The Urban Review, Vol. 36, No. 3, September 2004 (© 2004)

The Hidden Curriculum of Domestication

Juan S. Muñoz, Rosario Ordoñez Jasis, Patricia A. Young, and Peter McLaren

Four ethnically diverse faculty members in the field of education discuss the professional impact and personal affects of introducing critical themes of race, class, gender, and culture within their research and course offerings. Given that the professional outlook for university faculty of color in general, is grim, a willingness to imbue their research and courses with a critical interrogation of prevailing education topics and theories would seem to invite greater personal risk and professional jeopardy. The following dialogue introduces both the mechanisms by which critical faculty in general, and faculty of color in particular, can be conditioned to subordinate their critical impulses and the strategies they use to resist academic cultures of domestication.

KEY WORDS: faculty of color; higher education; power and the professoriate; minority faculty.

INTRODUCTION

Four socioculturally and epistemologically distinct members of the professoriate in the field of teacher education discuss shared experiences as education faculty. In the context of these common experiences and the ensuing dialogue, the topics of entrenched notions of race, class and power in teacher education programs are evoked. The members of this dialogue are a motley combination of ethnically and culturally diverse participants. There is an equal representation of men and women present in this collective action. The individuals were compelled to participate in the dialogue for different reasons, however, their motives for participation in this action, which they see as part of a larger discourse that assaults repressive structures and expose

Juan S. Muñoz is an Associate Professor in Bilingual Education and Diversity Studies, at the College of Education at Texas Tech University, Lubbock. Rosario Ordoñez Jasis is an Assistant Professor in the Reading Department at the California State University, Fullerton. Patricia A. Young is an Assistant Professor in the Elementary Education Department at the University of Maryland University. Peter McLaren is a Professor in the Urban Schooling Department at the University of California, Los Angeles. Address correspondence to Juan S. Muñoz, Texas Tech University, Bilingual Education and Diversity Studies, College of Education, Lubbock, TX 79409; e-mail: juan.munoz@ttu.edu.

0042-0972/04/0900-0169/0

the mechanisms by which silence and subordination are secured, are uncannyingly alike. One works in the area of teacher education and literacy, another in the education of students of color, a third in the area of at-risk urban students, and the fourth member, unarguably the most accomplished and visible of the conversants, examines educational theory and praxis in a global context. While all four participants approach education from different applied perspectives, they are nevertheless theoretically intertwined by a common sense of critical ethics and a shared history of subtle and explicit abuse within the university as a consequence of their critical, ethical and equity-minded agency as practitioners in teacher education.

While the wide swath of educational research in teacher preparation covers such broad areas as recruitment and retention, subject matter preparation, teacher education curriculum, instruction, equity, to the more philosophical role of the teacher, (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Dilorth, 1992; Fenstermacher, 1986; Greensburg, 1983) few works have examined the context for faculty in teacher education that purport to advanced more critical notions of all of the aforementioned areas of study.

Moreover, few studies still have considered the impact of race, class and power in teacher education on the personal well-being and professional trajectories of specifically faculty of color. The research on the ability of the university to successfully address the matter of faculty diversity and retention of faculty of color, in fact, evidences the university's incapacity at self-reform (Trowers and Chiat, 2002). When faculty challenge the university system, it is like any organism in that it wants to survive at all cost, and it will ferociously defend itself when challenged (Baez, 2002a). Thus, if and when critically minded faculty, and in particular faculty of color, expose themselves professionally vis-à-vis their public counter-narrative of prevailing expressions of race, class and power in teacher education, they also face an emaciated institutional commitment to insulating and retaining them within the university.

The following dialogue was born out of months of impromptu conversations, commiserations, detailed discussions, and careful examination of teacher education research that addressed the climate for critical educators in schools/colleges of education, and the ability of critically minded faculty to questions and/or agitate prevailing notions and practices within teacher education. More directly, the outcomes of these discussions illuminated a commonality of experiences that had heretofore been understood, certainly by the junior faculty, to be isolated and individualized experiences. What was learned through this exercise was an affirmation of the importance of solidarity in the face of structures that seeks to silence voices of critique, and an ability to illuminate said structures through collective and deliberate action. What follows then, is but one more skirmish in the battle for existence and equity in field of teacher education.

Juan: Patricia, Rosario and Peter, I am glad that we finally have this opportunity to formally meet and attempt to add some unifying architecture to the various independent conversations we have had over the last few months regarding race, class, and power specifically within the precincts of teacher education programs. Additionally, this dialogue also allows us to further our discussions regarding the detrimental consequences on the faculty responsible for courses that introduces and negotiates these socially and politically loaded topics. Baez (2002b) refers to these types of professorial considerations as "race work." In his examination of these topics, and specifically in relation to the subject of race, Baez notes that faculty of color typically evidence notions of "race issues" within their teaching, service, and research. This group of faculty often feel a sense of urgency to represent "race issues" in their professional activities either because no one else will or because the prevailing understandings of race are erroneous or hostile to people of color in general. According to Baez, faculty of color often address race in the context of their courses, and thus this same group is encouraged to teach "diversity courses." In fact, even those faculty of color that do not believe "race issues" is part of their professional obligation are sometimes compelled to do "race work" such as teach diversity courses. (Baez, 2002b). One of the issues that we have repeatedly discussed is the heavy personal and professional toll as a result of deliberately evoking "race issues" within our teaching, service, and research.

