Racism 2.0 and the Death of Social and Cultural Foundations of Education:
A Critical Conversation

By Cleveland Hayes
& Kenneth J. Fasching-Varner

Introduction

In the age of the Obama presidency many claim we live in a post-racial society. As social justice pre-service teacher educators, the mythical 'post-racial' context has created a certain death for socio-cultural foundations (SCF)[1] of education as well as culturally relevant approaches to teacher education. Simultaneously the virulent racism of the past has been replaced with what we might call 'racism 2.0,' a less direct but equally problematic set of engagements with race, hiding behind the thin veil of politically correct language. What is worse, the death of SCF and culturally relevant approaches systematically works to ensure that the gaps between White and non-White students remain, while education maintains its neoliberal social reproduction role in the free-market.

To prepare pre-service educators to occupy educational environments with society's most vulnerable

Cleveland Hayes is an associate professor in the College of Education and Organizational Leadership at the University of La Verne, La Verne, California. Kenneth J. Fasching-Varner is the Shirley B. Barton Endowed Associate Professor in the School of Education at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Lousiana.

students, we believe pre-service teacher education must take seriously the need to return to cultural engagement of students based in SCF (Ayers & Schubert, 1992; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Crocco & Hendry, 1999; Doll, 1989; Doll, Fleener, & Julien, 2005; Dimitriadis & Carlson, 2003; Haberman, 1991; Hendry, 2008, 2011; King, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1994; McLaren, 1995, Merryfield, 2000; Popkewitz, 1998; Sleeter, 1996). For our purposes we lean on Ladson-Billings' (1994) culturally relevant pedagogy as a framework by which educators might better value and address the socio-political contexts of education. Educational contexts within the United States have historically served and represented White, male, Christian, patriarchal, and heteronormative perspectives, despite K-12 students who do not mirror these characteristics. Ladson-Billings' (1994) framework suggested that setting high expectations for student achievement, enacting cultural competence, and manifesting socio-political commitments work toward equity. Such a framework, consequently, has the potential to address persistent gaps in achievement between White and non-White students that have persisted over the history of schooling in the U.S.

The U.S. teaching force is approximately 84% White, monolingual, and female (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2012). NCES (2012) suggested that over the last 25 years the teaching force has become less experienced; approximately 26% of teachers in 2011 had less than five years of experience, a sharp rise from the 8% of similarly experienced teachers in 1988. On the other hand the Pew Center for Research (2007) suggested that annually more and more students of color, and White students as well, attend school in increasingly segregated contexts; Pew suggested that in 2007, 60% of students of color attended schools that were nearly all minority and 70% of White students attended schools that are nearly all White. The complexity these demographics reveal, then, is that Black and Brown students are being taught and socialized by inexperienced White monolingual females who look, act, and sound different from them; at the same time White students are being socialized about what it means to be White by their predominately White, female, monolingual teachers who nearly all look, act, and sound like they do.

Many teachers exit their preparation programs with little of no knowledge of themselves as raced, gendered, and classed beings, with little preparation that centers on social justice, and/or little interaction with groups outside of their own racial and cultural identity makers. Our experiences as teacher educators suggest that when pre-service teachers gain experiences in settings with underrepresented students, their 'mentor' teachers have often not proven to be successful with these students, thus it is difficult for the pre-service teachers to experience sound pedagogy. When our candidates report back on their experiences, we learn that that the classroom teachers often reinforce negative stereotypes about communities of color, groups with low socioeconomic standing, as well as the historically marginalized and underrepresented. Many pre-service teachers, consequently, are underprepared to identify, implement, or assess culturally responsive teaching and learning (Bell, 2002; Cross, 2005; Fasching-Varner & Dodo Seriki, 2012; Fasching-Varner, Mitchell,

Martin, & Bennett-Haron, 2014; Juárez, Smith, & Hayes, 2008; Hayes & Juárez, 2012). Instead of fighting against these trends, many teacher preparation programs are responding to conservative neoliberal calls to focus on accountability by placing inordinate amounts of pressure on teacher education faculty, tokenizing faculty of color, and alienating White ally faculty, while essentially obliterating attention as well as resources from socio-cultural foundations, social justice, and diversity in the preparation programs.

This article shares two counternarratives that highlight the challenges in teacher education, as it relates to race and the need for engaging with SCF. These counter-narratives open up a space to talk about race and the foundations of education. As a result, this article provides a set of analytical insights that can serve as a mechanism to understand why critical conversations about race and SCF are largely 'unspoken' in teacher preparation programs. Finally, we offer a series of recommendations regarding how faculty members and leaders in teacher education can move forward to work against the resistance to race and foundations.

A Tale of Two Faculty

We now focus on two faculty members, Marcus and Buddy, through counternarratives. These composite stories represent actual conversations within two teacher education programs. Each story is presented in its own sub-section.

