On the Meaning and Necessity of a White, Anti-racist Identity

Barbara Applebaum
Illinois State University

Erin Stoik
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto

In this essay we argue not only that a positive, white anti-racist identity is possible, but also that it is fundamental to the success of any social justice educational initiative. Central to our analysis is a discussion of the perspective of the Deconstructionists (also referred to as New Abolitionists). These theorists, who call for the abolition of white identity, conflate "whiteness" as a system of dominance and oppression with "whiteness" as an individual identity. On the basis of this conceptualization, they conclude that the eradication of white dominance requires the deconstruction of white identity. This conceptual flaw compromises the feasibility of the proposals generated for anti-racist education from within this framework and ignores important questions of agency. Nevertheless, we contend that the Deconstructionists' position offers tremendous educational insights. When whiteness as a system of dominance is theoretically distinguished from whiteness as white identity, the complex relationship between these two concepts is illuminated and the positive educational implications of some of the Deconstructionists' recommendations are brought to light.

Different situations prompted each of us to think more deeply about this issue. Last year, in a course on Anti-racist Education Initiatives, I (Erin) presented a critique of Peter McLaren's recent work in which he contends that the renunciation of white identity by white individuals is fundamental to the abolishment of racism.[1] Following the presentation, one of my classmates, an African-Canadian male, asked me in a most incredulous tone, "How can you argue for retaining any aspect of white identity when it is so harmful and negative?" As a white person committed to social justice, the question catapulted me into months of discussions with my classmate, critical self-reflection and further readings on the topic. Certainly, from a psychological perspective, the implication that there could be no positive, anti-racist white identity disturbed me greatly because it raised doubts around my own self-identity as a white person committed to social justice. Yet I was also troubled philosophically because implicit in my classmate's comment was an unswerving certitude regarding the assumption that whiteness as a system of hegemony can *only* be abolished through the eradication of white identity.

My (Barbara) entry point is connected with my experience last year as a white, female, Jewish, heterosexual educator teaching courses on diversity to predominantly preservice white teachers in the heart of Appalachia. My students' initial reactions to my attempts at raising their awareness of dominance were either immobilizing guilt or harmful resentment. And because the neoconservative backlash on campuses across the United States has gained momentum, many of my white students were embracing white identity as victimization rather than as an oppressive

and privileged force. Such an embrace of white identity as victimization was manifested in their assaults on affirmative action programs, multicultural initiatives, and a general rejection of racial politics. It became clear to me that there was no chance that I was going to succeed in getting my students to understand the subtle nature of systemic racism, sexism, and heterosexism without also giving them a constructive self-image to which to aspire.

Indeed, Henry Giroux maintains that white youths that are beginning to recognize whiteness as an object of critical scrutiny need to be afforded an opportunity to employ this understanding constructively.[2] Giroux argues for the need to reconstruct a positive, anti-racist white identity with our students. Yet at the same time that I was resonating with Giroux's arguments, I discovered the contemporary literature in whiteness and cultural studies which was replete with books and articles that were claiming that such an identity is an oxymoron. These writers argued that the eradication of white dominance requires the deconstruction, not the reconstruction, of white identity. To achieve social justice, white people must renounce their white identity. "There is nothing positive about white identity," claims Noel Ignatiev, one of the principal champions of The New Abolitionists.[3] He maintains that "treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity."[4] Similarly Peter McLaren strongly contends,

> I do not argue for the construction of a positive white identity, no matter how well intentioned. Rather, I argue against celebrating whiteness in any form….Whiteness retains its positive meanings only by denying itself. I call for the denial, disassembly, and deconstruction of whiteness as we know it.[5]

Although the arguments of the Deconstructionists intrigued me, as a teacher I knew that they were educationally unsound. In what follows, we will refer to those who along with McLaren argue for this position as the Deconstructionists (but also sometimes the New Abolitionists) and to those who support the position advocated by Giroux as Reconstructionists.

