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Greetings readers of Taboo. We have had a busy year of special issues, backlogged articles, and re-organization as we settle in as Co-Editors in Chief at Taboo. We are excited to bring a regular issue with five distinct and unique pieces. There is not necessarily an intentional connection between the articles, but is as common at Taboo we have accepted unique pieces that take us, as readers, on a journey of interesting and thought-provoking proportions ranging from names, to Mad Men, representations of homosexuality in television, foreign language education, and memory with Black feminist art.

Instead of summarizing each piece in a sentence or two we have decided to incorporate the abstracts of all the pieces right into our editorial introduction so that you can read a little about each piece before delving into the individual articles.

First, “Culturally Responsive Teaching Across PK-20: Honoring the Historical Naming Practices of Students of Color” by Norman A. Arrun: 

Abstract: By the time children enter school, they know how to spell their names and are accustomed to their family’s and community’s pronunciation of their names; those names are generally the first aspect of their identity we educators recognize when they enter our classrooms. As the nation’s classrooms become more diverse, there is an urgent need for educators at all levels to enact multicultural and cultu-
ally responsive teaching to bridge theory and praxis as central in developing critical race theory’s commitment to social justice. My work builds on Pérez Huber and Solórzano’s (2015) racial microaggressions model by analyzing historical and current naming artifacts that challenge the mispronouncing, Anglicizing, and (re)naming of students of color. I describe pedagogical tools that educators can employ to foster the development of critical consciousness about the importance of students’ names and their connection to their identities. Finally, the ‘hidden transcripts’ of names and naming practices within communities of color reveal their intergenerational resistance to white supremacy.

Second, “Don Draper, Teacher-As-Artist: A Diffractive Reading of Mad Men” by Gabriel Huddleston & Samuel Rocha:

Abstract: Popular culture can be used as an apparatus of diffraction, in order to understand the complicated entanglements within both the object and in connection to other elements of society. This article posits that the television drama Mad Men is an ideal apparatus of diffraction of the role of teacher, making that assertion collaboratively between the co-authors, demonstrating how popular culture continues to diffract, even when it is “held” from different angles. This article initially reads disjointed as the authors’ work is intercut strategically but not necessarily coherently. By using popular culture as an apparatus of diffraction, the authors become implicitly implicated in a larger entanglement; in this case, between the authors, Mad Men, and education. With your reading, the entangled web is extended, and the authors hope further understanding can be gleamed.

Third, “Cloned This Way: Emphatic Dissonance and Mixed Messages in the Representations of Non-Heterosexual Sex Acts in Three Television Series” by Vincent W. Youngbauer and Joseph R. Jones:

Abstract: The United States has experienced increasing social and political acceptance of LGBTQ culture. This increasing acceptance has been accompanied by increased representations of LGBTQ in popular culture, particularly television, and, in the case of this work, fictional narratives. While there are certainly representations that are worthy of the term “trailblazing” in their treatment of LGBTQ relationships, many seem to be included in plotlines for shock value. This article discusses and explores three questions: First, what impact might media representations have on heteronormative understandings of LGBTQ culture? Second, does acceptance of LGBTQ culture follow any sort of historical trajectory that is similarly evident in other examples such as with changes in the representation of race over the history of television? And third, how might the representations reviewed in this article affect the struggle for LGBTQ rights?

Fourth, “The Spaces in Between: Foreign Language Education as Critical and Intercultural Education” by Paula Girogis:

Abstract: This contribution will focus on a much needed critical and interdisci-
plinary reflection on fields which are too often treated separately, Foreign Language Education and Intercultural Education. Giorgis discusses the issue from the double perspective of a foreign language teacher and researcher, briefly presenting some data from a research study to then focus more in detail on a classroom activity designed to favour a critical awareness on both language and interculture. The author’s own position of teacher-researcher allows her to address another fundamental issue: the urgency of co-working and integrated cooperation between academic research and factual school practice.

Fifth, “Dark Water: Rememory, Biopower and Black Feminist Art” by Stephanie Troutman and Brenna Johnson

Abstract: What does water mean to contemporary society today? This article is interested in water and race; Blackness specifically, wherein the Middle Passage (Mid-Atlantic Slave Trade) marks the beginning of a fraught and complex relationship between African-Americans and water…typified many might argue by Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath in 2005. This article looks backward at water’s ability to destroy and to create through lenses focused on race and art: something akin to water as a symbol of America’s complicated relationship with race. Using cultural texts such as art and film this piece works to unsettle the intimate connections of power, gender, and sexuality and offer alternative cartographies of empowerment and survival with regard to racialization and water.

We hope you enjoy these pieces as much as our reviewers and editorial team have.

In Solidarity,
Kenny and David
Abstract
By the time children enter school, they know how to spell their names and are accustomed to their family’s and community’s pronunciation of their names; those names are generally the first aspect of their identity we educators recognize when they enter our classrooms. As the nation’s classrooms become more diverse, there is an urgent need for educators at all levels to enact multicultural and culturally responsive teaching to bridge theory and praxis as central in developing critical race theory’s commitment to social justice. My work builds on Pérez Huber and Solórzano’s (2015) racial microaggressions model by analyzing historical and current naming artifacts that challenge the mispronouncing, Anglicizing, and (re)naming of students of color. I describe pedagogical tools that educators can employ to foster the development of critical consciousness about the importance of students’ names and their connection to their identities. Finally, the ‘hidden transcripts’ of names and naming practices within communities of color reveal their intergenerational resistance to white supremacy.

Introduction
In this article, I argue that the first step in becoming a multicultural and culturally responsive educator is respecting students’ names. When educators mispronounce, Anglicize, or (re)name students of color, they convey a colorblind message to their
students that their racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and family and historical backgrounds do not matter in the classroom. This practice frames students of color with non-Eurocentric names as needing to be ‘fixed’ or ‘helping’ them ‘fit in’ through assimilationist practices such as ‘Americanizing’ their names.

I divide this article into three sections: first I share my name story and highlight the “juicy contradictions” of my last name, which are often overlooked because literature has primarily focused on first names (Harris, 2017, p. 439). I discuss how the literature within multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, and critical race theory (CRT) has addressed naming practices in schools. Educators at the PK-12 levels have become more aware and somewhat more accepting of culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education, whereas CRT’s prominence has been in higher education and the examination of the experiences of students of color, in particular within college campuses. By bridging these frameworks, we can address the impact of race on the academic confidence of students of color, their retention, and the importance of creating learning environments that respond to students along the PK-20 pipeline.