In this vein, I have said privately to you all on separate occasions that there are significant risks involved for teacher preparation professionals who challenge or agitate the established institutional order and its ensuing practices. Among these risks are the unique forms of symbolic and concrete acts of aggression targeting faculty who dare to author discursive spaces in their scholarship and classrooms that critically interrogate and destabilize prevailing ideological and enacted conditions of domination and suppression within teacher preparation programs. These risks runs the gamut from professional isolation, limited support opportunities, censorship of work/effort, stigmatization by colleagues, and of course, the threat of being denied retention, tenure or promotion (Baez, 2002b).

For those who would be the architects of premeditated and co-ordinated acts of aggression, originating either from student or colleague, against critically-minded faculty in general, and faculty of color in particular, there is a substantial institutional culture that encourages an "uninviting, unaccommodating, and unappealing" professional climate (Trowers and Chiat, 2002). Trowers and Chiat allude to the "subtler (institutional) norms that undercut efforts at diversity." Collectively, these norms create a useful distance for the institution that cloaks discriminatory practices such that the source of these practices are exceedingly difficult to isolate and expose.

Thus, the individual faculty that experiences hardship is perceived as the result of their individual failings rather than an institutional climate that may be actively hostile or benignly indifferent toward them, ''the theory of institutional racism suggests that (these) faculty members of constrained by academic practices that appear neutral but in fact discriminate through their disproportionately detrimental on racial and ethnic minorities'' (Baez, 2002a p. 91). And I would and that the same would apply to non-faculty of color that subscribe to a similar critical ethic and ideological compass to that espoused by faculty of color committed to preserving ''race work'' in their professional lives.

Indeed, faculty of color who attempt of advance a renewed examination of race, class, and power are distractive elements to an otherwise functioning teacher-training apparatus. This point is in reference to the curriculum (in what passes as worthwhile information) and instructional practices present in teacher education. These assailants also argue that faculty of color have a personal investment in preserving particular understandings of race, class, and power. According to this line of reasoning, faculty of color are parasitic forms of ''ideological pimp'' clutching to conceptualizations of disenfranchisement in order to protect their privileged position as spokesperson for the disadvantaged.

Faculty of color in particular, face personal risks when their students construct them as the enfleshed absence of intellectual rigor, disciplinary objectivity, and ideological sophistication. By virtue of one's ''blackness,'' ''brownness,'' ''poverty,'' etc. faculty of color is perceived by some students as incapable of being more than simple-minded, and therefore simply dismissible conduits for a specifically interested articulation of race, class, etc. For many White students then, and also for some students of color that have assumed a motivate conservatism, faculty of color are incapable of expressing any theoretical or ideological insight other than a feeble liberal discourse that is predictably antagonistic to the dominant culture and the social relations it helps to preserve. With one mental gesture by students, faculty of color's entire academic training and lived experience is neatly dismissed as immaterial—once again, an act of violence.

Faculty of color who dare to be critical pedagogists are further constructed as hypocrites because they, the students might argue, are the embodiment of the success that is possible in the United States for ethnics willing to ''apply themselves.'' For these students, faculty of color are those who have ''made it,'' and yet these same individuals have the arrogance and ingratitude to critique the system that has essentially handed them their livelihood. This construction of ''ethnicity (faculty of color) as hypocritical'' further fuels intractable student opinions about the information and ideas articulated by this same faculty.

As a Chicano cultural worker and educational researcher I say that we are—I use the term *We* as inclusively as possible to invite into this discussion both ethnic and ideologically aligned colleagues regardless of sociocultural background—collectively vulnerable to the unilaterally dangers effects of an unabated ideological campaign to undermine not just of the work of scholars of color in particular, but indeed to call into questions once again the contributions of people of color in general. This summation of the efforts and experiences of faculty of color is yet another unconscionable expression of negation that hopes to render our work invisible; and thus another example of the symbolic violence that critically minded faculty and faculty of color experience. What is most troubling, is the fact that these bigoted attitudes are being expressed within the context of teacher training programs and by individuals who will inherit the responsibility of teaching members of the same ethnic groups that they privately disdain.

Part of what I envisioned this dialogue potentially offering readers is a rare glimpse into the conditions experienced by faculty from significantly different backgrounds, teaching in different departments with different official "mandates" and how the ideological disposition and practical dispensation of their work attracts a similarly hostile reaction from students, and potentially from colleagues. Placed within this context, what emerges is a common culture of resistance among said faculty but from different sociocultural and experiential locations. Patricia, at this point let me invite your thoughts on this general subject.

Patricia[1]: Let me begin my response by stating that I am the embodiment of academic achievement for myself but more so for my race. I am never just a black individual but I am always the colored representative of my race. My actions, ways of being, seeing and doing things are scrutinized as a whole versus a part. This evaluation of my being is pervasive and invasive. As students, faculty and the colleagues that I work with seek to understand and define who I am. They are not sure of how to read me. I am one of few. The role I play is burdened with and by my blackness. I cannot pass for anything "other." My womanness is further complicated by my blackness —for my being is inseparable and must be analyzed as a whole.

