

An Unten(ur)able Position

THE POLITICS OF TEACHING FOR WOMEN OF COLOR IN THE US

ANNA M. AGATHANGELOU AND L.H.M. LING

Global Change Institute, Cyprus, and New School University, New York

Abstract

The U.S. academy wants 'multiculturalism' in the classroom. But its public rhetoric of fairness, standards, and diversity falls far short of its exclusionary actions in private, particularly for women of color faculty at tenure time. Tenure evaluations, we propose, reflect a narrative of institutional power that perpetuates the academy's religious-colonial legacy. Priest-Novitiate relations rule the academy more than a community of peers. Accordingly, women of color faculty face not just a glass ceiling when it comes to tenure and promotions. Rather, they encounter a more subtle, complex, and insidious form of resistance. It consists of a specific configuration of racial (white), gender (male), class (aristocratic or upwardly-mobile), and cultural (Western medieval) criteria that women of color cannot possibly satisfy. We conclude with some suggestions for transforming these social relations in the academy.

Keywords

politics of tenure, women of color, postcolonial critique, Priest-Novitiate relations, liberalism, power and knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

Who teaches what in the world, defines it. Herein lies the politics of teaching, for knowledge is neither intellectually neutral nor politically insulated in 'ivory towers'. That knowledge is power compels us to admit, also, that power *makes* knowledge, yet we cannot resign to such cynical authoritarianism, especially in the wake of 11 September. The events in New York and Washington have awakened hegemonic elites to a subaltern reality: that is, multiple contestations

in understanding, meaning, and interpretation daily construct our world(s). Forcibly imposing one world onto this crowded legacy merely stirs annihilistic fantasies that respect neither space nor time. Put differently, we need to understand these multiple worlds, not just to thrive but to *survive*.

In recent decades, the US academy has come to value 'multiculturalism', if not for paradigmatic richness then for its economic value in a globalizing world. The academy has diversified faculty and curricula to provide access to more worlds, internally with ethnic studies, women's studies, and gay/lesbian studies; externally, with area studies, international relations, and study abroad programs. But still, the US academy falls short of its liberal promise. Publicly, it offers an array of multiculturalism while, privately, it bars real entry to those who are diversity's foremost agents.

We refer, specifically, to the US academy's abysmal record of tenure for its least represented yet most crucial faculty for multicultural learning: women of color.¹ In the US, among tenured professors, women of color faculty rank the lowest in number: 38 per cent for Latinas, 41 per cent for Asian and Native Americans, 46 per cent for African Americans compared to 47 per cent for Anglo-European females and 68 per cent for Anglo-European males (Schneider 1997).² Yet data on postgraduate enrollment in US academies indicate a relatively even spread between men and women in the earlier stages of academic training, with a steady increase of minorities. For instance, women comprised 57 per cent of all graduate enrollment in the social sciences in 1997 (Brandes et al. 2001: 325).³ Between 1991 and 1998, African American and Asian female doctorates in political science, specifically, exceeded their male cohorts by 6.9 per cent compared to 4.3 per cent, respectively, for the former; 3.4 per cent to 2.7 per cent, respectively, for the latter (Brandes et al. 2001: 321). Hispanic female doctorates lagged slightly behind their male cohorts with 2.9 per cent compared to 3.7 per cent, respectively; American Indian male and female doctorates had 0.5 per cent each (Brandes et al. 2001: 321).⁴ The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) projects that by the year 2007, women will constitute 46 per cent of all doctorates (NCES 1997).⁵

Why do so many women of color 'fail' in the US academy? Not achieving tenure has little, if anything, to do with a lack of personal attributes such as intelligence, dedication, or even documentable, 'objective' criteria like number of publications or teaching evaluations. Many candidates denied tenure are highly accomplished, committed, institutionally astute, and driven to succeed. Nevertheless, we retain the word 'failure' to convey the severity of the non-tenured condition. Subsequent applications for jobs will always reflect this initial 'failure' no matter how substantive a candidate's record ('Maybe she has problems, we shouldn't hire her'). Tenure also signals that crucial benchmark of academic 'success'. Lifetime employment not only provides economic security, a much-needed haven after decades of academic debt and deferred earnings, but it also indicates a certain professional maturation from a junior status of relative insecurity to a more established, leverageable position in the academy.

Let us clarify: the tenure process torments *everyone*. Institutional pressures to interject oneself socially, intellectually, and professionally are all-pervasive. Anglo-European males must submit to tenure's scripted politics as much as anyone else. The difference lies, as this paper shows, in the *additional* scripts and roles that apply to faculty of color.

Tenure, we propose, reflects a narrative of institutional power. Drawing on public domain documents as well as personal testimonies from women of color faculty, we find a series of private rules and power relations operating *behind* the public rhetoric of tolerance and diversity. These rationalize racism, sexism, and classism in order to screen out persons who do not fit the academy's designation of who and what the faculty of color should be.⁶ Specifically:

1. few in the academy could afford the illusion that the tenure process reflects rational decision-making based on clear-cut, universally applied, and objective standards. For women and faculty of color—especially women of color faculty—the tenure process typically induces a highly charged atmosphere where hidden rules and subsidiary criteria suddenly apply. A candidate's *particularities*, rather than a supposedly universal standard, tend to predispose her tenure outcome, even if the decision is made in the name of liberal rationality, transparency, universality, and objectivity;
2. senior faculty may see themselves as exemplary liberal citizens: that is, they are informed, judicious, and fair. But, more often than not, their lack of reflection on race, gender, and class issues renders them ignorant of *how* to know the Other, *when* judicious interventions are needed, or *what* 'fairness' entails. An implicit standard results, set by those predominant in the academy—Anglo-European, middle-class, heterosexual males—for those who may exhibit some or none of these characteristics. Thus the candidate's acceptability is measured, invariably, by how much her position approximates the 'mainstream' rather than adds to it;
3. routinized applications of Affirmative Action or Equal Opportunity guidelines conflate 'representation' (a warm body) with 'participation' (an active voice). Faculty of color as 'extras' expected to play pre-scripted, supporting roles in the academy. These are placed in *separate* and *discrete* categories of 'race' or 'gender' or 'sexual orientation' ('class' does not merit equal attention in the academy).⁷ Rarely does the academy consider the complex configurations that each category creates through its intersection with others (e.g. a woman of color lesbian scholar from a working class background and so on);
4. far from being a 'marketplace of ideas', the US academy devolves into embedded racial, sexual, and class stereotypes. For women faculty, an unspoken heteronormativity further requires their adherence to conventional definitions of 'femininity'. This institutionalized hierarchy of values and rewards produces an internalized racism, sexism, and classism among women and faculty of color, dichotomizing a class of Grateful Outsiders from all Others. The former act as gatekeepers for the academy, ensuring and

embodying its 'universal standards'. For this reason, non-'mainstream' faculty cannot presume instant solidarity along ethnic, gender, or class lines. Those deemed Others usually face exile from or marginalization in the academy on the grounds of 'disloyalty', 'inadequacy', or 'incompatibility'.

Race-gender-class in the academy has received little attention, so far, because of the institution's *religious-colonial* nature. A medieval tower of knowledge, the academy started out as a training ground for priests and missionaries. During Europe's Age of Exploration (sixteenth–nineteenth centuries), the academy expanded its reach to serve its latest benefactor: the colonizing merchant-state. In this function, the academy fulfilled two goals at once: conversion of *and* intelligence-gathering about the Other. Many today accuse the US academy of another kind of colonization, an 'internal colonialism' (DiGiacomo 1997) and 'academic apartheid' (Unger 1995) that swell the ranks of temporary, faculty-for-hire. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reports that nearly half of all faculty appointments made at institutions of higher learning fall in the adjunct or other part-time category—with women as the majority recipients (AAUP 1993).⁸ As this paper will show, these two types of academic colonization—historical-external and contemporary-internal—enable and sustain the same power relations within the academy.

Indeed, the relationship between Priest and Novitiate best characterizes the academy's dominant social norm. That Priest and Novitiate connote a sacred, masculine bond should indicate its hierarchy as well as its other prerequisite, gender. Note, for example, the ratio of male to female faculty over time and as one moves higher in the ranks of the academy. Male faculty members comprise 66 per cent of total faculty in the US (AAUP 1998). Male full professors outnumber female full professors by almost five to one while, at the rank of assistant professor, the proportion of male to female professors remains relatively equal. Put differently, nearly half (46 per cent) of all assistant professors are women, but they become only 21 per cent of all full professors (Bellas 2002).

Globalization disrupts this legacy of academic religious-colonialism. Even before 11 September, capital's need for international markets, consumers, and producers has compelled a more cosmopolitan teaching of the world. Domestically, the US academy has needed to globalize, also, to: (1) retain an increasingly multiethnic student body, especially those who can pay high tuition fees during times of constricting budget cuts;⁹ (2) uphold its liberal reputation as a 'marketplace of ideas'; and (3) keep apace with managerial, financial, and technical trends arising from various locations in the world. Yet the US academy, as the world's leading producer of knowledge and expertise, has not developed a sufficient means of reconciling these multicultural, globalizing demands with its religious-colonial order. Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity commitments spread the academy's few, designated multicultural resources (faculty of color) over a wider domain of activities (research, teaching,

advising, committee work, program development) but do not succeed in transforming them. What results is a narrowing of the academy's vision and pool of talent, when it could least afford to do so.

