

Critical Education

Volume 5 Number 14

October 1, 2014

ISSN 1920-4125

Anti-Oppressive Education and the Trap of 'Good' Intentions

Lessons From an Interdisciplinary Workshop

Michelle Stewart
Michael Cappello
Claire Carter
University of Regina

Citation: Stewart, M, Cappello, M, & Carter, C. (2014). Anti-oppressive education and the trap of "good intentions." *Critical Education*, 5(14). Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/critical/article/view/184392>

Abstract

This article is about the challenges of doing anti-oppressive education in a post-secondary context with a community of interdisciplinary colleagues. Critical examination of an anti-oppressive workshop, and subsequent focus group, reveals how good intentions can nevertheless reproduce the conditions we seek to challenge. To make sense of the challenges of doing this work, the authors offer three different analyses of the feedback received in the focus group. Drawing on literature from anti-oppressive education, feminist and critical theory, the authors focus on the role of engagement and recognition to highlight the power that underlies participation. By analyzing key insights from a focus group discussion, the authors seek to disrupt the relationship between identities rooted in goodness and efforts to do anti-oppressive work. Anti-oppressive work must grapple with the lived political, everyday realities we inhabit. This necessarily involves actively challenging the structural conditions that facilitate oppression.



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and Critical Education, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or Critical Education. Critical Education is published by the Institute for Critical Educational Studies and housed at the University of British Columbia. Articles are indexed by EBSCO Education Research Complete and Directory of Open Access Journals.

Introduction

This article is about anti-oppressive education in post-secondary settings. Focused on the challenges of interdisciplinary cross-campus collaborations, the article analyzes material from a focus group held to obtain feedback on an anti-oppressive education workshop held in Spring 2012. The authors of this article organized both the workshop and the focus group. The intent of this article is to discuss the challenges of *doing* anti-oppressive work, to draw attention to the need and demands of this work, alongside the slips that can be encountered along the way. In so doing, we will highlight the ways in which good intentions can incidentally allow one to replicate the very conditions one seeks to challenge. In what follows, we investigate both the design and delivery of the workshop as a means to better understand how the best-laid plans can go awry and the need to interrogate the trap of good intention.

To begin, we want to offer some background for the article and our work. The idea for this project was sprouted at a new faculty orientation in 2011. At the time, two of us were new to the campus and city. Our discussions about research and pedagogical interests drew us together and the context of campus reinforced our interest in this work. The University of Regina hosts approximately 12,000 students with upwards of 1500 international students. The campus itself has three federated colleges including First Nations University of Canada. Sitting on ceded territory, residents of the area are understood to be Treaty Four people; this language is meant to acknowledge the historic relationship between First Nations and settlers at the time of colonization.¹ Alongside the blossoming international student program, the University has established ‘Indigenization’ as a central mandate for all programs and services on campus. The city and surrounding areas has a large First Nations population that continues to experience high levels of discrimination, violence and marginalization. Additionally, the region has seen an influx of new immigrants due, in part, to the so-called economic boom in mining and oil extraction. Thus, it felt timely to have a dialogue about anti-oppression because these conversations are vital to our personal and professional lives.

In Fall 2011, in the midst of our first year of teaching, we collaborated on a funding application to engage in a cross-campus anti-oppressive education project. Once funding was secure we busied ourselves with planning informal discussions with colleagues in advance of a workshop on anti-oppressive education. By Spring 2012 we were ready for our workshop and invites were sent out. As workshop hosts, we were situated as white, middle class, younger academics. We hosted the workshop in coordination with a more established faculty member. Although the workshop brought out many individuals already familiar with anti-oppressive education, and we received positive feedback on comment cards, we had mixed feelings after the workshop.

It was only in the follow-up focus group that some participants explained the ways in which the workshop facilitated the same terms of oppression we sought to challenge. Desiring to create and sustain a space for supporting and discussing anti-oppressive education, we had taken it upon ourselves to write a grant that would allow us to collaborate, design and host a workshop.

¹ This language of being “treaty people” is often meant to signal unification of residents. We evoke this language to underline settler accountability; to recognize the terms of the treaty as it was the basis upon which land was ceded and rights revoked. We also note that despite the treaty, there are ongoing inequities and challenges as they relate to enforcing the terms of the treaty.

We had hoped that the focus group would help us identify the strengths/weaknesses of the workshop and enable us to deepen the conversation on campus about anti-oppressive education. The focus group revealed that, despite our deliberate planning and consulting, the workshop produced the very conditions we were seeking to challenge. How could this be? This article investigates that very question. We argue that the spaces of anti-oppressive education, in spite of our best intentions, are always loaded with the oppressive realities that are being engaged; dominant and oppressive identities are enacted in the moment of anti-oppressive education.

As anti-oppressive work is necessarily interdisciplinary, we have chosen a poly-vocal approach to this article in order to allow for different disciplinary perspectives. In what follows, we offer individual analyses but we are unified in our overall argument. After reviewing the material from the focus group, each of us identified the same moment in the discussion to analyze. In his section, Michael approaches the project with a background in education and raises questions about the spaces we create in these workshops (and by extension in other locations like the classroom). Focusing closely on the language used he illustrates the specific ways in which subjects are produced and reproduced in these engagements. Drawing on her background in political anthropology and social justice, Michelle raises questions about the underlying ideologies that collide in the workshop. She argues that there is a politics of recognition that must be named in these spaces and that the menace of liberalism must be confronted lest this work be reduced to banality or its own form of violence. Informed by her research and teaching background in Women and Gender Studies, Claire draws parallels between her classroom experience teaching on intersectionality and the encounter in the workshop. She raises questions about how we potentially enact/reenact oppression while wrestling with the limits of doing anti-oppressive work. Claire argues that the challenge of making visible the intersectionality of oppression is often made difficult by the act of compartmentalization when trying to teach or discuss forms of oppression.

We offer this article as a means to contribute to the discussion on the challenges of *doing* anti-oppressive education that is a combination of work we do in the classroom and with our colleagues. Before turning to the analysis we offer a short overview of the literature on anti-oppressive education as it relates to the project and social justice more broadly.

