

**COPYRIGHT NOTICE**

**Stockdill & Danico, eds./Transforming the Ivory Tower**

is published by University of Hawai'i Press and copyrighted, © 2012, by University of Hawai'i Press. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher, except for reading and browsing via the World Wide Web. Users are not permitted to mount this file on any network servers.

## CHAPTER ONE

# The Ivory Tower Paradox

*Higher Education as a Site of Oppression and Resistance*

---

BRETT C. STOCKDILL AND MARY YU DANICO

Our solidarity must be affirmed by shared belief in a spirit of intellectual openness that celebrates diversity, welcomes dissent, and rejoices in collective dedication to truth.

—bell hooks (1994: 33)

The academy is often imagined as an idyllic place, neutral and untarnished by the ugly inequalities that mar the “outside world.” Yet the “ivory tower” is a part of the world and, like other institutions, is a site of oppression, resistance, and transformation. As educators and scholars, we have a profound opportunity and a responsibility to speak out and to take action against social injustice both outside and inside the academy. The contributors to *Transforming the Ivory Tower* thoughtfully critique academic inequalities and provocatively challenge us to collectively remake the academy. We ground our vision of higher education in justice, activism, equality, and hope. In this introduction, we identify paradoxical dynamics in higher education to contextualize the chapters that follow, all of which provide theoretical and strategic models for igniting social change in the academy.

Heterosexist, affluent, White males have historically dominated universities and colleges in the United States. Marginalized groups have

fought for access and equality in educational settings and have made significant progress toward these goals. In contrast to notions of ivory tower neutrality and openness, the costs of entrance for oppressed groups have been high. Academics from both privileged and oppressed groups are professionalized to conform to dominant norms that reinforce social inequality, and those who disrupt the status quo typically face negative sanctions, including harassment, stigmatization, and discrimination in retention, tenure, and promotion. All too often, the expectation of working-class people, people of color, women, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer<sup>1</sup> (LGBTQ) people in academe has been that they will assume the politics, values, and ideals of their upper-middle-class, White, male, heterosexual peers (Dews and Law 1995; Ladner 1998; Latina Feminist Group 2001; Mintz and Rothblum 1997; Stanley 2006).

While conventional teaching pedagogies, research, and theories have historically perpetuated racial, class, gender, and sexual inequalities, there is also a rich legacy of utilizing education in the pursuit of liberation. When we look, there is a dissident tradition in virtually all disciplines, from physics to economics to sociology (Anzaldúa and Moraga 1983; Ayers, Miller, and Quinn 1998; Feagin and Vera 2008; Freire 2000; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1998; Miheusah and Wilson 2004).<sup>2</sup> Because our privileges as faculty members rest upon this historical legacy as well as on broader movements for change, we have an obligation to do more than passively occupy the spaces created. Our goal for *Transforming the Ivory Tower* is to build upon this living history of thoughtful critique and collective struggles of women, LGBTQ, racial/ethnic minority, progressive, and leftist faculty in the United States. Such an intellectual project is crucial because academic inequalities are interconnected with inequalities in other spheres of the social world. Grounded in lived experiences shaped by a matrix of oppressions and privileges, the authors dissect the complex mechanisms of bias and inequality in the ivory tower as well as strategies to make it more inclusive and democratic. Along with our contributors, we offer this anthology—a collection of testimonies of survival, cultural and institutional critiques, and alternative approaches to research, teaching, and service—to illuminate ongoing efforts to transform the ivory tower into an inclusive, egalitarian community grounded in social justice.

## Origins in Solidarity

This project began in 1998 when, as newly hired assistant professors at a state university in Southern California, we grappled with the contradictions that reflect, in the words of bell hooks (1994: 4), “the difference between education as the practice of freedom and education that merely strives to reinforce domination.” Discovering a colleague who shared similar views about education, scholarship, and advocacy was energizing and supporting. Interestingly, our personal biographies do not mirror each other, but are in fact quite different: Mary is a straight, 1.5 generation<sup>3</sup> Korean American woman who immigrated to the United States from South Korea as a child. Brett is a gay White man born in the United States. Mary attended a public school—the University of Hawai‘i—for graduate school, while Brett attended a private school—Northwestern University. Politically, Mary might best be described as a liberal and Brett as a queer leftist. Though our shared middle-class background is no doubt significant, one might expect that we would have little in common based on narrow notions of identity politics. But we immediately bonded as junior faculty members because we both valued struggles for social equality and we believed passionately in social justice and the power of teaching and mentoring students. Building on our previous activist experiences in antiracism, immigrant rights, decolonization, feminism, and HIV/AIDS, we endeavored to place social change and social justice at the core of our teaching, research, and professional activities. While we were not strangers to bias and discrimination in academia, having endured our respective undergraduate and graduate programs, we grew increasingly troubled by systemic attempts to dismiss our concerns about inequalities on campus and quash our individual and collective defiance of these inequalities.

We experienced quite viscerally a central paradox of the academy: Critical thinking was promoted only to the extent that it did not call into question biases and bigotry *within* the department, the classroom, or the university. Within the university, there is an inherent expectation of loyalty and unquestioned conformity from faculty. Yet institutions themselves are often not loyal to faculty, students, or staff. Multiple inequalities linked to hierarchical, undemocratic decision-making

processes make higher education an alienating place for many students and staff and faculty members. When we questioned institutional contradictions and bigotry, some staff, faculty, and administrators viewed us as “troublemakers.”

While we certainly faced the generic biases that commonly target, in Mary’s case, immigrants, Asian Americans, and women, and in Brett’s case openly LGBTQ people, our deliberate decisions to speak out against classism, racism, sexism, and homophobia within our department and university provoked much deeper antagonism and reprimands. We possessed less institutional power than did tenured faculty and administrators, but our recognition of our privileges compelled us to confront both subtle and overt inequities. We recognized that the inequalities we both experienced in our respective lives were interconnected and that we could not fight one form of social injustice without fighting others. For five years, we watched each other’s back, provided mutual support, and helped each other navigate the peaks and valleys of the academic terrain. It would have been difficult to emotionally survive our early career had we not had each other to articulate our shared consciousness of being targeted and in some cases ostracized for not going with the flow. We viewed our resistance as a continuation of our earlier activism and as a contribution to broader political struggles. In a sense, our camaraderie and teamwork<sup>4</sup> represent a microcosm of key themes in this book: While teachers and scholars who work for social justice face negative reprisals, we can effect change by strategically and defiantly working together, in particular by building alliances between different groups and communities.

