Engaging Student Disengagement: Resistance or Disagreement?

Barbara Applebaum
Syracuse University

> I used to agonize over the "resisters" and they are, of course, still of concern because they too are going to graduate in the fullness of time and be let loose to teach the nation's children. However…no matter what I do, for a very small percentage, 'race talk' is simply not what a teacher education course ought to be about. I must admit that after a decade I am frequently tempted to give up on these students despite the fact that they have taught me much. I have, for example, learned to no longer take their harsh criticisms personally. I have learned that much as I might want to, I cannot simply dismiss these students as "hard-core racists".…I am, however, still not entirely clear about how to go about this.…I find it extremely difficult, for example, to put myself as well as the other students through racist diatribes based on some of the students' experiences with Indigenous people that they want to pass on as the ultimate "truth" because it had happened to them.[1]

While it is not uncommon to find discussion guidelines on course syllabi and in first class introductions on university campuses throughout North America, in 2002 the rules for classroom discourse that Lynn Weber Cannon has used for over 18 years in teaching courses in women's studies at the University of South Carolina at Columbia sparked a ferocious controversy involving charges of "bias" and "indoctrination." In these guidelines Weber asked students *for this class* "to acknowledge that racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and other institutional-ized forms of oppression exist" and "to agree to combat actively the myths and stereotypes about our own groups and other groups so that we can break down the walls that prohibit group cooperation and group gain."[2]

One of the students in Weber's class objected to "being told to think that way." She argued that the guidelines are inappropriate because they could be viewed as requiring her to agree with the professor's beliefs as they were expressed in the guidelines. Somehow the guidelines were sent to The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), a neoconservative organization that claims to defend the rights of students on American university campuses. In a letter to Weber's university president, FIRE publicly denounced the guidelines as "thought control" and "a threat to freedom of both speech and conscience" because it "require(d) students to hold certain arguments as unquestionable truth in order to participate in class without penalty." Charles Duncan, chairman of the university's College Republicans chapter, added his support to the letter by declaring that the guidelines represented a "closed mind to conservative opinions" and to those who have beliefs that conflict with the professor's. Duncan said he personally would take issue with guidelines that asked students to acknowledge heterosexism because "[m]y personal opinion is that homosexuality is wrong."[3]

To many, these guidelines epitomized a "liberal bias" pervasive on university campuses, exemplified the imposition of a particular ideology on students, and intimidated and silenced students who may disagree with this political orthodoxy. Weber (like others who defend similar guidelines) maintains that the guidelines are necessary to encourage a safe classroom environment where not only full and open,

but also sensitive and respectful, dialogue can occur. In addition the guidelines, according to Weber, are required for discussion that has a high level of participation and where students can be exposed to multiple realities in respectful and enlightening ways. The guidelines, then, are seen as necessary to create a classroom where race, class, gender, and other power dynamics do not inhibit learning. To the objection that her guidelines tell students what to believe, Weber responds that her guidelines require only that students maintain an open mind. According to Weber, "It's not about agreeing.…[but about] promoting respect while recognizing difference."[4]

At this juncture, it might seem of philosophical interest to jump into the extensive debate around freedom of speech that some members of this organization have so competently addressed and to defend (or at least explain) Weber's guidelines on the basis of this scholarship.[5] Framing the issue prematurely as one that involves questions of freedom of speech, however, risks underemphasizing the interesting and unique conditions regarding learning and teaching that Weber's guidelines are a response to. Thus, in this essay, I attempt to explore the complexities of student engagement and disengagement that are particular to courses taught with commitments to social justice. I want to understand why it is so common to hear social justice educators inform their students that what they are concerned with is their students' engagement with the issues rather than their agreement and what they might mean when they say this.[6] Why is resistance to learning and knowing so rampant in such courses? What type of student engagement and disengagement do social justice educators encounter? Shoshana Felman, the eminent psychologist, explains that resistance to learning and knowing is a refusal to know that involves "not so much [a] lack of knowledge [or]…simple lack of information but the incapacity — or refusal — to acknowledge one's own implication in the information."[7] Resistance to learning and knowing is very prevalent in courses that address systemic oppression and privilege. I will argue that unlike courses that do not make race, gender, class, and sexuality explicit, courses that address systemic oppression have to consider that the classroom dynamics *are* an essential part of the course content. This essay, therefore, scrutinizes such classroom dynamics, highlighting unique challenges that might be overlooked by those who do not have such classroom experiences.