Next, I describe pedagogical tools that educators along the PK-20 pipeline can employ to foster the development of critical consciousness through engaged dialogue about the importance of personal names, their connection to students’ identities and culture, and deepening historical knowledge about marginalized communities. I analyze historical and contemporary examples in the media and popular culture to understand how people of color experience racial microaggressions that are rooted in white supremacy. Specifically, I examine two online videos, *Key & Peele* (2012) and *Facundo the Great* (2008), to explain how the use of humor can show educators what it is like when we flip the roll call script and move away from the Black-white racial binary. I show how colorblindness is a common response from white people attempting to reject racism by using racially coded language; I cite the white Duke professor who posted a comment on the *New York Times* criticizing the African American community for giving their children “strange” names that impede their upward mobility. I then analyze dominant discourses about naming practices from sociohistorical and political contexts that challenge the racial hierarchy of names.

Finally, I highlight pedagogical approaches that can help facilitate critical reflecting and conversations about the racial hierarchy of names, the politics, and the practices of naming that occur in classrooms to different audiences, including education faculty and students in a graduate multicultural education course and a course on teaching diverse learners. This article offers a starting point for educators to engage in responsive multicultural education pedagogies, to bridge theory and praxis as central in developing CRT’s commitment to social justice by reflecting on naming practices in the classroom. It also provides pedagogical tools that incorporate popular culture and social media to help educators critique and analyze the covert and subtle forms of racism when teachers mispronounce, Anglicize, or (re)name students of color, and demonstrates how names are tied to family history, culture,
language, and racial and ethnic identities. I apply a qualitative textual analysis of online videos and social media posts to analyze contemporary discourse around people of color with non-Eurocentric names.

**My Name Story: A “Juicy Contradiction”**

My name is Norma Angelica Marrun. My name has been mispronounced, Anglicized, and Spanglishcized throughout my education. My earliest school memory of mispronunciation of my name was in second grade. I remember feeling confused and frustrated every morning when my second grade teacher called roll. I had just arrived in the U.S. and did not speak English. I remember the first time I heard my teacher calling out Norma. She called my name once, but I did not respond; she called my name a second time and I still did not respond. By the third time, the teacher raised her voice and looked straight at me. At that moment, I realized that my name was Norma. I was confused and did not know how to tell my teacher that I preferred to be called by my middle name, Angelica, the name my family used at home and the name my teachers in Mexico used. I did not know how to explain it to my teacher because English was not my first language. From that day on, I was Norma in the public space and was Angelica in the private space of my family and community.

As a child, my family instilled the importance of respecting my elders; this included my teachers. Within the Latino community, children are taught to respect their teachers and questioning or correcting a teacher is a sign of disrespect and an indication of one’s family failure to raise un hijo bien educado (a child that is well educated) (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Valdés, 1996). In the aforementioned story, I would not have corrected my teacher even if I had been fluent in English because I was taught not to question her authority and to respect the values of the school. Respect for teachers in the Latino community prevents many students and their families from questioning teachers for (re)namining their children. Although I preferred to be called by my middle name Angelica, my teachers called me by my first name Norma because that was how I was listed on the class roster.

Although my first name and last name are simple to pronounce, they are often Anglicized. I often am asked, “How do you pronounce your last name?”, to which I respond, “It’s pronounced like the color maroon.” My response accommodates English speakers, and privileges their linguistic and cultural backgrounds by making them feel comfortable about their linguistic privilege. In the Latino community, and more specifically with Spanish speakers, my last name is Spanglishcized by adding an accent to become Marrúñ. Intentionally inserting an accent to my last name comes from a place of respect and affirmation of my cultural and linguistic identity. My last name signifies a straddling of differing linguistic borderlands that I negotiate in my everyday life (Anzaldúa, 1999; González, 2001). On one hand, English speakers who have not been exposed to, or do not attempt to accent my last name, often struggle with the double RRs. On the other hand, Spanish speak-
ers pronounce my last name correctly, but often ‘correct’ its spelling by adding an accent.

My family narrative demonstrates a much more complicated history. I was adopted when I was 13 years old and was given my last name by my adopted parents. I identify as Latina of Mexican nationality and racially mestiza roots. Although I do not navigate the world as a multiracial Latina, I can relate to the participants in Harris’ (2017) study of multiracial women’s everyday experiences with multiracial microaggressions, specifically when their last names and physical features did not match others’ assumptions about their monoracial identities. One participant referred to the juxtaposition of her last name and physical features as a “juicy contradiction” that often resulted in a source of discomfort when interacting with monoracial individuals and an invalidation of her multiracial identity (Harris, 2017, p. 439).

My adopted father’s family migrated from Lebanon to Durango, Mexico. His father added an extra R to their last name to blend in to the fabric of the Mexican culture. Our last name is a linguistic hybrid of Arabic and Spanish. Moreover, not only is it difficult for individuals to conceptualize race outside of binary conceptions, but also to (re)conceptualize family dynamics away from normative ideas of biological and nuclear structures of belonging in mixed families. My family’s last name ‘Marrun’ is rooted in a history of migration across geographic borders, triculturalism,2 multiracial, and intergenerational resistance, a collective consciousness that bonds us together through our last name.

**Theoretical Frameworks:**

**Multicultural Education, Culturally Responsive Teaching, & Critical Race Theory**

Multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, and critical race theory work to build inclusive school environments and welcoming classrooms that validate and affirm the multiple, changing, and fluid identities of students of color, while also maintaining high academic expectations for all students. Bridging these frameworks can support teaching and learning that invites educators to respect and provide support for the emerging identities of students of color, to center and listen to their counterstories, and to enact culturally responsive pedagogies that transform deficits into assets and turn challenges into teachable moments. Multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching acknowledge both the growing diversity in U.S. classrooms and the importance of including student’s identities and ways of knowing in all aspects of learning (Gay, 2018; Nieto, & Bode, 2011). Instructors at the PK-20 levels often are faced with limited understanding about students of color and hold unconscious biases and stereotypes about them, leading them to have lower expectations, and to ignore and to devalue their contributions to the production of knowledge in the classroom. Students of color internalize these messages about themselves in ways that influence their academic confidence, as demonstrated in
the research of Joshua Aronson (2004) on “stereotype threat”, which indicates that deficit perceptions associated with one’s group (i.e. racial, ethnic, gender) can lessen feelings of belonging in school and can cause devastating effects on student’s identity and academic achievement (p.18). Of primary importance in a culturally responsive classroom is the importance for students of color to find relevant connections among themselves, with their instructors, peers, and most importantly with the curricular content. An important strategy for educators is to engage in critical self-reflection and develop historical knowledge about marginalized communities that challenge, unlearn, and disrupt dominant ideologies and the myth of meritocracy.