We have sometimes been met with looks of bewilderment and shock when we share our stories about racism, sexism, and homophobia with friends outside the academy. Many people believe that members of the academy are somehow more enlightened and open-minded than other people: “You would think people in higher education would know better!” Yet denial is a common response to charges of racism, sexism, and homophobia. Many university staff, faculty, and administrators, particularly those from privileged groups, minimize or do not recognize the inequalities they condone or enact in departmental meetings; retention, tenure, and promotion proceedings; administrative policies and

practices; or as teachers, advisors, and mentors to students. This lack of recognition is frequently exacerbated by the self-righteous belief that possessing a PhD exempts one from complicity in systems of oppression, particularly among social scientists who perceive themselves as “experts” in their fields. When we identified bias, we were accused of “being too sensitive,” “not being able to let go and move on,” or simply being “the problem.”

While we faced barriers within our department and university, our shared experiences reminded us that we did not have to remain silent or invisible, but rather we had to be proactively outspoken, visible, and engaged in the university. Although we were junior faculty (without tenure), we felt compelled to expose the language and politics of exclusion and marginalization and to offer alternative ways of thinking and acting within the ivory tower. In particular, we saw tremendous opportunities to educate, mentor, and advocate for our students in ways we had never experienced.

Our experiences were not and are not unique. When we participated in and organized conference panels that addressed inequalities in higher education, attendees commonly expressed surprise, solidarity, appreciation, and encouragement. They were not surprised by the experiences described, but rather that we were willing to name in public forums the inequalities within our own departments and institutions. There were audible sighs of relief from those who realized they were not alone, but instead part of a collective who shared experiences of being tokenized, alienated, and exploited. In formal and informal discussions, we talked about the root causes of such prejudice and discrimination—some that were clear-cut and others that were murky or even bizarre. We met many other scholars committed to pushing for an inclusive curriculum, equitable practices and policies in departments and universities, and working in solidarity with student and community activists.

Many people told us that publishing analyses of the often hidden dynamics of oppression and resistance in the academy would be invaluable to graduate students, new faculty, administrators, and especially those in various fields who defy the status quo to work for social justice. We realized then that we had to seek out scholars who not only had endured alienating doctoral programs, divisive department and

university politics, or the grueling retention/promotion/tenure process, but who were also willing to share their perspectives publicly.

Our invitation for submissions was received with great enthusiasm, and professors from across the United States sent us both their insightful critiques and their strategies to fight for social change in the ivory tower and beyond. The contributors speak from different social spaces and individual biographies, but they share a commitment to using their privileged roles as professors to examine the legacy of oppression that permeates higher education, to mentor students, and to give back to their communities. They reflect on different facets of higher education including teaching, mentoring, research, academic culture and practices, university-community partnerships, and campus activism. Each chapter is guided by a commitment to praxis—the idea that theoretical understandings of inequality must be applied to concrete strategies for change. The chapters build on the historical struggles to open up colleges and universities to oppressed groups and to dissenting voices.

### **Social Change and the Academy within the United States**

Contrary to notions of ivory tower intellectual and political neutrality, universities have been crucial sites of social conflict and change around the world for centuries (Boren 2001; Lipset 1993). Here we provide a brief historical backdrop of key patterns in higher education in the United States. A focus on the United States is important because the educational system, particularly the theoretical knowledge produced therein, has played a key role in promoting Western colonialism and contemporary neoliberal domination of less industrialized countries (Connell 1997). In turn, anticolonial and antiglobalization movements have been interconnected with antiracist and anti-imperialist activism on United States campuses (Wei 1993; Welton and Wolf 2001; Zinn 2003).

On the one hand, United States universities have contributed to systems of oppression—racism, sexism, homophobia, classism, and imperialism. Mainstream scholars—from a vast array of disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences—have portrayed people of color as violent, lazy, stupid, and conniving and in general inferior to Whites (Goldberg 1993; Gould 1996); women as irrational, physically

and mentally weak, and necessarily subordinate to men (Fausto-Sterling 1985; Russett 1989); and lesbians and gay men as diseased, perverted, and a threat to (straight) families (Chauncey 1994; Fone 2001). Such depictions have been used to justify patterns of exploitation, abuse, and violence too numerous to even summarize here, but we provide a few examples. The “science” of eugenics laid the groundwork for the coerced sterilization of hundreds of thousand of immigrant women, poor women, and women of color (Davis 1983); physics, chemistry, and math have been harnessed to make more accurate and deadly weapons of mass destruction such as the atomic bomb, napalm, and white phosphorous (Langford 2004); and neoliberal economic theories have facilitated the atrocities of free trade—environmental destruction, sweatshop labor, poverty, genocide, and ethnocide (Danaher 2001; Gedicks 2001).

On the other hand, dissident academics have cultivated oppositional ideologies including myriad forms of Marxism, feminism, critical race theory, and queer theory that provide theoretical frameworks for dismantling inequalities (Freire 2000; Miheuah and Wilson 2004; Pellow, this volume; Vargas 2002). Campus activists across the country have nurtured protests against slavery, militarism, segregation, and disenfranchisement. Radical students in particular have time and again been the midwives of social movements including the students of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee who galvanized the civil rights movement (Carson 1996) and Students for a Democratic Society who ignited the antiwar (Vietnam) movement (DeBenedetti 1990; Pekar, Buhle, and Dumm 2009).

Such revolutionary thought and action have often been intertwined with demands for full equality in education for women, people of color, lesbians and gay men, and poor and working-class people. Until the 1970s, the vast majority of students, faculty, and administrators were affluent White males—publicly heterosexuals. In the face of exclusion and discrimination, oppressed groups have struggled to attain equal rights to formal education.

While White boys and girls across the socioeconomic spectrum were provided with public primary schools beginning in the mid-1800s, their schooling was stratified by class, and few poor and working-class students went to high school until after World War I. In turn, few poor

and working-class people—men or women—met the necessary admissions requirements for colleges and universities until well into the twentieth century, and costs for tuition and room and board effectively barred many from entry. After World War II, several interrelated factors including activism, the GI Bill, economic trends, and political developments such as the Cold War led to the expansion of city and state university and college systems, allowing a greater number of poor and working-class people to pursue higher education (Thelin 2004). Class inequalities at colleges and universities include economic obstacles (e.g., high tuition and other costs), lack of support services for low-income students, and middle-class biases in teaching and research. In the post–World War II era, academics of working-class origin have challenged such inequalities as well as the related pressure to assimilate to the constrictive, upper-middle-class values and ideals that are often at odds with their communities of origin (Dews and Law 1995; Ryan and Sackrey 1984). Classism often works in concert with racism and sexism, and working-class people of color and working-class women experience—and resist—the effects of multiple, interlocking forms of bias and discrimination.

Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, communities of color organized to gain access to primary, secondary, and higher education. Pioneers, such as African American scholar and activist W. E. B. DuBois, endured racial bigotry at White institutions, blazing paths for future generations (Marable 1986). Communities of color also acted collectively to challenge inequities in higher education. For example, a significant number of African Americans, largely from the middle class, attended historically Black colleges and universities established primarily during the Jim Crow era (Bennett 1993; Roebuck and Murty 1993).

The exclusion and underrepresentation of students and faculty of color in the academy have frequently been framed within a Black-White paradigm. The racialized discourse has often rendered invisible the experiences of Asian Americans, Native Americans, Chican@s and Latin@s,<sup>5</sup> and other ethnic minorities in higher education. Native Americans, of course, lived in what is now the United States for millennia. Many Latin@ and Asian communities predate United States colonial expansion into what is now the southwestern and western United States as well as the Caribbean. Falsely portrayed as newcomers

and habitually ignored, these diverse communities have waged battles for equal access to education that have often been erased from public discussions and academic research (Calderon, this volume; Champagne and Stauss 2002; Mirandé 1989; Takaki 1987).

Social movements in the post–World War II period such as the civil rights movement, the Chican@ movement, and the Third World Liberation Front tackled racial and class exclusion and marginalization. These movements commonly focused on the integration of schools on all levels, leading to increases in the number of students of color in United States colleges and universities in the 1960s and 1970s and catalyzing more multicultural approaches to education (Muñoz 2007; Wallenstein 2009; Wei 1993).

Beyond primary (and later secondary) school, the majority of women did not attend college until the 1970s due to gender inequalities. Some upper-class White women attended finishing schools to prepare them for marriage, and a significant number of young women attended “normal schools” to become teachers. Women such as Jane Addams<sup>6</sup> attended women’s colleges created by middle- and upper-class White women in the 1800s. These colleges were central sites of organizing for women’s suffrage and other first-wave feminist campaigns. Other women, such as African American Anna Julia Cooper,<sup>7</sup> attended predominantly male (and White) schools. Women fought for and gained greater access to higher education after World War II, a movement that escalated with the emergence of second-wave feminism—the women’s movement of the 1960s and 1970s—and contributed to increased opportunities in higher education for women (Solomon 1986). In 2007–2008 women earned 57 percent of all bachelor’s degrees in the United States (U.S. Department of Education 2010).

Social movements won integration as well as affirmative action policies that resulted in more people of color and women entering graduate school in the 1960s and 1970s and joining the ranks of faculty in the 1970s and 1980s. However, changes in the composition of the faculties of colleges and universities have been much slower than changes in the student population. In 1941, the Julius Rosenwald Fund surveyed predominantly White colleges and universities and found only two Black faculty members in the United States (Wilson 1995). The numbers of Black and

other faculty of color were miniscule until the 1970s and remain alarmingly low today. Though they make up approximately one-third of the U.S. population, racial minorities make up only 17 percent of full-time professors and only 13 percent of full professors (the highest professorial rank). Latin@s, African Americans, and Native Americans, who respectively make up about 15, 12, and 1 percent of the United States population, account for only 2, 3, and 0.3 percent of full professors. White men make up approximately 32 percent of the total population, but 63 percent of full professors (*Chronicle of Higher Education* 2009).

By 1940, women held 25 percent of tenure track positions in the United States, a percentage that declined after World War II to 23 percent in the 1950s and 22 percent in the 1960s (Chamberlain 1988). While women account for slightly more than half the total population, they make up 42 percent of full-time faculty and only 26 percent of full professors (*Chronicle of Higher Education* 2009).

Systemic sexism and racism (e.g., androcentric/Eurocentric curriculum, pedagogy, and research; gender/racial stereotypes; bias in performance evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions; harassment and violence) shape the experiences of women and people of color on college campuses today. Both female faculty and faculty of color earn lower salaries than their White male counterparts and are disproportionately concentrated in the lower ranks of faculty (e.g., nontenure track) and in less prestigious universities and disciplines (American Association of University Professors 2008; Barbezat and Hughes 2005; Bernal and Villalpando 2002; Toutkoushian 1998). The interactive effects of racism and sexism compound the structural barriers facing women of color who make up only a small percentage of tenure track and tenured faculty (Myers 2007; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001; Vargas 2002).

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people have historically faced systemic harassment and discrimination in the ivory tower, and homophobia has forced many students, faculty, and administrators to live double lives or risk expulsion or dismissal. Fueled by other movements of the 1960s, the gay liberation movement encompassed gay male and lesbian student demands for the right to education free from prejudice, harassment, and discrimination. In recent decades an ever-increasing number of students, and a smaller portion of faculty, have

been “out” on college campuses, but homophobia continues to pervade higher education, creating barriers for both LGBTQ students and faculty members. The pervasive hostility toward LGBTQ communities in broader society spills over onto campuses. Systemic heterosexism and homophobia—often interacting with class, race, and gender—create a hostile cultural climate in the classroom, in meetings, at campus events, and within the performance evaluation of staff and faculty for those who challenge heteronormative ideals and norms (American Sociological Association 2002, 2009; McNaron 1996; Mintz and Rothblum 1997; Stockdill, this volume).

The entrance of larger numbers of women, working-class folks, and people of color as well as the increased visibility of LGBTQ people in classrooms, departments, and disciplines has provoked challenges to heteropatriarchal, racist, and elitist teaching pedagogies, research methodologies, theoretical frameworks, and professionalization practices. Beginning in the late 1960s, student-led movements forced universities to create minors, majors, programs, and departments in Ethnic Studies (including Black/African American, Native American, Latin@ and Chican@, Asian American, and Arab American Studies) and Gender/Women’s Studies (Butler 2001; Butler and Walter 1991; Champagne and Stauss 2002; Lim and Herrera-Sobek 2000; Miheuah and Wilson, 2004; Vö, this volume). Students and faculty organized Gay and Lesbian/LGBT/Queer Studies courses in the 1970s and 1980s with the first programs created in the 1990s. Students also demanded and gained various cultural or student centers organized to provide resources, support services, and safe spaces for students of color, women, LGBTQ people, and other oppressed groups.

In the wake of the social movements of the 1960s, other marginalized groups have also organized for access to (and better quality of) higher education, including differently abled people. In recent decades there has been an increase in the number of “nontraditional” students (students over the age of twenty-five and/or students working full-time who are not recipients of the GI Bill) and undocumented immigrant students on U.S. campuses as well.