In this paper, we explore the situation of tenure in the US. It should be noted that academies in other advanced, capitalist societies like the Netherlands, the United Kingdom (UK), and Japan follow criteria for evaluating faculty for promotion similar to those used in the US, though their procedures may differ. Those in the UK most closely mirror the tenure and promotion process in the US, but fierce competition among UK universities today renders promotion, especially from Senior Lecturer to Reader or Professor, extremely difficult even if tenure is easier to obtain. Some Senior Lecturers have five or six books to their name but still face little prospect of promotion. In the Netherlands, tenure is assessed individually but promotion comes only when a vacancy arises through retirement, resignation, or death. Or, an individual could receive a 'personal promotion' from one's home institution when given an outside offer. The situation in Japan may seem, in comparison, less competitive. Academics immediately secure tenure when hired and promotion proceeds according to seniority. Hence, one can expect to be a Professor when one reaches a certain age, regardless of output or performance. This system, however, tends to promote male academics exclusively given a generalized bias against women in patriarchal institutions like the academy.

Academies in 'developing' economies like Taiwan and Cyprus formally mimic US/UK tenure and promotion criteria to gain international credibility as 'liberal' institutions. But they still favor men over women informally when it comes to jobs, resources, and recognition. Another factor operates in these post-conflict societies: political identification. In Taiwan, for instance, one's pro- or anti-independence stance for the island-state *vis-à-vis* China may affect one's chances for promotion or grants; in Cyprus, one's position on relations between Greeks and Turks on the island.

It seems, then, that the US academy provides the most conducive and meritocratic arena for competent women scholars, whether domestic or international. In practice, however, a different picture develops. We turn now to explore the embedded nature of discrimination and exploitation in the US academy today.

Let us begin with the US academy's public rhetoric on tenure.

PUBLIC RHETORIC ON TENURE

The US academy's public rhetoric on tenure can be condensed into the following, four maxims.

1. *Tenure evaluations follow rational and open procedures to eliminate bias or any kind of prejudice. These focus on research, teaching, and service, in descending order of importance.* In the US academy, tenure and promotion follow particular procedures. Though institutions may vary on specifics (e.g.

length of 'probationary' period, extent of external references, number of publications), they share a general pattern in decision-making. First, a candidate's record is divided into three categories: research, teaching, and service. Research, especially at large universities, captures the central attention. Research is defined by the number of one's publications with preference given to single-authored works. Co-authorship is frowned upon as a sign of intellectual inefficacy rather than collaboration or multidisciplinary.¹⁰ Again, an ordered preference prevails: university-press, scholarly books (as opposed to trade-press textbooks), refereed journal articles, book chapters, reports, letters to the editor. Within this ranking lies another for the social sciences: quantitative analyses (statistics, formal theory, econometrics) carry greater intellectual weight than qualitative ones (interviews, archival research, discourse analysis). Accordingly, 'hard-science' outlets are valued over those considered more 'soft-science', even if both journals may exhibit comparable levels of quality with the latter perhaps even enjoying a larger readership given its greater accessibility. (The US academy, like those in Europe and the UK, still reflects a natural science model of acceptable scholarship.) Teaching and service rank a distant second and third; unless one is at a teaching college, in which case teaching becomes most important. Teaching is assessed primarily through teaching evaluations, filled out by students at the end of term. Sometimes, senior faculty also observe junior faculty in the classroom. Service covers everything else in the candidate's activities for the academy—e.g. committee work, student advising, dissertation/thesis/honor's supervisions—and the profession generally—e.g. participation in professional associations/conferences, manuscript reviews for journals/publishers, organizing panels/workshops/conferences. Second, the tenure and promotion decision usually involves at least three levels of institutional decision-making: the candidate's home department reviews the case with the tenured faculty voting 'up' or 'down', a university-wide tenure and promotion committee affirms or reverses the department's decision, and a university Dean, Provost, President/Chancellor, or Vice-Chancellor finally formalizes this decision with a letter to the candidate. A university-level reversal could take place, though rarely. Usually, the university committee votes to deny tenure and promotion rather than overturn a departmental vote.

2. *The academy treats all members equally.* Local cultures may vary but the US academy has aimed, in recent decades, to foster an atmosphere of equality and democracy within its ranks. Full and assistant professors, as with their graduate students, typically address one another as peers. Some professors even extend such familiarity to undergraduate students. Publicly, the academy presents itself as a pure meritocracy: race, gender, class, culture, sexuality, or any other source of 'difference' does not matter. Teaching evaluations, for example, are treated as objective measurements of *all* professors in the *same* ways (based on some consensual standard of 'good' vs 'bad' teaching). Similarly, senior faculty assume that *all* faculty—regardless

of differences in rank and power—make decisions based on the *same* set of ordered preferences. Department chairs, for instance, routinely urge untenured colleagues to act as good, departmental ‘citizens’ by sitting on numerous departmental or university committees while also cautioning them to ‘just say no’ to protect research and writing projects which, as noted above, matter most at tenure time.

3. *Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity ensure diversity and equal representation*. Most accounts of gender or racial discrimination in the academy focus on shortfalls of fairness as legislated by Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity guidelines. They define discrimination in terms of unfair treatment for underrepresented groups such as women, minorities, gays/lesbians, the disabled, and so on. Accordingly, discussions of discrimination have centered on issues such as ‘inequitable distribution of resources’ (rank and wage disparities, hiring and firing inequities), ‘work–family burdens’ (child care, maternity/paternity leave), ‘hostile work environment’ or ‘chilly climate’ (sexual harassment, heterosexism, preferences for male students or ‘masculine’ traits) (cf. MIT 1999; Blum 1991, Hall and Sandler 1982).¹¹ The academy thus assumes that discrimination cannot occur *within* a certain category. That is, all women or minorities have the same interests without regard to other, intervening factors such as race, class, or sexuality for women, gender, class, or sexuality for minorities, and so on.
4. *The academy represents a ‘marketplace of ideas’*. The US academy bills itself as *the* liberal institution (Brann 1999). It values individual merit, open competition, and multicultural education (Lang 1999). Compared to institutions of higher learning in other countries, where political identification or family connections may intervene, the US academy seems to offer the most conducive arena for talented scholars, whether male or female, domestic or international. Hard work and good teaching, the academy’s public rhetoric assures, would ensure success. By the same token, failure in academe must result from one’s inability to satisfy its high standards.

RULES OF SUBALTERN STANDING: CONSTITUTING RACE, GENDER AND CLASS RELATIONS IN THE ACADEMY

What many faculty of color, especially women, encounter at tenure time is a very different scenario. Five implicit rules sustain a gaping discrepancy between public rhetoric and private actions in the academy. These rules recall what Derrick Bell has called ‘rules of racial standing’ (Bell 1993: 109–26). We extend this definition to include race’s intersection with gender and class. Accordingly, we call them rules of subaltern standing.

To begin, we need to acknowledge the critical role of *interpretation* in a tenure case. Senior faculty usually disclaim any resort to such given interpretation’s subjective and thereby unreliable connotation. We grant that most

senior faculty proceed in good faith and apply themselves to the best of their capabilities. But herein lies the problem. Since all faculty operate within structures ridden with stereotypes, prejudices, and misperceptions about people of color, women, and working class people, and the tenure process itself is cloaked in secrecy, underlying prejudices about race–gender–class may remain unchecked and unexposed. Yet such assumptions profoundly shape departmental evaluations of a candidate’s tenurability long before tenure time. For any faculty outside the ‘mainstream’, this public secret flags unpredictable dangers. ‘Should I conform or speak out? Should I teach mainstream or dissident material? Should I address a colleague’s or student’s racism/sexism/classism publicly, privately, or not at all?’ For the woman of color faculty, such considerations are complicated by conflicting images, demands, and constituencies due to her location at the nexus of race–gender–class.

To exemplify how the rules of subaltern standing operate, we refer to cases published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *PS: Political Science & Politics*, anthologies compiled by women of color faculty, and personal communications from women of color about their experiences in the academy. Given this mixture of published and personal testimonies, we refer to each candidate’s story anonymously: e.g. Candidate A, Candidate B, and so on. This labeling method also keeps attention focused, appropriately, on the institutional politics, rather than the individual personalities, involved.