Through critical reflection, educators can gain awareness about their own biases and how they privilege certain names over others. After recognizing the connection between names and students’ identities, educators can challenge naming practices that exclude and reinforce a hierarchy of non-white inferiority in schools and society. Self-reflection and critical engagement enable one to understand the history of resistance of communities of colors to the dominant culture by giving their children unique names, names connected to their family history and cultural backgrounds. Peterson and Alley (2015) provided the following pedagogical approaches to honor students’ names:

(a) emphasize correct pronunciation and writing students’ given names as a classroom practice;

(b) engage students in language and literacy activities that explore written names and their spelling, name origins, family naming traditions, and the importance of names to cultural identity;

(c) capitalize on “teachable moments” when questions or conflicts arise surrounding names; and

(d) integrate critical discussions of multicultural literature that features names and identity into language arts and other curricular activities. (p. 44)

Educators can demonstrate cultural caring and respect by affirming students’ identities and taking the time to learn the correct pronunciation of their names. Most importantly, teachers must be patient and ask for help in learning how to pronounce a student’s name.

Critical Race Theory & Racial Microaggressions: (Re)claiming Our Names!

CRT originated in Critical Legal Studies (CLS), a theoretical framework generated in the mid-1970s by legal scholars of color who were concerned with inadequacies of CLS in addressing issues of racial oppression in society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). The movement towards CRT in education was led by educational scholars Gloria Ladson-Billings and William F Tate’s 1995 call for “the need for a critical race theoretical perspective to cast a new gaze on the persistent problems
of racism in schooling” (p. 60). Ladson-Billings and Tate were frustrated with the lack of under-theorization of race within mainstream educational research; thus, by utilizing CRT, they believed we could better understand and eradicate racial inequality in education. As educational scholars have responded to their call, the following core tenets have developed: (1) the intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of subordination; (2) the challenge to dominant ideology; (3) the commitment to social justice and praxis; (4) the centrality of experiential knowledge; and (5) the use of interdisciplinary perspectives (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

CRT in education challenges liberal ideologies such as colorblindness, meritocracy, and beliefs of education as the great equalizer (Ledesma & Calderón, 2015). The ideologies of meritocracy and colorblindness contribute to the master narrative pervasive in education that blame students for their academic underachievement and their families for their stagnant upward mobility. A major assumption underlying CRT is that race and racism are central to understanding the permanence of racial inequality in every aspect of social life, including racial inequities in educational policies and practices. While many educators believe that school segregation and unequal schools were issues of the past, racial inequality in schools has never been resolved and students of color continue to attend segregated and underfunded schools, and to be taught by unqualified and often long-term substitutes (Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014). Families of color are made to believe that their children have an equal and fair chance of achieving academic success based on their merits and hard work. The reality is that students of color enter schools that are inherently unequal and where their academic confidence and identities are slowly stripped away. They are denied the advantage of being taught by a teacher or an instructor who looks like them, who affirms their identities, or who learns to correctly pronounce their name.

CRT in education also seeks to uncover the historical and contemporary persistence of racial inequality and racial discrimination in schools, while also capturing the ways in which race intersects with other manifestations of oppression, such as having a non-Eurocentric or a gender nonconforming name or last name. From a CRT framework, Rita Kohli and Daniel Solórzano (2012) argued that students of color experienced racial macroaggressions when teachers mispronounced their names in school. Kohli and Solórzano (2012) argued that when students of color endured years of humiliation by teachers and peers for mispronouncing their non-Eurocentric names, they internalized negative perceptions about themselves, felt inferior and felt shame about their culture and families. Many of the participants in their study experienced high levels of anxiety and embarrassment during roll call because teachers often mispronounced their names. A native Hawaiian and multi-ethnic participant in Kohli and Solórzano’s (2012) study; Ku’ulani recalled her experience during roll call:

I used to always get nervous and dread the roll call, because especially at the beginning of the school year or when we had subs, there would always be a pause
before my name while the teacher tried to figure out how to say it. Then they’d butcher it. It’s pronounced ‘Koo-oo-luh-nee.’ They would say ‘Koolawnee’ or ‘Kaeeoolawnee’ or ‘Kalawnee’. Most times, they’d never ask, ‘Is that how you pronounce it?’ Or ‘How do you pronounce it?’ (p. 458)

As evidenced in other studies, educators can utilize multicultural and culturally responsive pedagogical approaches to recognize and connect student names to their cultural, linguistic, familial, and community wealth in the classroom (Nieto & Bode, 2018; Payne, Philyaw, Rabow, & Yazdanfar, 2016). By honoring students’ names and creating opportunities for them to share their stories, students gain a deeper understanding of the sociocultural, historical, and political influences in naming practices. Ultimately, these acts can help students develop positive racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural identities, as well as empowering students to take action when they hear their peers making fun of non-Eurocentric names.

According to Pérez Huber and Solórzano (2015), microaggressions “are a form of systemic, everyday racism used to keep those at the racial margins in their place” (p. 302); they analyzed a photograph from the 1930s as a historical artifact to reveal how racial microaggressions are manifested through ideologies of white supremacy. They also analyzed a contemporary class-action lawsuit Floyd v. City of New York (2013) of ‘stop and frisk’ to show how the primary (men of color) and secondary (communities of color) targets experienced the effects of racial microaggressions. My work builds on Pérez Huber and Solórzano’s (2015) racial microaggressions model by analyzing historical and current naming artifacts as pedagogical tools that challenge the mispronouncing, Anglicizing, and (re)naming of students of color. Mispronouncing, Anglicizing, and (re)naming students, then, can be read as an act of assimilation by stripping them of their cultural and linguistic identities and replacing their names with more Americanized sounding names. When one considers the racial identities of PK-12 teachers, the majority (84 percent) of whom are white, and enact heteronormative teaching practices, we see how they have the power to (re)name and impose what they consider ‘normal’ and ‘American’ (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Such practices are motivated by white superiority, and moreover, on the assumption of the inferiority of people of color. Educators can challenge naming practices by creating a safe space for students to feel a sense of pride about their names and helping them to recognize that they can maintain a positive racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural identity. However, too often, educators are faced with a limited understanding of cultures other than their own and are unaware of the rampant practices of Anglicizing and (re)naming students of color. The diversity of students’ names in the classroom can either contribute to a deficit perspective about students’ backgrounds, or can provide an affirming space of student identities that can, in turn, strengthen classroom relationships. As simplistic as it may sound, learning how to pronounce students’ names correctly is a critical step in demonstrating respect and caring for students’ identities, families, and communities.
Popular Culture and Humor: Flipping the Roll Call Script