As the wave of affirmative action, Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and related programs and services surged, conservatives mounted attacks against such initiatives beginning in the 1970s (Butler 2001). The leaders

of the backlash focused on dismantling affirmative action policies and stating a need for “color-blind” curriculum, admissions, and hiring policies. Opponents argued that affirmative action constituted “reverse racism,” discriminatory racial preferences benefiting people of color and hurting Whites (Connerly 2000). Detractors framed the existence of Ethnic Studies, Women’s Studies, and support services for students of color and women as “proof” of special treatment and as evidence that racism and sexism were no longer institutionalized. Conservative people of color such as Thomas Sowell, Ward Connerly, and Dinesh D’Souza joined conservative Whites in assaulting affirmative action and asserting that institutionalized racism against people of color no longer existed. Since the 1980s, many universities have moved away from directly addressing racism and other inequalities. Within the context of the dismantling of affirmative action and related policies, racial minorities have experienced significant bias and discrimination in purportedly color-blind settings (Dovidio and Gaertner 1996; Gómez, this volume; Plaut, Thomas, and Goren 2009).

The dialectical forces of oppression and resistance continue in the twenty-first century. Collective action, including the development of coalitions between oppressed groups, regularly shakes the ivory tower and holds the doors open to marginalized groups. Women, people of color, LGBTQ people, and other oppressed groups such as undocumented immigrants continue to struggle against systemic inequalities on campuses throughout the United States. To both the public and insiders, the university is still commonly viewed as a neutral or benevolent institution where all who enter its halls are evaluated and treated equally; in reality, myriad types of bias and discrimination persist. While blatant inequalities continue, as Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues in the aptly titled *Racism without Racists*, in the post-civil rights movement era, more subtle forms of “color-blind racism” have emerged that complicate the inequalities targeting people of color (see also Bonus, this volume; Brown, Lomax, and Bartee 2007).<sup>8</sup> The paradigm of color-blindness has been applied to gender and sexuality as well, and more covert types of sexism and homophobia have emerged that target women and LGBTQ people. The specious contention that systemic oppressions have been virtually erased adds another layer of complexity to the interlocking

forms of oppression that undergird the ivory tower in the twenty-first century (Vargas 2002).

While some members of marginalized groups have blended into the mainstream by assimilating to the dominant norms of the academy, others have used their own privileges as teachers, researchers, and activists to not only study inequality but also to challenge it. Feminist, queer, and antiracist faculty, including male, straight, and White allies (Armato, this volume), have increasingly forged a shared political consciousness that guides multifaceted campaigns for social justice on and off campus (Banks 1996; Brown-Glaude 2008). The chapters in *Transforming the Ivory Tower* shed light on such efforts to build alternative approaches to higher education.

### Transformative Voices, Transformative Actions

Just as the contributors to *Transforming the Ivory Tower* derive inspiration and courage from past struggles, one central purpose of presenting our perspectives is to offer strategic solidarity to members of marginalized groups and their allies. A related goal is to educate those in the academy from all backgrounds on ways to better understand social inequalities and work toward social justice. While interconnected inequalities pervade the everyday practices of the university, critical analyses of resistance to these inequalities expand the horizons of the transformative power of higher education.

Following in the Black feminist tradition of *testifying* (Collins 1990),<sup>9</sup> the contributors share their testimonies of the many faces that oppression and resistance take in the ivory tower. Telling such stories pierces the silence that masks the very real costs and pains of bias, harassment, and discrimination that permeate the academy. Dominant academic culture inculcates myths of race, class, gender, and sexual(ity) neutrality as well as norms of docility and complicity with domination into faculty and administrators. We must unmask these myths and breach these norms to reinvent a university, one that is not only diverse, but also just.

The chapters by no means represent the totality of the forms of academic inequality or the types of faculty dissent. Most of the authors focus

primarily on the impact of racism on faculty of color and efforts to confront the racisms of the academy. This emphasis reflects the strong representation of Ethnic Studies scholars and should not be read as prioritizing racism over other forms of oppression. The activism and scholarship of feminists of color and lesbian feminists (overlapping groups) reveal that White supremacy, patriarchy, homophobia, and economic exploitation interlock and often operate simultaneously. In turn, an intersectional approach is essential to battle crisscrossing inequalities (Anzaldúa 1987; Cohen 1999; Smith 2006). Collectively, the chapters exemplify ways to build alliances not only between communities of color, but across race, class, gender, and sexual lines. Such a coalitional approach is essential to combating the overarching oppressions that impact all people, in both oppressed and oppressor groups. In turn, this requires recognition of not only relative oppressions but also relative privileges that landscape the halls of academia.

By grounding their analyses in personal experiences and observations, each contributor illuminates how her or his experiences with inequalities have been shaped by both oppression and privilege. The narratives presented here represent the complicated interplay between personal biographies and social forces that characterize life in the academy and beyond. Such critical analyses are crucial in challenging inequalities inside and outside the ivory tower. Though the anthology is only a partial exploration of social inequality and social justice in the academy, it addresses many of the inequities that confront women, LGBTQ people, and people of color navigating the academy, as well as resistance to these inequities.

While oppressed groups have made inroads in the academy, underrepresentation is still a problem today. Poor and working-class students and students of color are not proportionately represented at the most elite schools. These students are more likely to attend community/junior or city colleges and/or lower-tier public institutions that have fewer resources. What is also clear is that from junior colleges to Ivy League schools, conventional approaches to teaching and mentoring regularly fail students in oppressed groups because they do not take into account the many ways in which inequalities shape the educational experiences of working-class students, students of color, women, and LGBTQ students.

This problem is intimately connected to the even greater racial, gender, sexual, and class disparities among faculty and administrators. As faculty, we work in a system that has not yet caught up with the student population. Increasing numbers of women, people of color, openly LGBTQ students, first-generation students from low-income backgrounds, and immigrant students have changed the face of college campuses, yet a disproportionately high number of tenured faculty and top-level administrators are White men operating within a heteronormative framework. Multiple studies demonstrate that White men receive more mentoring than women and people of color and that this disparate socialization of graduate students and junior faculty provides more cultural capital and accompanying advantages for White males than for others (Margolis and Romero 1998; Tierney and Bensimon 1996; Turner and Thompson 1993). LGBTQ graduate students and junior faculty are also faced with inadequate mentoring and often do not receive other forms of social and academic support (American Sociological Association 2002, 2009; McNaron 1996; Mintz and Rothblum 1997).

Sensitive to the obstacles posed by institutionalized sexism, racism, and homophobia, female faculty, faculty of color, and openly LGBTQ faculty typically spend considerable time and energy working with students in marginalized groups. Women and faculty of color are often beleaguered with enormous teaching, mentoring, and service responsibilities that reinforce their vulnerability with respect to tenure and promotion (Fogg 2003; Turner 2002).