Marcus and Emily

Marcus is a Black, gay, male, who works in teacher preparation. He is tall, strong, and challenges stereotypes. He serves not only in teacher education, but also in the military. Marcus obtained a Ph.D., focusing on science education, multiculturalism, and social justice. Emily is a White, monolingual female, and serves as the chair of the teacher preparation unit. Emily's role as chair creates a power differential between her and Marcus, the only faculty member of color in the department. The following is a conversation that took place between Marcus and Emily.

Emily: Marcus, I really need to see you.

Marcus: What is this about, Emily? Am I in trouble, again?

Emily: Of course not. I need to talk to you about some of the students' concerns. A group of students came to talk about me about your class. They feel like they are not getting the strategies they need.

Marcus: This is not about the strategies the students need. How would they know what they need better than their professor. These students are upset because they think I am spending too much time on what they think is my 'agenda.'

Emily: Well it does seem that your focus on social justice and culturally relevant pedagogy leads them to not learn the critical teaching strategies they need to be successful with getting poor kids to do well on their assessments for PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) and to meet the

Common Core standards? That is the goal Marcus. You can't leave them without these strategies—they're more important than being sensitive to Black kids.

Marcus: You're talking like Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is the enemy of engagement. This concerns me. This is also not a matter of [lifting two finger on each hand to make air quotes] "being sensitive to Black kids."

Emily: WELL, Marcus, your class is not a class on culturally responsive teaching.

Marcus: WELL, Emily, you're correct; the class is NOT just about Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. BUT, what you are missing is that Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is about setting high standards for student achievement, being socio-politically connected, and being culturally competent about ourselves before we go trying to "fix" Black kids with the "best practice" of the day. By being culturally relevant, we get to the heart of the work they will do as in-service teachers, which actually helps their students achieve on these standardized assessments.

Emily: I mean…

Marcus: …NO, let me finish. Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is extremely important, especially if my students are going to be teachers in Southern California. Do these students know that Black and Latino males have the highest drop out rates in the country? This is very important Emily; did you know that? Also, when I ask my students what Culturally Responsive or Relevant teaching is, not one of them knows what the terms mean. Culturally Responsive Teaching is an approach to teaching they should be using regardless of what their content area is, and serves as foundation for those precious strategies you always talk about. This is not a class on how to teach, but how to think about teaching. This is what socio-cultural foundations of education courses do. This is what we need to commit to in their training. I DO address strategies, Emily, but through a foundations framework so that we learn about context, and not just focus on strategies devoid of thinking about who is actually in front of us in the classroom.

Emily: [Shakes her head like she does not believe Marcus]. There's just no winning with you, I guess.

Marcus' university has no foundations courses, though there is a single decontextual-ized diversity course; that course is outdated in many ways and does not even draw on 'classic' critically engaged scholars in the area of diversity such as Banks (2001), Banks and Banks (2009), Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 2000), Ford (1992, 1995, 1998, 2010), Haberman (1991), and Nieto (1992, 2000, 2010).

Later this same day, Marcus logged onto the college's Blackboard system to check the reading responses that his students had been assigned to complete. One of the students who had approached Emily to complain about Marcus had posted the following response: "I am going to be a P.E. teacher. So, sure I guess culturally relevant pedagogy is important, and that I should be culturally aware and fair, blah blah, but at what point can we all just drop the 'you are a different color crap.'"

Marcus responded to the entire class, with a heavy heart, conveying to the students his concern about how cavalier they seemed to be about "this different

color crap" topic. What this student, and many of her fellow White classmates, failed to realize is that by being White, they have that option to "just drop all this different color crap" any time should they tire of it; for people of color that is never a choice. For children in urban centers who attend PreK-12 U.S. public schools the choice to not consider race is a non-option; they live race every day from the stark phenotype contrasts between themselves and their teachers, to their under resourced schools that lay in stark contrast to their White peers, to the prison-to-school pipeline (Fasching-Varner, Mitchell, Martin, & Bennett-Haron, 2014) that looms in front for many of these students and is represented with high levels of police presence and surveillance in their communities.

In the end Marcus was verbally chastised by the administration of his college for sending the email to his students, a microagression that pitted him, as one of few faculty of color, in the position of being controlled by the narrative of the in-stitution. Marcus was assigned a 'helping committee' of faculty designed to keep Marcus in his place and stop talking to so much about SCF ideas, and focus instead on creating an environment that focused on decontextualized teaching strategies.

Buddy, Holly, Maggie and the Chair

Buddy is a White, male endowed professor in teacher education. He is in his mid thirties, but brings a wealth of experiences that contradict perceptions of his age. Buddy grew up in poverty, and while he understands his life experiences may create some understandings of marginalized populations, he is also clear that growing up poor and White afforded him privileges that even people of color who grow up affluent never receive. Buddy was hired to run an elite Masters program for pre-service teachers, engaging them in a intensive single year as the candidates work toward their certification; it should be noted these candidates already pos-sess a Bachelor in education and have completed all of the state requirements for certification except for student teaching.