Today’s students are immersed in popular culture and social media that ranges from music to television shows to online posts. Popular culture and social media matter because they are a vital part of students’ everyday lived experience. Multicultural scholars suggest that incorporating and critically teaching popular culture and social media is one pedagogical approach to make teaching relevant to the lives of students of color and to examine their role in shaping our perceptions of self and others (Clark, 2002; Gay 2018; Duncan-Andrade, 2004). In addition, placing CRT in the forefront allows both students and faculty to acknowledge how race and racism are imbedded in the daily practices of classrooms. Meaningful learning activities like analyzing the images and messages conveyed about the names of people of color within popular culture and social media allows students to disrupt, challenge, and critically (re)think the politics and practices of naming in PK-20 classrooms. Educators might also analyze their favorite shows and note the characters’ names and compare them to names in their families and communities. This activity lends itself to discussions about the lack of diversity in names on television and to challenging stereotypes about ethnic and racial sounding names. Discussions can also deepen students’ and educators’ understanding of the implications of mispronouncing, Anglicizing, and (re)naming students of color. In the following sections, I analyze two examples from popular culture that disrupt dominant naming practices when the teacher and students flip the roll call script.

The Urban in Suburban Meets the Black/white Racial Divide

The comedy duo Keegan-Michael Key and Jordan Peele, the creators of the Key & Peele show, had great success for five seasons on Comedy Central. The show’s sketches focused the parody of aspects of Black culture and challenged and critiqued issues of racism. “Substitute Teacher,” one of their most popular sketches, has been viewed over 130 million times on YouTube. Although racial microaggressions in this example are not directed at people of color, the comedy sketch inverts the roll call as a tool to show how racism is enforced and experienced by students of color in the mispronunciation of their names. In the episode, Mr. Garvey, an African American substitute teacher, introduces himself to a predominantly white classroom. He relies on his teaching experiences of over twenty years in the inner city as a signifier of his ‘toughness’ and ‘coolness.’ As he leans his body forward and presses down on his desk, he scans the room, raises his voice, and tells his students, “So don’t even think about messing with me. Ya’ll feel me!” Although his physicality and dress of a collared white shirt and tie convey an image of middle class Black male respectability, it is juxtaposed against an aging Black hypermasculine performance (he appears to be balding) through his ‘toughness’ and unapologetic attitude. After his introduction, he picks up his clipboard and starts taking roll. He
mispronounces the names of his suburban white students, but the students resist him by refusing to respond and by correcting his mispronunciation of their names. His mispronunciation of student names elicits the following responses:

Jakequaline – Uh, do you mean, Jacqueline?
Balakay – My name is Blake
De-nise – Do you mean Denise?
A-Aron – It’s pronounced Aaron.

When he reaches the end of the list he calls out “Tym-oh-tee,” and from a corner of the room, a Black male responds to an elongated “Pre-sent.” With a relief in his voice, the teacher exhales, “Thank you.” Mr. Garvey’s presence in the classroom inverts the power of naming to show how white teachers are predominantly placed in urban schools (racial code to describe schools that predominately serve students of color) without understanding the communities in which they teach.

So, what happens when the classroom space is flipped and a Black male teacher asserts his authority in a predominantly white, suburban classroom? This three-minute script is a powerful pedagogical tool that shows what happens when the roll call script is flipped. I have shown the clip in my courses and students have appeared to grasp and to empathize with the painful experience that many students of color face when teachers mispronounce, Anglicize, or (re)name them. For many new teachers, pronouncing students’ names correctly can be a challenging task. After class discussions, however, students realized that what matters is showing students that their names matter by making an effort to learn how to pronounce their names, even if means making mistakes. My classes also discuss steps that they can take, such as having students introduce themselves on the first day of class and asking them what name they prefer.

(De)centering the Black/white Racial Binary:
Contested Histories of School Segregation

The precariousness and (in)visibility of the segregation of Mexican American students and their treatment as second-class citizens dates back to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848, when the U.S. imposed a racial hierarchy and the demarcation of the Black-white binary (Nieto, 2004). Although Mexican American students were racially classified as white, de facto segregation excluded Mexican Americans from designated white spaces, including schools (San Miguel Jr. & Donato, 2010). However, schools relied on their last names to segregate Mexican American students into Mexican rooms and Mexican schools. Discrimination based on surname was documented, most notably with Méndez v. Westminster (1946), which served as a precedent in the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education (1954), and argued that separate was not equal and thus ended de jure segregation in California’s K-12 public schools (Valencia, 2008). In Méndez v. Westminster (1946), the aunt of the Méndez children enrolled them at Westminster Elementary School.
school, but the school officials denied them from attending based on the grounds that they were deficient in English (Gonzalez, 2013). The aunt was surprised by the decision because her children attended the school; however, she realized that her children phenotypically passed as white and “their last name sounded acceptably French or Belgian to the teacher in charge of admissions…[whereas] The Méndez children, however, were visibly darker and, to the teacher, their last name was all too clearly Mexican” (Strum, 2014, p. 307). The official’s racial microaggression in this situation was the racial coded language of denying attendance to the Méndez children based on their deficiency in English without assessing their language proficiency. Placing Mexican American children in Mexican rooms and Mexican schools was an everyday form of de facto racism consistent with Pérez Huber and Solórzano’s (2015) definition of racial microaggressions.

In the 2008 animated StoryCorps story, Facundo the Great, Ramón “Chunky” Sanchez retells the story of his schooling experiences during the 1950s in a Southern California elementary school. Ramón recounts the painful experiences that Mexican American children endured when their white teachers (re)named them by Anglicizing their names. He recalls the discrimination and humiliation that Mexican American children experienced in schools as their names were changed from Ramón to Raymond, from María to Mary, and Juanita to Jane. When a new classmate named Facundo arrives at the school, Ramón recalled how the white teachers called an emergency meeting to figure out how they were going to (re)name him. After several attempts at trying to (re)name him by shortening his name, they realized that they could not shorten his name to Fac because “it sounded too much like a dirty word” and another teacher added, “You can’t say, ‘Fac, where’s your homework?’ you know?” This verbal assault and racial macroaggression was directed towards Mexican American students and enforced by white teachers as a normal practice. For Ramón, it was a day he would always remember because Facundo “was the only guy who never got his name changed.” Not (re)naming Facundo demonstrated an exception to the mispronunciation of the names of students of colors, and not the rule.