Rule 1: Mask Substantive Decision-making with Institutional Procedures

Because the academy’s rules are derived from customary practice or tradition, senior faculty may seek to work ‘innovatively’ within the academy’s publicly stated rules for procedural decision-making. This is understandable since the academy tends to present its procedures in rigid, bureaucratic code, on the one hand, while permitting constant revamping, on the other. Yet when applied to the complexities of race–gender–class, this hazy decision-making environment may enable senior faculty to mask spurious reasoning with technical adherence to bureaucratic guidelines on procedure. Hence, all sorts of argument could prevail with impugnty as long as they complied with the public rhetoric on ‘rationality’, ‘fairness’, and ‘equal treatment’.

Such verbal slickness becomes most apparent with ‘controversial’ tenure cases, usually involving faculty, especially women, of color. Take, for example, the familiar litany of research, teaching, and service in tenure considerations. What really counts, every tenured professor recites to junior colleagues, is publications. Publish or perish, as the cliché goes. But, if the woman of color candidate satisfies the criterion of quantity in publications, additional demands begin to surface: one must publish in the *right* journals, with the *right* publishers, and most insidiously, conduct the *right* kind of research (cf. Bell and Gordon 1999). A generation ago, Anglo-European feminists faced this kind of

institutional weeding for pursuing heterodox topics like women and politics.¹² One recounts that though she had authored two books and won a prestigious dissertation prize 2 years after receiving a doctorate in the early 1970s, her senior colleague chastised her ‘commitment to scholarship [which, he claimed,] interfered with [her] ability to perform effectively as a faculty member’ (Freeman 1996: 182). She eventually left academe to ‘practice law, journalism, editing, and many other things to earn [her] bread’ (Freeman 1996: 183). Today, we hear of more elaborate rationales.

When a woman of color satisfies both criteria of quantity and quality, according to ‘mainstream’ standards, then her teaching becomes suspect, followed by that category which no one considers a barrier to tenure: service. Criticisms on teaching usually focus on negative evaluations for one particular course, usually a large undergraduate class. The lynchpin argument used to undermine any counter explanations (e.g. ‘all large classes have varied teaching evaluations’) is that the candidate abused her students in the classroom. Note the case of Candidate A, a multiracial lesbian scholar. She had won several prestigious fellowships and authored three books but her department voted against tenure due to concerns about her teaching, primarily, and service, secondarily. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* reports that,

[a]lthough students applauded [Candidate A] as a well-organized and highly intelligent teacher, they complained that she was impatient and had little interest in helping them grasp key concepts. A report on her tenure bid issued by the political-science department in January 2001 says she even ‘shouted’ at students and ‘commented abrasively on what she saw as their intellectual failings’.

(Wilson 2001: A9)

Candidate A dismissed the charge as ‘absurd’. ‘I don’t yell at students’, she told the *Chronicle* (quoted in Wilson 2001: A9). Candidate B, an Asian American female professor, faced a similar, uncorroborated accusation. She recounts how her department’s tenure committee branded her a bad teacher for calling a student a ‘fool’ for asking a question *without any investigation into the matter*.

No senior faculty would have considered ‘impatience’, ‘high standards’, or any of the other teaching traits attributed to Candidates A and B outrageous for a male Novitiate, especially one who is young, ambitious, and Anglo-European. They would have lauded him (benevolently, perhaps even nostalgically) as a ‘young man in a hurry’ who does not ‘suffer fools gladly’ or whose pedagogical ‘experiments’ may not have worked out as well as hoped; nevertheless, he should be lauded for trying. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this ‘genius’ model is applied liberally to Anglo-European males, often at the expense of non-Anglo-Europeans and women.

Candidate A’s senior colleagues queried why she ‘presumed’ that ‘her research should “trump” the rest of her record’ (Wilson 2001: A9). Candidate A explained

that she was merely following the university's and department's public rhetoric on tenure. The *Chronicle* reports:

Her colleague [an Anglo-European woman] who joined the political-science department the year [Candidate A] did, agrees. 'It was made very, very clear to all of us that we were going to be promoted on the basis of our research, and we should say no to as much as possible, including independent studies with undergraduates, because it was not in our interest', says [the colleague], an associate professor who earned tenure in 1999.

(Wilson 2001: A9)

The academy penalized Candidates A and B for following its own incentive structure. Candidate A had produced research at a prodigious rate, as encouraged by her department, but that worked against her at tenure time due to perceptions of 'presumptuousness'. Candidate B, like all assistant professors, sought to publish as much as possible before tenure but her department questioned her scholarly integrity in doing so. (*'Is she publishing just to get tenure? What about afterwards?'*)

Service matters in contradictory ways for women of color faculty. Departments may hire a woman of color precisely to satisfy a certain constituency of students and/or courses yet refuse to acknowledge such at tenure time. 'I just felt very, very pressured to do all this service stuff', said Candidate C, an African American woman scholar denied tenure, '[It] is not taken seriously at tenure time because they're primarily looking at publications' (quoted in Lederman 1995: A19). Even so, the candidate herself may consider service an important part of her job. After all, how many mentors do minority, female students have? Students, also, take the opportunity to seek counsel and learn from 'one of their own', but these politics and their institutional implications are silenced or rendered invisible when senior faculty, on the one hand, direct all 'minority' business to 'minority' faculty ('she'll understand, I don't') while, on the other, dismiss such mentoring services as a throw-away category ('service doesn't matter in tenure considerations'). A 'ghettoization' takes effect whereby the woman of color faculty is burdened with increasing service activities that somehow become her sole bailiwick while senior faculty feel free to divest themselves of non-'mainstream' issues and students.

Perversely, the opposite applies as well. Faculty of color with impeccable research and teaching records are sometimes penalized for not performing *enough* 'minority service'. Candidate A's department, for example, defined service solely in terms of activities rendered to the university, such as advising students, rather than those that contributed to the profession, such as organizing international conferences. 'She [Candidate A] wasn't bringing anything back to the school. It was all about her', the *Chronicle* quotes a senior colleague, explaining the department's negative vote. 'That's OK if you don't want anything from the institution, but you can't behave like that and then want them to keep you here' (quoted in Wilson 2001: A9). In a memo evaluating her tenure

bid, Candidate A's personnel committee wrote: 'If [Candidate A] can do so much for students and others at Brown or Harvard or in South Africa while on research leaves, why has she been unwilling to make similar efforts on [our] campus?' (quoted in Wilson 2001: A9).

The academy thus double-binds any talented, non-'mainstream' Novitiate. Officially, departments encourage all members to seek and obtain prestigious fellowships/awards as well as engage in high-profile, external activities to enhance the university's reputation, but privately, those who succeed in doing so suffer from professional competition. What seems really upsetting to the senior colleagues in the cases cited above is that a junior colleague, whether Anglo-European feminist or a woman of color, has achieved *too much*. Accordingly, she cannot assume the position of the Grateful Outsider, forever indebted to her senior colleagues for their gracious admittance into academe. These politics of resentment rarely attend to Anglo-European male Novitiates since they, by definition, are supposed to succeed and graduate into full-blown priesthood. A Latina scholar expresses the no-win situation of this institutional double-bind:

You diminish me when you say that I should not have a problem getting hired because of what I represent and then you turn around once I am hired to deny me many things because of what I represent.

(Quoted in Manrique and Manrique 1999: 108)

All members of the academy, in short, do *not* enjoy equal treatment. The reason: the Anglo-European, Priest-Self *always* sets the standard for the racialized, sexualized Novitiate-Other.

Rule 2: The Anglo-European, Priest-Self Sets the Standard for the Novitiate-Other

As a religious-colonial order, the academy's Priests decide all key matters affecting the Novitiate's future (e.g. raises, grants, sabbaticals, promotions, tenure, recommendations, grades, and so on). In turn, the Novitiate pays tribute in venues material (e.g. conducting research, co-authoring an article, obtaining a grant) or social (e.g. flattery, loyalty). But the colonial nature of the academic priesthood prohibits such reciprocity between an Anglo-European Priest-Self and a racialized, sexualized Novitiate-Other precisely because the latter is defined as a *negation* of the former: that is, the Novitiate-Other cannot graduate into Priest-Selfhood—unless the latter is willing to accept a subordinated *assimilation* (more below).¹³ The very definition of a colonizing Self refers to preserving privileges and power denied to the Other. The Novitiate-Other, then, is relegated to a position of constantly demonstrating to the Anglo-European Priest-Self that she, in effect, can turn into what she is not.¹⁴ Note this quote from Candidate C's Dean, seemingly demonstrating her university's supportive

environment but really highlighting the candidate's *difference* from the university norm:

It was entirely appropriate . . . for [the university] to create a position for an able black candidate like [Candidate C], and to go to 'unusual lengths'—including extra research support and teaching-load reductions—to help her succeed.

(Quoted in Lederman 1995: A19)

Accordingly, when Candidate C cannot conform to the norms set out for her, then *she* has failed, not the university.

Evaluations of teaching underscore this point. Gayatri Spivak (1998: 473) has observed the following dynamics in the multicultural classroom:

What actually happens in a typical liberal-multicultural classroom 'at its best'? On a given day we are reading a text from one national origin. The group in the classroom from that particular national origin in the general polity can identify with the richness of the texture of the 'culture' in question, often through a haze of nostalgia . . . People from other national origins in the classroom (other, that is, than Anglo) relate sympathetically but superficially, in an aura of same difference. The Anglo relates benevolently to everything, 'knowing about other cultures' in a relativist glow.