In “Transforming the Place That Rewards and Oppresses Us,” Rick Bonus explores how he responds to these and other dynamics related to inequality. His analysis reveals how academic racism shape the teaching, research, and service of faculty of color as well as how faculty can utilize their privileges and resources to combat endemic racism that isolates and alienates students of color. Within the context of the ongoing backlash against affirmative action, Bonus argues for the need to expand educational opportunities in higher education, in his words, “to convince those who think that this quest is reserved for the few elite or those who are White, and that it is only they who can lay claim to such a pursuit.” He describes how Pacific Islander Partnerships in Education (PIPE), a university-wide mentoring program he founded,

simultaneously promotes cultural empowerment among Pacific Islander students and provides them with the tools to excel academically. The success of PIPE led to the creation of allied mentoring programs for Chican@ and Latin@, African American and African diasporic, and Native American students at his university.

Bonus also dissects the double binds experienced by many faculty of color. In academia, decisions on the retention, tenure, and promotion of faculty are typically based on evaluation of three areas: teaching, research, and service. Mentoring students of color, which frequently encompasses all three of these areas, is often seen as the responsibility of faculty of color, but such mentoring is repeatedly devalued in retention, tenure, and promotion evaluations. In the face of this reality, he emphasizes faculty support of students' well-being as one path to transform schools.

This investment may come at the cost of producing scholarly research that is deemed of sufficient quality by the gatekeepers of academic work. Bonus analyzes how senior scholars have often deemed his research on Filipino Americans as unworthy of inquiry—another form of academic racism. On a broader level, he explains how Ethnic Studies as a whole is underprivileged and undervalued, both in terms of resources and legitimacy (a topic taken up in Linda Trinh Võ's chapter as well). Here again, he argues that struggling—both internally within Ethnic Studies and in the larger world of the academy—is necessary to transform universities. These struggles necessitate moving beyond “nonthreatening” approaches to diversity (for example, merely counting the number of faculty of color) to approaches that challenge institutional barriers to oppressed groups and center social justice as a goal on and off campus. Despite the challenges, Bonus finds pleasure in developing community-based, antiracist teaching and mentoring as well as conducting research that critiques Eurocentric conventions and centers the lives of people of color. As other chapters also demonstrate, supporting, inspiring, and giving hope to students produces rewards that keep many faculty members motivated to stand against the many obstacles within the ivory tower.

The bodies of LGBTQ people, women, and people of color are not the sole indicators of transformation in the university. Representation

of oppressed groups has increased among faculty members, and some forms of blatant inequality have diminished, but both old and new forms of the “isms” have marked the post–civil rights movement era. The more subtle forms of homophobia, sexism, and racism are sometimes difficult for people to identify and comprehend, particularly for straight people, men, and Whites. When faculty from oppressed groups speak out against systemic institutional and cultural factors that negatively impact their productivity, many faculty and administrators view them at best as noncollegial and at worst as the sources of conflict. Instead of assessing historical and contemporary practices that create hostile work environments, other faculty and administrators, whether consciously or unconsciously, blame the victims and in many cases directly or indirectly push such faculty out of academia (Stanley 2006). Decoding the different manifestations of inequality that operate in the academy is therefore imperative in order to retain faculty committed to diversity and social justice.

It is critical that progressive and leftist faculty understand and name the “new” racisms and other inequalities encoded into (sometimes) subtle language and practices. Only when faculty members speak out and testify about the inequalities that shape their lives in the classroom, in faculty meetings, and as they move through retention, tenure, and promotion can we collectively move toward meaningful change in university policies and culture. Because many straight, male, and White academics (including administrators) are oblivious to their roles in perpetuating inequalities in the workplace, the individual and collective voices of dissident faculty play a critical role in educating their colleagues.

In her chapter “Telling Our Stories, Naming Ourselves: The Lost María in the Academy,” Christina Gómez identifies incidents of racial and gender discrimination she has endured in higher education. As is often the case, even as her research and teaching deconstruct and critique institutionalized racism and sexism, she faces both blatant and subtle discrimination from colleagues and students. She writes, “With overt forms of bigotry, one learns very quickly whom to stay away from, whom to be aware of, and whom to trust. But the covert forms of racism that now permeate our society create perilous ambiguity.” Gómez uncloaks this ambiguity by naming particular instances of bias and discrimination.

On multiple occasions, White male faculty advisors and colleagues have misnamed Christina as “Maria,” Gómez as “Gonzalez.” Gómez writes that in contrast to students of color, who typically address her as professor or *doctora*, many White students and faculty refer to her by her first name (see also Turner 2002). Such incidents are emblematic of the common sexist and racist customs that impede women of color in the academy, customs commonly unacknowledged, but enacted, by male faculty and White faculty. They reflect the monolithic gendered and racialized perceptions of Latinas and women of color in general.

The prisms of race and gender distort individual characteristics and qualifications. The demonization of affirmative action policies provokes the questioning of the professional worth of women and faculty of color by their peers. Like other women and faculty of color, Gómez reports being automatically seen as a beneficiary of affirmative action. In turn, such dynamics often make faculty of color and women feel that they have to prove that they deserve their position (Chilly Collective 1995). As Gómez writes, one by-product of this is the pressure on faculty of color to take on an excessive amount of service commitments (see also Brayboy 2003; Turner and Myers 2000). Faculty of color and other marginalized groups face a double bind in the area of service. Many faculty of color want to contribute to efforts to increase the representation of students and faculty of color, but in the process, administrators and White colleagues exploit their labor and commodify faculty of color as representations of racial and ethnic diversity (Tierney and Bensimon 1996), diversity that is typically very thin. Women of color, like Gómez, face being tokenized doubly as symbols of both gender and racial diversity.

Gómez explores the tensions in being not only a woman of color, a Latina, whose scholarship focuses on race and ethnicity, particularly Latin@ communities. On the one hand, her research and writing on Latin@ experiences is sometimes devalued, while on the other hand, she is often expected to conduct research only on “Latino” issues. For many women of color, race- and gender-based research is seen as “self-serving” by many White and male colleagues (Wright 2006: 86).

Echoing other scholars (Chilly Collective 1995; Stanley 2006; Turner and Myers 2000; Myers 2007), Gómez describes the isolation and emotional pain that result from such abusive patterns at a primarily

White institution. Creating community with other faculty of color to share experiences and provide mutual support has helped Gómez to survive the ordeals of the ivory tower. Faculty of color who have support systems and diverse social networks are more likely to be retained and promoted (Cooper 2006; Rockquemore and Laszloffy 2008; Wright 2006). These communities of resistance—as chronicled in this volume—are crucial in nurturing the collective voices, visibility, and activism of queer, feminist, and antiracist faculty.