Mispronouncing or (re)naming students with non-Eurocentric names forces students of color to give up parts of their identities to fit into the education system. Furthermore, when the names of students of color do not fit into the dominant school culture, “they are marked as inferior, strange, difficult, or esoteric” (Payne, Philyaw, Rabow, & Yazdanfar, 2016, p. 2). The separate and unequal treatment of students of color with non-Anglo names leads to internalize oppression and feelings of inferiority (Fanon, 2008). Ramón’s story was about the connection of students’ names to their identity and a message to children of color to (re)claim their names as an act of resilience.

Whites Policing the Names of People of Color

Every Asian student has a very simple old American first name that symbolizes
Jerry Hough, a professor at Duke University, contributed the preceding comment in a *New York Times* editorial. Hough argued that the uprisings that occurred after the murder of 25-year old Freddie Gray by Baltimore police officers could only be explained by their lack of “integration,” a kind of weak white liberal tolerance and benevolent act of dominance. He did not see how his comments were historically, economically, and politically inaccurate by generalizing that Asian Americans have not suffered from racial discrimination and thus reinforce the current social position of Asian Americans as the ‘honorary white’ buffer (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Chou & Feagin, 2015). In this example, Hough is the perpetrator—the one enacting the racial macroaggressions. Although there is not one primary target, the secondary targets impacted by the macroaggressions are African Americans in Baltimore who are forced to live in segregation because of institutional racism. Furthermore, a common response from white people is to deny the existence of racism by using racially coded language; Hough (2015) thought that because African Americans have “strange names” they are to blame for their lack of social mobility. Shortly after the editorial was published, Hough was placed on leave; it was inconclusive, however, if his leave was connected to his post.

University classrooms are supposed to be safe spaces of learning, but how can students of color in Hough’s classroom feel safe when their professor is blatantly racist and (mis)educated about the history of race relations in the U.S.? His comments indicated that having a “simple old American first name” is perceived as having greater privilege and being at the top of a racial hierarchy of names.

**Off-the-Record:**
**The “Hidden Transcript” of Resistance**

James W. Loewen (2015) responded by calling out Hough’s ignorance and lack of understanding on the history of race relations, including names and naming practices within the African American community. Dillard (1976) explained that the names of enslaved Africans could be easily found through planation records, and “those who haven’t found them simply haven’t looked” (p. 19). Loewen (2015) discussed the history of naming practices within the Black community, starting with how slave owners named enslaved Africans rather than the parents. He wrote, “Some owners, including George Washington, gave ‘their’ slaves pretentious names like Pompey and Caesar, making fun of their powerlessness.” Enslaved parents resisted this practice, however, by giving their children secret names that they used among their community. Laura Álvarez López’s (2015) work asked whether the names found in official historical documents were in fact the actual names used within enslaved communities. She found numerous examples in archival records where slave owners used the same names to name both enslaved Africans and
domestic animals. Her work expanded on James Scott’s (1990) ‘hidden transcript’ by privileging non-hegemonic discourses, including the subtle and collective forms of every day resistance of enslaved Africans who (re)claimed their humanity and dignity through naming practices. Álvarez López (2015) explained:

And even when slaves were given official names by their owners, different strategies of resisting these names were possible (‘the hidden transcript’), maybe as a result of the changes in how the enslaved populations valued and interpreted the world depending on the circumstances in which they lived. (p.168)

Here ‘the hidden transcript’ is key in understanding the resistance of enslaved Africans outside of the official records that were kept as part of the ‘public transcript’. As a result, enslaved parents rejected their official names and those of their children by retaining African naming practices in their everyday life. Black naming practices took a turn during the nadir of race relations from 1890 to 1940, when whites refused to refer to a Black man or woman as ‘Mr.’ or ‘Mrs.’ Sheila Walker (1977) further explained, “To express a sense of socially sanctioned superiority, many Whites—especially in the South—tried to deprive Blacks of their dignity by calling them only by their first name, whatever their age and however elevated their educational and socio-economic status” (p. 75). The verbal assault of infantilizing African Americans by using only their first name is a racial microaggression. The institutional racism of the Jim Crow Law subordinated, disrespected, and demeaned Black bodies within public spaces. The Black community responded to these racial microaggressions by giving their children “initials like T.J. [and] daughters might get named with positive adjectives, like Patience and Precious” (Loewen, 2015).

Black identity and pride were strengthened during the Civil Rights Movement as a result of uncovering more about their history, including the exposure of the horrors of slavery that Alex Haley (1976) portrayed in his novel and the subsequent television miniseries Roots: The Saga of an American Family. The miniseries retold the story of one family’s historical trauma of slavery, and also highlighted the family’s intergenerational resistance. The family’s resistance was portrayed in different forms including rejecting the naming practices of their white masters. In one of the most painful and powerful scenes, Kunta Kinte was brutally beaten and flogged for refusing to answer to his slave name Toby. The story of Kunta Kinte’s refusal to give up his African name and to accept his slave name was passed down from one generation to the next. The family passed on the history of his survival by resisting and staying connected to Kunta Kinte’s African name, values, spirituality, language, and cultural practices.

The 1960s Afrocentrism counternarrative and the (re)claiming of Black power and identity were attempts to forge an oppositional consciousness, including giving Black children Afrocentric and unique names. Joey Lee Dillard (1976) archived the resistance and survival of African names and naming practices through the ‘hidden transcripts’ or (un)official records such as folklore, jazz music, and linguistics pat-
terns and practices of African Americans. According to Dillard (1976), the shift in naming practices within the African American community during this time period was seen as giving up their ‘slave’ names and “Going back to the roots—looking for historical authenticity—was only a small part of what the Black parent wished to express when he gave his child an African name” (p. 18). Justin Kaplan and Anne Bernays (1999) also noted that “those who do shed their slave names in favor of African names are motivated…by an authentic and profound desire to touch and cling to their lost heritage” (p. 89).

**Sustaining Strategies of Resistance: #SorryNotSorry**

Throughout history, whites have controlled and policed the names of people of color through the institution of slavery, Jim Crow laws, and through subtle and unconscious forms of racial microaggressions. We have also witnessed intergenerational strategies of resistance within communities of color through names and naming practices. Social media has produced strong collective responses and has served as critical platforms for national conversations about issues of race and institutional racism. Artists of color have used social media and popular culture to turn the script back to a white audience by centering the ‘hidden script.’ Notably, the lyric, “He better call Becky with the good hair” in performer Beyoncé Knowles-Carter’s 2016 song “Sorry” created social media frenzy to determine who was ‘Becky.’ The social media community did not identify Becky but was sure of one thing: she was a white woman because of the reference to ‘good hair’ and her Eurocentric name. Similar to Key & Peele’s skit of the Black teacher’s mispronunciation of white students’ names, Beyoncé flipped the script onto a white audience by using the name ‘Becky’ as a code word for whiteness. Those who failed to see how Beyoncé flipped the script onto a white audience reacted negatively, however, with accusations of reverse racism.