One of my colleagues queried my use of the term "resistance" to describe what she perceived as simply disagreement with class content. Yet the resistance to learning and knowing that I am referring to is not mere disagreement. While one can engage with course material and disagree, what often takes place in courses that teach about systemic injustice involves a premature disengagement and refusal to engage. I will discuss the unique challenges regarding engagement that social justice educators face and then, employing Kelly Oliver's notion of "witnessing," I flesh out the type of engagement that I believe Weber's guidelines attempt to encourage. I maintain that Weber's guidelines can only be understood within the context and complexities of this unique type of student engagement and disengagement.

The Unique Challenges of Teaching with Commitments to Social Justice

In the last two decades, a burgeoning area of scholarship has developed grounded in the realization that "the failure of equity education initiatives is attributable to a misidentification of change object."[8] The need to focus not only on the victims of systemic injustice but also to "turn the gaze inward" on those who perpetuate and sustain such systems has in many circles in higher education become routinely emphasized.[9] Many universities now include in their curriculum courses whose primarily objective is to understand, analyze, and challenge oppressive social systems, courses that aim to examine critically dominant norms (such as, for example, whiteness and heteronormativity) on the basis of which "difference" is constructed. In schools of education, where a predominantly white student body is expected to go out into schools to teach children from diverse backgrounds and social positionalities, courses that encourage students to critically examine systemic privilege and oppression have often become a fundamental part of the curriculum. These courses aim not only to empower marginalized students but also to stimulate systemically privileged students to reflect on their status as privileged and how such privilege impacts what they do in the classroom.[10]

Concomitantly, another body of scholarship has developed around students' resistance to courses that unleash "unpopular ideas."[11] The unique challenges that educators face in classrooms where systemically privileged students are encouraged to engage with learning about systemic oppression have become the focus of academic study. Because they do not experience systemic oppression and because the frameworks through which they interpret their experience support their beliefs, systemically privileged students often enter such courses believing that systemic oppression is a relic of the past or, if it does exist, that they are not responsible for it. In denying systemic oppression, they deny that they are systemically privileged and contend that any advantage they enjoy is merited or "normal" and "natural." In terms of race, for instance, white students often resist interrogating what it means to be white since whiteness is traditionally the unmarked category that confers privilege on those who are ascribed whiteness.

Moreover, such students do not perceive themselves as resisting but rather often maintain that they are just expressing their disagreement with the political nature of the course — university courses should be ideologically neutral, not biased and imposing of particular viewpoints. As Roberta Ahlquist notes (but does not endorse), resistance can be perceived as "a healthy response to controversial material, as critical questioning, and as a lack of willingness by students to conform blindly to the expectations of others."[12] To teach these students about systemic oppression and privilege, then, is a distinctively demanding task.

It is important to emphasize that not all systemically privileged students tenaciously resist. Some might resist at first but then welcome engagement and become willing to explore the sources of systemic oppression even when this means they must consider their own accountability and complicity. Yet others are so certain that their viewpoint is correct and are so convinced of their own moral innocence that

they are reluctant to even consider a critical exploration of their view. For social justice educators, the challenge is how to get *all* students to engage in a context in which a concern for the pedagogical comfort and safety of systemically privileged students often comes at the expense of the comfort and safety of those systemically marginalized. If the aim of social justice pedagogy is to encourage students to examine and bring to awareness the power dynamics supporting systems of oppression and privilege, then social justice pedagogy itself must strive not to reproduce such systems of oppression and privilege in the classroom.