When hired, the chair was clear about Buddy's research and commitments; Buddy shared his writing, gave a lengthy job-talk about his commitments, and talked at length about his approach in his 1:1 meeting with the chair during the interview. The chair also promised that another socio-cultural foundations or cur-riculum theory faculty member would be hired to work alongside Buddy to run the program. A year in the second faculty member was still not hired as the chair said, "The financials just don't add up right now Buddy; I can't get another line."

During that first year, however, Buddy reinvigorated the program. The program moved students into a single yearlong student teaching placement and ensured that all placements where in urban contexts. The program went from having lost its accreditation prior to Buddy's arrival, to being reaffirmed due to the revisions that Buddy created. The clinical supervisors were now drawing on an evaluation and assessment tools in the field that were based in Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as well as data-informed practice, and everyone in the program was relatively happy.

Many supported Buddy's work, but two associate professors—Holly and Mag-

gie—were not happy with what Buddy was doing in the program. In their minds he was wreaking havoc in the department through his advocacy for urban education, and not paying attention to supporting their strategy development work from the undergraduate program during the Master year. Holly and Maggie were also threatened by the fact that Buddy, despite his heavy administrative responsibilities, had out-published both of them combined, and even engaged the students in writing and publishing articles and a book; the program was returning to its roots as a leader in preparing teachers to be scholar-practitioners. In their disdain for Buddy, Holly and Maggie made constant micro-aggressive threats and, occasionally, public attacks. They even threatened him around the topic of tenure, but Buddy persisted.

The following year finances improved and the department chair Dilbert announced at a faculty meeting that Buddy's program would hire a new faculty member, and that he appointed Holly to chair the search committee; Buddy was still an assistant professor, and though on an endowed line, Dilbert did not allow assistants to chair searches. Dilbert said that Holly would be in touch shortly about the search. Buddy approached Holly after the meeting and asked when she wanted to meet about the
search. Holly replied to Buddy's inquiry with,

> Uhmm, neither you nor your program will be involved. We're gonna hire someone whose gonna contain you and this program. You focus too much on all this urban stuff, and now it's time to get to the basics of teaching or these folks will never get their kids to pass the tests.

Holly walked away and literally never spoke to Buddy again until she left the university two years later. Buddy was taken aback by Holly's behavior, to say the least, but the search continued. Holly, Maggie, and their reductionist friends on the faculty were assembled to make the search committee, and they began their work. No one from the program—faculty, clinical faculty, mentor teacher or students—was on the search committee, despite the clear articulation that the hire was for *this* program.

Buddy went to Dilbert and demanded a discussion. The following excerpt is from their conversation:

> Buddy: Why am I running a program if I don't have input on whom we hire, and my decisions about this program are undermined? Are you just using me to do the work for the program? You sure weren't upset when I redid accreditation a week into the job and all the administrative work got done. Are you kidding me?

> Dilbert: It's complicated young man [Dilbert often called Buddy "young man"]. You have done things you think are good and maybe they are, in some ways. So, sure, the program is reaccredited. And yes, students and mentors may even be happy with the changes. I have been here 40 years and you curriculum people always do the same thing, pushing your agendas on everyone. I have no intention of filling the program up with people just like you with all this curriculum theory non-sense. Your are not balanced in what you do, you talk too much about this

culture teaching [referring to Culturally Relevant Pedagogy], you focus entirely too much on race, and you are always going on about metropolitan education [Buddy thinks he was referring to urban education, which he did talk about, but Dilbert kept calling it metropolitan]. One Buddy is enough for me, and so we are going to hire a faculty member who does research on strategies that work, something that can actually help our pre-service teachers. I am sorry if you don't like it, but this is my decision.

Buddy: How could you allow her [Holly] to not have anyone from the program on the committee? You know she bullies me and you do nothing about it.

Dilbert: I don't have to justify anything to you, young man. You're not even tenured. I know you think you want to go up for tenure early, but that's not going to happen either—publish all you want, but I don't have to support you.

Buddy: This is not what I signed up for; you promised me help. You knew what I would do, and who I am; I sat right here and told you.

Dilbert: Do you have anything in writing young man?

Buddy: Wow, really?

Dilbert: Look, this is really simple Buddy—stop making waves, go with the flow, stop talking about how kids are so disenfranchised, and start getting to the teaching; maybe that will help. You publish a lot, and when the time is right for your tenure you will go up and I am sure you'll be fine. You're smart, so I don't know why you aren't making this easy on yourself. I don't trust Holly, I don't even think that Holly is as smart as you, but that is not why she is chairing the search. Holly will do what I tell her to do and that's why she is chairing this search. The curriculum theory group of faculty has had too much power for too long and we are going to change that trajectory right now.