Anti-Oppressive Education and Social Justice

Anti-oppressive education and other approaches to social justice work involving teaching and learning take many forms including critical social justice education (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). While professional programs, most noticeably in Education (Kumashiro, 2000; Schick & St. Denis 2005; Hytten & Bettez, 2011; Picower, 2011) and to a lesser degree social work (Calliste, 1996; Mulally, 2002; Razack, 2003) and nursing (Gustafson, 2005; Puzan, 2003) are well represented in the scholarship, less scholarly attention has been directed at the space for anti-oppressive education in the university writ large. At a time when post-secondary institutions are increasingly charged with contributing to students' commitment to social justice issues (Mayhew & Fernandez, 2007), it seems important to examine how universities can act as spaces to move these conversations forward. At the same time, as the language of social justice is readily adopted by universities, the present neo-liberal organization and funding practices of higher education (Meister, 2011; Polster, 2007) complicates the pursuit of social justice interests in a university setting (Ross, 2009; Sonu, 2012).

While the breadth of anti-oppressive teaching practices precludes simple or narrow definitions, our interest in these approaches is further nuanced by anti-racist feminisms (Bannerji, 1987; Mirchandani, 2003; Razack, 1999). These critical stances enable an intersectional analysis of oppression, highlighting the way that systems produce, enact, and discipline identities around race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability in order to position some bodies for privileges and ‘other’ bodies for oppressions. This analysis is partly dependent on poststructural approaches to subjectivity that allows us to highlight the production/regulation of identities. Subjectivity can be described as how one comes to be known as “this or that identity” (Sumara & Davis, 1999, p. 195). Because a postmodern subject is always understood as a “person made in relations of productive power” (Youdell, 2006, p. 48), it becomes possible to trace the ways our anti-oppressive practices imagine, work on, and produce subjects.

A final theoretical nuance shaping this work centers on the literature that explores the various ways that dominant interests are resisted in the attempt to unlearn oppressive practices (Applebaum, 2004, 2007; Kumashiro, 2002). Lather’s (1991) work invites us to consider how we might, “position ourselves as less masters of truth and justice and more as creators of a space where those directly involved can act and speak on their own behalf” (p. 137). Recognizing the problematic ways in which this speaking ‘on their own behalf’ is also implicated within ongoing relations of power (Ladson-Billings, 1996) is difficult and most necessary to understanding the complexities and dynamics at work in anti-oppressive education.

Background: The Ticking Clock & Focus Group

Following six months of planning, grant applications, consultations, team meetings, supervision of graduate students, workshop development, promotion, and web page design, we were finally ready to host a multi-disciplinary workshop on Anti-Oppressive Education. We were a cross-section of faculty hoping to bring together colleagues from across campus. In our eager attempt to engage with as much information as possible we had a carefully managed schedule that mobilized the language of modules, group work and debriefs into a three-hour workshop. The workshop had a list of 36 registered participants from across the university campus, including faculty, instructors and support staff. We even ended up with last minute people who arrived in the morning and asked to participate. Our final tally had us at capacity.

We were off to a great start!

Following introductions, participants were guided into the first of several group projects and discussions. These timed encounters were meant to help assist strangers navigate a challenging discussion. In the first 30-minute exercise, participants in groups of 5-7 were asked to: discuss, define and share their conceptualizations of oppression. This was followed by a short debrief before transitioning into a lecture-style format for a more formal discussion of anti-oppressive education. A final small group activity involved reading and discussing case studies of anti-oppressive education as a way to both nuance the difficulties of these ways of teaching as well as demonstrate what these practices might look like in the classroom. At the conclusion of the workshop, we realized that some things “worked” and other things did not. We distributed evaluation forms but we were keen to talk to participants and get their feedback during a focus group.

Eight weeks after the workshop, seven original participants attended a focus group held on campus. The one-hour session was a guided discussion around 10 organizing questions meant to gather information on participants' overall experience of and thoughts on improving the workshop. We told participants that we would close with a more informal discussion about how to continue this work on campus in the coming year. Our goal in hosting these events (informal discussions, workshop, focus group and follow up sessions) was to expand these conversations and facilitate ongoing engagements, recognizing that colleagues were already taking up anti-oppressive education across campus. Within the first 12 minutes of the focus group discussion, we received some disconcerting feedback that reflected overall issues with the workshop.

We began with a general question about overall expectations of the workshop. Participants shared their hopes to gain “actual [classroom] strategies” or ways in which to make their classrooms more accessible alongside strategies to use “when confronting resistance”, especially from students who “cling to hierarchies of oppression.” Some indicated they didn't know what to expect, but were overall happy with the experience. Early on in the focus group, Myra, a First Nations female professor spoke about the divisive and two-layered experience that developed. Myra reflected on her experience in the workshop and how she felt compelled to take on the all too familiar role of storytelling. She felt that there was an implicit expectation that she – as one of the few women of colour in the group – would have something to offer up; a wound and/or truth of oppression that the group could ‘learn’ from. This expectation created a distance as those in more dominant subject positions could secure themselves in an observing, rather than a storytelling, role. Engagement with Myra's critical feedback will serve as a focal point in our analysis.

What does it mean that some participants are expected to be vulnerable and share their experiences of oppression, while others are able to maintain a distance from these experiences and position themselves as ‘there to learn’? How is this enabled, and is it possible to disrupt or intervene in the reproduction of these relations of inequality? As organizers, it was frustrating to be reminded again of the difficulties of this work. In spite of our intentions to minimize tension and experiences of marginalization, there they were – enacted in the midst of the very spaces we had created to explore and work against oppression in our teaching.

In what follows we will analyze this material from three distinct positions. We will begin with Michael who comes from an education background, followed by Michelle who has a background in anthropology, we will then turn to Claire who has a background in women and gender studies followed by a conclusion that raises questions about ways to move forward with this work.

The Space For Learning (Michael)

Who gets to engage in anti-oppressive work? How does engagement in an anti-oppressive workshop position people differentially depending on their multiple subject positions? This question invites a consideration of the subject positions made available through anti-oppressive teaching. Recognizing and describing these positions must be nuanced; this is not an attempt to fix subjects or roles, but rather an attempt to use these descriptions as a way to understand something of the dynamics of these conversations, the possibilities and impossibilities inherent when we engage around such 'troubling' knowledge (Kumashiro, 2009).