(Spivak 1998: 473)

But what happens when multicultural education strays from this 'best' scenario, as it usually does? Students tend to displace their sense of anxiety, discomfort and frustration with the message (e.g. racism, sexism, colonialism, imperialism) onto the messenger, usually through teaching evaluations. For a course on multiculturalism, for example, scattered comments like 'the class contains too much conflict especially when discussing issues of race', 'it is too intense', 'I felt frustrated about the problems of the world', tend to receive disproportionate attention even when the rest of the evaluations would show an overwhelmingly positive response to the course and the instructor. Other typical comments target the woman of color faculty's behavioral traits: 'She's tough/impatient', 'She doesn't take student ideas seriously'.

Candidates A and B, for example, were blamed for 'poor' teaching evaluations on primarily one course. Interestingly, the course for both candidates involved a large, undergraduate class on international relations. To popular impressions, international relations conjures notions of states, power, militaries, wars, treaties, and negotiations. Not only are these activities naturalized as 'masculine' but they are ceded almost exclusively in the West to Anglo-Europeans, a legacy of international relations' colonial history.¹⁵ A woman of color professor, then, faces two immediate prejudices when walking into a class on international relations: neither white nor male, she could not be taken seriously on the subject. A woman of color like National Security Advisor and former Stanford professor, Condoleezza Rice, could overcome such prejudices by demonstrating her

commitment to conventional (masculinized) canons of the field. But what if the woman of color professor takes a critical or dissident perspective? Where lies her 'authority', then, according to the 'mainstream' undergraduate? All around the typical student swirls society's stereotypes, augmented by the media, about 'minorities' and 'women'. On what basis can the 'mainstream' student, whether Anglo-European or Otherwise, accept as an authority figure—a producer of knowledge—people who look like 'The Jeffersons' or Janet Jackson or their cleaning woman or the prostitute who died in that movie? Granted, the media stereotype Anglo-Europeans as well. For every 'George Jefferson' there is an 'Archie Bunker', but Anglo-European actors cover a far wider range of characters than minority ones. For every 'Archie Bunker' there is a 'James Bond', 'Luke Skywalker', or 'Rick' in *Casablanca*.

Post-adolescent students may be excused for such responses. They may not be aware of the politics of their comments nor their impact on professors' careers. The problem arises when senior faculty take student evaluations out of context. Studies show that women of color faculty consistently receive problematic teaching evaluations. Donald L. Rubin (1992) demonstrates the impact of race/ethnicity on undergraduate evaluations of teaching in the following experiment. He showed a picture of an Asian (Chinese) teaching assistant (TA) and an Anglo-European one to an unspecified undergraduate class. For both pictures, he played the *same* taped lecture. A certain percentage of students reported hearing an 'accent' for the Asian TA whereas none attributed such to the Anglo-European. Students also claimed *less* comprehension of the material for the Asian TA than for the Anglo-European. More generally, studies show that students favor male professors over female ones,¹⁶ regardless of race, even when exhibiting the same behavioral characteristics (Geffen 1990; Gordon 1991; Williams 1991).

So why would academics, normally so fixated on accuracy and precision, misconstrue teaching evaluations? Perhaps because they, too, displace their anxieties. We surmise that senior faculty tend to pathologize the faculty of color by labeling her teaching as 'bad' or 'intimidating', with rumor, innuendo, and lies mixed in to strengthen the bias. This act of Othering allows the senior faculty to escape from interrogating the conditions that crystallized difference in the classroom in the first place. Like many 'mainstream' students, senior faculty may not want to question why they feel so uncomfortable, shaken, or disturbed when confronted with the content of what women of color teach or may represent outside of an established Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity category. It's much easier to individualize what is otherwise a structural problem and blame the faculty of color.

Put differently, senior faculty, mostly Anglo-European, middle-class, heterosexual, and male, could not—would not—concede their position as the standard in the classroom.¹⁷ Accordingly, they could not—would not—understand the *difference* that a woman of color faculty, whether straight or gay, brings to the classroom. When faculty of color teach about 'globalization' or 'multiculturalism', their mere presence accentuates a contradiction of privilege in a supposedly liberal environment. Aida Hurtado has observed that,

ultimately white privilege depends on its members not betraying the unspoken, nonconscious power dynamics socialized in the intimacy of their families. White solidarity [or privilege] may on first sight appear an oxymoron . . . [but] most [privileged white people] can detect when whiteness is being questioned and its privilege potentially dismantled . . . [M]echanisms in the academy are geared to the maintenance of structural power for white people as a whole.

(Hurtado 1996: 149)

Rule 3: Separate Race from Gender from Class

Technical adherence to Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity treats race, gender, and class as separate categories. Such compartmentalization prohibits a deeper, more profound understanding of discrimination: that is, the intersections *between* and *among* race–gender–class. Studies conducted within this compartmentalized framework reproduce this bias. Nowhere in MIT’s (1999) supposedly pathbreaking study of gender discrimination, for example, does it consider the issue of race—not to mention the triple impact of race, gender, and class—on a woman faculty’s career. Indeed, the report speaks from a position of implicit whiteness. It recognizes that ‘discrimination consists of a pattern of *powerful but unrecognized assumptions and attitudes that work systematically against women faculty even in the light of obvious good will*’ (emphasis added). Yet it confesses that ‘[m]ost of us thought that the Civil Rights laws and Affirmative Action had solved gender “discrimination”’. Most faculty of color would not risk such a presupposition.

For example, reports on tenured faculty rarely break down according to gender *and* race. The latest survey of tenured faculty in political science, as a case in point, shows that women comprise 22.2 per cent of all full-time faculty in the discipline (Brandes et al. 2001: 320). In a separate category marked for minority faculty, the survey indicates that 5.3 per cent are African American; 2.5 per cent Asian; 2.1 per cent Latino; and 0.3 per cent Native American (Brandes et al. 2001: 320). But we don’t know how many women of color are included in either the ‘women’ or ‘ethnic’ categories. Women of color, in short, remain invisible. The same erasure applies to salary discrepancies. It is important to note that women professors, on average, earn 91 cents on the dollar compared to their male counterparts. Men, in general, enjoy a salary advantage of 10 per cent in both public and private top-paying institutions (Bellas 2002), but it is equally significant to learn about salary discrepancies between women of color faculty and their Anglo-European female counterparts as well as compared with male colleagues, both Anglo-European and Other. Hiding differences *within* categories of race–gender–class serves only to buttress the academy’s existing hierarchy of power and privilege.

Another organizing principle is class. This phantom factor in the academy affects academic ‘success’ throughout the ranks from undergraduate to graduate students, assistant to tenured professors:

The distribution of students to different-ranked institutions is linked to their social class and sex background, regardless of undergraduate achievement and rank of undergraduate institution attended. This inequality confers on certain groups and classes clear advantages in participation within the academic hierarchy. Working-class students, from highly-ranked undergraduate institutions and with high achievement levels, cannot expect to attend the same-ranked graduate schools as students with similar merit backgrounds from the middle and upper middle classes.

(Lang 1987: 456–7)

Class takes an unexpected toll, emotionally and institutionally. A senior colleague once confided that she did not vote for a tenure-track post for one of the co-authors of this article because the latter did not graduate from an Ivy League institution; therefore, her doctorate was valued less institutionally. This comment, though casually delivered, dented the co-author's self-confidence and exacted precious psychic and emotional energy to sort through. Coming from a working-class and 'foreign' background, the co-author had to engage the contradictions of racial, gender, and class politics and fully address her position within the academy before she could overcome feelings of *gratefulness* for admission into the hallowed halls of academe.¹⁸

The US academy's class structure constructs faculty of color into members of a domestic underclass or foreign migrant community, regardless of personal history. A Hong Kong-born female professor, for example, found that even undergraduate students challenged her qualification to lecture on Machiavelli or J.S. Mill ('Learn English!' one student admonished her) despite her doctorate in Western political theory from Princeton University (Lee 1997).

This implicit class and racial hierarchy 'exiles' the faculty of color. Faculty of color are allowed in only if 'good', thereby propagating a sense of institutional *noblesse oblige*.¹⁹ For this reason, the academy's gatekeepers feel an extra sense of indignation, if not outrage, when faculty of color refuse to play the Grateful Outsider. Those few who are willing to take on this role are rewarded amply in contrast to those who are not. ('I'm better than you even though we are both minorities in this institution.') Thus a fierce competition often sears through relations among faculty of color, often causing petty in-fighting and other types of fragmentation.

Rule 4: Allow Stereotypes

The US academy rarely questions embedded stereotypes. Note, for example, this article from the March 1993 issue of *PS: Political Science & Politics*. It purports to dispense friendly though frank advice to untenured faculty through the voice of an avuncular character, Uncle Wuffle. He uses a supposedly humorous device to caution assistant professors from overstepping their bounds with senior colleagues:

Wuffle says: 'Assistant professor like turtle, what not stuck out can't be chopped off.'