For social justice educators, dealing with classroom dynamics *is* part of the course content.[13] Elizabeth Higginbotham explains

> Teaching to a diverse student population requires attention to classroom interactions. Our classrooms are part of the larger social world, thus structural inequalities in the larger society are reproduced in the classroom in terms of power and privilege.[14]

Following Weber, Higginbotham notes how in the classroom, "members of privileged groups are more likely to talk, have their ideas validated, and be perceived as making significant contributions to group tasks."[15]

Although it is important to help all students recognize the racial effects of practices and discourse, often the needs of systemically privileged students are tended to without consideration of the needs of marginalized students, who have the right to be able to be educated in a safe environment free from overt and covert forms of discrimination. Marginalized students must often listen to their privileged peers who are either, in the best case, educated or, in the worst, become further entrenched in their own privilege. Karen Elias, a white educator who teaches with commitments to social justice, recalls how in her writing seminar:

> some white students began vigorously denying the existence of racial profiling. I tried using these comments as springboards for further analysis, but I noticed that a young Afro-Caribbean woman was obviously disturbed. She met with me in private to say that she was having a hard time sitting through the class. "I hear enough of this in my daily life," she said. "I shouldn't have to put up with it here…."One of my biggest fears is that despite my best intentions, the racist dynamics of the larger society will get replicated in the classroom. Her words had a profound impact on me.[16]

Often white students not only refuse to acknowledge their privilege, but also have *their privilege reflected in the very questioning of the social facts that are at odds with their experiences*.[17] They have what Peggy McIntosh refers to as "permission to escape" and what Alice McIntyre calls "privileged choice"; the mere fact that they can question the existence of systemic oppression is a function of their privilege to choose to ignore discussions of systemic oppression.[18]

Systemically marginalized students may feel offended, hurt, and unsafe (and feel that their humanity is denied) in classrooms where such systemically privileged students are allowed to recenter their privilege. In my own class, after showing students statistics about the gender and race wage gaps, one white male student dismissed the data with the claim that this has not been his experience and that where he works women are paid more than him. This student forcefully insisted that even if the gap were real, women should not complain because they are still better off than women in Third World countries. In the aforementioned case, it is the white

student's experience that counts, and his arguments seem to him to make perfect sense because, as Higginbotham explains, "his sense of entitlement gives him the liberty to challenge the validity of those data, even when they are supported by government statistics."[19] Allowing him to express his disagreement and spending time trying to challenge his beliefs often comes at a cost to marginalized students whose experiences are (even if indirectly) dismissed by his claims.

For educators who are committed to social justice, managing a diverse classroom discussion involves balancing the needs and perspectives of all students and not just centering attention on the pedagogical needs of white students. Getting systemically privileged students to engage while at the same time avoiding or at least minimizing recentering their privilege is one of the most intractable challenges that those who educate with commitments to social justice face. Weber's guidelines can only be understood within this pedagogical challenge. Educators with commitments to social justice must find ways to "reach white students to teach them about race — especially accountability and white privilege — without simply recentering them (and whiteness) to the exclusion and detriment of students of color."[20] As many of us who teach such courses know, this is not easy. The class is traditionally imbalanced to benefit systemically privileged students, as their issues and their concerns are usually the center of the teacher's interest. When balance is established in the classroom by seriously considering the needs of systemically marginalized students, the group that has usually been routinely centered will often complain of "imbalance" and even challenge the professor's authority to change the classroom status quo. (Indeed, this challenge to authority is often greater when the professor is a person of color who is assumed to have an "agenda."[21])

RESISTANCE NOT DISAGREEMENT

Systemically privileged students' resistance to learning and knowing is more than merely one's individual personal disagreement with the course content. Rather, it is an exhibition of a culturally sponsored defensiveness and refusal to engage that is not only offensive to the systemically marginalized but that also reproduces systems of oppression and privilege in the classroom. Such resistance can take many forms but it is most insidious when it is manifest in a refusal to explore or attribute credibility to the existence of systemic oppression.[22] Denials of systemic injustice are fueled by culturally supported moral sensibilities. For instance, in terms of race, students might argue that they do not "see color" and consider this morally virtuous. As Nado Aveling contends, "These students firmly refused to 'see' colour as a means of establishing their *non-racist credentials* and became defensive when their assumptions were challenged."[23] To consider such challenges would call into question their moral innocence.