As part of the workshop, groups were directed to “work at defining and explaining their conceptions of oppression.” Myra, an experienced anti-oppressive educator, noticed a separation between, “faculty of colour or the instructors of colour who are coming to it from a personal position” and from others “looking at an area of study or the adopting of a language.” This distinction between the personal language and lived experiences of oppression on the one hand and those that can enter the space by adopting a scholarly language on the other underlines how subjects are being produced differentially in the conversation.

This echoes Butin's (2002) critique of the way that anti-oppressive education can privilege the rational and can fail to mark the ways in which this education is already embedded within relations of power. Who gets to stand outside of the oppressive realities and adopt a new ‘scholarly’ language to describe it? It is not those marginalized by the oppressive forces of racism or sexism or homophobia. The intellectual invitation to consider these problems with a disregard for the ongoing presence of relations of power embedded both in the local politics of the university, and in our workshop space reinforce this lack of attention to the relations of power that Butin critiques. The space created by the workshop, especially in the directions to ‘define and explain conceptions of oppression’, was problematic.

Performing for Dominance

Myra described her experience within her group at the workshop by saying, “I felt compelled to storytell.” Storytelling here concerns her experiences of marginalization and oppression, as well as her stories of teaching against such marginalization and oppression. She noticed that other, “participants of colour were also positioned that way too.” For her, “it was one of those awkward moments for me where I had to decide ‘Am I going to perform this here?’” This language of performance underlines the burden of performing particular subjectivities being placed on marginalized groups in these contexts, especially performing the role of the victim or ‘someone with experience.’ Moule (2005) describes the differential cost to people of colour who engage in this work. She offers that there is a psychological cost of partially reliving experiences of marginalization through retelling these narratives as an attempt to bridge the gap (p.31). She also notices the tendency for white students to “dismiss and disrespect the teacher of color” (p.32) and thus dismiss and disrespect the content. Myra’s choice around the decision to “perform this here” is laden with these realities. This is a moment where the inducement of the marginalized person to tell her stories, combined with the expectation that they will tell their stories, reinforces the binary between dominant / marginal.

The Violence of Dominance

Another piece that comes out of the attempt to define and describe conceptions of oppression revolves around the violence of the space. Myra relayed one more story from the workshop. Another colleague, also an academic of colour, was describing the recent killing of Trayvon Martin.² Her storytelling was both, “experienced and expressed in an emotion laden way- hurt and anger and frustration.” Myra felt that this academic was exposed and not really

² The workshop was held within one month of the fatal shooting of 17 year-old Trayvon Martin by “neighborhood watch” volunteer George Zimmerman. Protest followed when the police did not pursue a murder investigation despite the Martin being unarmed. At the time of our workshop it was unclear if there would be charges laid in the case. In the time between the workshop and the focus group Zimmerman was charged with second degree murder. In the time between the focus group and the writing of this article, Zimmerman was acquitted of all charges.

supported in her sharing. She described the experience thusly, "It is an intimate thing for us. I don't want it to just be our intimacies." This narrative captures both the psychological cost and the dismissal and disrespect described by Moule. The very act of defining and describing oppression in such mixed-company creates the conditions where trauma can occur, and where there are opportunities for privileged colleagues to disrespect the content of these lived experiences. This narrative also highlights the distance between the lived-experience of marginalized subjects and those produced as dominant. The realities of oppression enter the conversation, even in the moment of discussing anti-oppressive possibilities. Who bears the weight? While Brooks (2011) suggests that discomfort and violence are necessary conditions for learning this material, applied to this introductory workshop on anti-oppressive education in the academy, who is feeling the violence? Or, who feels like the violence is directed at them? Who bears the disproportionate weight of the burden of learning/unlearning oppressions?

'Listening' and the Performance of White Ignorance

In the end, Myra decided not to perform, "not to tell my story in the setting." What about those other participants around the table? It is important to consider those inviting or anticipating the performance. How do they get to enter into anti-oppressive education? According to Myra, "they create a distance for themselves and use the language to observe it..." In the space of the anti-oppressive workshop we offered, many of these faculty members could adopt 'the listening stance.' Dominantly positioned colleagues could distance themselves from the realities being discussed/engaged through the adoption of academic language. Moreover, there is a recognition that these oppressive realities being described are, in Myra's words, "intimately intertwined in our day-to-day lived experience as people of colour." These realities are not as easily seen as intertwined and connected to the lived experiences of dominant subjectivities. Dominantly positioned colleagues could distance themselves by being unwilling or unable to connect with oppression through their own lived experiences. They imagined they had few narratives that placed them meaningfully within the conversation.

By adopting the listening stance, these colleagues maintain their innocence of the oppressions being discussed. This performance of dominance hinges on the presumption of innocence and neutral positioning. The listening stance allows dominantly positioned colleagues to act as if they are innocent and un-implicated in the realities under consideration. The listening stance reinforces the neutrality of the academic, positioned as outside the fray, as choosing to think and enact thoughtful theories at a distance, jeopardizing the work needed to acknowledge the realities of dominance necessary to create a safer place/space.

This performance of dominance is also an enactment of what Applebaum (2010) describes as white ignorance: the "product of an epistemology of ignorance, a systemically supported, socially induced pattern of (mis)understanding the world that is connected to and works to sustain systemic oppression and privilege" (p. 37). The example here is the expectation that an academic of colour should describe their experience of oppression - such knowledge is readily available to anyone who would take the time to read. What will be substantively different about this performance? Will this be the time that dominant groups believe, or agree, or acknowledge that such things are constitutive of reality? Ignorance here is not only not knowing, but it is also a certain kind of knowledge that already determines where and how such stories can be heard. This ignorance is also exemplified in the silence of the listening stance, the inability or unwillingness of dominantly positioned faculty to 'storytell' about dominance. It is a choice to

narrate dominant positions as normative and therefore neutral, and thus maintain the goodness and morality of those positioned. Ignorance is thus the condition for maintaining innocence.