A Black, female, intellectual, and professor is an anachronism. Students don't expect my "coloredfied" self to be walking to the front of the classroom—the back will do. The expressions on their faces indicate that some are pleasantly surprised, others shocked, others horrified and some fearful of the unknown. These negative emotions are usually associated with their non-interaction with black folk. It is associated with their failure to get to know others of my race as "human" beings. It is a fear of the unknown. A fear based on stereotypes, biases, hearsay, but ultimately race—*baby*. I briefly glance up at their anglicized eyes and softly say hello. I

unpack my bags and write an affirmation on the board followed by today's agenda.

This position of guardedness is what faculty of color, and others who share a common ideological shoring, face as we tread unexplored and under explored classroom terrains. It is a mine and mind field as we try to negotiate a place of comfortability between us and them and those. The uneasiness we begin with is echoed in silence and words. As a professional, I prepare myself by not thinking into the stares, gazes, or gawking eyeballs that could become invasive if I felt what they were really thinking. As a Black, female, intellectual I must be ready for anything. Moving the conversation forward, I know that Rosario has expressed similar sentiments and experiences related to how she negotiates her sense of activism within a sterile academic context.

Rosario: Thank you Patricia, as a Chicana activist, researcher and educator, I too, am often consumed with how we can hope to continue our critical work to transform notions of power and privilege in the face of such ''domestication,'' while remaining whole. My thoughts return to Paulo Freire who reminds us that teaching requires not only rigorous academic or intellectual training, but an ''affective'' preparation as well. To our classrooms we bring our critical understandings and reasonings, along with our passions, our location in the world, our emotions, our histories. We are also embedded in the many emerging or untold stories of community resistance and struggle for education and empowerment. As members of the communities of which we teach, speak and write about, we have strong, intimate connections to their struggles for voice, and in many ways, their histories ARE ours. Because of a need to forge of new consciousness of opposition, as faculty from communities of color we situate ourselves in the middle of this academic ''battleground,'' this political terrain of struggle for self-determination, but it is not without significant emotional and ideological costs. In our work to address the many gaps of traditional teacher preparation programs we consciously and purposefully introduce the perspectives and the voices of those—our brothers, sisters, grandparents, parents—who have historically not had their experiences fully articulated or validated within the literature. I understand the need to challenge, reawaken and to educate future teachers. However, many times I am also profoundly pained when confronted with students who, in their commitment to their positions of dominance, demean, discount, de-value these ''untold stories'' of subjugation, subordination and resistance. During my academic training, I did not receive the kind of ''affective'' preparation needed to engage and overcome the overtly racist discourse of some students. To engage in that contestation successfully, I often explore the two worlds of meaning I inhabit daily: the largely White, hierarchic academic environment, and the

strength of my Chicano–Latino community, with its familiar terrain of affections, memories and hopes. It is not an easy balance.

Juan: Peter, you and I have spoken over the years regarding the often debilitative affects of essentialist racial politics. I have argued for some time that among communities of color, despite their heterogeneity, there is a private historical experience, a shared consciousness, that offers most in these communities a tentatively common and distributed understanding of their self and self and collective whole. Certainly for Chicanos, there are common historical experiences and discernable cultural expressions and formations that are uniquely Chicano/a. Within the context of racialized political projects, we have discussed the divisiveness of an exclusionary or isolationist *politque* as counter-productive. The notions of screening potentially sympathetic political agents based on the illusion of ethnic/cultural purity, aside from scientifically and rhetorically indefensible, promotes a political distrust and animus that ultimately functions to disable collective action and forms of social change that benefit more than one or two groups. This manifestation of political vision is adolescent and further promotes delimited understandings of communities of color and of their possible contributions to social change and social justice.

While we both recognize the determining presence of race and of the immutable politicization of context, Peter, how do you place yourself within this history of the experiences of faculty of color? How does your socio-economic past inform your present?

Peter: Despite my working-class roots and a family history that goes back to the farmlands of Canada's Appalachia, and the dockyards of Glasgow, Scotland, my blonde hair, blue eyes, and pale bone-colored skin (colorfied as disgustingly pink in the Los Angeles smog) provided for me a vine-covered educational portal decorated with solemn Latin mottos, through which I was able to walk, politically embalmed, yet with a confidence marinated in the unctuous poison of white racial arrogance. Fortunately, growing up in Canada, I was able to assume greater control over the means of the production of my identity, and eventually was able to commit race and class suicide of a sort. Unlearning one's whiteness is a long haul. It is a task that is never complete, and one that you have to be vigilant about all the time.