The conversation continued for a few minutes. Buddy left the office in great dismay, and the search continued uninterrupted. No one from the program had any input and the search did not result in a viable candidate; they hired someone who ended up working in a different part of the unit. Four years into his time at ACME State University, Buddy still runs the program and there is no other tenure-track support for the program. Dilbert was encouraged by those above him to retire, which he did, and the program continues to challenge candidates to be more inclusive, culturally responsive, and thoughtful about their approaches with underrepresented students.

Discussion

Both Marcus's and Buddy's counterstories draw on real experiences in higher education, and represent some of the many challenges of the racism 2.0 environment as it relates to engaging historically underserved students, and paying attention to the socio-cultural contexts that foundations work is committed to engaging.

The university is supposed to be a safe haven for thinking and open expression of one's commitments and research. We were trained in our doctoral programs to push teacher candidates toward their best potential as future educators. The core

commitment of foundations and curriculum studies is questioning the sources of power and thinking with a big "E" about the meaning of Education.[2] As the social philosopher Hannah Arendt is once quotes as saying, "The aim of totalitarian education has never been to instill convictions but to destroy the capacity to form any." As critical race theorists we agree with Arendt, which is why our courses' engagement in socio-cultural foundations of education creates a space to understand the gaps between White and non-White students that play out and re-replicate themselves with each generation.

Despite the "back-to-basics approaches" of the department chairs in both stories, the truth is that PK-12 public schools in our segregated "post-racial" racism 2.0 society and a focus of culturally relevant pedagogy and SCF is more critical now than ever. Traditional teacher education is continuing to be replaced by neoliberal-oriented alternative certifications such as Teach for America (TFA), where less and less attention is paid to justice-oriented thinking and SCF types of insights (cf., Crocco & Hendry, 1999; Doll, 1989, 1993; Dimitriadis & Carlson, 2003; Dimitriadis & McCarthy, 2001; Gay, 2002; Haberman, 1991; Hendry, 2008; King, 1991; McLaren, 1995; Merryfield, 2000; Pinar, 2012; Popkewtiz, 1998). The 'limited time in training for career switchers' approach of alternative certification programs furthers the gap in experience mentioned earlier, as those programs take even less experienced teachers than traditional preparation programs and put them in the most vulnerable settings with the highest identified needs.

What Emily and Dilbert—as well as Holly and Maggie—fail to account for is that any conversation about strategies that does not properly account for the complexity of the teaching and learning landscape will never bring about meaningful and long-lasting change. Perhaps, though, that is point: no changes are needed. The "free market" wants workers, like Holly and Maggie, as well as leaders, like Emily and Dilbert, to create smoke and mirrors by investing in approaches that are "known." But when these "best practices" are decontextualized, they simply do not to work. The system relies on players who genuinely believe, however, that they are making a difference. So where Emily, Holly, Maggie, and Dilbert treat their colleagues in atrocious manners, ironically we believe they do so with a genuine belief that their approach(es) to eliminate SCF is in the best interest of students because those types of courses are believed to be unnecessary and overly critical (cf. Hartlep, Porfilio, Otto, & O'Brien-Cristian's article in this special issue). Coupled with their genuine belief in what they do, their racism and disdain for engaging foundations make Marcus's and Buddy's refusal to cooperate threatening to these neoliberal players; Marcus and Buddy are perceived as challenging a system on which many rely to be a part. Faculty like Marcus and Buddy, consequently, will continue to be marginalized and disenfranchised so that the system can continue to run unremitting.

The Use of Counter-Narratives in the Struggle Against Whiteness

Counterstories (Fernández, 2002; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Taylor, Ladson-Billings, & Gilborn, 2009) challenge White supremacy by providing alternative interpretations or understandings of social scenarios, arrangements, experiences, and outcomes regarding individuals and communities of color. Counterstories create a space for faculty of color and White allies for expressing their personal experiences of racial mistreatment as lived experiences in the academy. These stories highlight the absurdity of the dominant narratives that are the basis of how teacher preparation operates in many places. Marcus's and Buddy's counterstories are presented relatively early in this article to expose and challenge the majoritarian stories of White privilege in teacher education and larger U.S. society as the basis for the rest of our analysis (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Marx, 2006; Sleeter, 2001; McIntosh, 1989).

The counterstories presented herein challenge the Whiteness of teacher education by helping readers see why SCF and culturally relevant frameworks are simply "not spoken" in teacher education (Hayes & Juárez, 2012). Because politically correct discourse privileges silence the unspoken nature of the complexities of racism 2.0 in the post-racial' Obama-era, assault on and near extinction of socio-cultural foundations is difficult to reveal without counterstories such as those we present here (cf., Hartlep & Porfilio, 2015).