There are some starting places that are more foundational than a desire for justice and the ability to be seen as good. Minus the understandings of the relations of power (around race for example) that are always/ever present, clinging to innocence and performing ignorance reproduce dominance when they are enacted. In a racist and racialized context, innocence and ignorance produce/maintain whiteness as dominant. Similarly in a homophobic and heteronormative context, innocence and neutrality produce/maintain dominance. Speaking about and reifying marginalization without also speaking about privilege enables the innocence and neutrality to stay in place. While difficult, it is necessary to theorize and speak in ways that makes the practices of privilege visible, as opposed to only seeing the effects of those practices. It is important to trace the ways in which privilege, and especially the ways the privilege of those dominantly positioned in the workshop, produces inequality. To be able to hear those stories (and not just the stories of the marginalized) and to be able to speak about and implicate dominant selves within these processes is necessary (and difficult).

Who speaks? Who gets to listen and learn? Who has the knowledge, the experiences of oppression for example that need to be drawn out and exposed, explored and walked through? Who can imagine that they are largely unaffected, or uninvolved? Or that their silent, listening position is one that is helpful/productive? I raise these questions because they begin to describe the complicated space of learning about anti-oppressive work in mixed-company. By this I mean the complex spaces that are inhabited and organized with multiple positions of privilege and oppression mingling together. And while this is a space where the work of being allies might be imagined/ worked towards, it is at the same time also a space where the extra burden placed on the marginalized is often left unexplored. How might workshop interventions like this make the space a little more troubling for dominantly positioned faculty? How might the inherent goodness, the innocence and neutrality of dominant positioning be brought more forcefully to the forefront, so that more faculty felt that their experiences were important to share – as witnesses and perpetrators and victims and more fully as allies. How might speaking about these realities become intimate and personal for all who participate?

Privilege & Performance - "What's Going on Here?" (Michelle)

In his analysis, Michael poses a series of questions about who is allowed and expected to speak, and what it means to create spaces in which more dominantly-positioned individuals are compelled to engage. In the section that follows, I use the focus group discussion as the foundation upon which to re-examine anti-oppressive education. I want to state from the outset, the intent is not to indict participants but rather to take seriously the need to modify the way in which we engage and collaborate. Anchoring the analysis in the work of Nancy and Elizabeth Povinelli, I hope to offer a vantage point from which to critically engage anti-oppressive education practices that, despite great intentions, are entangled in the politics of recognition and the cunning of a post-colonial liberalism.

The hope from the focus group was to collect feedback from participants about their experiences in the workshop. By the second question, it was clear that participation was a primary issue in the workshop such that some participants could assume an observer position.

Michael explained that dominantly-positioned faculty “used the language to distance themselves;” while some colleagues treated the experience as a type of scholarly exercise, others did not have the privilege to do so. Myra, when explaining her experience in the workshop, remarked to the focus group, “[it is] one of those: what’s going on here moments?” Indeed, what is going on here?

In this formulation, those in privileged positions understood that they had nothing to contribute to the discussion about anti-oppression. Framing themselves as a privileged class, they understood their role was to “listen and learn”—in this position, silence was meant to constitute/convey respect. Not part of the oppressed, they remained silent. But this silence is underwritten with the expectation of education, of performance. The “listen and learn” approach forever obligates performance and a particular type of labor: teaching oppression through one’s perceived authentic experience.

In choosing some exercises over others, our goal was to avoid this type of expected performance of oppression. Despite our intentions we nevertheless reproduced the conditions upon which performance of oppression was facilitated. The frustrations with this outcome were thankfully revealed in the focus group. Anti-oppressive education is necessarily collaborative – but these collaborations take time to gel as the systemic forms of oppression we seek to challenge are embedded and entrenched. As such, anti-oppressive education can incidentally replicate the same systems of oppression one seeks to confront.

In their work on anti-oppressive education, Kumashiro and Ngo (2007) argue that this approach to teaching is divergent and does not follow a particular script and practice. It is a practice and pedagogy best developed through collaborations. These collaborations are meant to help us dig deeper into systems of oppression that impact our students, our classes and ourselves. Identifying and challenging these systems by naming them in the classroom is difficult work and it requires that, as educators, we work together to better identify links between issues to amplify our response in the classroom. But to do so, we must be willing to mark privilege and oppression in the classroom and with our colleagues. This is challenging and often times we stumble in our attempts, but we have to critically engage these missteps and then dig deep to discern the structural issues, and ideologies, that underlie it. That said, I want to explore the performance expectation in the workshop. Using Fraser and Povinelli, I will interrogate the underlying assumptions and ideologies that haunt this work and the dominant ideologies we must concurrently challenge if we are to further disrupt systems of power.

(Re)approaching Recognition

In her work on multiculturalism, Nancy Fraser (2000) critically engages the politics of recognition with attention on the need for redistribution of resources and wealth—rather than simply a gleeful agreement that we are different and a celebration of that difference. She cautions, “[e]verything depends on how recognition is approached” (Fraser, 2000, p.109); this can be complemented with the work of Elizabeth Povinelli who argues for a “critical theory of recognition” so as to be aware of the cunning of recognition (Povinelli, 2002). Fraser discusses the ‘identity model’ in the politics of recognition, in which identity is formed through a Hegelian dialogical process in which subjects are formed based on a process of mutual recognition between one another. Taken together Fraser and Povinelli argue recognition is a political and personal process marked with power and context. Moving from Povinelli and Fraser, I want to

think critically about the discussion and dynamics at play in the workshop and the exercises that provoked/required certain individuals to “perform” and the relationship this has to recognition.

In an era of ongoing multiculturalism in which more time is spent on “recognizing difference” than economic redistribution for ongoing social injustices, we have to take stock when a group of predominantly white participants expect an Aboriginal woman to explain oppression to them. Although each likely thought they were correctly performing respect through a tacit agreement to remain silent – to listen and learn — they were concurrently revealing, and enacting, the troubled politics underlying this recognition. In so doing, they misread the queue: they had been invited into a discussion and in their silence missed an opportunity to engage, and learn.

This would be the hardline critique: you were invited to participate and instead chose to remain silent, in which silence itself constitutes its own form of violence. By not seeing oneself as the direct recipient of oppressive practices, and remaining silent, one is also not acknowledging how they are the beneficiary of these practices. In this particular moment of late-modernity, a moment in which colonialism is framed as a “closed chapter” in history (Stewart, 2011) and a celebration of diversity is the tune of the day, there is much work to be done—and undone. In this workshop with colleagues, the challenge was to facilitate a different way of understanding oppression(s) such that when the topic is raised, it can be framed effectively as a structural issue for which *each* of us has something to say, a question to ask, a thought/experience to share.