Gómez's writing is her weapon in fighting for inclusion and justice. Writing about her own experiences and using ethnography to chronicle the experiences of Latin@ communities, she presents perspectives commonly absent in scholarly discourse. Like Bonus, Gómez proclaims that her privilege as a professor comes with a responsibility to challenge the barriers of the ivory tower. She visualizes her research as a vital tool to understand inequality and to cultivate new opportunities for oppressed groups.

Recognizing the responsibility that accompanies privilege is particularly important for straight faculty, male faculty, and White faculty who are committed to struggling against homophobia, sexism, and racism. Michael Armato, in his chapter “Striving to Be Queer: Challenging Inequality from Positions of Privilege,” embodies a call to action against the everyday “mundane, ordinary practices” that reproduce privilege and inequality in the academy and beyond. In this case, Armato analyzes how as a graduate student, he challenged a prominent leftist male professor who, in a letter published in *The New York Times*, argued that men “should be able to obtain an injunction against the abortion of the fetus he helped create.”

His careful examination of a specific incident of academic sexism exposes the common dynamic of “progressive” faculty whose unwillingness to reflect on their own privilege is part and parcel of their participation in oppression. In turn, Armato critiques another pattern: people who disagree with bigotry remaining silent. Though there were many feminist graduate students and faculty members (including tenured professors), few spoke out publicly against the patently sexist ideas in the writings of the prestigious White male scholar. In the face of this knowledge without action, Armato reminds us that there is never “a

good time” to challenge sexism and other inequalities, “because doing so disrupts the everyday goings-on that constitute academic (and other institutional) life.” Armato vividly illustrates how allies can (and must) interrogate straight, male, and White privileges to contribute to the transformation of the ivory tower. He writes about the legitimacy accorded White heterosexual men who speak publicly about inequality and the tendency for men to enact their privilege by acting in “chivalrous defense of women.” He describes pivotal life events that led him to question his own privileges, including his immersion in feminist theory and men’s studies, which led him to speak out publicly against sexism, racism, homophobia, and classism in his department and the ivory tower in general.

Armato points out that privilege obligates people to *consciously* struggle to take action against sexism and other forms of oppression because their silence is complicity (see also Stockdill, this volume). His analysis is relevant not only to White heterosexual men, but to all people who occupy any position of privilege. Straight academics should “strive to be queer” by undermining heteronormative ideas and confronting homophobia in their teaching, research, and activism. Whites must combat racism, and men must battle sexism. For Armato, “striving to be queer” is about recognizing privilege while simultaneously undermining the categories and assumptions that buttress privilege and oppression. More than an identity, it is taking action against injustice when others turn away from it.

Social justice work has not historically been highly valued by elites in the ivory tower. Activism often falls into the category of service—one of three traditional criteria used to evaluate professors for retention, tenure, and promotion. Service is frequently a paradoxical area for members of marginalized groups. As mentioned above, women, people of color, and LGBTQ faculty are often called upon to participate in service activities related to “diversity.” Such diversity initiatives include promoting diversity in the composition of students and faculty as well as improving the campus climate and support services for marginalized groups on campus. Members of oppressed groups are also more likely to be sought out by students to advise clubs, direct student research projects, and provide mentoring than are men, Whites, and straight faculty. In turn, because of

their own experiences with oppression, they are likely to actually want to engage in these types of service, including campus and community activism. But in United States colleges and universities, service is less valued than research or teaching (Baez 2000). Thus, as Padilla (1994: 26) writes, faculty from oppressed groups often experience “cultural taxation”:

the obligation to show good citizenship toward the institution by serving its needs for ethnic representation on committees, or to demonstrate knowledge and commitment to a cultural group which may even bring accolades to the institution but which is not usually rewarded by the institution on whose behalf the service was performed.

One way for progressive and leftist faculty to navigate such paradoxical hurdles is to integrate activism (one form of service) into both teaching and research. In his article “One Activist Intellectual’s Experience in Surviving and Transforming the Academy,” Jose Guillermo Zapata Calderon chronicles his four decades as a public sociologist.<sup>10</sup> Calderon’s commitment to using sociology in the pursuit of social justice was inspired by the sacrifices of his parents, who were Mexican immigrant farm workers, and the courageous organizing of Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers Union. Along with Calderon’s own experiences with racism and anti-immigrant prejudice, these examples of struggle propelled him to participate in antiracist and antiwar activism in the late 1960s and early 1970s. While some faculty of color feel burdened to address “minority issues” (Baez 2000), Calderon views antiracist activism on and off campus as his vocation. Calderon states that “public sociology has particular salience for historically excluded individuals from diverse racial, class, gender, and sexuality backgrounds, for whom the educational experience can be both an alienating and empowering experience.” He outlines a wide array of community-based teaching and community-based research projects that encapsulate his role as a public sociologist and social change agent.

Calderon vividly describes his challenges to academic sociology in graduate school. Frustrated with the failure among many graduate students and professors to discuss theory’s relevance to peoples’ lives, he has

dedicated himself to applying both theory and research methodology to promoting social change in various communities. Rejecting traditional research approaches, Calderon's doctoral research was grounded in participant observation as a resident and community organizer. He used this methodology to analyze social conflict stemming from changing racial and class dynamics among long-time Latin@ residents and new Asian Pacific immigrants in Monterey Park, California, and to work with community members from both groups to bring about change. Calderon has utilized this type of community-based research to reduce racial tension in Alhambra, California, high schools and to document and support the struggles of farm workers and day laborers.

Following the path of Paulo Freire, Calderon also infuses social justice into the classroom, teaching students not only theories and concepts, but also how to apply them to effect change. In one of his classes, students learn about community-based organizing theories in class, and during an "alternative spring break" they learn directly from farm worker union activists. Students then participate in service projects that support the goals of the union. This and other similar initiatives provide insight into how teaching can be utilized to galvanize awareness and collective action.

Like other anthology contributors, Calderon has survived and thrived in the ivory tower by actively seeking out and building communities of like-minded scholars and activists. He demonstrates the transformative power of creating alternative spaces in which scholars link teaching, learning, and research to catalyze social justice. These "democratic spaces" provide critical ideas, support, and resources for developing the types of alternative approaches to teaching, mentoring, research, and service/activism featured throughout this book. In contrast to hegemonic teaching pedagogies, research methodologies, and theoretical frameworks that fuel oppression, Freirean educational models (Freire 2000; hooks 1994), Participatory Action Research (PAR; see Feagin and Vera 2008), and other community-based research strategies, as well as various *critical* theories—feminist, queer, critical race theories, etc. (Collins 1990; Smith 2006)—promote empowerment, liberation, and self-determination. The creation of alternative approaches to teaching and research are essential to transforming higher education.