Contrasting our different entry points exposes a conceptual problem common to both my (Erin's) classmate and the Deconstructionists that Barbara was reading about. As I (Erin) understood it, my classmate's question was strongly focused on the *conceptual* premise that whiteness is inherently harmful. On this Deconstructionist view, whiteness is devoid of any cultural content and has no independent ontological or epistemological status outside of its hierarchical relationship to blackness. It is nothing but a socially constructed system of dominance that confers certain unearned benefits and privileges on white people.[6] Since whiteness and white identity are inseparable and almost co-extensive, if whiteness must be eradicated so must white identity. In other words, whiteness subtracts from white identity without remainder. According to this perspective, supporting white identity in any way only fortifies the status quo. Understood as based on a conceptual claim, my classmate's argument ignores the educational implications of this conclusion that are underscored by Barbara's experience.[7]

We argue in this paper that by not distinguishing between whiteness and white identity, the complex relationship between the two is ignored and questions of

agency that have educational implications are concealed. Avoiding this conflation, we contend, illuminates the tremendously important educational contributions of the Deconstructionists' recommendations.

RENOUNCING WHITE IDENTITY

In order to appreciate the question of agency that is raised by the Deconstructionist position, we must first clarify what they actually mean when they demand that white identity be renounced. Although they do not make this distinction, there seem to be two different recommendations made by these theorists. The first is that white people should embrace black identity and the second is that white people should disown their white privilege.

According to the first recommendation, in order to cross out whiteness, white people must crossover to blackness. The belief underlying this recommendation is that whites take a big step toward becoming human when they reject their racial identity.[8] McLaren argues that whites can "choose" not only to be nonwhite, but also to be black or brown.[9] Quoting theologian James Cone, McLaren maintains, "Whites will be free only when they become new persons — when their white being has passed away and they are created anew in black being."[10] The New Abolitionists argue that, in this way, whites must be converted into "reverse Oreo cookies." This is a step that would seem to entail, for many, some engagement with blackness, perhaps even an identification as "black," and recent experience, in the United States and elsewhere, would indicate that it does.

There is, however, a second sense in which Deconstructionists demand that white people renounce white identity. The New Abolitionists write approvingly of "race traitors" — those individuals who renounce the societal privilege conferred on them by virtue of their skin color. One example of race traitors is the small groups of white people who are organizing "copwatch" programs across the United States. These programs were developed in response to the realization that the police are harassing innocent people of color for DWB (driving while black) or are giving non-white drivers stiff penalties for small infractions that white people get away with a mere slap on the hand. Such discrimination only becomes illuminated when contrasted to white privilege but otherwise goes unquestioned. It is so common to hear among white people that "the police are just doing their duty; blacks just commit more crimes." The objective of such initiatives is to monitor the conduct of the police for signs of racism and discrimination. Although Civil Rights activists have been involved in similar programs since the 1960s, the extraordinary aspect of these contemporary anti-racist efforts is not only the concern to correct unjust discrimination, but, moreover, the concern to correct unjust discrimination that is obscured by white privilege. These anti-racist white people are concerned with arresting hidden types of discrimination by renouncing their white privilege. The New Abolitionists are demanding that white people become aware of their white privilege and disown it.

The educational implications of both of the New Abolitionists' recommendations, the call for white people to embrace black identity and the demand that white people renounce their white privilege, are problematic. It is the height of white

arrogance to assume that white identity can be denied at will and that black identity can be appropriated. The New Abolitionists exalt a group of white Indiana high school girls who refer to themselves as the "Free to Be Me" club and attempt to appropriate black identity. These girls were ridiculed and harassed by the white community in which they lived. Yet in their glorification of this group, the New Abolitionist completely ignore the reality that no matter how much these girls suffered they did not forgo all of their white privilege. Whatever hardships these girls endured, their suffering could not be compared to that which the black people in their community experienced as a consequence of what the girls did. Moreover, recognition of the fact that white people cannot totally renounce their privilege illuminates the problematic nature of the New Abolitionists' second recommendation — that white people renounce their privilege. Can white people renounce the privilege that is conferred upon them by virtue of their membership in the dominant group?

This insistence on the rejection of white privilege, however, is one of the strengths of the New Abolitionists' argument. We argue that the serious flaw in their approach is the failure to explicate what this rejection can mean. Because the New Abolitionists perceive whiteness and white identity as synonymous they cannot appreciate the complex relationship between the two nor can they recognize the notion of choice that is possible regarding white identity. Consequently, they are unable to propose realistic and constructive ways of renouncing the unearned privilege that they claim is necessary for the eradication of whiteness. Through conceptual analysis, however, we can glean an important insight from the New Abolitionists' approach — the performative aspect of white identity. This insight can also facilitate a more realistic understanding of what it means to renounce white privilege.