Perhaps it was encountering the writings of Marx (1959), Marx and Engels (1956), Trotsky (1972, 1980), and Lenin (1961), and then learning about Malcolm X, Guevara, Freire, and Marti[2], and a few white sixties radicals, perhaps it was the contrast between the racism I saw in the school and in the streets and the good fortune of having a mother and a father who taught me to respect everyone from all ethnic backgrounds and who embraced people of color in a genuine, non-patronizing manner when I was growing up in a fairly

homogeneous part of suburban Toronto, maybe it was my dad, proud of his Scottish heritage, who told me stories about how the Highland people were massacred during the Jacobite rebellion by Lord Cumberland's troops and how, over the years, they were thrown out of their homes, some sold as slaves, and over many generations fled to the four corners of the world, and my dad would emphasize how important it was that all people live in peace and with dignity, maybe it was my anger at watching my father wasting away with emphysema and dying unemployed after being laid off from a transnational corporation to which he had dedicated his life—I am not sure exactly what it was—but I grew up angry as hell at how people behaved, at how white folks practiced and invested in racist behavior, how they organized their institutional lives, how they treated each other, and how they used the power of the state (which enforced laws that kept white privilege in place) to keep themselves on top and others at the bottom. I was, simply put, a mad dog. I had choices other folks surely didn't have, on the basis of my skin color, and clearly I took advantage of some of those choices; but brewing in the froth of the cesspool of contradictions in which my subjectivity was formed was an anger that, in my early adulthood, I directed at the grand swindle of corporate whiteness—the bankers, the capitalists, the corporate robber barons—and then years later, I began to the see the problem as having less to do with the natural propensity of white folks to oppress anyone in their way of accumulating surplus value or profits, and more to do with how race and gender are embedded in the contradiction between the social relations of production and the forces of production within the larger social universe of capital. I became interested in the relationship between whiteness and the dominant ideology, the relationship between the society's ruling ideas, and the ruling class. So for me capital (the social relation) and capitalism (the enterprise) became less a "white" thing in isolation, that is, less about having white skin, and more connected to the history of the (fictionalized but none the less having real effects on those considered non-white) "white race" as it intersects with capitalist social relations. I won't rehearse that history here, because it will take me too far afield from our discussion. Let me just say that for me, it is important to locate racism and the process of racialization within the social relations of production, because I believe these relations constitute the material basis of racism. However, that said, I also want to emphasize that racism is something we need to fight in a multipronged way—we need to attack it's mythologies, ideologies, symptomologies, epistemologies, and its material basis in the exploitation of human labor—we can't fight it through class struggle alone. Manning Marable makes this quite clear when he talks about the racism among white workers, labor unions, and white "progressives" in the context of why Black Americans are not socialists.

Juan: Let me ask the three of you, why is it that as critical intellectuals are we asked to arm ourselves differently than conventional scholars? What is it about the ideas we advance and about the pigmented bodies that are advancing these ideas that engenders such rage? It would seem that in addition to our academic preparation, which is shared by all in academe, our presence in the academy requires a heightened training to prepare us to navigate the "mind and mine fields" that seem to be placed before our every step. How can we avoid "thinking" into the stares, grins and grimaces that characterize the foreboding classrooms we are required to work in? How do we isolate ourselves from these mercenary attitudes without becoming so jaded and cynical that we eventually chose to "isolate" ourselves from the work and workers we hoped to serve when we entered this industry of ideas? How then, can the "colorfied" remain hopeful?

Patricia: We are not asked to arm ourselves differently. We are forced to defend and protect ourselves from the onslaught of attacks. It is by design for certain folk to remain fieldhands of the ivory tower because we challenge the institution and its ways of thinking and doing. Our ostracization is indicative of any form of subjugation where those in power seek to rule absolutely by oppressing those who challenge or disagree with their elitism. Color, also invokes rage in the cultureless—those without a conscious. I care not about their rage but how they seek to oppress me and others through their racialization. I am constantly reminded to stay in my place, publish only in certain journals, engage in a restrictive type of thinking, being and seeing of the world, and to write only through the puppeteering voices of other academics. For me, this intellectual oppression is a death row sentence.

The classroom is a different "mind and mine field." The utterance of one word could bring an avalanche of heartache. As students via for what isn't rightly theirs—my ass. It is difficult to not loose your mind amidst these attacks to ones person, mind, identity, body, spirit, pedagogy, and race. I believe a "get out of jail free" card might do good for me.

Critical theorists must collectively support each other and share our experiences. A freeing of thoughts and voice is paramount to any kind of healing. Everyday, I think about leaving the academy, but I am consumed by the work. I am stifled by the quantity of work to be done, and I am abhorred by the fact that we, me and us must do it. Because many others fear the fight, I will sacrifice myself and my career. This is what critical theorist do; this is our mercenary mission. My hope is that our voices will not be oppressed and that our persons will remain intact from the battle. But the battle needs many soldiers to replace the casualties (i.e., those maimed, dead, silenced). I pray that history will see our work as revolutionary discourses that altered the direction of intellectual thought. I think

we should be hopeful and wait and see how history characterizes our valiant efforts. I hope to live that long.