(Wuffle 1993: 89)

Not one of *PS*'s readers has protested in print this racist reference to Charlie Chan and other fortune-cookie imaginaries of Anglo-American culture. If this kind of racist imagery passes through a representative journal like *PS* without commentary, then what can faculty of color expect from the academy at large? For women of color, this colonialist-imperialist legacy leaves them few identities other than that of slave, servant, or prostitute. The academy's reputation as a 'marketplace of ideas' takes on quite another meaning for women of color. Sumi Cho writes about Candidate D, an Asian American female professor who concentrated on US-China trade at a major business school (Cho 1997). Despite receiving consistently high praise for research, teaching, and service from both the university and her department, Candidate D was turned down for tenure. Her department's reason: 'the Wharton School is not interested in China-related research' (quoted in Cho 1997: 207). A more plausible explanation for her chair's negative evaluation of her case, asserted Candidate D, was her rejection of his sexual advances. Candidate D filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC); later, the case went to the Supreme Court which ruled in her favor. Nevertheless, the school and university administration resisted reassessing Candidate D's case under the guise of First Amendment claims to 'academic freedom'. This apparent stance on principle, notes Cho, veiled an implicit judgment by the academy that this Asian American's case *must have no merit*. Popular culture perpetually portrays Asian women as prostitutes or mail-order brides, teeming from the 'entertainment industries' that cater to US military bases in Asia. Their singular goal: to marry an Anglo-European male, thereby achieving 'security' for life. Why should it be different for Asian women who happen to be professors?

An Asian American female professor comments on the implications of this entrenched stereotype for Asian and Asian American female faculty:

If we act like the [passive] Singapore Girl, in the case of some professors, then they feel 'she is [unequal to me]'. If we don't act like the Singapore Girl, then [our] accomplishments must have derived from 'a relationship with the chair'.

(Quoted in Cho 1997: 209)

She could have added: 'or any male'.

Many women adjust to the academic priesthood by masculinizing themselves through appearance, speech, behavior, and norms.²⁰ Sometimes this strategy incurs sexual slurs of 'bitch' or 'dyke' but many are willing to accept such name-calling in exchange for the power and resources they accrue. Alternatively, others assimilate by conforming to religious-colonial notions of femininity: deferential, loyal, and chaste when young; maternal and managerial when older. These women may receive greater protection with this strategy but they also risk marginalization later in their careers.

For women of color, neither strategy works in the long-run. Not only must they contend with the same sexual slurs, but they also encounter those that are specifically racialized and class-based. For example, African American women risk being labeled the ghetto 'hussy'; Latinas, the uncontrollable, barrio 'spitfire'; Asians, the red-taloned, red-light district 'dragon lady'. Ironically, these stereotypes heighten their sexualization since women of color are not allowed, like Anglo-European women, to 'pass' for men. Neither can women of color rely on a strategy of feminization: e.g. African American women become the 'slave' or 'mammy'; Latinas, the 'slut'; Asians, the 'lotus blossom baby'.

Behind this racialized hierarchy operates a sexual and classed one: that is, what it means to be a 'woman' in the academy.²¹

Rule 5: Heteronormativity for All Women

Two Anglo-European feminists identify the contradictory demands that the academy places on the professional woman:

If the junior woman acquiesces in departmental demands for service and teaching, senior colleagues might really believe they like her; they might wonder why more professional women are not like her. However, when it comes time to make decisions about tenure, these same senior faculty are as likely to find, sadly, that she is just not 'professional' enough . . . Conversely, a competing stereotype of women in professional settings is that they are very 'professional': they publish, they speak up, and they do not seem to be especially nurturing. These women seem to be masculine, somehow, and do not satisfy senior colleagues' expectations of what a woman should be. Again, regardless of research records or actual behavior, departments may deny these women tenure because they are 'difficult' and no one would want to have them as colleagues.

(Anonymous and Anonymous 1999: 92)

Race complicates these contradictions, especially when Grateful Outsiders discriminate against their own. In Candidate A's case, her department claimed that no discrimination could have occurred since its senior faculty of color also opposed tenure for Candidate A. This presumed solidarity within compartmentalized categories of race vs gender vs sexuality hides subtle fissures (e.g. homophobia) within. A colleague of Candidate A's explained it this way to the *Chronicle*:

The black and Hispanic scholars who have opposed[Candidate A's] tenure bid were offended that she didn't act the way they thought a young minority professor should, says[a colleague]. 'It's really tricky for an untenured person',[she] adds, the only black woman in her department. 'You have to convince your colleagues they're lucky to have you on the one hand, and on the other you have to subscribe

to all of their stereotypes about you and capitulate to a variety of ideas and demands on your time'.

(Quoted in Wilson 2001: A10)

Himani Bannerji places this gatekeeping function within a larger context of race-gender-class privilege:

This silent social organization of labour on the grounds of 'race' and gender has an implicit racist-sexism embedded in it, though presumably no one has explicitly instructed these [Gatekeepers] . . . in an ideology and explicit administration of racism . . . the norm has been diffused in the [academy] among other things, through a convention in hiring, through a systematic physical absence, which has incrementally created the white[s]' sense of their 'normal' space or territory.

(Bannerji 1995: 136-7)

UNDERLYING POWER RELATIONS

Power makes these rules possible. We find four constitutive types, in particular, 'the liberal paradox', 'double-double standards', 'gender and class collapsed into race', and 'colonization of difference and knowledge'.

Power Relation 1: The Liberal Paradox

A liberal paradox confounds the US academy. It pretends to judge an individual's record according to *impartial* and *rational* rules and procedures when, in fact, they are highly *subjective* and *culturally defined*. At the same time, pressures for globalization (interpreted as liberalism writ large) compel the academy to hire those very people whose subjectivity and cultural background clash most with the academy's colonial priesthood.

While committed to 'diversity', the academy cannot accommodate it. That is, liberalism presumes its universalism to encompass difference. Tolerance usually serves as a code to mask the politics behind who is privileged with universality and who is deemed differentially particular. When a breach occurs, liberalism targets the bearer of difference rather than its source which stems more accurately from a conflict between the different structural locations of the faculty of color and those who espouse liberalism's supposedly universal standard. The liberal paradox allows little *negotiation* between the bearer of difference and liberalism's rigid parochialism (sold as benevolent cosmopolitanism). The former, typically, must conform to the academy's version of diversity.

Such logic concludes, rationally, that if the woman of color candidate still doesn't exhibit conventional markers of academic success, then it must be *her* fault. Nowhere is there a consideration that the standards for evaluation may

reflect silent practices of 'race' and its attendant stereotypes such that the candidate would need to overcome *additional* burdens before succeeding.

Power Relation 2: Double-Double Standards

A public/private double standard operates within the overall Self/Other, male/female ones already discussed. That is, the academy resists publicly recognizing the otherness of the Other ('we are all individuals') even though such otherness is assumed privately ('we hired her to teach about Others'). Since women of color faculty satisfy two Affirmative Action requirements—gender and race—the academy typically subjects them to two sources of pressure. Accordingly, women of color faculty feel they have less room to make mistakes, grow, learn, and thereby succeed. Note this remark by a Latina scholar:

Of course I've heard via a number of sources in other departments that there are faculty here who say I am an affirmative action hire. They see me as this Hispanic schmuck who was willing to come to their college even though I know they are disappointed that I don't look like their stereotype of a Hispanic. And so I have to pay the price of having to show them how good I really am. It is not enough for me to do my job. You have to be very good so it overcomes the fact that you are not from here. And you can't afford to make a mistake because the mistake you make will not be judged as an honest mistake but because of what you are—a foreign Hispanic woman.

(Quoted in Manrique and Manrique 1999: 109)

Affirmative Action requirements further engender an institutional environment whereby formal representation ('a minority person') becomes conflated with substantive participation ('we welcome her views'). All committees in the academy, for instance, seek women and faculty of color as members to satisfy affirmative action requirements. But no rules *ensure* equal voice because of structural asymmetries. No assistant professor, regardless of race or gender, would challenge a senior colleague's decision—without risking retribution at tenure time. At most, junior colleagues proffer suggestions. If not taken, they are dropped discreetly. For the woman of color faculty, she is twice in demand but for half as much authority. And what is this power for? To reproduce the academy's version of subjectivity for the woman of color faculty.

Power Relation 3: Gender and Class Collapsed into Race

Here, race plays a critical, intervening role, especially in relations between women in the academy. Anglo-European women occupy a fundamentally ambivalent position within any institution of power run by Anglo-European men. While subjected to similar processes of othering and exile, (heterosexual)

Anglo-European women nonetheless enjoy a special status because they are the ones who 'reproduce more people like [Anglo-European men] . . . [They are his] accessories to power' (Hurtado 1996: 136). Though never 'close to full participants', Anglo-European women are rewarded if they comply and punished if they do not. As bell hooks notes:

No doubt white patriarchal men must have found it amusing and affirming that many of the white women who had so vehemently and fiercely denounced domination were quite happy to assume the role of oppressor and/or exploiter if it meant that they could wield power equally with white men. Nor should it have surprised us that those individual white women who remained true to the radical and/or revolutionary vision of feminist politics, who had been among the vanguard of the struggle, were soon marginalized as feminist politics entered the mainstream.