Yet if students believe they are morally justified in refusing to see race, they not only will reject the acknowledgement of racial patterns of social injustice, but also will not use racial labels to describe themselves. As a result, the unearned privilege that they are afforded because of their racial positionality need not be explored. Such "moral sensibilities" might become manifest in the classroom when privileged students describe marginalized students as "just too sensitive" or state that "they

complain too much" or are "playing the race card." Resistance is also ironically encouraged by conceptions of moral responsibility and moral agency that forefront individual intention, as is implicit in one of the student evaluations Alhquist reports receiving.

> This course was an assault of horrors…every class some new injustice was presented…students were not sure what these had to do with them. (The teacher) went overboard in her concerns. Things aren't all that bad. And even if they were, one person couldn't do that much to change them. Some of them just didn't want to deal with this order of things…*(they shouldn't be blamed because) they were nice people and not participating in these injustices*.[24]

It is beyond the scope of this essay to examine the need to rearticulate our conceptions of moral responsibility and moral agency. Instead, I will briefly focus my attention on the variety of discursive practices available to systemically privileged students, because such discursive practices make it difficult for a teacher (and the student) to recognize when a student refuses to engage, a refusal that involves premature dismissal of whatever the student hears.

Kathy Hytten and John Warren's excellent ethnography of the rhetorical strategies their students performed in courses that attempt to teach about systemic oppression and privilege offers many examples of such tactics. Hytten and Warren emphasize that these discursive moves were culturally sanctioned discourses of evasion that "were not original — that is, they are already available, already common forms of asserting dominance."[25] These rhetorical strategies work to obstruct engagement so that any complicity in systemic oppression can be evaded. Similarly, McIntyre coined the phrase "white talk," which is discourse that functions to "insulate White people from examining their/our individual and collective role(s) in the perpetuation of racism."[26]

Among the types of discursive strategies examined by Hytten and Warren and McIntyre (among others) are remaining silent, evading questions, resorting to the rhetoric of ignoring color, focusing on progress, victim blaming, and focusing on culture rather than race. For instance, systemically privileged students may assert their ethnic identity to demonstrate that they are victims, too. While bringing up one's ethnic identity is important to highlight how identity is multiple and complex, in some cases connections to ethnic identity function to recenter the attention on oneself and to divert attention from considering one's own accountability in racial injustice. Another tactic is to insist that people of color are racist too, or to complain about reverse discrimination, again to demonstrate that white people are the real victims. In all these cases, although it may appear the student is just stating an opinion, their discourse also works to redirect the conversation away from having to consider how systemically privileged students might be complicit in systemic injustice. Moreover, such students often do not realize how dismissive their discourse is of the experiences of marginalized students and so they are totally bewildered when marginalized students retreat in frustration.[27]

In a stark illustration of white talk, Kim Case and Annette Hemmings describe a white student in their class who expressed the belief that Black people just have to take more personal responsibility for their own progress in the face of racism. This

student told the class of how her Black friend dropped out of college because he felt that in many ways the environment was cold and hostile. It was not that she actually denied that he was having experiences that never happened to her. However, she felt the best response was "Just ignore those people. Just go back and deal with it."[28] While her intentions are undeniably good, what her discourse *does* is minimize and dismiss the systematic dimension of her friend's experiences and places the burden on her friend rather than on the need for real institutional change. In the end, her good intentions contribute to the perpetuation of the status quo. To explain this to her would require that she consider her own complicity in systemic oppression when she may not as yet have the tools to do so. Weber's guidelines are meant to address such classroom complexities. They aim not only to balance the playing field in the classroom, but also to strongly convey the message that certain types of engagement will be required for learning to occur in her class.

ENGAGEMENT: DOES IT REQUIRE AGREEMENT?

To be engaged is to be willing to participate, to take part and to give attention to something. Yet what type of student engagement is a prerequisite for learning in courses that focus on systemic oppression and privilege? To reply that students must be open-minded and willing to critically examine their taken-for-granted cultural beliefs seems too trite. I find Marilyn Frye's suggestion more helpful. Frye contends that in our relations with the Other we must take care to avoid relating as an "arrogant perceiver."[29] Arrogant perception involves relating in a way in which everything one hears is viewed with reference to oneself and one's interests.