Rosario: Speaking for myself, I am as Delgado-Gaitan (2002) describes, an "insider and outsider" to academia. Swimming (and sometimes sinking) in Bhabba's[3] (1997) notion of the "third space," I constantly negotiate the need to function as a cultural and academic mediator between the racist and classist assumptions of some of my students, with my own history as a working class activist committed to long-term social change. As an insider I am able to comprehend and articulate the struggles faced by my students who, for many, are encountering narratives of oppression and resistance for the first time. For these students, coming from an unquestioned location of privilege, resistance narratives are highly destabilizing. Clearly, their realities were easier to "understand" before our classes: it takes courage to critically reflect upon one's own long-held assumptions and beliefs and to address the emotional and psychological discomfort that accompanies the resulting shift in paradigms. At times I even understand the underlying hostility some students show towards me as symptomatic of a profound fear of diversity and change. Through my inside positioning I have come to appreciate those daring students, who in their journey to become critical educators themselves, come to terms with their privileged status taking seriously their role in democratic schooling. However, the "outsider" struggles to understand. The Chicana grows impatient with the system's failure to successfully educate children from communities of color. This part of me knows only too well that so many of OUR children are placed into classrooms with teachers who feel neither a desire nor a responsibility to teach them equitably. The outsider cannot, WILL NOT understand or accept why a disproportionate number of Chicano, Latino, African-American and Native American children are effectively foreclosed from receiving a meaningful education, are mislabeled as "learning disabled," segregated, or pushed out of the educational system altogether. Most of all, the outsider fears that the hostility and toxicity, those "stares and glares," directed at me, at us, will one day be re-directed towards *their* students of color in *their* K-12 classrooms. Thus, the need to penetrate and question the official explanations and dominant ideologies that educationally cripple our children is imperative. To honor their families and communities, I have chosen a pedagogy that deconstructs issues of power, access and privilege in education and in society. It is an ideological and political undertaking often populated by undercurrents of frustration, as well as by smaller but significant victories. May I again borrow from Freire and Freire (1995) and Freire (1998), and their assertion of the necessity to develop "a pedagogy of hope." And, as a fundamental building block, hope is also highly (and happily) destabilizing. As a junior faculty of color, my praxis has become this on-going navigation among the worlds I inhabit, a complex social trajectory as both an insider

and an outsider. A balance of frustration and hope: a struggle to create a safe emotional space to continue my educational work, while maintaining my ideological convictions, my sense of self, and my humanity.

Peter: Both Patricia and Rosario allude to the framework for successful action for the professoriate of color working in critically informed areas of research and practice. Clearly we need to be united in the struggle against racism in the academy. Malcolm X made a statement in the Corn Hill Methodist Church in Rochester, New York, back in 1965 that strikes a chord with me: "We don't judge a man because of the color of his skin. We don't judge you because you're white; we don't judge you because you're black; we don't judge you because you're brown. We judge you because of what you do and what you practice. And as long as you practice evil, we're against you. And for us, the most—the worst form of evil is the evil that's based upon judging a man because of the color of his skin. And I don't think anybody here can deny that we're living in a society that just doesn't judge a man according to his talents, according to his know-how, according to his possibility—background, or lack of academic background. This society judges a man solely upon the color of his skin. If you're white, you can go forward, and if you're Black, you have to fight your way every step of the way, and you still don't get forward." Do Malcolm's statements pertain to conditions today? Let's look at the academy. Without a doubt, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of professors of color, and administrators, when compared to the time when Malcolm spoke his truth to power. But how many white students still see professors of color as decaffeinated white scholars? If I can borrow one of Malcolm's terms, "evil" hasn't disappeared, it's become more fully integrated into the collective subjectivities of the population so we don't really notice it anymore. It has become the collective lens through which we focus our everyday perceptions. I am always struck with how naturalized evil has become in this country. We refuse to name injustice let alone challenge it. The media—the propaganda arm of the capitalist state—is largely responsible for shaping the perceptions of the citizenry and most of what we see is brought to us by the largely white-controlled corporate media. By the time white kids get into college, many of them have been conditioned to see every professor of color as having escaped from the hood and having made it into the academy through the benevolence and generosity of some kindly white patron.

Juan: Peter, your case is rather unique in the sense that early on your work was innovating a critical species of scholarship that was at once politically uncompromising and truly among the first manifestations of interdisciplinary work within traditional educational research. Given that you not only had tenure, but also held the title of Renowned Scholar-in-Residence and given the fact you had so many books and possibly hundreds

of articles in the most prestigious journals in the field of education, it is amazing that you had such a struggle early on with your current appointment.

Peter: Having been let go from my first teaching position in Canada, because of my political teachings (my contract was not renewed), I joined the faculty of a university in the Midwestern United States. There I was taught that to succeed one had to ventriloquize the red-cheeked, white patriarchs of the department. Some of them refused to even acknowledge me when I said hello. They would avert their eyes, and emit some kind of growling sound when I said good morning. On a few occasions when I went out of town to give a speech, I had my personal mail taken from my mailbox and copied and put into the faculty mailboxes, and this was criminal activity of course, and meant to embarrass me. Fortunately, there were some wonderful young colleagues in the department who helped to steer me through tenure without me having to abandon my leftist politics, which I wouldn't have done in any case. Henry Giroux was there, and it was terrific to have him as an ally. Henry and I backed each other up, and often this show of strength helped us survive. I am one of the few leftists that I know who made it through tenure on the first try. But when it came time for me to move to UCLA I had a re-tenuring process, which was not easy given my politics. Fortunately, I had the support of some key faculty, and a new Dean. Still I feel somewhat like an historical accident, even though my full professorship sailed through as smoothly as a cutter on a gulf current. Now at the time my work was evolving (some people have used the term "devolving"!) from a resistance postmodernist orientation to a Marxist humanist perspective. Of course, this cocked eyebrows and I am sure sounded alarms, but in the main I must say that I have survived because I have enjoyed the good fortune of meeting some outstanding students, whose friendships even from my first days in the academy are still very active and ongoing; I have had some wonderful colleagues with whom to talk and share ideas, and I have been able to publish on a number of issues. Right now I am writing on the dialectics of terrorism and the Bush/Cheney/Rice junta and the danger they present to world peace and to democracy here at home. Now as a white professor who has published work on the abolition of the white race, on the abolition of capitalism, on the move towards fascism here in the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, and who works from a revolutionary Marxist perspective, I have had my share of attacks and criticisms. I am sometimes called a traitor to the white race, a criticism that I wear proudly. But I would say that the difficulty that I face in holding positions that go against the grain of what is largely a liberal centrist academy, is in the form of subtle attacks. I think if my work reached a wider audience, or somehow caused rich patrons to withdraw their endowments