Anti-oppressive education is articulated as a necessarily collaborative process. That said, as a collaborative process, the dialogical encounter perhaps needs to be purposefully facilitated. A critical assessment of our process revealed that much was left unsaid in the format of the workshop. To facilitate a critical engagement with the material, we needed to have more time to frame up systemic oppression and have a discussion about what constitutes engagement with the material. Instead of being concerned about the dominant voices at some tables, we needed to be more cognizant of the silences. There is a particular seduction in this work, in which the attempt to produce change can serve to mask the very conditions in which the work is done. In this particular political moment in Canada we are embroiled in the rhetoric of multiculturalism and the attendant politics of recognition.

The Cunning of Recognition

Cunning is that which is attractive; it is that which is deceptive. When we say that something is cunning, it is most often with a negative inflection. I want to think about the tension between attraction and deception that is a marked feature of cunning. I do so as a means to better understand the challenge of identifying the lure of recognition and the trap it can produce. In her work on the cunning of recognition, Elizabeth Povinelli discusses the ways in which contemporary manifestations of multiculturalism are framed in such a way that the subject seeking recognition must produce itself in such a way that the state can clearly identify it. Her ethnographic background in working with Aboriginal peoples in Australia serves to illustrate various examples in which the state expects Aboriginal subjects to manifest particular (impossible) cultural practices as a means to land claims and rights. I would argue that attraction and deception taken up in the Australian example plays accordingly: it is attractive to think that the state is going to settle up land claims and engage in redistribution of resources, but the

deception is that the subjects that require recognition are expected to live up to an expectation of what the state (and other agents) believe is their Aboriginal cultural background.

Using this same scaffolding, and turning to the example of the anti-oppressive workshop, we attempted to bring together a divergent group of individuals and made the critical error of presuming that this coming together would produce, through the workshop process, a type of critical engagement with recognition. In fact, the opposite was true. The conditions of liberalism overdetermined the setting and, as Povinelli (1998) cautions, “[S]omething fundamental about liberalism teeters on the ability of subalterns to articulate the good of their culture and the ability of liberals to recognise this good” (p. 9). Thus, the liberal fantasy at once allows the subaltern to be recognized while, concurrently, it delimits the contributions they are expected to make. Seen this way, a workshop on anti-oppressive education in which those in dominant classes come to “listen and learn” is predicated on this same model in which liberals recognize the oppression of others and expect to learn from it -- to have that oppression performed for them in a way that feels more authentic --- through first person narratives (the story telling that Michael and Claire discuss).

Accordingly, we reproduced forms of oppression in the room that are themselves conditioned by the ideologies of liberalism. Povinelli offers us a cautionary tale upon which to think about anti-oppressive education. She offers a way in which to see the underbelly of multiculturalism and its neoliberal aspirations. In her work, she highlights what is at stake in the moments of recognition in which the subaltern are expected to articulate themselves, to perform. She frames the practice of recognition in which the ultimate outcome is that “you [subaltern] can liberate yourself from the network of social and cultural subordination in which you currently find yourself” (Povinelli, 1998, p. 9). Seen this way, the gesture of respect (listen and learn) is burdened with the ultimate threat -- neoliberal regimes of responsibility.

As stated earlier, the intent here is to investigate the workshop and to understand the dynamic we facilitated. The goal is not to chastise those individuals that attended the workshop and remained silent. All who attended the workshop wanted to engage in something called anti-oppressive education, to figure out a better way to engage students and to produce different outcomes in the classroom. That said, good intentions (on our part and theirs) must still be critically engaged. As a collaborative venture, we must be willing to do the forensic audit of the workshop to understand what worked and what didn't. In this section, I have pointed out the challenge of the workshop, identified problems in planning and outcome, followed by a short theoretical investigation into the ideologies and power structures that operate in the background of this work. We cannot escape the imprint of liberalism. Concurrently, we are compelled to challenge the impact of multiculturalism rhetoric as it serves to undermine this work. In turning to the work of Fraser and Povinelli, I want to emphasize that our attempts at anti-oppressive education must be backed up by a commitment to systemic change. If we only engage in these practices with colleagues and in the classroom without an explicit discussion about the need for economic redistribution of resources, we are only serving to reinforce the conditions of oppression.

Oppression, Space and Identity: Reflections on trying to *do* anti-oppressive work (Claire)

Michelle has drawn attention to the politics of recognition and the critical need to be aware of the influence from the intersection of neoliberal discourses with multiculturalism on our efforts to do anti-oppressive education. In re-examining our workshop and focus group, I reflect on a recent classroom experience that paralleled the divisive and two-layered experience in our research. This reflection examines the spaces we hope to create when doing anti-oppressive work, and the differing ways individuals think about oppression and subsequently, enter these spaces.

I remember being both enthused, engaged, and distracted for both the workshop and the focus group because I was 9 months pregnant for the former and consequently a very new parent for the latter. I had to bring my son to the focus group, and as newborns do, he became fussy – and so I felt I was emotionally and physically at a distance from much of the conversation. However, there was a sentiment that I carried home, and upon listening to the focus group on a later date – the feeling resurfaced. This feeling was not new - as a feminist educator it is something that often exists within the classroom, but often there is not sufficient time to sit with the discomfort, frustration and/or disappointment when particular patterns and relations present themselves. Therefore, I welcome the opportunity to take that time now, here in this space with my two colleagues to discuss some of the discomforts and frustrations that arose.