(hooks 1995: 99)

Bernice Sandler (1986: 13) finds, for instance, that women of color faculty 'are more likely than white women to be excluded from the informal and social aspects of their departments and institutions—sometimes by white women as well as white men. The isolation these women face is exacerbated when they are few or no women of color who can serve as mentors'. Studies of this double-edged position apply historically to relations between 'native' and 'white' women in other patriarchal institutions such as the household ('maid' and 'madam'), the plantation ('slave' and 'mistress'), the media ('character actor' and 'star'), and the corporation ('secretary' and 'boss'). Why would the academy be exempt? In each instance, colonial patriarchy casts the Anglo-European woman as the colonizer-Self's proper, civilizing Other or 'angel of progress' (McClintock 1992). The 'native' woman, in contrast, seduces 'dangerously', threatening 'civilization as we know it'.²² As in Anglo-European society generally, the academy's woman of color remains the 'outsider-within' (Carty 1991; Collins 1990).

Power Relation 4: Colonization of Difference and Knowledge

To receive protection, Novitiate-Others must behave according to the Priest-Self's image of who and what they are. The academy reinforces this stipulation by valuing one type of research from the Novitiate-Other in contrast to another from the Novitiate-Self. The former, in brief, must stay within certain boundaries of knowledge-production: i.e. the research should be *about* the Other *for* the Self *within* global capitalism.²³ As Trinh T. Minh-Ha (1991: 72) observes, '[i]ndigenous anthropology allows white anthropology to further anthropologize Man'. Much less condoned would be research *about* the Self *from* the perspective of the Other *beyond* global capitalist interests. This would transgress the academy's religious-colonial order whereby the Novitiate-Other *reinforces*, not instructs,

the Priest-Self. The Novitiate-Self, in contrast, can conduct research on anything, even attacks on the Priest-Self (e.g. postmodernism).²⁴ Although penalties also exist for not towing the establishment line, the academy's liberal ideology can kick in to forgive *this* exception, *this* case, *this* individual. Thus, not only are faculty who are not *of* a particular racial-sexual-class group de-legitimated; research which is not *in* a particular mode, which lacks the dominant focus or explores topics in non-dominant ways, suffers from the same de-legitimation.²⁵

Uma Narayan explains how a pre-scripted role of Native Informant unfolds for the woman of color in the academy:

When individuals from Third-World backgrounds, including feminists, enter the discursive spaces of mainstream Western academic contexts, they enter a field of Preoccupations where a variety of concerns about inclusion, diversity, and multiculturalism are already in place and being played out. These concerns are often strongly shaped by the understandings of mainstream Westerners, who have numerical as well as institutional power in academic settings. These concerns also become Preoccupations in another sense, when they construct roles that function as pre-existing locations within mainstream Western academic settings and discursive encounters that Third-World individuals find themselves occupying.

(Narayan 1997: 123)

Not surprisingly, women of color faculty often feel alienated, lonely, and frustrated. One woman of color professor analogizes the situation to being 'lost in space' (quoted in Manrique and Manrique 1999: 118). Another writes,

It was not just extreme encounters with racism, or sexism, or homophobia that were most debilitating to my confidence, but also the unquestioned assumptions about who and what was worth studying that wore most consistently on my determination.

(Cohen 1996: 185)

Without institutional support, especially crucial since they work within institutions and must satisfy institutional 'standards', women of color faculty often find themselves giving in or dropping out. This strategy, though, is 'much less an outcome of their own psychological predisposition and rather an achievement of their own [colleagues] in keeping with social relations of power which intrinsically structure[s] [the academy]' (Bannerji 1995: 139).

How do we transform these social relations of power?

CONCLUSION: TRANSFORMATIONS

Liberalism's emancipatory focus on the individual tends to overlook structural/institutional practices of racism, sexism, and classism, whether these are consciously intended or not. Aida Hurtado characterizes Anglo-European society's

liberal double talk as a form of privileged 'play'. Speaking in the voice of the 'white man', she delineates how power is applied, sustained, and rationalized:

I will develop elaborate pseudo rules that will allocate how much power every person and child will have in my play, and I will call it 'merit'. Merit will be defined by me (or those like me) and will have the semblance of objective rules of achievement. When I am questioned about how the rules were developed, I will claim exclusive wisdom for their origins. I will develop mass testing techniques that will be skewed in favor of knowledge only available to those I have determined belong to my group. Everybody will have access to the test but few will have access to the knowledge in the test. When a sizable number of nongroup members are successful, I will change the test and the rules of the game. If my people are failing or do not meet the objective standards I have set, I will find exceptions to the rule that will leave our privilege untouched. The casting of the play is inherited. Those most like me are determined through family ties of race and class.

(Hurtado 1996: 155)

In short, the academy reflects a colonizing system at work. It does so through (at least) five ruling discourses and their implicit power relations. The rules of subaltern standing are: (1) institutional procedures mask substantive decision-making; (2) the Priest-Self sets the standard for the Novitiate-Other; (3) gender and class are collapsed into race; (4) allow stereotypes; and (5) apply heteronormativity to *all* women in the academy. This discourse rests on the power to deny liberalism's internal contradictions: that is, rules and procedures are impartial and rational when they are, in practice, highly subjective and culturally defined, thereby placing the Novitiate-Other under double double standards that colonize both difference and knowledge.²⁶

Given this rigged context, a particular strategy of success becomes apparent for faculty of color: (1) conform to the academy's religious-colonial order; (2) exhibit *acceptably* stereotypical behavior; (3) suppress one's racial consciousness; and (4) conduct non-threatening, empirical fieldwork that reports on the Other rather than theory-building critiques that re-center the Other as an authorizing agent. Table 1 summarizes the academy's version of its liberal procedures and their structural outcomes for women of color faculty.

Alternatively, we may begin to transform the academy's institutional asymmetries. We need to overcome our social conditioning of 'injury' to *educate* one another as well as 'the oppressor[s], too, [or] at least give them a chance to make an option for justice' (Zarate 1989: 41). More than ever, people of color need the support of a community whose attendant relations differ from those described here. Such a community would allow for a reflexivity that acknowledges various groups' *different* social locations, power asymmetries, and implicit privileges, thereby preventing the academy from playing its 'white man's game' under the guise of 'liberal' education.

Table 1 Discourse on tenure for the Other

<i>Underlying power relations</i>	<i>Rules of subaltern standing</i>	<i>Public rhetoric</i>	<i>Generalized outcome</i>
The liberal paradox: highly subjective, culturally defined institutional criteria judge individuals with alternative subjectivities and cultural norms	Mask substantive decision-making with institutional procedures	Rational and open procedures evaluate research, teaching, and service	Conformity or exile: few could afford the illusion of rationality and objectivity in tenure decision-making
Double double standards (male vs female, public vs private, Self vs Other)	The Priest-Self <i>always</i> sets the standard for the Novitiate-Other	Everyone is treated and evaluated equally	Normalcy or pathology: senior faculty remain ignorant of <i>how</i> to know the Other, <i>when</i> judicious interventions are needed, and <i>what</i> 'fairness' entails
Race>Gender+Class	Separate race from gender from class	Compliance with Affirmative Action & Equal Opportunity guidelines ensure diversity and representation	Tokenism: 'representation' (a warm body) is conflated with 'participation' (an active voice)
Colonization of difference and knowledge	Allow stereotypes, including heteronormativity for women	The academy is a 'marketplace of ideas'	Native informants and gatekeepers: the academy retains its religious-colonial order

Some initial steps include the following.