WHITENESS AND WHITE IDENTITY

Underlying the Deconstructionists' claims is the assumption that white people can *choose* to renounce their identity. However, if race is socially constructed and mediates every part of our lives as many race scholars have illustrated, to what extent can individuals really change who they are? Indeed, many questions arise about the nature and malleability of identity once attention is paid to the issue of agency. For example, is the call for the destruction of white identity tantamount to a call to the destruction of self-identity? Can white people genuinely renounce their white identity simply by deciding to become black or is this just another manifestation of audacious white privilege? Can white people choose to abandon their white identity by forgoing their white privilege when their white appearance sustains that privilege whether they want it to or not? And what effect would renouncing white identity, on an individual level, actually have on eradicating whiteness, at the systemic level?

In their claim that white hegemony will be dismantled only if white people make a choice to deny their whiteness, Deconstructionists blur the conceptual distinction between "whiteness" as a system of dominance and white identity. This conceptual confusion obscures the complex relationship between dominance and personal identity, and obfuscates the type of agency that can be linked with white racial

identity. While these two concepts — whiteness and white identity — do not operate independently from one another, conceptually separating them so that the connections between them can be illuminated is important.

In his attempt to unpack and remap the content of whiteness, Nelson Rodriguez explains how whiteness has often been viewed only as a feature of identity politics, as a facet of individuality on par with ethnicity or skin color.[11] This has had deleterious effects in helping to keep the "regulatory ideal" of whiteness hidden. Whiteness, Rodriguez emphasizes, must be understood not only as an identity but also as a "normalizing system", that is, as a social and structural vehicle for the production and perpetuation of oppressive standards and norms.[12] If whiteness is a social-political system of dominance, what is its relationship to white identity and how is this normalizing mechanism sustained?

As a system of dominance, white hegemony is ubiquitous, implicit in all avenues of semiotic production in our society. But the system can only be upheld and perpetuated by the performances of the people who are a part of it. Both the subordinated and the dominant have roles to play in keeping the system running smoothly. Systems of domination require "everyone's daily collaboration."[13] Consequently, systems of domination will only be dismantled if the identities that sustain them are renounced and if the practices that support them are disrupted. Renouncing identities, however, is a complicated issue because who we racially are is not something that is always under our control. What does it mean that our racial identity is not entirely under our control?

Distinguishing between personal and ascribed identity draws our attention to the messy intricacies of agency that can be connected to racial identity. This distinction also facilitates our understanding of the relationship between whiteness and white identity and draws our attention to the performative aspect of the latter.

WHITE IDENTITY — PERSONAL IDENTITY AND ASCRIBED IDENTITY[14]

When I (Barbara) first decided to stop smoking, I was told that I had to learn to see myself as a "non-smoker." In fact, although I tried many times to stop smoking, it was not until I made that paradigm shift in my mind that "I am not a smoker" that I successfully stopped smoking. In *Memoir of a Race Traitor*, Mab Segrest discusses her allegiance to people of color and her disallegiance to her own race. As she begins to feel more uneasy around whites in the South she reflects, "Maybe whiteness was more about consciousness than color?"[15]

But is white identity just a frame of mind? Is white identity just a matter of personal identity — an issue of who we think we are? In his discussion of gender and race as sources of identity, Anthony Appiah distinguishes between ethical and metaphysical identity.[16] Appiah argues that we must think of social categories such as race and gender as both sources of our self-identity (what he refers to as ethical identity and that we refer to as personal identity) and as categories by which others classify us (what he refers to as metaphysical identity and that we refer to as ascribed identity). While there is a sense in which we can all clearly choose our ethical identities, who has choice regarding metaphysical identity and what this choice means is a much more messy issue.

To illustrate this messiness, my close friend is biracial and has light-skin and "white" features. She announces to the world that she sees herself as a black person, but the world shouts back denying her blackness and imposing whiteness upon her. In terms of ascribed identity (her metaphysical identity), she is racially white, even though her personal racial identity is not. However, this is to oversimplify ascribed white identity because it takes more than white skin to make a person "white." As a white, middle-class Jewish woman, I know from my ancestors that, regardless of their light-skin, Ashkanazi or European Jews in North America were not always considered "white." Yet, I know that today I obtain privileges that others are unjustly denied because I am considered "white." When did Jews "become white" and who bestowed this status upon them? Similarly, Noel Ignatiev argues that having fair skin was necessary but not sufficient to make the Irish eligible to be "white."[17] They had to earn their status as "white."