In her 1998 Philosophy of Education Society Presidential Address, Ann Diller offers another valuable suggestion when she argues that in order to be a philosopher of one's own education, one must be willing to be torpified. The capacity to be torpified involves an

> ability to be awed, to be surprised, to be astonished, to be moved in a deeply moral or ethical, or aesthetical, or epistemological or ontological way. It takes considerable courage, self-knowledge, a brave heart, and honest openness to face one's own ignorance and to stay present in the concomitant experience of discomfort.[30]

I have found that Kelly Oliver's distinction between eyewitness testimony and bearing witness extends Diller's recommendations and is extremely effective to help flesh out the type of engagement that I believe is implicit in Weber's discussion guidelines.

Oliver critiques the politics of recognition so popular in discourses around multiculturalism and multicultural education on the grounds that such "recognition" perpetuates rather than challenges systemic oppression. Recognition as a condition of positive identity formation assumes that there is one invested with power to grant such recognition and, thus, keeps relationships of dominance and subordination in place. Instead of recognition, Oliver advances the metaphor of witnessing, and more specifically "bearing witness," as a more fruitful method of social relation. Witnessing is more than just an issue of eyewitness reporting but also suggests an almost religious sense of "bearing witness" to that which cannot be seen, is considered impossible to think of, and is "beyond recognition." What victims of oppression seek

is not only visibility and recognition from someone who has the power to recognize. Rather, according to Oliver, what they seek is witnessing to the horrors of what is beyond recognition.[31]

In order to explicate how subjects can avoid assimilating difference into what is familiar to them and, instead, to encourage the type of listening that can hear what is beyond one's recognition, Oliver offers a provocative story based on the work of Dori Laub, a psychoanalyst who does research on Holocaust survivors. Laub reports on a debate between historians and psychoanalysts involving a woman who claims to be an eyewitness to the Auschwitz uprising. The woman describes the fires set by the Jewish prisoners, noting in her description that four chimneys were destroyed. Laub observes how this woman's testimony was dismissed and discredited by the historians because while the woman reported that four chimneys were set ablaze, historical evidence indicates that there was only one chimney destroyed. In contrast, the psychoanalysts responded differently to the woman, understanding that she was not reporting on historical facts but rather about another level of truth involving something so radical and unimaginable, something beyond recognition, that is, the occurrence of resistance at Auschwitz. Such experiences cannot be captured by the facts and figures. Oliver writes, quoting Laub, that "what the historians could not hear, listening for empirical facts, was the 'very secret of survival and of resistance to extermination.'"[32]

While there are many interesting questions that can be raised, the relevance of this story for the discussion of student engagement in social justice education is illuminating. Oliver explains that while the historians were listening for confirmation of something that they already knew, the psychoanalysts were listening to hear something new, "something yet beyond comprehension." It is not that Oliver implies that historical accuracy does not count. Rather, she is drawing our attention to a type of listening that does not require prior agreement and in fact is a response in which agreement or disagreement is (like in Weber's guidelines) tentatively suspended. Such an address and response, rather than recognition, according to Oliver, is the linchpin of subjectivity because it is not the recognizer's approval but rather an acknowledgment of one's humanity that is paramount.

Michalinos Zembylas succinctly articulates this type of engagement with others when he writes, "bearing witness to the other means opening oneself to creative affective connections with the Other."[33] That the marginalized are bearing witness that requires this type of engagement has been powerfully expressed by the quote from Gayle Jones with which Hazel Carby opens her oft quoted article, "White Woman Listen! Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood."

> I'm leaving evidence. And you got to leave evidence too. And your children got to leave evidence…They burned all the documents…We got to burn out what they put in our minds, like you burn out a wound. Except we got to keep what we need to bear witness. That scar that's left to bear witness. We got to keep it as visible as our blood.[34]

CONCLUSION

Weber's discussion guidelines, I maintain, attempt to encourage the type of engagement that involves bearing witness. Her guidelines do not demand agreement

with her viewpoint but rather an engagement with the course material and with the experiences of marginalized others. This might require students to sometimes tentatively suspend their beliefs about the nonexistence of systemic oppression. Her guidelines also convey a strong message to those who might resist knowing and learning. Resistance will not be allowed to derail the class discussions! Of course, those who refuse to engage might mistakenly perceive this as a declaration that they will not be allowed to express their disagreement but that is only precisely *because* they are resisting engagement.