- *Rehaul standard definitions of knowledge and instruction.* In the social sciences, generally, and international relations, especially, the conventional distinction between ‘domestic’ and ‘international’ subfields should be dismantled. Such a division perpetuates a religious-colonial myth: that is, the Self is separate from and independent of the alien Other; accordingly, the Self needs to protect itself from the Other either through conversion or conquest. In the global political economy today, the Anglo-European Self aims to convert/conquer Others with American-style democratization or neoliberal economic policies under the rubric of ‘globalization’. In the academy, the Anglo-European Self aims to convert/conquer Others with American-style hegemonic education under the rubric of ‘multiculturalism’. Just as protestors now swell against the onslaught of G8-globalization at various sites around the world, so faculties of color (whether ‘native’ or ‘foreign’) are wising up to the religious-colonial politics at play. Stolid institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank finally realize that they cannot continue with business as usual. Neither can the academy. One step towards reform would be for the academy to educate its colonial-priesthood on race-gender-class relations *within* the academy and how they reflect or sustain generalized conditions of race-gender-class in the world at large (‘how do *you* relate to your colleagues/students and why?’). By extension, the academy needs to re-evaluate teaching evaluations. Questions on context, for instance, need to be asked: e.g. what’s the racial, gender, and class composition of the class? If they are mostly Anglo-European, male, and suburban, shouldn’t we *expect* more critical/emotional statements on teaching evaluations in a class on American imperialism than, say, American constitutional law? If there are such emotional reactions, how does one read them most appropriately?
- *Communicate across disciplines, methods, subjects, activities, and sites.* As mentioned earlier, the academy still abides by an informal, asymmetrical weighting of ‘quantitative’ over ‘qualitative’ research in journals and books. Not coincidentally, this asymmetry inherently valorizes a Western, masculinized hegemony that emanates worldwide, thereby de-legitimizing Other sources of knowledge as quaint, exotic, peripheral, and dependent. Knowledge of the Other may enhance a student’s ‘cosmopolitanism’ (after all, that is the definition of a liberal arts education) but it serves as a fine accessory only (e.g. learning a foreign language) for more essential endeavors (e.g. ‘finding a job’). Instead, the academy needs to recognize the fundamental *intimacy* between Self and Other, education and culture, knowledge and economics. That is, knowledge of the Other is central to understanding and liberating the Self. This realization removes the Self from a constantly defensive and wearying stance. One step towards Self-liberation is to revise the academy’s dichotomization of ‘hard’ vs ‘soft’ science, ‘quantitative’ vs ‘qualitative’ research, ‘objective’ vs ‘subjective’ data. Put differently, the academy needs

to facilitate greater communication *across* various disciplines, methods, subjects, activities, and sites. Journals with contending audiences could sponsor joint symposia, for example,²⁷ just as Anglo-European faculty and their Other colleagues could co-teach courses or collaborate on research that combine previously disparate subjects such as American imperialism and American constitutional law. Additionally, conferences could be organized between academies in the West and other sites of knowledge production such as women's colleges or organizations in other parts of the world on issues of common interest as well as global concern.

- *Build coalitions.* We need to share our common struggles in the academy and organize for our own growth. In addition, we need a broader, more transnational perspective about our social relations. Otherwise, we may miss potential alliances and allies in an ongoing struggle for equality and justice. If colonial history has taught us anything, it is that we need to coalesce with one another. We need to transform the asymmetries that differentiate and alienate us as informed by ethnicity, gender, or class. At the same time, the academy needs our revitalization with public interrogations, not private commiserations. This paper offers one, preliminary effort towards that end.

In sum, a thriving, democratic society needs to realize its connections with the larger world—especially in these globalizing times. As Anthony Arblaster (1984: 10) warned almost two decades ago, the West faces a creeping complacency that could turn liberalism into a “dead dogma” rather than a “living truth”. The academy risks the same.

Anna M. Agathangelou
Global Change Institute
Nicosia, Cyprus

L.H.M. Ling
New School University
New York, NY, USA

Notes

- 1 The term ‘women of color’ does not designate an ‘essentialized’ subjectivity. Rather, it serves as shorthand to refer to the *perturbations* associated with the presence of ‘other’ women in the territory of white subjects, thereby ‘violat[ing] the preestablished convention of the “normalcy” of their workplace’ (Bannerji 1995: 136).
- 2 We use the term ‘Anglo-European’ to underscore that ‘white’ qualifies as an ethnicity also.
- 3 From 1982 to 1992, however, the number of African American female doctorates

- dropped by 20 per cent (survey conducted by the American Council on Education in 1993, quoted in NRC 1995).
- 4 Political science has the lowest proportion of minority students in graduate programs within the social sciences, lagging behind the natural sciences and engineering (Babco 2000: 297).
 - 5 Although, the National Research Council (NRC 1995) reports that women received 49 per cent of doctorates in 1993.
 - 6 We consider race–gender–class to be mutually constructing categories. This configuration reinforces other types of oppression as well, such as sexuality and disability. For example, the academy may discriminate against a white, middle-class lesbian but might still accord her some ‘white’ privileges denied to a black, middle-class lesbian, not to mention a black, working-class one.
 - 7 Of course, all of us *have* race, gender, and class. In terms of institutional decision-making, however, they surface as issues only for people who are not identified as Anglo-European or ‘mainstream’. This categorization reflects the dominant discourse on race relations which allows the fiction that Anglo-European, middle-class males escape the narrow confines of race–gender–class and Anglo-European females, of race and class though not of gender.
 - 8 The *Chronicle of Higher Education* reports that full-time employment declined by 1 per cent from 1991 to 1995; part-time employment, in contrast, rose by 18 per cent and part-time faculty at 2-year colleges surged from 19 to 31 per cent of faculty totals (Schneider 1998).
 - 9 See McPherson and Schapiro (1999) for a more detailed analysis of economic and other structural pressures faced by US liberal arts colleges and universities.
 - 10 This bias persists despite an increasing trend towards collaborative publications in the social sciences, generally, and political science, specifically (Fisher et al. 1998).
 - 11 Recent studies on gender equity in international relations affirm the importance and salience of these issues for this subfield. The issues involved are both personal and social. More women faculty (18 per cent), for example, tend to have never married compared to their male colleagues (13 per cent); once married, more women are divorced (11 per cent) than men (5 per cent); more women remain childless (58 per cent) than men (38 per cent); for those with children, more men (15 per cent) have more than three children than women (7 per cent). These data come from research conducted by Marie Henehan (Vanderbilt University) and Meredith Reid Sarkees (Niagara University) for the International Studies Association’s (ISA) Committee for Study on the Status of Women in International Relations, begun in 1992. See the *ISA Newsletter* for September 1996, February 1997, and July 1997.
 - 12 According to Sarkees and McGlen (1999), such backlash continues unabated in political science today.
 - 13 Some may dispute that assimilation always implies subordination. Are not covert rebellions/resistances possible? We contend, however, that such strategies involve too many intricacies and too much capitulation to sustain in the long-run.
 - 14 For examples of Anglo-European androcentrism taught as the classroom norm, see Guinier (1997) and Cohn (1987).

- 15 The sub-field itself affirms this bias as noted by Ann Tickner at a roundtable sponsored by the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 2000 (Brandes et al. 2001: 322–3).
- 16 See Lin (1984), Basow (1987), Kierstead (1988), Amott and Matthei (1991) and Brusckhe (1993).
- 17 Studies of organization management in the West affirm that the Anglo-European, middle-class, heterosexual male remains the implicit standard from which all 'diversity' is measured (Nkomo and Cox 1997).
- 18 For other works that examine the impact of class on academic careers, see Szymanski (1983), Ryan and Sackrey (1984), Lang (1984), Karen (1991), Tokarczyk and Fay (1993), Grusky (1994), and Dews and Law (1995).
- 19 A colleague reports that, in a recent tenure meeting for an Anglo-European woman, allegations of racism against the candidate came up but senior professors dismissed them as 'not an issue'. While it is admirable that these senior faculty did not succumb to unsubstantiated rumors to ruin a candidate's tenure decision, our analysis here questions whether such *noblesse oblige* would have been extended to the candidate had she not conformed to the academy's designation of the *proper* Novitiate.
- 20 A report from the Association of American Colleges, 'Success and Survival Strategies for Women Faculty Members', recommends against 'typical feminine behavior' for female professors: e.g. 'baking cookies for meetings', 'answering the communal phone', 'cleaning up after meetings', 'doing needlework in the presence of colleagues', 'apologetic speech', and 'presenting a "sweet" image by always smiling, nodding agreement and refusing to take a strong stand' (*Chronicle of Higher Education* 15 July 1992: A13).
- 21 We thank one of our anonymous reviewers for this point.
- 22 See Enloe (1989), Stoler (1991, 1997), and Ling (2000).
- 23 For a counter-critique, see Fromm (1986).
- 24 See, for example, Agathangelou and Ling (1997).
- 25 We thank one of our anonymous reviewers for this point.
- 26 For this reason, we dispute claims that '[c]onservative, white heterosexual men . . . are monitored like parolees, while homosexuals, feminists and people of color get away with comparative murder' (Tanenhaus 1998: 35). The most recent cries of indignation come from Kors and Silverglate (1998).
- 27 This could include joint symposia on topics of common concern sponsored by a Western-based journal and another located elsewhere in the world, with the proceedings published in both journals and in both languages.

Acknowledgements

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the International Studies Association (ISA), 16–21 February 1999, Washington, DC, and at Seattle University through the sponsorship of the Wismer Chairs and the Center for Social Justice in Society. We thank the following for their comments: Janni

Aragon, Margaret Chon, Kyle D. Killian, Augusta del Zotto, Kathleen Jones, and two anonymous reviewers.