The New Abolitionists recognize the power of ascribed racial identity — especially as pertaining to white racial identity. They recognize that white privilege is not simply a matter of who we think we are, or what skin color we have, but, more importantly, *how we appear to act*. Christine Sleeter's notion of "white racial bonding" is fundamental to understanding the New Abolitionists' position. "White racial bonding," according to Sleeter, involves the processes by which whites maintain racial solidarity. White racial bonding is formed through the implicit communicative actions and behavior of white people and takes many forms, among which are race-related "asides" in conversations, strategic eye contact, and jokes. As she puts it, "Often these communications are so short and subtle that they may seem relatively harmless."[18] The notion of "white racial bonding" draws our attention to the solidarity that is created by implicit but expected "white" action and behavior. Acting as expected secures racial bonding.

When the New Abolitionists call for white people to provoke mass confusion among white people over who is white, this is not some trivial and ridiculous demand. In this recommendation, the New Abolitionists underscore that white privilege is not only dependent on skin color but also a matter of *how white people act to each other*. Yet, because the New Abolitionists conflate whiteness and white identity, and thus, because they do not keep our personal and ascribed identity distinct, they often confuse the choice different people have regarding their racial identity. Consequently, they are led to pronouncements whose educational implications are unrealistic or counterproductive.

Only by distinguishing between whiteness and white identity, and, furthermore, between white personal identity and white ascribed identity can the more performative aspects of racial identity (what white people actually have control over and what they can change) be illuminated. The performative aspect of white identity can also help us better appreciate what renouncing white identity can mean.

RENOUNCING RACE PRIVILEGE — THE PERFORMATIVE ASPECT OF WHITE IDENTITY

To this point, we have argued that the Deconstructionist claim that the renouncement of white identity entails renouncing white privilege is insufficient

because it leaves several important questions unanswered. Should all white privilege be renounced? What exactly does it mean to renounce white privilege? Peggy McIntosh maintains that while some white privilege needs to be eliminated because it reinforces hegemony, some privilege that white people enjoy should just be extended to all.[19] In a related point, by focusing on the performative aspect of white identity, Alison Bailey offers us a way to understand both how white privilege sustains oppression and discrimination and what renouncing white privilege can mean.[20]

Offering a significant concept, a "race traitor," according to Bailey, is someone who belongs to the dominant group yet resists the usual assumptions and practices of that group. Borrowing from Ruth Frankenberg, Bailey distinguishes between "privilege-cognizant" and "privilege-evasive" white scripts.[21] While the former involves white ways of acting that acknowledge white privilege, the latter involves white ways of acting that sustain a blindness to the advantages incurred by enacting them. Using these concepts, "race traitors" are "privilege-cognizant white people who refuse to animate the scripts whites are expected to perform, and who are unfaithful to the worldview whites are expected to hold."[22] In contrast, race traitors, according to Bailey, are not white people who lose their privilege in the sense of becoming marginalized themselves. Rather, "race traitors" are dominant group members who change their way of seeing the world because they are critically reflective about their privilege and take responsibility for it.

From Bailey, the case of Anne and Carl Braden illustrates this point. When black families were continually being refused homes in all white neighborhoods, the Bradens, a white couple who wanted to do something about this injustice, bought a home in an all white neighborhood for the sole purpose of deeding it to Charlotte and Andrew Wade, a black couple. While she applauds their action, Bailey points out that although the Bradens lost some of their privileges as a consequence of their action (and in that sense became marginal), they never completely lost their white privilege (and in that sense could never be marginal like the Wades were). Thus, "race traitors" are not white people who become "non-white," because they *cannot* become "non-white." They cannot because their identity "as white" is only partially self-determined. White identity, as not only a personal identity but also an ascribed one, is also dependent on other whites. An individual is white when one *feels and acts* white but also when society confirms that the individual *is* white. Thus, race traitors become marginal, Bailey argues, not in the sense of their social location but rather in the sense of how they perceive the world. They make an *epistemic shift*. "Race traitors" are dominant group members who acknowledge their dominance and privilege and try to do something about it. Traitorous identities, Bailey writes, "(d)estabilize their insider status by challenging and resisting the usual assumptions held by most white people (such as the belief that white privilege is earned, inevitable, or natural)."[23]