Weber's guidelines also convey a powerful message to marginalized students that the learning of the systemically privileged will not be recentered at the expense of the learning and growth of the marginalized. Her guidelines welcome disagreement but insist that one must engage before one can disagree. Although this remains unsubstantiated at this moment, I would argue that systemically marginalized students would be more likely and willing to invest energy and time, and be more willing to engage with the systemically privileged, when the latter acknowledge their complicity and are willing to listen rather than dismiss the struggles and the experiences of the systemically marginalized.

Given the unique challenges that educators with commitments to social justice face, Weber's guidelines can be understood as exemplifying not a "liberal bias" or the "imposition of a particular ideology," but rather emphasizing the necessary condition for full and open dialogue across difference that is necessary for critical reflection and learning to occur — and that is engagement. Weber's discussion guidelines are not a panacea, as she herself acknowledges (and certainly not the only way of implementing what Megan Boler refers to as "affirmative action pedagogy"). Yet unless we fully appreciate the conditions under which Weber's guidelines are employed and that these guidelines are "not about agreeing…[but about] promoting respect while recognizing difference," questions about freedom of speech cannot be equitably addressed.

---

1. Nado Aveling, "Critical Whiteness Studies and the Challenges of Learning to be a 'White Ally," *Borderlands* 3, no. 2 (2004), http://www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol3no2_2004/aveling-critical.htm.

2. Lynn Weber Cannon, "Fostering Positive Race, Class, Gender Dynamics in the Classroom," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 18 (Spring/Summer 1990): 126–34.

3. Thomas Bartlett, "Guidelines for Discussion, or Thought Control?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 27, 2002, http://chronicle.com/free/v49/i05/05a01001.htm.

4. Ibid.

5. Megan Boler "All Speech Is Not Free: The Ethics of `Affirmative Action Pedagogy'," in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 2000*, ed. Lynda Stone (Urbana, Ill.: Philosophy of Education Society, 2001); Claudia Ruitenberg, "Check your Language! Political Correctness, Censorship, and Performativity in Education," in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 2004, ed*. Chris Higgins (Urbana, Ill.: Philosophy of Education Society, 2005); Audrey Thompson, "Anti-Racist Pedagogy – Art or Propaganda?" in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 1995*, ed. Alven Neiman (Urbana, Ill.: Philosophy of Education Society, 1996).

6. Ann Berlak, "Confrontation and Pedagogy: Cultural Secrets, Trauma, and Emotion in Antioppressive Pedagogies," in *Democratic Dialogue in Education: Troubling Speech, Disturbing Silence,* ed. Megan Boler (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 125.

7. Shoshanna Felman, "Psychoanalysis and Education: Teaching Terminable and Interminable," *Yale French Studies* 63 (1982), 30.

8. Cynthia Levine-Rasky, "The Practice of Whiteness Among Teacher Candidates," *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 10, no. 3 (2000), 263.

9. Nado Aveling, "Student Teachers' Resistance to Exploring Racism: Reflections on 'Doing' Border Pedagogy," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* 30, no. 2 (2002): 112–40.

10. By "systemically privileged students." I mean to refer to students who are afforded privileges that they take for granted because they are in one way or another ascribed membership to a dominant social group.

11. The term "unpopular ideas" is taken from Deborah P. Britzman, "Decentering Discourses in Teacher Education: Or, The Unleashing of Unpopular Things," *Journal of Education* 173, no. 3 (1991): 60–80. See also Estella and Alexander Williams Chizhik, "Are You Privileged or Oppressed? Students' Conceptions of Themselves and Others," *Urban Education* 40, no. 2 (2005): 116–43; Ann Berlak, "Teaching and Testimony: Witnessing and Bearing Witness to Racisms in Culturally Diverse Classrooms," *Curriculum Inquiry* 29, no. 1 (1999): 99–127; Audrey Thompson, "Entertaining Doubts: Enjoyment and Ambiguity in White, Antiracist Classrooms," in *Passion and Pedagogy: Relation, Creation, and Transformation in Teaching*, eds. Elijah Mirochick and Debora C. Sherman (New York: Peter Lang, 2002): 431–52; Kathy Hytten and Amee Adkins, "Thinking Through a Pedagogy of Whiteness," *Educational Theory* 51, no. 4 (2001) 433–50; Kim A. Case and Annette Hemmings, "Distancing Strategies: White Women Preservice Teachers and Antiracist Curriculum," *Urban Education* 40, no. 6 (2005): 606–26.