Speaking about difference, speaking about oppression

Reflecting on both the workshop and focus group, I want to trace some of the ways feminist and anti-racist scholars have critiqued and envisioned how we recognize relations of difference, power and subjectivity. There is a commitment among anti-racist feminist theorists to document and attempt to disrupt the trend of who is expected to ‘speak their difference’ (women of colour/poor/trans/queer/disabled women) and who is excluded from having to acknowledge their relation to oppression (white/able bodied/middleclass/heterosexual women). Trinh T. Minh-Ha (1989) recounts the movement from ignoring or denying women of colour’s experiences within mainstream feminism to including them only with the intent or expectation that they ‘express their authentic difference.’ Women of Color – and in particular Third World Women - she argues are not invited to speak about the first world and/or first world women, but rather are encouraged to talk about “their difference or otherness...[as long as it does] not go so far as to question the foundation of [White/first world women’s] beings and makings” (Minh-ha 1989, p. 88). What this pattern inevitably does is reproduce the inequitable relations among women because there is no allowance for the examination or interrogation of the systemic processes and knowledges that inform oppression – nor the subject positions it creates. This has led to a situation whereby, for example, “we *may* know how colonization changed Aboriginal people, but do we know how it changed, and continues to change, white people?” (my emphasis Razack 1999, p.19). Why is oppression still predominantly thought of as something that belongs to, or is seen as the area of expertise of, those who are oppressed or furthest from the norm as opposed to those who do the oppressing/are closest to the dominant norm (white, male, heterosexual, able bodied and class privileged)?

In part, this can be understood through Crenshaw's analysis of the move from identity politics to an understanding of the multiple and interconnected relations between different identity groups coined by Crenshaw as intersectionality. Social groups, she argues, perceived identity politics differently such that within mainstream liberal discourse they were perceived as "negative frameworks in which social power works to exclude or marginalize those who are different," and consequently they sought to do away with these categorizations (1991, p. 1242). Alternatively, Crenshaw notes that within some feminist and anti-racist communities identity politics were imagined as potential sources of "social empowerment and reconstruction" (Ibid., p. 1242). For her, the challenge with identity politics is that individual categories tend to become 'conflated or ignore intragroup differences' such that understandings of racial discrimination among women's groups tend to be silenced or racial analyses become conflated to focus solely on racial oppression rather than also including experiences of racial privilege. Thinking about or working with identity categories has often fixed the relation between particular groups of people - those who are marginalized - and oppression, leaving out the critical discussions of privilege and social production of said categories. Intersectionality draws attention to what is lost or missing from analyses when race OR gender OR sexuality (for example) are examined separately rather than the ways in which they intersect, depend or build upon and sustain each other. As Crenshaw documents in her research, Black women's experiences could not be explained by examining race or gender in isolation from each other, and thus she stresses the "need to account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed" (Ibid, p. 1245). Thus, moving to examine the intersectionality of various subject positions and relations of power enables different forms of engagement and accountability, diminishing the possibility of divisive layers within critical dialogue on oppression.

Introducing intersectionality

The division and imbalanced expectation of storytelling that occurred in our workshop also took place in one of my Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies classes. The class in question was about a month into the term, and by this point we have done some serious work dismantling the notion that race, sex, gender, and sexuality are natural, biological and fixed concepts. Critical to this work is the examination of the fundamental role social power has in terms of the creation and reproduction of identity categories and the huge disparity between different social groups. In addition, we discuss the need to be wary of how the argument for the alleged naturalness of these disparities continues to be used to justify maintaining inequitable relations. As the course continues, I introduce in a more substantial way the notion of intersectionality, challenging the notion of singular identity categories. One of the articles I use is Audre Lorde's "Age, Race, Class and Sex: Women Redefining Difference" (1984). In this piece she discusses her frustration with being asked which form of oppression she experiences most severely – racism, sexism or homophobia, as if it were possible for her to separate out her 'multiple selves.' As a class, we have a discussion about what it would mean and/or feel like to be solely identified by a singular aspect of our selves/identities, such as race, gender or sexuality. Students usually engage quite enthusiastically and critically with this discussion, noting the impossibility of only thinking of themselves in singular terms. From this point, I move to focus on Lorde's statement (within the same piece) that it is not up to people who are oppressed to educate their oppressors about their experiences of oppression. I expect – or at least hope – by this point in the term that my students will be able to acknowledge and critique the idea that people defined by others/the norm must explain themselves and their experiences to those in

more privileged positions. Quite often when I teach this course, a strong majority of students make the connection and problematize this relation. While they do not go quite as far as Razack in flipping the frame onto experiences of oppression/privilege by those closer to the norm, they do question why this expectation (that those who experience oppression must educate those who oppress) exists and what – and who – it serves to benefit. However, in the winter of 2012, I had a different experience; many of my students (who on face value, appeared to occupy dominant/closer to norm identities) stated that they saw no problem with this pattern. Instead, they ask, “How could they learn about racism or colonialism or homophobia if those who lived those realities did not teach them?”

The dynamic in the class was comparable to that of our workshop, wherein some students felt they could sit back and learn, while others – either in actuality in our discussions or symbolically by their assumed relation to particular identities or forms of oppression we discuss - did the hard work of educating about various forms of oppression. There was a sentiment among some students in more dominant positions that they had nothing to contribute to the conversations. I tried to steer the discussion by posing questions back to the class about what it might mean to ask certain groups of people to talk about oppression, but not others. While this attempt to disrupt the seamless reproduction of this pattern worked to some degree, I left the classroom that day feeling both frustrated and with a sense of failure. While I can never fully know what led to this particular group of responses to Lorde’s piece, I am grateful for it. It has pushed me to re-examine my teaching - to rethink connections and/or critiques I make as well as to introduce more check-in points with my students about how they are engaging with course material. As Michael has already discussed, this class reflects some of the challenges of doing anti-oppressive work in ‘mixed company.’

Reflecting on the workshop, I think my sense of disappointment and frustration stems in part from our planning, and hence expectations for how conversations would unfold. Because we did a selective invite for the workshop to colleagues at the university engaged with and committed to anti-oppressive pedagogy, I was not as prepared for the outcome that transpired. Somehow, in our preparation for the workshop I temporarily lost sight of the fact that we are all in different places in our learning and that internalization of dominant power relations runs quite deep. An oft quoted statement by Lorde is useful here: “the true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us” (1984, p. 123). Lorde may have intended this for those positioned at a distance from the norm, however it points to the necessity for all of us to reflect on our personal relationship with internalization of dominant norms, the process for how we understand and know ourselves within this oppressive and unequal culture. I am left wondering what would it have meant to ask instead in our workshop – to focus on that piece of the oppressor within each of us? Would that have shifted the focus of the conversation? Could the expectation be shared or moved onto those closest to the norm to talk about – not their guilt about being the norm/oppressors – but rather, how they know themselves or are coming to know themselves in relation to oppression/privilege? Lather has argued that Women’s Studies programs create “spaces where debate over power and the production of knowledge could be held ‘through its cogent argument that the exclusion of women from the knowledge base brings into question that which has passed for wisdom’” (1998, p. 569). My hope with both the workshop and in my classroom was to create spaces where traditional ‘wisdom’ about difference, knowledge and subjectivity could be questioned. However, what also needed to be

acknowledged and investigated as Lather examines, is the resistance experienced by many in terms of recognizing themselves within matrices of power.