Educationally, it is important to emphasize to our white students that it is insufficient to understand racism from an individual perspective. Racism involves a social-political system of dominance — it is all over, in the air we breathe — and

is upheld and perpetuated by the performances of the people who are a part of it. These performances are best understood in terms of scripts that we learn at a very early age — in school, in our families, through the media. Although, racial scripts are so deeply ingrained in us that they are often hard to recognize, a white person can develop a critically reflective consciousness and refuse to perform the white script one has learned.

I (Barbara) remember entering a crowded subway train in Toronto. There were two seats available — one was next to a young, Black youth. My initial reaction, without thought, was not to sit next to the young black man. But immediately I caught myself. Another script in my mind asked me "why do you do that?" Furthermore, I wondered what message I might convey to the young, Black youth by not sitting next to him. So I made it a point to sit down next to him. But that I have to make it a point, to me, is indicative of my deeper socialization. While I can become aware of and can refuse to perform the white scripts that I have learned, I have to be continually vigilant because there are scripts that I do not see but that I act upon without being aware of them.

The performative aspect of white identity, however, also helps us understand what it means to renounce white privilege by underscoring that it is not enough only to not act as expected but it is also important to take positive steps to rectify an injustice. The limitations of this essay require us to be brief. But to return to the Braden case, the Bradens did not remain silent but risked some of their privilege in their action against social injustice. Because they acknowledged their privilege, they were able to see the discrimination that is usually hidden by white privilege. While they did not entirely renounce their privilege, in one sense it is clear that they *used* their privilege in ways not conventionally intended. Moreover, the Bradens *shared* their privilege by affording the Wades the respect that is usually an unearned benefit of being a member of the dominant group. They not only sold the Wades a house, they listened to the Wade's experiences, did not discount or dismiss them, and they responded to their situation by taking their needs and concerns seriously.

It is our contention that such traitorous identities as Bailey describes are redefining white scripts in privilege-cognizant ways. And we need more traitorous white identities!!! If enough white people are educated to be privilege-cognizant, whiteness and its concomitant oppression will more likely be challenged and will lose support. If more white people become privilege-cognizant, redlining would not be tolerated and profiling by the police would not have to be endured by people of color before it became a valid injustice requiring attention. If enough white people become privilege-cognizant, the degrading and aggravating experiences that people of color (and other subordinated social groups) endure daily would be taken seriously. The development of positive, white, anti-racist identities, we conclude, plays a crucial role in the success of any social justice education initiative.

CONCLUSION

In this essay, we have attempted to show that when whiteness as a system of dominance is theoretically separated from whiteness as white identity, important questions about agency and racial identity are clarified and the constructive

educational insights offered by the Deconstructionists become known. Only when whiteness and white identity are clearly distinguished so that the complex relationship between them is exposed can we appreciate what white, anti-racists can do and the role that a positive white identity plays in overthrowing white hegemony. Moreover, these distinctions not only delineate what a positive, anti-racist identity might look like but also powerfully explicate why such an identity is fundamental to the success of any anti-racist, anti-bias educational initiative.

Educators committed to social justice must not only help raise their students' awareness of dominance, they must also help their white students understand what they can choose to do about it. In refusing to animate privilege-evasive white scripts, anti-racist white people are not only renouncing their white privilege but also choosing to invent privilege-cognizant white scripts.

Yet as educators, we must not let our concern with our white students eclipse the needs and interests of our non-white students. Regarding the field of white studies, Maulana Karenga cautions white people to be open and reflective about its intent, methodology and effect.[24] Similarly, social justice educators must make certain that the focus on white identity does not make other voices peripheral or overshadow the political, economic and cultural suffering of non-white people and the ways in which their freedom and dignity are constrained by dominance. To make white people the center of attention for even well-intended reasons is to reaffirm the importance of white people and to reinscribe white hegemony.