David Naguib Pellow's chapter, "Activist-Scholar Alliances for Social Change: The Transformative Power of University-Community Collaborations," demonstrates the social change potential of two alternative projects that bridge the gap between campus and community. Because, as Pellow states, education has been "consciously and deliberately used as a tool of control and social reproduction by political, cultural, and economic elites," the academy is often like a bubble in which students, faculty, and administrators are separated from the experiences, ideas, and desires of other communities. Pellow proposes bursting the bubble and fundamentally changing how universities relate to activists and oppressed communities. In contrast to traditional paradigms in which universities operate in a top-down, hierarchical fashion to provide resources and expertise, Pellow argues for a framework in which universities are transformed by communities as much as the reverse. University-community collaborations produce new knowledge that is essential in catalyzing change within and beyond the ivory tower.

Pellow helped create the Transatlantic Initiative on Environmental Justice (TIEJ), a network that links universities, legal support centers, and community organizations in the United States and central and eastern Europe. TIEJ produces knowledge and applies it to advance struggles for social change for disenfranchised communities in the United States and Europe. For example, an international letter-writing campaign led to the relocation of a Roma community from a toxic waste site in Kosovo. Pellow created a website where activists share case studies of community campaigns against environmental injustice. TIEJ illustrates the capability of universities to support community activist initiatives, in particular by using resources to document and combat human rights abuses related to environmental racism.

Pellow also analyzes the collective efforts of faculty, students, and community activists to create the Activist/Scholars Dialogue (ASD). ASD established a nonhierarchical forum for dialogue that nourishes the social justice campaigns of community organizations and enhances learning at the University of California, San Diego. During the week, ASD faculty and students dialogue with community activists working around a vast array of issues affecting communities of color including sweatshop labor, HIV/AIDS, war, economic exploitation, environmental

injustice, domestic violence, immigrant and refugee rights, indigenous rights, and prisoner rights.

ASD has had an extremely positive impact both on and off campus. Community organizations have gained student volunteers, faculty participation, equipment, and other resources. As students have learned about local social movements, they have become more engaged politically both on and off campus. The political consciousness they have developed has led them to demand changes in university curriculum and internship offerings. Collaborative efforts, such as ASD, help break down common deep-seated divisions between universities and marginalized communities and can potentially spark radical collective action on and off campus. Both TIEJ and ASD provide models for what universities can and should do to nurture democracy locally and globally.

There is an intimate connection between student and community protest and the increased diversity of student populations as well as diversity within university curriculum. Campus social movements have forced universities to establish different interdisciplinary programs including Women's/Gender Studies, LGBTQ Studies, and Ethnic Studies (Asian American, African American, Chican@ and Latin@, Native American, and Arab American Studies). Such disciplines have faced a great deal of sexist, homophobic, and racist critique from some members of more established fields that deem them illegitimate. Departments and programs in these disciplines have historically been underfunded and often face the threat of budgetary cuts or elimination. Though internal conflict and division have emerged in most of these disciplines (and individual programs) over time, they frequently embody the most inclusive, democratic consciousnesses and practices on United States campuses (Butler 2001; Espiritu 2003).

Linda Trinh Võ, in her chapter "Transformative Disjunctures in the Academy: Asian American Studies as Praxis," reflects on these issues within the context of Asian American Studies. She explores how both her personal biography as a Vietnamese American and the field of Asian American Studies are products of United States colonialism, writing that "were it not for western imperialism in all its forms, we would have never left our homelands for America nor infiltrated academic institutions where we critique U.S. empire building." Võ underscores the

obstacles faced by Asian American Studies in its history, obstacles that continue to make it difficult for the discipline to secure legitimacy and security in an often hostile institution.

As Vō weaves together her personal experiences and the path of Asian American Studies, she examines specific forms of racial and gender inequalities in higher education and suggests strategies for making the academy more supportive of people of color and women. These inequalities include racist and elitist views of scholarship, deficient mentoring for women and people of color, tokenism, and a work environment unaccommodating to women faculty with children. Vō describes how these assaults thwart productivity and damage mental health, and she stresses the importance of building community as a key form of resistance, including survival strategies shared among women of color to balance career and family.

Vō also highlights political struggles that gave birth to Asian American Studies and analyzes the tensions—both internal and external—that have shaped its development since. Faculty and administrators in mainstream disciplines working within Eurocentric theoretical frameworks often devalue Ethnic Studies scholarship, particularly because of its interdisciplinary character and commitment to centering the experiences of people of color. As Vō explains, this translates into the lack of institutional support for Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies departments in general that leaves such programs vulnerable to budget cuts. While the number of Asian American Studies programs has increased in recent decades, inadequate university support fosters challenges in balancing academic, community, and political missions (Lee 2007).

In the face of elitist and Eurocentric notions of scholarship, Vō refreshingly refuses to restrict her research on race, ethnicity, and immigration to one narrow, compartmentalized discipline even as she acknowledges that “shortsighted faculty” continue to penalize graduate students and other faculty who work outside disciplinary borders. Her commitment to interdisciplinarity is twined with a responsibility to produce scholarship that catalyzes social change. Vō reminds other Asian Americanists of the roots of the discipline in community- and student-led protest, warning against assimilationist intellectual and social projects. She advocates for research on the social problems facing Asian

American communities that challenges many aspects of the model minority myth (Wu 2002) and lays out the importance of community-based research and the engagement of students—in both research and activism—as crucial ingredients in charting a transformative path for Asian American Studies.

Võ thoughtfully links the trials and tribulations of Asian Americans to other communities of color and is attentive to the intersections of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Võ's chapter holds provocative lessons for not only fellow Asian Americanists, but for all academics invested in teaching, researching, and advocating for social justice.

The devaluation of Asian American Studies, Ethnic Studies, Women's/Gender Studies, and LGBTQ Studies parallels the bias and discrimination facing faculty of color, female faculty, and LGBTQ faculty. Racial, gender, and sexual inequalities are rooted in institutional policies, practices, and culture that deny marginalized group members adequate mentoring, resources, and support. University relationships with these communities—on and off campus—have historically been antagonistic. Over the past two decades many colleges and universities have instituted cosmetic diversity initiatives that do little to change entrenched structural inequalities (Bonus, this volume). Cosmetic workshops on multicultural issues and various heritage/history months—Black, Latin@, Asian American, Women's, LGBT, etc.—in many cases contain rather than expand social change. The hiring of women and faculty of color is crucial, but it is insufficient if not part of larger efforts to address inequalities entrenched in interpersonal interactions, faculty evaluation criteria, program funding disparities, retention of both students and faculty from oppressed groups, and the undemocratic decision-making processes that govern university functioning.