12. Roberta Ahlquist, "Position and Imposition: Power Relations in a Multicultural Foundations Class," *Journal of Negro Education* 60, no. 2 (1991), 166.

13. Bonnie TuSmith, "Out on a Limb: Race and the Evaluation of Frontline Teaching," in *Race in the College Classroom*, eds. Bonnie TuSmith and Maureen T. Reddy (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2002), 120.

14. Elizabeth Higginbotham, "Getting All Students to Listen: Analyzing and Coping with Student Resistance," *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, no. 2 (1996), 205.

15. Weber Cannon, "Fostering Positive Race, Class, Gender Dynamics in the Classroom," 129; Higginbotham, "Getting All Students to Listen," 205.

16. Karen Elias and Judith C. Jones, "Two Voices from the Front Lines: A Conversation about Race in the Classroom," in TuSmith and Reddy, eds., *Race in the College Classroom,* 11.

17. Higginbotham, "Getting All Students to Listen," 209.

18. Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies," in *Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, eds. R. Delgado and J. Stefancic (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), 291–300; Alice McIntyre, *Making Meaning of Whiteness* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).

19. Higginbotham, "Getting All Students to Listen," 209.

20. Patti Duncan, "Decentering Whiteness: Resisting Racism in the Women's Studies Classroom," in TuSmith and Reddy, eds., *Race in the College Classroom*.

21. Gloria Ladson-Billings, "Silences as Weapons: Challenges of a Black Professor Teaching White Students," *Theory and Practice* 35, no. 2 (1996): 80–5; Kendra Hamilton, "'Race in the College Classroom': Minority Faculty Often Face Student Resistance When Teaching about Race," *Black Issues in Higher Education* 19, no. 1 (2002): 32–7.

22. Pat Griffin, "Facilitating Social Justice Education Courses," in *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice: A Sourcebook*, eds. Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell and Pat Griffin (New York: Routledge, 1997), 292.

23. Nado Aveling, "Student Teachers' Resistance to Exploring Racism," 120.

24. Roberta Alquist, "Position and Imposition," 163 (emphasis added).

25. Kathy Hytten and John Warren, "Engaging Whiteness: How Racial Power Gets Reified in Education," *Qualitative Studies in Education* 16, no. 1 (2003), 66.

26. Alice McIntyre, *Making Meaning of Whiteness: Exploring Racial Identity with White Teachers* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 45

27. Alison Jones, "The Limits of Cross-Cultural Dialogue: Pedagogy, Desire, and Absolution in the Classroom," *Educational Theory* 49, no. 3 (1999), 299–316.

28. Kim Case and Annette Hemmings, "Distancing: White Women Preservice Teachers and 9ntiracist Curriculum," *Urban Education* 40, no. 6 (2005), 616–7.

29. Marilyn Frye, "In and Out of Harm's Way: Arrogance and Love," in *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory* (Trumansburg, N.Y.: The Crossing Press, 1983), 67.

30. Ann Diller, "Facing the Torpedo Fish: Becoming a Philosopher of One's Own Education," in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 1998*, ed. Steven Tozer (Urbana, Ill.: Philosophy of Education Society, 1999), 8.

31. Kelly Oliver, *Witnessing: Beyond Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 16 and 8.

32. Kelly Oliver, "Witnessing and Testimony," *Parallax* 10, no. 1 (2004), 83, http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AnS/philosophy/faculty/parallax.pdf.

33. Michalinos Zembylas, "Witnessing in the Classroom: The Ethics and Politics of Affect," *Educational Theory* 56, no. 3 (2006), 313.

34. Gayle Jones, *Corregidora* (New York: Random House, 1975), 14 and 72, as quoted in Hazel V. Carby, "White Woman Listen! Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood," in *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader*, eds. Les Back and John Solomos (London: Routledge, 2000), 389.