from the university, there would be an attempt at some kind of institutional discipline. And I also think that the Bush administration could move to purge the university of radical professors—especially Middle Eastern Muslims, or Marxist professors—on the pretext of the war on terrorism. I think that is a real possibility.

Juan: Peter, you have often spoken to me about the virtually terminal personal, professional and spiritual sacrifices of this critical path we four have selected for ourselves. How would you characterize the climate of receptivity to your ideas to advance critical projects in and out of the academy? What would you advise to younger faculty hoping to blaze a similar academic and activist path toward social justice and democratic potentiality? What would be your counsel from the trenches for those faculty members who face politically derelict colleagues and apathetic classroom audiences? How have you remained politically, intellectually, and spiritually animated about the work?

Peter: Well, I have already talked about this a bit. For me, I don't see the academy as a place where I have a career, but a place where I exercise a political project. Sure, early on I was conscious of making sure some of my publications were in "top tier" journals, and I still write for these journals on occasion because I want my ideas debated in the mainstream as a way of educating a wider public via a critical theory analysis of contemporary capitalist society, but the content of my work has always challenged the system. Mostly, I would argue that my most radical work is ignored rather than criticized. That is a very common tactic in the academy. I have even seen it among my *compañero/as* on the left, because the left is very competitive. Leftists often don't get attention in the public sphere because their work is too threatening to the *status quo* or too esoteric—or both—so the only terrain that gives them some kind of public affirmation are the academic journals. That becomes their terrain and they mark off their territory like pit bulls. Even though they are ostensibly on the same side, they will work against you. The key is to find responsible and forward-thinking editors of some top journals, editors who recognize the importance of linking educational research and theory to the plight of real, living, breathing people, and especially those who are being oppressed within our white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, to borrow a phrase from bell hooks. I have met some very good editors, who have integrity. They do exist.

I think the academy permits a few white folks to take on the role of the muckraker, the radical, the political activist, because that gives the system legitimacy to have an official antagonist: look, we have a Marxist on faculty, we are all about diversity! And without question it's more difficult for professors of color.[4] Professors of color are often forced to fit the "official" sanitized (i.e., whitened) role of the professor of color. It's the white

hierarchy who write the script. You can see this in how the academy judges fields of inquiry such as action research, critical race theory, critical pedagogy and "multiculturalism." I've read more reports than I care to remember by tenure committees who advise junior faculty of color to focus on more "serious" topics. Advice? The key is to establish personal links with experts in the field, make alliances, and join organizations who can support you. Another tactic to watch out for is the "divide and rule" game, orchestrated by the white institutional hierarchy, where professors of color are pitted against each other and pressured to work against each others' interests. I've seen this happen, where African-American professors criticize other African-American professors, Chicano/a professors battle with other Chicano/a professors for the little bit of turf the white administration has given them.

Juan: Patricia and Rosario, I'd like to put the same question to you but in the future tense. As we three are at the beginning of our careers working in educational communities and training teachers to understand and pursue their work with a deliberate sense of the social and political implications of teaching in American public schools, we should occasionally pause to assess and reflect on the work that we have achieved and that which we hope to yet see realized. How then, will we remain politically, intellectually, and spiritually animated about the work? As the hidden curriculum of domestication seeks to sedate our individual and collective efforts, and further compel us to, as Peter writes, "ventriloquize" the hidden curriculum anesthetizing siren song of changes without sacrifice or substance, how will we, and other like us, work to survive in this environment of caprice and capitulation.

Patricia: Good question. After 3 years of professional and personal struggle at a predominately white institution, I have now happily moved to a historically black college. Finally, my research makes sense. Finally, those around me understand what I have been writing about because they are the essence of my words—my work. Connecting African- Americans to technologies of literacy receives a pleasantly affirmative nod versus a befuddled raised brow.