Communities of color continuously challenge institutional racism in their everyday life, from subtle forms of resistance by giving their children (un)official names that connect to their ancestral roots, to more visible ways as using popular culture to flip the script on a white audience.

**Racial and Gender Signifiers in Names**

A student’s name is one of the most important parts of their identity, but it can also reveal racial disparities. Parents and families invest time in choosing a perfect name for their child and many parents want to give their child a unique name. Others choose names that are tied to their family history, heritage, cultural backgrounds, and political or religious values. When choosing their child’s name, parents of color are confronted with the long-term consequences of how their child’s name will impact how they will be treated in school or perceived on job applications (Bertrand
Norma A. Marrun

& Mullainathan, 2002; Wykes, 2017). While parents of daughters especially must consider how their child’s name could make her vulnerable to sexisms. Moreover, some parents of color consciously decide to give their children ‘American’ sounding names in an attempt to hide their children’s racialized identities, and thus protect them from being discriminated against and/or to access white privileges.

It is commonly believed that the end of legal segregation afforded different racial groups equal opportunities to education and employment. However, racial discrimination in education and in the labor force continues to be pervasive and more difficult to prove (Bonilla-Silva, 2014). In fact, many employers have adopted the practice of colorblindness in hiring. Banks and Banks (2016) argued that colorblindness, however, “can never exist because there are racial meanings attached to other racial markers…besides what a person looks like” and including a person’s name (p. 211). At the same time, sexism continues to exist because there are also gendered signifiers attached to a person’s name. When employers respond to prejudices and biases based on raced and gendered stereotypes of perceived intelligence, productivity, and criminality, racial and gendered macroaggressions surface when evaluating candidates and making hiring decisions.

Job Searching While Brown

Social psychologists have researched how individuals in positions of authority react and behave to other’s name using the concept of implicit-egotism effect, which is when individuals tend to gravitate towards people and places, including individual’s names that most resemble the self (Pelham, Carvallo, & Jones, 2005). Whether on a college or job application, individuals reviewing and making decisions have been shown to implicitly associate different characteristics with applicant’s names, and to use that association to make judgments about the person’s intelligence, work ethic, or moral values; consider also that the people in power who make these decisions are also predominantly white and male (Delgado, & Stefancic, 2017). In a BuzzFeed video, a Latino male named José shared his story of submitting online applications and his inability at receiving responses (Carrasquillo, 2014; Matthews, 2014). On any one day, he sent out an average of 50 to 100 resumes; these numbers show his strong determination to find employment, but they also debunk stereotypes of Latino males as lazy and unambitious (Romero, 2011). After several months of applying, he realized that because José might be read as a Latino-sounding name, so he changed it to Joe, a more white-sounding name. After only dropping one letter in his name, his email inbox was filled by responses from employers. In this example, José was the primary target of the racial microaggression and colorblindness functioned to sustain workplace segregation and to ensure the economic subordination of people of color by denying them access to employment opportunities. Before changing his name, the message from employers was that José was inherently unqualified for jobs that belonged to white
applicants. A second message that was reinforced was that everyone has an equal chance to find better employment opportunities, and that we live in a post-racial society with no structural barriers. When people of color are qualified for these jobs, but are denied or are told that they are not a good fit, messages that people of color are inferior to whites reinforces the internalization of oppression within minoritized groups. José’s process of documenting his experience and sharing it through social media proved the institutional racism of the subtle, invisible, and often not intentional racial microaggressions that people of color endure daily. Social psychologists argue that employers discriminate based on implicit-egotism effect. This approach blames the individual, however, rather than showing how racism is systemic and rooted in white supremacy. Employers might adopt a colorblind hiring process by saying that they do not see color. In this case they did not have to see a person’s color but, rather, they saw it in the applicant’s name.

Enacting Culturally Responsive Teaching
Along the PK-20 Pipeline:
Who Named You?

Although PK-12 teachers are encouraged to enact culturally responsive teaching, such teaching is often missing or glossed over in teacher preparation programs and across college classrooms. With the growing number of minority-serving (MSI), Hispanic-serving (HSI), and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institutions (AANAPISI), colleges and universities struggle to retain and graduate students of color. According to Hayes and Fasching-Varner (2015), the problem with culturally responsive teaching in higher education is that it is not being spoken, in particular within teacher education programs; faculty are told “that diversity is the way ‘it is going, like it or not,’ and then shy away from actual engagement with diversity” (p. 112). If more faculty enacted culturally responsive teaching, students of color would see and experience a less hegemonic side of higher education and would be more likely to feel a sense of connectedness with instructors, peers, and curriculum. For example, important aspects of culturally responsive teaching are knowing yourself first, understanding your students’ identities, and validating the linguistic and cultural assets that students bring to the classroom. Faculty’s first step can be learning the names of their students and then taking the time to learn about their names.

For classroom teachers and college professors, the first day of classes can create anxiety about name pronunciation. While it may not appear overtly racist when instructors avoid calling on students with non-Eurocentric names because of their fear of mispronouncing a student’s name, it can cause a student to feel invisible, humiliated, and disconnected from the classroom space (Harris, 2017; Kohli & Solórzano, 2005). As educators, we have a responsibility to learn how to correctly pronounce our students’ names as a way to value and honor their families
and identities. Payne, Philyaw, Rabow, and Yazdanfar, (2016) also reminded us that, although it is not always easy to pronounce names that are phonetically unfamiliar, as educators “ensuring that the dignity of a student is maintained should be every educator’s goal” (p. 7). A student’s name is often the first piece of information we learn about them. How we respond as educators to the names, however, can either affirm their identities or can trigger feelings of shame or humiliation for students of color. I propose that the first step toward becoming a multicultural and culturally responsive educator is for the instructor to critically reflect on how they were named, how it defines them, and what experiences have they had with their name in school and the workplace. Thus, educators need to understand their own experiences about their names to understand how they respond to students with non-Eurocentric names.

Different pedagogical approaches and resources can disrupt practice of Anglicizing, (re)naming, or mispronouncing students’ names. Even in large lectures, faculty can attempt to learn students’ names by having students create personal name cards with academic (i.e. major) and personal information, such as a unique quality. These resources can help create a classroom environment where students feel connected and validated, and where they can feel they can succeed. Instructors can also take note on and reflect on how they pronounce their students’ name when taking attendance or upon whom they call to participate during class discussions.

