falls within two domains: theory and viability. Theoretically, reconstructionists do not accept Roediger’s maxim that whiteness is only false and oppressive because there are many examples of Whites who have fought against racism, such as the original abolitionists. Reconstructionists argue that Whites can be remade, revisioned, and resignified and are not merely hopelessly racist. Their search is for a rearticulated form of whiteness that reclaims its identity for racial justice. They acknowledge that whiteness is a privilege but that Whites can use this privilege for purposes of racial justice and therefore contribute to the remaking of whiteness that is not inherently oppressive and false. In schools, reconstructing whiteness includes focusing on White historical figures who have fought and still fight against racial oppression. Reconstructionists consider this strategy as more viable than arguing for the abolition of whiteness, which most Whites will have a difficult time accepting. The discourse of White abolition will only lead to White defensiveness and retrenchment and does not represent much hope for even progressive or anti-racist Whites. To the reconstructionists, abolitionism is tantamount to promoting a certain self-hatred and shame among Whites, guiltting them into accepting a movement that does not recognize their complexity. Rather, they prefer to instill critical hope in Whites.

Clearly, there has been a shift in race studies and whiteness has come to the fore much more visibly. It is driven by a complex yet plainly stated question: What to do with whiteness? The debate between White abolition and reconstruction is a fertile educational ground. It represents a neglected aspect in race studies, which is the future of a privileged people and how they can participate in undoing these same privileges. It also poses the question of, “What do Whites become after undoing these said privileges?” Do they become new subjects of whiteness or do they obliterate a racial category beyond recognition when they commit what Ignatiev and Garvey call “the unreasonable act” of race treason. Just as we may ask what the modern looks like after the postmodern critique (Lyotard, 1984), what do Whites look like, in the ontological sense, after the critique of whiteness studies? This essay hopes to generate not only insights about this process, but a rather needed dialogue. It is less concerned with identifying who is a reconstructionist or abolitionist of whiteness (although one can certainly have a productive discussion that begins there), and more with assessing the interventions that each discourse provides.

Short Biography

Zeus Leonardo is a Visiting Associate Professor of Education at the University of California, Berkeley. He earned his Ph.D. in Education from UCLA. He is the author of *Ideology, Discourse, and School Reform* (Praeger) and he is editor of *Critical Pedagogy and Race* (Blackwell), and co-editor (with Tejada and

Martinez) of *Charting New Terrains of Chicano(a)/Latino(a) Education* (Hampton). His articles have appeared in many journals including *Educational Researcher*; *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*; and *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. In 2007, he edited a special issue of *Race Ethnicity & Education on No Child Left Behind*. He is currently working on the *Handbook of Cultural Politics and Education* (SensePublishers) and *Race, Whiteness and Education* (Routledge).



The Modern Seduction Of Race: Whither Social Constructionism?

Professor **Crain Soudien**, University of Cape Town

Abstract

This paper will explore the complexity of race as a category of social differentiation in global discourse. It makes the argument that despite important developments that have occurred in both the social and natural sciences, in fields such as sociology, anthropology, cultural studies and genetics, embodied notions of race continue to dominate languages of description in everyday life, in the world of political struggle and most paradoxically in the academy. How this has happened, it is suggested, is through the neutralisation of important concepts such as social constructionism. The focus of the paper is to interrogate how this concept, one of the central conceptual innovations in post-positivist social theory, has been taken up in fields such as education.

Short Biography

Crain Soudien is a Professor in Education and formerly the Director of the School of Education at the University of Cape Town. He teaches in the fields of Sociology and History of Education and has published over 100 articles, reviews, and book chapters in the areas of race, culture, educational policy, comparative education, educational change, public history and popular culture. He is also the co-editor of three books on District Six, Cape Town and another on comparative education and the author of *The Making of Youth Identity in Contemporary South Africa: Race, Culture and Schooling* and the co-author of *Inclusion and Exclusion in South African and Indian Schools*. He was educated at the Universities of Cape Town, South Africa and holds a PhD from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He is involved in a number of local, national and international social and cultural organisations and is the Chairperson of the District Six Museum Foundation, President of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies and currently the Chair of a Ministerial Committee on Transformation in Higher Education.