Following Thompson (2004), we put Whiteness at the center of our examination of U.S. teacher education in the counter-stories. Both Marcus' and Buddy's professional experiences reveal racialized, not simply ideological, differences that permeate teacher education programs. We see Whiteness as an identity that is neither problematized nor particularized within discourses on race because it assumes a role as the normo-idem, or normalized identity; interestingly idem, from Latin, represents identity but also means same, suggesting a parallel to the way White racial identity has been normalized into the sameness of a male, Christian, heteronormativity (Tate, 2003; Fox 2007; García, 2009).

Emily's decision to support the White students who questioned Marcus's pedagogy legitimatizes the Whiteness of teacher education, as does the "helping" committee Marcus was assigned that was designed to contain him, and the silencing of Buddy and his program from their own hiring of faculty. Both counterstories reveal not just attacks that center on race, but link race to considerations of SCF as an unnecessary luxury far removed from what a teacher needs. That both chairs enacted privilege to marginalize the voices of faculty members who challenge the normativity of Whiteness in education exemplify how processes of White racial domination are enacted by individuals and groups to expressly maintain the status quo of the neoliberal free market.

Similarly, using the hiring process as a mechanism to punish and contain faculty who are committed to SCF, curriculum theory, and/or culturally relevant pedagogy, represents a perverse mechanism to maintain White superiority and privilege. One

may say, "Well, Buddy is White as were the other faculty and chair, so how is this White superiority or racism?" That Buddy's positions and approaches advocate predominately for students of color, through the commitment to urban education, signals to Holly, Maggie, and Dilbert that Buddy is a "race traitor" (Ignatiev & Garvey, 1996) given that they exercise dramatically different commitments as identified in their comments to Buddy throughout his time at ACME State University. Their resistance to him, as a nexus to race, is manifestation of White superiority. That the faculty in both stories refuse to be questioned or held accountable when it comes to the engagement of students of color is highly problematic.

Moments of enacting White racial domination render Whiteness both legitimate and normal, but are very difficult to reveal without vulnerable faculty making the stories and experiences known—counterstories are an ideal mechanism, theoretically and pragmatically—to create spaces for the stories to be revealed. The buttressing and perpetuating of Whiteness as normal and dominant, through the punishment of voices that represent challenges on socio-cultural foundations, social justice, or culturally relevant fronts, cannot be easily understood within the confines of the educational metanarratives the free-market relies upon. Through our storytelling we are able to reveal persistent and problematic ways in which racism and anti-foundations approaches permeate teacher preparation.

Conversations Missing In Action

Many deans and department chairs like to believe that their colleges of education, departments, and teacher preparation programs are somehow "cutting edge" in how they approach preparing pre-service teachers for today's classrooms. Their commitment to educational equity remains to be seen, however, especially when we know that the educational outcomes for White, Black, and Brown students are not only disparate, but have been steadily so for over last 50 years (Fasching-Varner, Mitchell, Martin, & Bennett-Haron, 2014). If teacher preparation programs were doing as well we would also expect to see a narrowing of the achievement gap (among other indices). So what is *going on* in education, or more importantly, what's *not going on*? We posit that SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are often "not spoken," and will highlight a few reasons why we think this is the case.

SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when teacher education programs forcefully tell the faculty that diversity is the way "it is going, like it or not," and then shy away from actual engagement with diversity. This is particularly troublesome when programs have no courses on the history of Black, Indigenous, Asian, or Latin@ education. Equally troubling is when programs ignore the demographics of surrounding communities where their candidates engage in field placements.

SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when teacher education programs continue to put together hiring committees who "want" to hire faculty of color, but only when they teach '*just science*' or '*just literacy*

methods.' Yes, you "want very much to have *a* Black person in [your] department as long as that person thinks and acts like [you], shares [your] values and beliefs, [and] is in no way different" (hooks, 1989, p. 113, emphasis in the original). Often these searches end in the conclusion that "No qualified candidates of color were available."

SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when White teacher education faculty members and White students are offended by the curriculum offered through SCF, saying we spend too much time talking about race, inequity, and social justice. White people are, to be certain, regularly offended—as demonstrated by an appalling oppressive and bloody history known all over the world (Baldwin, 1985). After 244 years of slavery, 100 years of lynching, and 40 plus years of formal civil rights, we still seem to be moving just a little too fast for White sensibilities. We know, you do not like being continually "beaten over the head" as you say with conversations about White racism. Yes, we remember, you "have this Black friend" which seems to justify your racism. And we know how our SCF examination of inequity makes you feel terribly guilty about being White. But, we would like to remind you that White racism may hurt all of us, but has lasting consequences for only some.

SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when there a constant need to end every meeting, seminar, or class on a positive note, without subjecting ourselves to the 'messy' and 'uncomfortable' conversations that socio-cultural foundations requires. African American students cannot simply decide that today is not a good day to be Black at school, so perhaps tomorrow or next week will be better. And, forgive our incredulousness and boredom that you were not the first White person we heard say, "I didn't own any slaves and neither did my family."

SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when programs think they are 'doing diversity' by inviting White colleagues to share what they learned on their [field]trip to Peru and Madagascar as keynote speakers for the university's faculty discussion forums. Taking your body into spaces of the *other* and coming back to tell about it does not make you an expert on diversity or culture; it makes you someone who loves to visit the margins of Whiteness and then come back to tell about its exoticness. We believe in study abroad, to be sure; one of the authors has been leading a study abroad experience with students to Chile for the last 10 years. But, do you really think it matters whether or not we require our students to do a student teaching practicum or an internship abroad when neither you nor they know how to unpack your collective 'first world' White privileges?

SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when teacher education programs indignantly protest and charge faculty of color with reverse racism when they tell you that they deliberately and explicitly put the perspectives and experiences of racialized peoples at the center of their research and teaching, even though you do the same for Whiteness. Faculty of color sit in meetings where most of the faculty participants are White, except for the token

people of color who are often untenured junior faculty, yet people of color are the racist ones? It is not progress just because you pulled the knife you stabbed someone with out a little bit or even all the way. Indeed, it is not progress until you admit that it was you who stabbed in the first place.

Finally, SCF and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education are "not spoken" when teacher education programs are astonished, even indignant and outraged, that people of color and White allies had the audacity to question and criticize the many efforts and awards White liberals receive for helping the racialized other and working in the racialized other's neighborhoods and schools. Why should you have to keep proving that you are one of the good Whites who get it?; every time you do you are trusted less. Well-behaved (Juárez & Hayes, 2010) people of color do indeed serve as a marvelous means of helping White people to fulfill the obligation of nobility to the ignoble (DuBois, 1920, cited in Lewis, 1995, p. 554).

The need for the perspective of SCF, social justice, curriculum theory, and culturally relevant pedagogy is more needed now than ever. An uncomfortable silence fills the halls of the academy. Where noise is made it often has to be buried in the counternarrative, not open for all to see. When social justice and culturally relevant pedagogy through SCF becomes "spoken" in our programs, the narratives of folks like Marcus and Buddy do not have toile and lurk in the deep dark alleys in the margins of Whiteness.

The Critical Conversation Needed in Teacher Education

Lest we be criticized as not offering solutions, here we offer some perspectives about what we see needing attention in higher education, and teacher preparation specifically. First, faculty members and leaders in teacher education programs need to understand that racism is an endemic part of American society. The problem with the racial power of Whiteness is the ability to deny issues of race and racism and the consistent practice of refusing to consider the everyday realities of race and racism. To recognize racism's pervasiveness requires Whites to face their own racist behavior and to name the contours of racism (Bergerson, 2003; Gillborn, 2005; Fasching-Varner, 2009).

Second, faculty members and leaders in teacher education programs need to understand that they often engage colorblindness but that colorblindness is not an appropriate ideal for social justice. Bergerson (2003) suggested that Whites attribute negative stereotypes to racial minorities while at the same time espousing their opposition to blatant racism. Only in a racist society do we reward saying one thing and doing the complete opposite. When White liberals fail to understand how they *can* and/or *do* embody White supremacist values, even when they themselves may legitimately not embrace racism, they support the racist domination they wish to eradicate (Gillborn, 2005; hooks, 1989).

Third, faculty and leaders in teacher education programs need to understand that merit is highly problematic in the context of the United States. It is inadequate to say that anyone who works hard can achieve success. Students of color are sys-

tematically excluded from education and educational opportunities despite their hard work. The economic imperatives of the free market will continue to replicate the structure needed for the many to serve the few, and schools become the first line in that sorting process (Fasching-Varner, Mitchell, Martin, & Bennett-Haron, 2014). Return on education is unequal: the hard work of some pays off more than the hard work of others. Merit operates under the burden of racism; racism thus limits the applicability of merit to people of color (Bergerson, 2003).

Finally, faculty members and administrators in teacher education programs need to understand the role that experiential knowledge plays in the discourses of people of color. When teacher education programs are unwilling to recognize the knowledge of students of color as legitimate, appropriate, and critical, they deny those students their humanity; this delegitimizing results in the silencing and constraining of these students, regardless of their democratic intentions (Sue & Constantine, 2007). Posturing toward democratic inclusion without matching action is, what Hytten and Warren (2003) called merely an appeal to authenticity. In Hytten and Warren's (2003) model, when White faculty members cite their own experiences to counter or contradict non-White voices, they undermine the experiences of people of color as less valid and useful.