I have much work to do and that scares me into submission. When friends suggest a recreational activity after I finish my work, I tell them I have 30 years worth of work in front of me. The daunting thought of the amount of work leaves me unmotivated—wondering how can I do this, why do I have to do this, and when can I ever get it all done. These thoughts are selfish and unfair to the work that I have accomplished thus far. The burden is great for me as I try to understand my purpose in this madness. I find the thought of the enormity of the work stifling. I find the interactions with children and the community invigorating. I find my spirit strong and in a constant state of regeneration. I need the interaction with children and the

community to remain motivated by and to what I am doing in terms of research and practice. I can't seem to connect otherwise. As I sit at my lonely desk, there is no connection to the real world so I have to stay linked and continue to do research and feed off the energy of the community around me—that will sustain me for the long haul. I will publish in journals that respect my work and its contributions. I will continue to speak my mind, whether it be written or verbally, with eloquence but also from an authentic and creative perspective. I need to have freedom in what I do—in the work that I create. Otherwise, I am not fulfilled and I can't work. There must be freedom within the words we write and the songs we speak. Liberation must not be confined to the classroom and the minds of students but it must permeate the minds of academics and the mine fields of the towers of academia. This liberation must begin now. I feel free here—*to act the fool.*

I am blessed to have the opportunity to live and work in a predominately coloredfied community where much work in terms of literacy practices and educating children of color is in demand. I will remain motivated by the children that I see. I will remain their advocate. I will speak for them. They don't need to know about my advocacy just that I am their overseer—*their sista girl on guard.*

Politically, I am always angry about the injustices that I see in and surrounding urban communities and schools. As long as I work in the community, I will be active and empowered to act. My advocacy for poor and minority students will never retreat. I understand poverty, racism and injustice—*for real though*. It is who I am—who I will always be. As long as there are issues, I will continue to fight for justice, resist what is, argue for what should be, and if necessary construct where we need to go. I plan to remain "active" and "angry" in my community. The community needs me and I them.

Rosario: As I reflect upon the joys and rigors of this chosen path, what comes to mind is the work that was done before me and the work that still remains. I believe my role in academia is pivotal, yet at times, uncomfortable. As I enter the university campus, what are "neutral" places for some —the classroom, meetings, etc. — unexpectedly become sites of tension and contestation. The usual nods accompanying the daily negotiations about curricular, pedagogical, even budget allocations impacting our teaching and research are uncomfortably subverted by becoming an arena where to inject the emerging multicultural community voices that rightly belong there. These powerful undercurrents of commitment propel my teaching about critical social theory, contextualized with both the honor and responsibility of carrying the dreams, aspirations and, most importantly, the strength of my family and community. This historical consciousness sustains my sense of direction. I am under no illusions, it is THEIR sacrifice and dedication

that has made it possible for me to be here to engage, and reflect upon these critical educational issues with the three of you. I also carry the moral commitment of others in and out of academia, who, through their stories, teachings or writings remained uncompromising in their work to realize a cultural and economic democracy. Philosophically, spiritually or politically their work inspires me. For this reason, I am particularly appreciative for Peter's account of his trying times. As I look forward, I see a vision of schooling not yet realized. It is essential that we continue to, unwaveringly, imagine and reimagine more egalitarian social relations within schools and in society. Significant questions can and should be raised about the nature of schooling as it presently exists: high stake testing, disempowered teachers subjected to the "bureaucratization of the mind" and the practice of privileging standardization over learning are just a few issues that deeply trouble me. At a time when parent "involvement" in schools is being pushed at all levels, a neodeficit discourse permeates such that poor and working class families are continuously perceived as unentitled and subsequently denied meaningful participation in shaping the policies that have a direct, and oftentimes negative, impact on the educational lives of their children. Within this educational landscape, there is an imperative to inject the dynamics of contest and conflict in the discourse dominated by the rhetorical ideologies of conservatives who refuse to address the political or pedagogical concerns raised within broader social contexts. Maintaining *solidaridad* (solidarity) with these, as Peter mentioned "real, living, breathing people" relegated to the margins, brings relevance to my work. Expanding alliances of struggle is another way I survive. Crossing (although many times it feels like trespassing) the many borders of this world of academia, I have realized the necessity to construct boundaries to sustain myself. For now, I let only a few in. There is an old saying that has been repeatedly told to me over the years, "*Dime con quien andas y te dire quien eres*" (loosely translated, "Tell me who your companions are and I'll tell you who YOU are"). There is a certain affinity felt with those who share similar goals, and in my case, with those diligent in their efforts towards emancipatory education. Members of our professional faculty organization, R.A.C.E,[5] share in scholarly pursuits which center on a critical analysis of equity, class, culture, race, gender and linguistic diversity. Core members of the group, my "companions," have been a source of comfort and support in this somewhat tumultuous, yet affirming journey. It is in this mediated space where I find solace and camaraderie. Presenting, writing and generating ideas together have been so instrumental to my scholarship. At the conference we presented together last year, Trowers and Chiat (2002) shared some interesting, yet not-so-surprising findings from their research: only 5% of full professors are African-American, Chicano/Latino or Native American. They discussed the high

proportion of faculty of color who find academia "uninviting, unaccommodating and unappealing." In a small period of time, we have helped to co-create, though still somewhat marginally, a university culture that is becoming more accommodating to the unique challenges faced by a new generation of scholars embracing alternative avenues of scholarly inquiry. I'm still overjoyed with the reception we hosted just a couple of week ago where both the President and Vice President of our university pledged their support. There was such an incredible receptivity and a sense that real bridges of understanding and compassion were beginning to develop. My spirit is fueled by the faith of collective efforts such as these conceived out of such collegial solidarity.

Juan: Peter, Rosario and Pat, let me end by first thanking the three of you for your candor, courage, and insights regarding the circumstances plaguing faculty of conscious in general, and faculty of color in particular. As we have collectively heard, there appears to be a salient pattern of treatment for critically minded faculty that becomes further complicated when these faculty members are also people of color. How some students and colleagues construct faculty of color is unavoidably tragic and must be addressed in regards to broader conversations of race, power, bigotry and institutionalized discrimination.