References

- Agathangelou, A. and L.H.M. Ling. 1997. 'Post-Colonial Dissident IR: Transforming Master Narratives of Sovereignty in Greco-Turkish Cyprus', *Studies of Political Economy* 54: 7-38.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 1993. *The Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- 1998. *Doing Better: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1997-98*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Amott, T. and J. Matthei. 1991. *Race, Gender and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the United States*. Boston: South End Press.
- Anonymous and Anonymous. 1999. 'Tenure in a Chilly Climate', *PS: Political Science & Politics* March 32(1): 91-9.
- Arblaster, A. 1984. *The Rise and Decline of Western Liberalism*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Babco, E. 2000. *Professional Women and Minorities: A Total Human Resources Data Compendium*, thirteenth edition. Washington, DC: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology.
- Bannerji, H. 1995. *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism, and Anti-Racism*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Basow, S.A. 1987. 'Evaluations of College Professors: Effect of Professor's Sex-type and Sex and Student's Sex', *Psychology Reports* 60(2): 671-8.
- Bell, D. 1993. *Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bell, S. and J. Gordon. 1999. 'Scholarship—The New Dimension to Equity Issues for Academic Women', *Women's Studies International Forum* 22(6): 645-58.
- Bellas, M. 2002. 'Faculty salary and Faculty Distribution Fact Sheet, 2001-2002'. Washington, D.C.: Association of American University Professors (AAUP).
- Blum, D.E. 1991. 'Old Issues Unresolved', *Chronicle of Higher Education* 9 October: A1.
- Brandes, L., E. Buker, S. Burgess, C. Cook, J. Flammang, S. Geiger, S. Okin, B. Yoon and M. Ackelsberg. 2001. 'The Status of Women in Political Science: Female Participation in the Professoriate and the Study of Women and Politics in the Discipline', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34(2): 319-26.
- Brann, E.T.H. 1999. 'The American College as the Place for Liberal Learning', *Daedalus* 128(1): 151-72.
- Bruschke, J.C. 1993. 'Student Ethnocentrism, Dogmatism, and Evaluation: A Study of BAFA BAFA', *Simulating and Gaming* 24(1): 9-20.
- Carty, L. 1991. 'Black Women in Academia: A Statement from the Periphery', in H. Bannerji, L. Carty, K. Delhi, S. Heald and K. McKenna (eds) *Unsettling*

- Relations: The University as a Site of Feminist Struggles*, pp. 13–44. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Cho, S. 1997. 'Converging Stereotypes in Racialized Sexual Harassment: Where the Model Minority Meets Suzie Wong', in A.K. Wing (ed.) *Critical Race Feminism: A Reader*, pp. 203–20. New York: New York University Press.
- Cohen, C. 1996. 'The Struggle Continues', *PS: Political Science & Politics* June 29(2): 184–5.
- Cohn, C. 1987. 'Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals', *Signs* 14(4): 687–718.
- Collins, P.H. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Dews, C.L.B. and C.L. Law. 1995. *This Fine Place So Far from Home: Academics from the Working Class*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DiGiacomo, S.M. 1997. 'The New Internal Colonialism', *Critique of Anthropology* 17(1): 91–6.
- Enloe, C. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fisher, B., C.T. Cobane, T.M. Vander Ren and F.T. Cullen. 1998. 'How Many Authors Does it Take to Publish an Article? Trends and Patterns in Political Science', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 31(4): 847–56.
- Freeman, J. 1996. 'We've Come a Long Way . . . ?', *PS: Political Science & Politics* June 29(2): 182–3.
- Fromm, H. 1986. 'The Hegemonic Form of Othering; or, the Academic's Burden', in H.L. Gates, Jr. (ed.) *Race, Writing, and Difference*, pp. 396–9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Geffen, K.v. 1990. 'Influence of Professor Gender and Perceived Use of Humor on Course Evaluations', *Humor* 3(1): 65–73.
- Gordon, L. 1991. 'On Difference', *Genders* 10: 91–111.
- Grusky, D.B. (ed.). 1994. *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Guinier, L. 1997. 'Of Gentlemen and Role Models', in A.K. Wing (ed.) *Critical Race Feminism: A Reader*, pp. 73–80. New York: New York University Press.
- Hall, R.M. and B. Sandler. 1982. *The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?* Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women for the Association of American Colleges.
- hooks, b. 1995. *Killing Rage: Ending Racism*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Hurtado, A. 1996. *The Color of Privilege: Three Blasphemies on Race and Feminism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Karen, D. 1991. 'The Politics of Class, Race, and Gender: Access to Higher Education in the United States, 1960–86', *American Journal of Education* 208–37.
- Kierstead, D. 1988. 'Sex Role Stereotyping of College Professors: Bias in Students' Ratings of Instructors', *Journal of Educational Psychology* 80(3): 342–4.
- Kors, A.C. and H.A. Silverglate. 1998. *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lang, D. 1984. 'Education, Stratification, and the Academic Hierarchy', *Research in Higher Education* 21: 329–52.

- 1987. 'Equality, Prestige, and Controlled Mobility in the Academic Hierarchy', *American Journal of Education* 441-67.
- Lang, E.M. 1999. 'Distinctively American: The Liberal Arts College', *Daedalus* 128(1): 133-50.
- Lederman, D. 1995. 'Wrestling with the Issue of Race', *Chronicle of Higher Education* 14 April: A19.
- Lee, T.M.L. 1997. 'Teaching the "Canon" from the Perspective of a Woman of Color', *PS: Political Science & Politics* March 30(1): 7-9.
- Lin, Y.G. 1984. 'The Use of Student Ratings in Promotion Decisions', *Journal of Higher Education* 55(5): 583-9.
- Ling, L.H.M. 2000. 'Globalisation and the Spectre of Fu Manchu: White Man's Burden as Dark Irony', in J.S. Fritz and M. Lensu (eds) *Value Pluralism, Normative Theory and International Relations*, pp. 27-43. London: Macmillan.
- Manrique, C.G. and G.G. Manrique. 1999. 'Third World Immigrant Women in American Higher Education', in G.A. Kelson and D.L. DeLaet (eds) *Gender and Immigration*, pp. 103-126. New York: University Press.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). 1999. *A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT*. Cambridge: MIT Dean's Office.
- McClintock, A. 1992. 'The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term "Post-Colonialism"', *Social Text* 31/32: 97.
- McPherson, M.S. and M.O. Schapiro. 1999. 'The Future Economic Challenges for the Liberal Arts Colleges', *Daedalus* 128(1): 47-76.
- Narayan, U. 1997. *Dislocating Cultures*. New York: Routledge.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Report. 1997. *Projections of Education Statistics to 2007*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Research Council (NRC). 1995. *Summary Report 1993: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Nkomo, S.M. and T. Cox, Jr. 1997. 'Diverse Identities in Organization', in S.R. Clegg et al. (eds) *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 338-356. London: Sage.
- Rubin, D.L. 1992. 'Nonlanguage Factors Affecting Undergraduates' Judgments of Nonnative English-Speaking Teaching Assistants', *Research in Higher Education* 33(4): 511-31.
- Ryan, J. & C. Sackrey. 1984. *Strangers in Paradise: Academics from the working-class*. Boston: South End Press.
- Sandler, B. 1986. *The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Sarkees, M.R. & Nancy E. McGlen. 1992. 'Misdirected Backlash: The Evolving Academic and the Status of Women in Political Science.' *Political Science of Politics* 32: 100-108.
- Schneider, A. 1997. 'Proportion of Minority Professors Up to About 10%', *Chronicle of Higher Education* 20 June: A12.
- 1998. 'More Professors Are Working Part-Time, and More Teach at 2-Year Colleges', *Chronicle of Higher Education* 13 March: A14-A16.
- Spivak, G.C. 1998. 'Teaching for the Times', in A. McClintock, A. Mufti and E. Shohat

- (eds) *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, pp. 468–90. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stoler, L.A. 1991. 'Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Gender, Race, and Morality in Colonial Asia', in M. di Leonardo (ed.) *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge*, pp. 51–101. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1997. *Race and the Education of Desire*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Szymanski, A.J. 1983. *Class Structure: A Critical Perspective*. New York: Praeger.
- Tanenhaus, S. 1998. 'P.C. 101', *New York Sunday Times Book Review* 8 November: 35.
- Tokarczyk, M.M. and E.A. Fay (eds). 1993. *Working-Class Women in the Academy: Laborers in the Knowledge Factory*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Trinh, T.M-H. 1991. *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Unger, D.N.S. 1995. 'Academic Apartheid: The Predicament of Part-time Faculty', *Thought and Action* 11(1): 117–20.
- Williams, P. 1991. *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, R. 2001. 'Divided Loyalties at Umass', *Chronicle of Higher Education* 23 November: A8–10.
- Wuffle, A. 1993. 'Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Assistant Professor', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 26(1): 89–90.
- Zarate, R.M. 1989. 'Rosa Marta Zarate', in R. Sen (ed.) *We are the Ones We are Waiting For: Women of Color Organizing for Transformation*, p. 41. North Carolina: A Project of the United States Urban Rural Missions of the World Council of Churches.

Copyright of International Feminist Journal of Politics is the property of Routledge, Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.