Choosing Differently

As we think about our experiences as a teacher educator, we conclude that new teachers continue to enter the classroom unprepared to teach all students not because White teacher educators do not like or care about students of color, but because the racial power of Whiteness structures activity within teacher education programs to work against what socio-cultural foundations believes. We believe that it is largely irrelevant that teacher educators are most often kind, dedicated, and nice people. *Niceness* and *goodness* have little, if anything, to do with the knowledge that guides the interactions and activities in which White teacher educators engage future teachers; many colleagues have little meaningful context or experience working effectively with students of color. As a result, relying on decontextualized strategies becomes a defensive posture to avoid what socio-cultural foundations might tell those faculties: inequity matters; context matters; and social justice matters.

We posit that the racial power of Whiteness must be considered and addressed explicitly within the context of preparing future PK-12 teachers to realize social justice in the classroom. The sabotaging, silencing, and gagging of social justice and socio-cultural foundations in the preparation of teachers with the intertwined resistance to race and equity is unlikely to be interrupted without a serious consideration of the role of Whiteness. We hope that by sharing the experiences of Marcus and Buddy that others will be encouraged to take up "the open secret [of White racism] in America" (Feagin, Vera, & Batur, 2001, p. 89) in search of ways to reconfigure the power of historically White teacher education so culturally responsive teaching will finally be spoken here. We hope that by viewing examples

of moments in our experiences when opportunities emerged to choose to enact or challenge the dominant norms, the possibilities for making choices differently are exposed. Individuals make choices about Whiteness and social justice in teacher education. By moving away from tacit complicity with Whiteness to explicitly choosing against it, we believe that it is possible for teacher educators to lean into having socio-cultural foundations and social be what we speak, what we do, and most importantly what we live.

Note

[1] In this article we use the term socio-cultural foundations (SCF) because we value that the schools are both social and cultural institutions and Education, as a concept, lives at the intersections of societies goals, hopes, and aspirations which have been culturally mediated. We recognize that ideas related to social justice education, multicultural education, curriculum theory, philosophy of education, and the history of education all play into our conceptualization of SCF. Other authors in this special issue have used the terms Social Foundations of Education (SFE), Educational Studies, Cultural Foundations of Education (CFE), and we recognize there are a variety of terms that essentially describe similar conceptualizations.

[2] Education with a big "E" refers to the teaching and learning that occurs in schools, but rather to the larger concepts of what society values for its citizens to know and how society chose to engage what counts as knowledge.

References

Ayers, W. C., & Schubert, W. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Teacher lore: Learning from our own experience*. Bel Air, CA: Longman. doi: 10.1080/1047621920050118

Baldwin, J. (1985). *The price of a ticket: Collected non-fiction 1948-1985*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Banks, J. A. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum and teaching* (4th ed.). London, UK: Allyn.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. doi: 10.1207/s15327892mcp0801_10

Bell, L. A. (2002). Sincere fictions: The pedagogical challenges of preparing White teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(3), 236–244. doi: 10.1080/713845317

Bergerson, A. A. (2003). Critical race theory and White racism: is there room for White scholars in fighting racism in education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 51–63. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000033527

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Crocco, M., & Hendry, P. M. (1999). *Pedagogies of resistance: Women educator activists, 1880-1960*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education and the same ole' oppression, *Educational Studies, 38*(3), 263–274. doi: 10.1207/s15326993es3803_6

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the 'legitimate' knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 169–180. doi: 10.1080/713845282

Dimitriadis, G., & Carlson, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Promises to keep: Cultural studies, democratic*

education, and public life. New York: Routledge.

Dimitriadis, G., & McCarthy, C. (2001). *Reading and teaching the postcolonial: From Baldwin to Basquiat and beyond*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Doll, W. E. (1989). Foundations for a post modern curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21*(3), 243–253. doi:10.1080/0022027890210304

Doll, W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Doll, W. E., Fleener, M. J., & Julien, J. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Chaos, complexity, curriculum and culture: A conversation*. New York: Peter Lang.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1920/1995). The souls of White folk. In D. L. Lewis (Ed.), *W.E.B. DuBois: A reader* (pp. 550–581). New York: Henry Holt.

Fasching-Varner, K. J. (2009). No! The team ain't alright! The institutional and individual problematics of race. *Social Identities, 15*(6), 811–829. doi: 10.1080/13504630903372520

Fasching-Varner, K. J., Mitchell, R. W., Martin, L. L., & Bennett-Haron, K. P. (2014). Beyond school-to-prison pipeline and toward an educational and penal realism. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 47*(4), 410–429. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2014.959285

Fasching-Varner, K.J., & Dodo Seriki, V. (2012). Moving beyond seeing with our eyes wide shut. A response to "There is no culturally responsive teaching spoken here." *Democracy and Education, 20*(1), 1–5.

Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Batur, P. (Eds.). (2001). *White racism: The basics*. New York: Psychology Press.

Fernández, L. (2002). Telling stories about school: Using critical race and Latino critical theories to document Latina/Latino education and resistance. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*(1), 45–65. doi: 10.1177/1077800402008001004

Ford, D. Y. (1992). Determinants of underachievement as perceived by gifted, above average, and average Black students. Roeper Review, 14(3), 130–136. doi: 10.1080/02783199209553407

Ford, D. Y. (1995). Desegregating gifted education: A need unmet. *Journal of Negro Education, 64*(1), 52–62. doi: 10.2307/2967284

Ford, D. Y. (1998). The underrepresentation of minority students in gifted education problems and promises in recruitment and retention. *The Journal of Special Education, 32*(1), 4–14. doi: 10.1177/002246699803200102

Ford, D. Y. (2010). *Reversing underachievement among gifted Black students*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Fox, C. (2007). From transaction to transformation: (En)countering White heteronormativity in "safe spaces." *College English, 69*(5), 496–511.

García, L. (2009). "Now why do you want to know about that?" Heteronormativity, sexism, and racism in the sexual (mis)education of Latina youth. *Gender & Society, 23*(4), 520–541. doi: 10.1177/0891243209339498

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116. doi: 10.1177/0022487102053002003

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of White supremacy: Whiteness, Critical Race Theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(4), 485–505. doi: 10.1080/02680930500132346

Haberman, M. (1991). The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(4), 290–294. doi: 10.1177/003172171009200223

Hartlep, N. D., & Porfilio, B. J. (2015). Revitalizing the field of educational foundations

and PK-20 educators' commitment to social justice and issues of equity in an age of neoliberalism. *Educational Studies, 51*(4), 1–20.

Hartlep, N. D., Porfilio, B. J., Otto, S., & O'Brien, K. (this issue). What we stand for, not against: Presenting our teacher-education colleagues with the case for Social Foundations in PK-12, teacher-preparation programs. *Journal of Educational Foundations*.

Hayes, C., & Juárez, B. G. (2012). There is no culturally responsive teaching spoken here: A Critical Race Perspective. *Democracy and Education, 20*(1), 1–12.

Hendry, P. M. (2008). Learning from Caroline Pratt. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 4*. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/jaaacs/vol4/hendry.htm

Hendry, P. (2011). *Engendering curriculum history*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking Black*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hytten, K., & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging Whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 65–89. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000033509a

Ignatiev, N., & Garvey, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Race traitor*. New York: Psychology Press.

Juárez, B. G., & Hayes, C. (2010). Social justice is not spoken here: Considering the nexus of knowledge, power, and the education of future teachers in the United States. *Power and Education, 2*(3), 233–252. doi: 10.2304/power.2010.2.3.233

Juárez, B. G., Smith, D. T., & Hayes, C. (2008). Social justice means just us White people. *Democracy & Education, 17*(3), 20–25.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, 133–146. doi: 10.2307/2295605

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491. doi: 10.3102/00028312032003465

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1996). "Your blues ain't like mine": Keeping issues of race and racism on the multicultural agenda. *Theory into Practice, 35*(4), 248–255. doi: 10.1080/00405849609543731

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1998). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 211–247. doi: 10.2307/1167271

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 206–214. doi: 10.1177/0022487100051003008

Lewis, D. L. (1995). *W. E. B. DuBois: A reader*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 10–12.

McLaren, P. L. (1995). White terror and oppositional agency: Towards a critical multiculturalism. In C. E. Sleeter & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference* (pp. 33–70). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Merryfield, M. M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of

multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(4), 429–443. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00004-4

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *NECES digest of education statistics*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/dt068.asp

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 180–187. doi: 10.177/0022487100051003004

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Pew Research Center. (2007). *English usage among Hispanics in the United States*. Retrieved April 25, 2015, from http://www.pewhispanic.org/2007/11/29/english-usage-among-hispanics-in-the-united-states

Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* New York: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94–106. doi: 10.117/0022487101052002002

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. International *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(4), 471–495. doi: 10.1080/09518390110063365

Sue, D. W., & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions as instigators of difficult dialogues on race: Implications for student affairs educators and students. College *Student Affairs Journal, 26*(2), 136–143.

Tate, W. F. (2003). The "race" to theorize education: Who is my neighbor? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 121–126. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000033563

Taylor, E., Gillborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Foundations of critical race theory in education*. New York: Routledge.

Thompson, A. (2004). Gentlemanly orthodoxy: Critical race feminism, Whiteness theory, and the APA Manual. *Educational Theory, 54*(1), 27–57. doi: 10.1111/j.0013-2004.2004.00002.x