One of the challenges in the twenty-first century is to expose the fundamental flaws in such approaches to diversity. Diversity without equality and justice is worthless. It is critical therefore to identify the particular manifestations of contemporary color-blind racism, gender-blind sexism, and sexuality-blind homophobia. While students, staff, and faculty who challenge racist, sexist, and homophobic practices of marginalization are often met with stigma and negative sanctions, the chapters in this anthology exemplify how collective struggles have chipped away at

inequities in the ivory tower and carved out more spaces marked by critical thinking and equality. Sustaining these struggles today still requires defying the status quo in a multiplicity of ways.

Brett Stockdill speaks to the need for disrupting business as usual in the academy in his chapter “Queering the Ivory Tower: Tales of a Troublemaking Homosexual.” Inspired by Black feminists and other feminists of color, he argues that strategic disruption must be collective and intersectional. Stockdill asserts that “a queer politic traverses both private and public situations, unmasking and defying the power differentials in the heterosexist, racist, sexist, and classist social order that shapes all of our lives.” Queer activism is grounded in a commitment to consciously and actively resist inequalities on a daily basis.

Reflecting patterns in social movements in general, collective action in the academy has commonly been focused on one form of inequality rather than taking aim at multiple, interlocking inequalities. This is often seen in diversity initiatives that specify the need to make changes with respect to race and ethnicity, but give minimal attention to gender, sexuality, immigration status, etc. Stockdill examines the ways in which blatant homophobia continues to be more acceptable than other blatant forms of inequality and highlights strategies for challenging heterosexism and homophobia in the areas of teaching, research, professionalization, and hiring.

While stressing the importance of resisting heterosexist oppression, Stockdill consistently argues that homophobia must be analyzed within the context of other crisscrossing oppressions including sexism, racism, and classism. “Queering the ivory tower” requires recognition of both the distinctions and the connections between different oppressive systems, including both their attendant privileges and injustices. Stockdill explores how these systems of domination warp teaching pedagogies, scholarship, and the evaluation of faculty performance.

In turn, he examines the negative sanctions that target activists struggling for social justice in the academy. Though there are definite costs of dissent, there are also tremendous gains to be made. Stockdill outlines concrete strategies to assist academic “troublemakers” to survive and to integrate activism into teaching, research, and service. Central to these strategies is the need to build alliances between different social

groups on and off campus. In particular, Stockdill urges faculty to both nurture and follow the leadership of progressive and leftist student activists who are continually at the forefront of struggles for social justice. Stockdill concludes by exploring how critical approaches to teaching that challenge dominant ideology and center the experiences of oppressed peoples can plant the seeds of student empowerment and social change.

\* \* \*

*Transforming the Ivory Tower* centers the analyses of antiracist, feminist, and queer teachers and scholars to catalyze social change. While equal representation of marginalized groups is still a key issue, the contributors focus primarily on what happens once “we”—and our allies—are in the professoriate. The costs of entrance often include isolation, alienation, harassment, and discrimination, particularly for those who agitate for institutional changes. Whites, men, and heterosexuals throughout the university hierarchy are commonly ignorant of their privileges and insensitive to the realities of racism, sexism, and homophobia. In turn, while having more faculty and administrators who are women, people of color, and openly LGBT people signifies progress, tokenizing individual figures deflects attention away from ongoing, systematic inequalities that continue to haunt higher education and society in general. Because more assimilated, conservative faculty members of underrepresented groups are more likely to be selected for high-level administrative positions, their positioning can at times be more of an obstacle rather than a harbinger of broader growth and change.

The paradox of token diversity is intrinsically connected to the failure of universities to change organizationally since the 1970s—despite increased numbers of women and people of color as well as increased visibility of LGBTQ people. The analyses in this anthology explode the myth that prevailing color-blind, gender-blind, and sexuality-blind policies and practices are equitable. They expose the absolute necessity of race-, gender-, and sexuality-conscious understandings and actions to promote diversity *with equality and justice*. A proactive approach encompassing both institutional and cultural changes is crucial to ensure that all faculty—and all members of the campus community—are valued and

respected. In particular, the evaluation for retention, tenure, and promotion must take into account the crucial importance of antiracist, feminist, and antiheterosexist teaching, mentoring, research, and service.

In critiquing various forms of oppression in the academy, professors and others run the risk of being labeled “political” by detractors, but mainstream policies, practices, teaching strategies, and scholarship are riddled with political content. A central goal of this anthology is to shine light on often hidden forms of bias and discrimination. This requires examining personal and collective struggles that are frequently painful. Expressing such pain transgresses academic norms of “objectivity” that include an aversion to emotions. Yet social justice work is grounded in emotions: pain, anger, frustration, compassion, joy, and hope. The voices of struggle presented here are both analytical and emotional. Collectively they provide critical perspectives that embody the potential of an ivory tower that is diverse, but also collaborative, just, and democratic.

## Notes

- 1 The term “queer” was historically used as both a term of self-identification by gay men and lesbians as well as a pejorative epithet targeting them. In recent decades many LGBT people have reclaimed the term, and it has been used to be more inclusive of the different groups outside the boundaries of heteronormativity (not only gay men and lesbians, but bisexuals, transgender people, and other groups). For many, being queer means celebrating sexual difference, destabilizing dominant sexual and gender (and other) categories, and challenging multiple forms of inequality. See chapters by Stockdill and Armato in this volume for discussions of queer identities and politics.
- 2 Because our backgrounds are in sociology and Ethnic Studies, the references in this chapter are largely from these and related disciplines.
- 3 1.5 generation are those who immigrated during their formative years and are also bilingual and bicultural. See Danico 2004.
- 4 Some colleagues derisively labeled us “the Siamese Twins.”
- 5 We use the nonsexist terms Chican@s and Latin@s to include multiple genders often collapsed into “Chicanos” and “Latinos.”
- 6 See Brown 2007.

- 7 See May 2007.
- 8 During a jury trial involving a Black Muslim male professor from the Sudan who was denied tenure at California State University, Hayward, David Wellman (Texeira 2001: 1) presented his criteria for “decoding” racism and successfully argued that academia, like society at large, has discarded “in-your-face” racism for “the subtle, easily disguised sort.”
- 9 Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998: 161) write that African American activist-scholars Anna Julia Cooper and Ida B. Wells-Barnett “create sociology from the standpoint of the oppressed; for them, the project of social analysis is justice and the method appropriate to the project is cross-examination. . . . Standing in the situation of the oppressed, they use social analysis to *witness* to what is happening, as a means of empowering the African American community, exposing the oppressors, and appealing to the conscience of potentially supportive publics.”
- 10 See Burawoy (2004) for a discussion of public sociology.