Concluding Thoughts

In this article we have argued that spaces of anti-oppressive education, in spite of best intentions, are always already loaded with the oppressive realities that are being engaged such that dominant and oppressive identities are enacted in the moment of anti-oppressive education. To make sense of the challenge of doing this work, we drew together our three different analyses and the critical perspectives of participants as conveyed through a focus group. We purposely chose a poly-vocal approach to this material as we each come to anti-oppressive education with varying levels of experience and disciplinary perspectives. Despite focusing on similar moments in the workshop, we wanted to capture our different perspectives. In reviewing the discussion from the focus group we each identified similar themes we wanted to analyze. In so doing, the focus group became an entry point to reconsider the workshop, but also anti-oppressive education more generally. Our comments oscillated around general themes of space, recognition and subjectivity, and draw together questions of intention and expectation for discussion in our individually authored analyses.

As we continue to engage in this work on our campus through informal brownbag discussions and other events, we are thinking about what it means to move forward with this work. To that end, and for those that might consider a similar project in the future, we offer the following reflections:

- We needed more time. The ticking clock was but one of the many challenges we faced. Focus group remarks and workshop comment cards indicated that participants wanted more time to discuss the material. Perhaps offering more time would require active engagement of all participants—to not allow some to remain silent. We need more time to make connections in these spaces and discussions.
- We needed more active facilitation of the discussion. Rather than start with an exercise about “what is oppression?”, we needed to start with a discussion about the role of participation and the politics of that participation. Asking everyone to engage in the discussion about participation/oppression and privilege allows for a rigorous interrogation of one’s own role and position.
- We needed to focus more carefully on dominance rather than on oppression. Maybe anti-oppressive education could also be named anti-dominance education in order to both highlight the necessity of dominance and frustrate the neutrality on which dominant subject positions depend. Removing this pretense of neutrality represents an important starting place.

But of course, just changing these three items won’t resolve some of the fundamental challenges of this work. We want to return to the theme that draws all our work together: the trap of good intentions. By engaging in this collaborative work we thought we knew better. The original attraction started with a few key words in a new faculty event: anti-racist, feminist, and social justice. Early stages of collaboration were exciting, and it appeared that a collegial network was being formed: from relative isolation to ongoing discussion, it felt like we were helping to create something good on campus. In putting the workshop together, we presumed

that if we brought together individuals already committed to this work, we would not reproduce the conditions we were challenging. Moving forward, we realize the trap of good intentions has many layers some of which we share below—some of which we are continuing to learn.

The trap of good intention is just that: a trap. It is attractive but it ensnares. We started with the implicit assumption that if you work from a place of good intention you can create a safe space. But all spaces and relations are embedded within unequal power relations—therefore no space is safe. Rather we must work towards recognizing ourselves within these relations. In our enthusiasm for collegiality, we became trapped by the hope that such spaces are possible. Another layer to the trap of good intentions connects to the production of dominant identities. Good intentions are the sign and guarantee of the neutrality on which dominant positions are dependent. We need to disrupt the relationship between identities rooted in goodness and our efforts to do anti-oppressive work. This anti-oppressive work must necessarily grapple with the lived political, everyday realities that we inhabit. This involves challenging the structural conditions that facilitate oppression. That is to say, good intentions are grounded in liberalism and if we remain entranced by good intentions we lose sight of the much larger context that enables dominant subjects to remain comfortable. Working within a settler society, on a campus committed to 'Indigenization', recognition of the embeddedness of liberal discourses within our attempts at anti-oppressive education is necessary.

In closing, it is not that these suggestions would have “fixed” what was wrong with our attempt at an anti-oppressive workshop. These attempts will always be fraught, always be partial, and always be located within local, national and international systems of oppression no matter the intentions of those involved. Anti-oppressive education is always, and necessarily, rooted in the lived experiences of dominance and oppression that we all inhabit; there is no neutral ground, no 'good' space that can be entered. Rather, these suggestions highlight ways that might refocus our attention in order to minimize some of the oppressiveness of the space while drawing attention to the ways in which we are already embedded within unequal relations of power. These suggestions move us towards a space where all of our stories might be marshaled, where dominantly-positioned participants might see and speak about the ways that their stories are necessary to the dominance being worked against, and where engagement might become intimate all around the table.

There are many ways to approach this work, many mistakes that can be made, and many things to learn. As collaborative work, it requires allies and collaborators in collegial spaces. We invite you to share your thoughts and insight.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank all of the participants in the workshop as well as the wonderful group of colleagues that helped collaborate on this project prior to and following the workshop. Thanks to Kim Karpa and Jason Fenno, our graduate student research assistants. Special thanks to Shauneen Pete and Taouba Khelifa who read previous drafts and offered comments along with our reviewers in this volume. This project was made possible by the participation of colleagues on campus and the support of the President's Teaching and Learning Scholar Grant at the University of Regina.

Authors

Michelle Stewart is an Assistant Professor in Justice Studies at the University of Regina where she teaches classes in the area of social justice and research methods and design.

Michael Cappello is an Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Regina where he teaches educational core studies.

Claire Carter is an Assistant Professor in the Women and Gender Studies Program at the University of Regina where she teaches in the area of sexualities and women's health.