Given these qualifications, the importance of reconstructing white identity must not be underestimated. To teach our students how to avoid enacting privilege-evasive white scripts is only a first, albeit significant, move that anti-racist educators must encourage. Reconstructing a positive, anti-racist white identity that *actively* struggles against injustice is also important. Even as we work together towards the aim of dismantling whiteness, this will take a long time. It is mistaken to think that by destroying white identity we will bring about the destruction of whiteness. On the contrary, only when whiteness is destroyed will white identity lose its meaning. Until that day, those of us who are white must always remember that we remain white although we can be white and yet committed to the obliteration of whiteness.

---

1. Peter McLaren, "Unthinking Whiteness, Rethinking Democracy: Or Farewell to the Blond Beast; Towards a Revolutionary Multiculturalism," *Educational Foundations* 11, no. 12 (1997): 5-39.

2. Henry Giroux, "Rewriting the Discourse of Racial Identity: Towards a Pedagogy and Politics of Whiteness," *Harvard Educational Review* 67, no. 20 (1997).

3. Noel Ignatiev, "Extract of *The New Abolitionists*," *Transition* 73 (1998): 199.

4. Ibid.

5. McLaren, "Unthinking Whiteness," 32.

6. Ibid., 29.

7. The classmate might argue that he is not making a conceptual claim but rather an empirical one. From the perspective of a person of color who has been marginalized by white people, it is empirically true that white identity is harmful. Moreover, the classmate might add that this empirical claim about the harmful consequences of white identity is not just referring to neo-conservatives who have been appropriating white identity but do not acknowledge the power and privilege of whiteness. Marginalization is a consequence of even well-intentioned white identity. To this we reply that we do not deny that it is an empirical fact that white identity as it is currently enacted is harmful in both explicit and implicit ways. Yet we argue that white people can work to change such empirical consequences. Because this individual is arguing that white identity cannot be changed, that it must be renounced, we see this as a conceptual, rather than empirical, claim.

8. Noel Ignatiev and John Garvey, eds., *Race Traitor* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 115.

9. McLaren, "Unthinking Whiteness," 30.

10. James Cone, *A Black Theology of Liberation* (New York: Orbis Books, 1986), 97 as cited in McLaren, "Unthinking Whiteness," 31. McLaren is not implying that white people put on blackface and feign blackness. Rather McLaren's notion of renouncing white identity is a demand to politically disidentify with white privilege and to identify with non-white social struggles. Employing phrases like "becoming black" and "choosing blackness or brownness," however, may mislead his readers.

11. Nelson Rodriguez, "Emptying the Content of Whiteness: Toward an Understanding of the Relation between Whiteness and Pedagogy," in *White Reign: Deploying Whiteness in America,* ed. J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, and R.E. Chennault, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 31-62.

12. Ibid., 32.

13. Alison Bailey, "Locating Traitorous Identities: Toward a View of Privilege — Cognizant White Character," *Hypatia* 13, no. 3 (1998): 33.

14. It is important to emphasize that we are not implying an essentialistic understanding of racial identity, nor are we reifying race. We recognize that whiteness, in general, and white identity, in particular, are always changing and in flux. The power of whiteness and white identity is always affected by its intersection with other axes of difference such as gender, class, and sexual orientation. Nevertheless, race is a facet of everyday existence and it is in this sense that we maintain race discourse cannot be ignored. To do away with race, we believe that it is necessary to go through race.

15. Mab Segrest, *Memoir of a Race Traitor* (Boston: South End Press, 1994), 80.

16. Anthony Appiah, "'But Would That Still Be Me?' Notes on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, as Sources of 'Identity,'" *Journal of Philosophy* 87, no. 10 (1990): 493-99.

17. Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

18. Christine Sleeter, "White Racism," *Multicultural Education* 1, no. 4 (1994): 8.

19. Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," *Independent School* (Winter 1990): 31-36; also see interview with Richard Delgado in "The Study of Whiteness," Roberto Rodriguez, *Black Issues in Higher Education* (13 May 1999): 23.

20. Bailey, "Locating Traitorous Identities," 27-42.

21. Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,1993).

22. Bailey, "Locating Traitorous Identities," 28.

23. Ibid., 32.

24. Maulana Karenga, "Whiteness Studies: Deceptive or Welcome Discourse?" *Black Issues in Higher Education* (13 May 1999): 26-27.