I have incorporated the importance of names into my syllabus. My in-service students have shared how they often avoid calling students by their names because they are afraid of mispronouncing them. However, after discussing the sociocultural and historical implications of Anglicizing and (re)naming practices, they realized that their well-meaning intentions were grounded in deficit thinking. As a class, we have also discussed different strategies, including having students introduce themselves on the first day of class so that the instructor and peers can listen to the pronunciation. Students can also record their names as a way to remember the correct pronunciation. My students read articles challenging the issues of mispronouncing of names and (re)naming practices in schools, including Kohli and Solórzano’s (2012) article entitled “Teachers, Please Learn Our Names!: Racial Microgressions and the K-12 Classroom”. Before discussing the articles, I have students answer the following questions:

1. Who named you?
2. How did your parents/family/legal guardian come up with your name?
3. Do you have different names in different contexts? For example, what name(s) were you called by at school, with your friends, or your family?
4. How does your name connect to your identities—race/ethnicity, language, culture, religion, and family history?

After they answer the questions, students share their stories in small groups. When we come together as a large group, volunteers from each small group share what
they learned about each other. After each group has shared its stories, I ask the class why names are important and what they learned about their peers. This activity of reflecting and sharing their stories provides an opportunity for students to define their own identities and to interrogate their biases. It also creates a sense of connectedness and openness. I pair the lesson with multimedia based instruction including the *Key & Peele* episode of the substitute teacher taking attendance and the *Facundo the Great* story. As the instructor, the activity provides me with a glimpse of my students’ lives, families, and communities.

Educators across the country have also taken a pledge to correctly pronounce students’ names by joining *My Name, My Identity* Campaign.1 The campaign was created in 2016 by the Santa Clara County Office of Education to raise awareness about the importance of respecting student names and identity in schools. Resources provided for teachers include guiding questions to help students explore their identities, docu-stories, publications, name tags, and buttons promoting the campaign.

**Conclusion:**

*Please Respect Our Names!*

Although changing a student’s name may come from a place of caring, educators need to be aware of how their unconscious bias of students with non-Eurocentric names reinforces racial hierarchies in the classroom. An educator who learns to correctly pronounce students’ names signals respect and validates students’ racial, ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural identities. Learning students’ names is the first step in becoming a multicultural and culturally responsive educator. Incorporating popular culture and social media as a pedagogical tool can also help raise all students’ social consciousness. Lastly, changes in naming practices within communities of color are often a reflection of sociopolitical changes and expressions of oppositional consciousness. My work demonstrates the active participation of people of color within social media and race-conscious scholars in the production of counternarratives and the contestation of dominant naming ideologies. With an overwhelming majority of white teachers in the nation, it is critical for educators with diverse classrooms to respect their students’ identities, starting with their names. Teachers, please RESPECT our names!5

**Notes**

1 *Facundo the Great* is part of the story collection in StoryCorps broadcast by National Public Radio (NPR) where people from across the country can record their stories. The stories are housed at the Library of Congress.

2 The ability to navigate three cultures, in my experience, includes the intersectionality of my linguistic identities of Spanish, English, and Arabic.

3 Hough’s comment received 235 ‘thumbs up.’
I would like to thank my students Anabel Sanchez and Amanda Billington for sharing with the class the My Name, My Identity Campaign.

The last sentence was inspired by Kohli & Solórzano’s (2012) article title. In addition to emphasizing that teachers must learn student names, I add RESPECT by emphasizing that learning student’s names is a sign of respect for their identities.
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Don Draper, Teacher-as-Artist

A Diffractive Reading of *Mad Men*

*Gabriel Huddleston & Samuel D. Rocha*

**Abstract**

Popular culture can be used as an apparatus of diffraction, in order to understand the complicated entanglements within both the object and in connection to other elements of society. This article posits that the television drama *Mad Men* is an ideal apparatus of diffraction of the role of teacher, making that assertion collaboratively between the co-authors, demonstrating how popular culture continues to diffract, even when it is “held” from different angles. This article initially reads disjointed as the authors’ work is intercut strategically but not necessarily coherently. By using popular culture as an apparatus of diffraction, the authors become implicitly implicated in a larger entanglement; in this case, between the authors, *Mad Men*, and education. With your reading, the entangled web is extended, and the authors hope further understanding can be gleamed.

**Introduction**

*Gabriel Huddleston*: As I have mentioned elsewhere (Huddleston, G., 2016a, 2016b) popular culture can be used as an apparatus of diffraction. Relying on New Materialism scholarship (Coole & Frost, 2010), more specifically Barad’s (2007) work, I have argued that, for a variety of reasons, popular culture is an ideal candidate for diffracting objects of examination in order to understand the complicated entanglements within both the object and in connection to other ele-
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© 2018 by Caddo Gap Press.*
ments of society. In other words, popular culture diffracts the traditional hierarchy of researcher examining (or measuring) the researched into a multitude of entangled connections. Building on this argument, I posit the television drama *Mad Men* as an ideal apparatus of diffraction of the role of teacher. While similar to my previous work, this paper adds a slight variation by working collaboratively with a co-author who’s use of *Mad Men* is different than my own, but reinforces my point by demonstrating how popular culture continues to diffract, even when it is “held” from a different angle. As such, this article will initially read disjointed as our work is intercut strategically but not necessarily coherently. To the ends that Barad suggest, diffraction is a way to glimpse into the entangled nature of our world, so the aim of this paper is to honor such an aim and not detangle such entanglements, but rather an attempt to examine them as they are at the moment of our writing and your reading. By using popular culture as an apparatus of diffraction, the scholar, in this case two scholars, become implicitly implicated in a larger entanglement; in this case, between us, *Mad Men*, and education. With your reading, the entangled web is extended, and we hope further understanding can be gleamed.

**Sam Rocha**: In my domain of interests, I am better described as an agnostic to diffraction in its theoretical usage. Larger still my agnosticism extends to the very idea of “culture” invoked within cultural studies, most of all when the object of study is, ostensibly, a work of art. My doubt emerges from the dilemmas of art that for me are not so much entangled within cultural or social elements but, instead, hold those realities hostage and supply the necessary and sufficient conditions for their own contingent entanglements. My interest in *Mad Men*, as we will see, is idiosyncratically somewhere between phenomenology and art criticism.