References

- Applebaum, B. (2004). Social justice education, moral agency, and the subject of resistance. *Educational Theory, 54*(1), 59-72.
- Applebaum, B. (2007). White complicity and social justice education: Can one be culpable without being liable? *Educational Theory, 57*(4), 453-467.
- Applebaum, B. (2010). *Being white, being good: White complicity, white moral responsibility and social justice pedagogy*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
- Bannerji, H. (1987). Introducing racism: Notes towards an anti-racist feminism. *Resources for Feminist Research, 16*(1), 10-13.
- Brooks, J. (2011). Bearing the weight: Discomfort as a necessary condition for 'less violent' and more equitable dialogic learning. *Educational Foundations, 25*(1-2), 43-62.
- Butin, D. (2002). This ain't talk therapy: Problematizing and extending anti-oppressive education. *Educational Researcher, 31*(3), 14-16.
- Calliste, A. (1996). Antiracism organizing and resistance in nursing: African Canadian women. *Canadian Review of Sociology, 33*(3), 361-390.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review, 3*, 107-120.
- Gustafson, D. (2005). Transcultural nursing theory from a critical cultural perspective. *Advances in Nursing Science, 28*(1), 2-16.
- Hyttén, K., & Bettez, S. (2011). Understanding education for social justice. *The Journal of Educational Foundations, 25*(1-2), 7-24.
- Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 25-53.
- Kumashiro, K. (2002). Against repetition: Addressing resistance to anti-oppressive change in the practices of learning, teaching, supervising, and researching. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(1), 67-92.
- Kumashiro, K. (2009). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning towards social justice*. New York: Routledge.

- Kumashiro, K., & Ngo B. (2007). *Six lenses for anti-oppressive education: Partial stories, improbable conversations*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a Black professor teaching White students. *Theory into Practice, 31*, 287-295.
- Lather, P. (1988). Feminist perspectives on empowering research methodologies. *Women's Studies International Forum, 11*(6), 569-581.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lorde, A. (1984) *Sister Outsider*. Crossing Press: New York.
- Mayhew, M., & Fernandez, S. (2007). Pedagogical practices that contribute to social justice outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education, 31*(1), 55-80.
- Meister, B. (2011) Debt and taxes: can the financial industry save public universities? *Representations, 116*(1), 128-155.
- Minh-Ha, T. T. (1989). *Woman, native, other*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana university press.
- Mirchandani, K. (2003). Challenging racial silences in studies of emotion work: Contributions from anti-racist feminist theory. *Organization Studies, 24*(5), 721-742.
- Moule, J. (2005). Implementing a social justice perspective in teacher education: Invisible burden for faculty of color. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(4), 23-42.
- Mulally, R. (2002). *Challenging oppression: A critical social work approach*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Picower, B. (2011). Learning to teach and teaching to learn: Supporting the development of new social justice educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(4), 7-24.
- Polster, C. (2007). The nature and implications of the growing importance of research grants to Canadian universities and academics. *Higher Education, 53*, 599-622.
- Povinelli, E. (1998). The Cunning of recognition: Real being and aboriginal recognition in settler Australia. *Australian Feminist Law Journal, 11*(3), 3-27.
- Povinelli, E. (2002) *Cunning of recognition: Indigenous alterities and the making of Australian multiculturalism*. Durham, NC: Duke Press.
- Puzan, E. (2003). The unbearable whiteness of being (in nursing). *Nursing Inquiry, 10*, 193-200.
- Razack, N. (2003). *Transforming the field: Critical antiracist and anti-oppressive perspectives for the human services practicum*. Halifax, Canada: Fernwood.
- Razack, S. (1999). *Looking white people in the eye*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ross, S. (2009). Critical race theory, democratization, and the public good: deploying postmodern understandings of racial identity in the social justice classroom to contest academic capitalism. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(5), 517-528.
- Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling nationalist discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(3), 295-317.

- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2012). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sonu, D. (2012). Illusions of compliance: Performing the public and hidden transcripts of social justice education in neoliberal times. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(2), 240-259.
- Stewart, M. (2011). The space between the steps: Reckoning in an era of reconciliation. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 14(1), 41-61.
- Sumara, D., & Davis, B. (1999). Interrupting heteronormativity: Toward a queer curriculum theory. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(2), 191-208.
- Youdell, D. (2006). *Impossible bodies, impossible selves: Exclusions and student subjectivities*. London, UK: Springer.

Critical Education

criticaleducation.org

ISSN 1920-4175

Editors

Stephen Petrina, *University of British Columbia*
Sandra Mathison, *University of British Columbia*
E. Wayne Ross, *University of British Columbia*

Associate Editors

Abraham P. DeLeon, *University of Texas at San Antonio*
Adam Renner, 1970-2010

Editorial Collective

Faith Ann Agostinone, *Aurora University*
Wayne Au, *University of Washington, Bothell*
Marc Bousquet, *Emory University*
Joe Cronin, *Antioch University*
Antonia Darder, *Loyola Marymount University*
George Dei, *OISE/University of Toronto*
Stephen C. Fleury, *Le Moyne College*
Kent den Heyer, *University of Alberta*
Nirmala Erevelles, *University of Alabama*
Michelle Fine, *City University of New York*
Gustavo Fischman, *Arizona State University*
Erica Frankenberg, *Penn State University*
Melissa Freeman, *University of Georgia*
David Gabbard, *Boise State University*
Rich Gibson, *San Diego State University*
Dave Hill, *Anglia Ruskin University*
Nathalia E. Jaramillo, *University of Auckland*
Philip E. Kovacs, *University of Alabama, Huntsville*
Saville Kushner, *University of Auckland*
Zeus Leonardo, *University of California, Berkeley*
Pauline Lipman, *University of Illinois, Chicago*
Lisa Loutzenheiser, *University of British Columbia*
Marvin Lynn, *University of Illinois, Chicago*
Linda Mabry, *Washington State University, Vancouver*
Sheila Macrine, *Montclair State University*
Perry M. Marker, *Sonoma State University*
Rebecca Martusewicz, *Eastern Michigan University*
Peter McLaren, *University of California, Los Angeles*
Brad J. Porfilio, *Lewis University*
Stuart R. Poyntz, *Simon Fraser University*
Kenneth J. Saltman, *DePaul University*
Özlem Sensoy, *Simon Fraser University*
Patrick Shannon, *Penn State University*
Kevin D. Vinson, *University of the West Indies*
John F. Welsh, *Louisville, KY*