As faculty of color continue to sparsely infiltrate the academy, to trespass as Rosie puts it, it is no longer enough to be present, but rather one must be seen, heard, and listened to. The grim statistic cites by Trowers and Chiat (2002), Turner and Smith (2002), and others offer a bleak outlook for the successful recruitment and retention of the faculty that are the subject of this dialogue. This exercise has contributed to exposing the seemingly intractable structures that marginalize and alienate faculty, and this dialogue further evidences the major factors that contribute to an inhospitable climate for same faculty, such as the deligitamization of "race work," professional isolation, and the lack of validation for research related to minority issues (Turner and Myers, 2000).

The racialization of faculty of color, and the ostracization of those who would be allies to this group of faculty, is fundamental to whether both faculty of color and their allies will be allowed to remain in the academe and influence the next generation of civic leaders. This last point can not be underemphasized in that, to the extent that faculty of color help to create an inviting climate for diverse students, students of color are also instrumental to creating the conditions for change in the university. These changes have included a greater emphasis on issues of diversity (i.e., the demand for ethnic studies beginning in the 1960s) that can improve the situation of critically-minded faculty invested in the study of "race work." Thus, the future of students and faculty of color are inextricable from each other.

To the extent that critical faculty are visible in the academy and allowed to articulate a modern, progressive, and humane understanding of the world and of their students' role in it, is proportionate to the likelihood that these same students will enter the global society with views and insights that allow them to effectively and compassionately negotiate its complex social and culture milieu. We have listened to our personal and collective instances of assaults from hostile students and invidious institutions. We have also shared our motives for continuing to exercise an uncompromising political project within the context of our research and practice. Collective action will be our ruder, and social justice our compass, as we navigate the treacherous currents of the academy. I am comforted in the knowledge that we will not undertake this journey alone. We will brave these tides, raising or falling, in *solidaridad*.

NOTES

1. Young's first two responses to this dialogue were written when she was an Assistant Professor at California State University Fullerton.
2. See Malcolm (1970), Guevara (1978, 1987), Freire (1970) and Marti (1968, 1978) for a more complete citation of these sources.
3. See references for a more complete citation of the Delgado-Gaitan and Bhabba sources.
4. Look, I want to make it clear that I respect those professors who choose to work in the interests of and alongside the oppressed, and I am not denigrating their role, because it is a role I have chosen for myself. I am just trying to show how the institution makes it work for them, too.
5. Researchers and Critical Educators.

REFERENCES

Baez, B. (2002a). *Race Work and the Faculty of Color: Changing the Academy From Within*. Paper presented at the keeping out faculties: Addressing the recruitment and retention of faculty of color conference, Minnesota.

Baez, B. (2002b). *Affirmative Action, Hate Speech, and Tenure*. New York: Routledge Falmer Press.

Bhabha, H. (1997). *The Location of Culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing the Profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2000). Researching change and the changing researcher. In B. M. Brizuela, J. P. Stewart, R. G. Carillo, and J. G. Berger (Eds.), *Acts of Inquiry in Qualitative Research* (pp. 390–410). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Dilorth, M. E. (1992). *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1986). Philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects. In M. Wittrock, (Ed.), Handbook of research in teaching (pp. 37–49). New York: Macmillian.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Press.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare to Teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Freire, P., and Freire, A. M. (1995). *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Press.
Greensburg, J. D. (1983). The case for teacher education: Open and Shut. *Journal of Teacher Education* 34(4):2–5.
Guevara, E. (1978). *El Dario de Che Guevara*. Mexico: Siglo Vientiuno.
Guevara, E. (1987). *Che Guevara and the Cuban Revolution: Selected Writings and Speeches*. Sydney: Pathfinder Press.
Lenin, V. I. (1961). *Collected Works* (Vol. VI.) London: Lawrence & Wishartand, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
Malcolm, X. (1970). *By Any Means Necessary: Speeches, Interviews and A Letter by Malcolm X*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
Marti, J. (1968). *The America of José Martí: Selected Writings*. Translated from the Spanish by Juan de Onís. With an introduction by Federico de Onís. New York; Funk & Wagnalls.
Marti, J. (1975). *Inside the Monster*. Translated by Elinor Randall with additional translation by Luis A. Baralt, Juan De Onis, and Roslyn Held Forner. New York: Month Review press.
Marx, K., and Engels, F. (1956). *The Holy Family: Or Critique of Critical Critique*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
Marx, K. (1959). *Capital,* (Vol. I). Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
Trotsky, L. (1972). *The Revolution Betrayed*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
Trotsky, L. (1980). *History of the Russian Revolution*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
Trowers, A., and Chiat, R. P. (2002). *Faculty Diversity: Too Little Too Long*. Paper presented at the keeping out faculties: Addressing the recruitment and retention of faculty of color conference. Minnesota.
Turner, C. S., and Smith, D. G. (2002). *Hiring Faculty of Color*. Paper presented at the keeping out faculties: Addressing the recruitment and retention of faculty of color conference. Minnesota.
Turner, C. S., and Myers, Jr. S. L. (2000). *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.