A short prefatory note on method. As should already be clear, I am not a “cultural studier” or a “cultural studyist.” I am a phenomenologist, so my interests are less cultural and more phenomenological in nature. My interest in film is because phenomenology, at its most basic level, is nothing more or less than the study of appearances. The “moving picture” is one way to understand the appearance of film and cinema, which functions within a conceptual sense of movement and the pictorial image that a phenomenological reduction might be especially suited for. This of course rejects out of hand the false limitation put on phenomenology by being reduced to the immediacy of “lived experience.” I am not familiar with dead or killed experience, or any experience that is not lived, but, more constructively, I believe that phenomenology can engage with the ordinary as such, which I have developed at some length in my notion of “folk phenomenology” (Rocha, S.D., 2015). In what follows, I will try to apply this sense of folk phenomenology to the appearance of the television moving picture series, *Mad Men*, as an analogy to and allegory of, the modern-day schooling industrial complex.

**Gabriel and Sam**: This article contains both a macro-level objective and two micro-level objectives, with a series of negations attached to each. The larger
objectives are outlined in the first paragraph with its negation expressed in the paragraph to follow. The smaller, more specific objectives are (1) Using Mad Men as an apparatus of diffraction to examine the teacher-as-artist role, negated through “seeing” Mad Men as formalist visual art with little to no content, and (2) excavating Mad Men’s version of nostalgia to diffract larger questions of curriculum and schooling, negated through the text of the film itself that interrupts the pastiche from settling in.

**Gabriel and/or Sam:** A profane narrative of office life has been a part of the modern social imaginary since at least Melville’s Bartleby the Scribner and was surely canonized by Kafka. Schools, by contrast, contain an affective recollection of institutionalization that largely goes on without irony or interruption. What I mean by this is the following: while the office is a worthy object of pop culture ridicule (as opposed to simple satire), the school is less easily profaned. What offices and schools share is an analogous disciplinary structure and relationship to the eros present in their archetypal nostalgia, desire for home. This short essay will describe an affective subtext found in the moving images of Mad Men, in and out of memory, and make believe (as one sees often in the daydreams of its protagonists) to show how Mad Men can be understood through the lens of school-day absurdity, imitating what seems to be culture but may only be smoke.

**Mad Men,** as with other period dramas, offers a bit of a dilemma. Is it saying something about the time of which it is set or something about our current moment? More specifically, is it problematic because of the period it represents or its current productive elements? Probably not surprisingly, I would contend it is both. A cultural studies framework (Grossberg, 1996, 2010; Hall, 1996; Johnson, 1996) insists on such an analysis due to a cycle of cultural production that considers the production of the text, the text itself, the multiple readings of the text and how those reading play out in the structures of everyday society and the lives of those within them. Period dramas like Mad Men present an interesting mode of diffraction because of their dual nature, a chance to analyze the past as well as the present. More specifically, while the text is set in the past, the popularity of it in terms of the readings represent a connection to the present moment. This is not unique to Mad Men (I am looking at you Downton Abbey and our current class identity crisis) but what is an opportunity for diffraction is the central character’s (Don Draper) dual role as both artist and ad man.

Make no mistake, this dual nature complicates all the things that makes Mad Men problematic. Its lack of diversity, treatment of women, and glorification of capitalism can all be discussed either in terms of a text representing the late 50s/60s world of corporate America or the various components of the production of the text itself. Throughout several episodes of season five, as examples, women are portrayed as either victims of horrible mothers or horrible mothers themselves. There are certainly documented examples of how women were discriminated against and
oppressed during this time, but to equate it all to a cycle of terrible mothers suggest that Matthew Weiner and the other writers of the show were making a comment on motherhood in general that certainly smacks of a present undercurrent of sexism. The point is to undercut Mad Men as an exalted touchstone and portray it as a tool of diffraction because of its imperfections—to lay claim to its whiteness and sexism is necessary to perhaps uncover the same in whatever object you seek to diffract.

Two terminological preambles on operational distinctions regarding nostalgia and emptiness. I want to first briefly distinguish between nostalgia and what I have called “nostalgia for nostalgia.” Nostalgia is what we find in the poetics of Homer’s Odyssey, where Odysseus’s longing for home is concretely located in Ithaca and his lover Penelope. Odysseus misses his home; his journey is moved by the eros of his nostalgia; his passion to return home greater than the offers to stay in other homes; his love for Penelope is never satiated by the offers of other lovers. In short, nostalgia accepts no substitutes for home. Odyssean nostalgia is the stuff that builds the Platonic Christian soul and its corresponding theory of recollection—the basis for all major theories of learning. “Nostalgia for nostalgia,” by contrast, is the sort of longing I experienced when I read and re-read the Odyssey. My experience is to yearn for Odysseus’s nostalgia, to wish I could have a home to long for like he does. Since I cannot experience nostalgia properly, in the Odyssean sense, my sense of nostalgia is then doubled. I suspect that this is the same sort of nostalgia for nostalgia we find in Don Draper’s existential angst about his bastard origins and later identity theft (yet the series itself discloses something different from Draper’s nostalgia for nostalgia). This is also a commentary on the experience of mestizaje in the United States, as opposed to native indigeneity—in this case, Draper’s experience is a mestizo experience while the series itself is steeped in a quintessential nativism that often lurks in essentialist conceptions of indigeneity that border themselves in the “Turtle Island” of the North American anglosphere. “Nostalgia for nostalgia,” then, is not knowing where one should or will be buried as opposed to the simple nostalgia of being far from one’s proper site of burial. “Nostalgia for nostalgia” is partly what is implied in the “X” of Malcolm X’s namesake: the rejection of a therapeutic and false home (e.g., “Back to Africa” or “I too am an American”). Here, in Malcolm’s “X” we find two complementary senses of emptiness: one the on hand, we have the empty signifier, which holds open the possibility of a home to come, a negativity that clears space for a future; on the other hand, we have true emptiness, which is what here I will refer to as “smoke,” where the object of desire is in fact nothing at all and all that is left is the nihilistic and consumerist pastiche of nostalgia: the ad and marketing campaign and shopping mall. Any other uses of these terms for this essay would risk a misunderstanding of my analysis.

Draper’s job at the beginning of the series is the Director of the Creative Department at the advertising firm of Sterling Cooper. His title morphs dependent on the changes at the company of which he works, but his job is essentially the same, create and pitch ad campaigns for his company’s current and prospective
clients. This is perhaps captured best in the episode, “The Wheel,” in which Draper reintroduces Kodak’s new slide projector as the Carousel:

Draper: It takes us to a place where we ache to go again. It’s not called the wheel, it’s called the carousel. It lets us travel the way a child travels—around and around, and back home again, to a place where we know are loved.

In the fictitious world of *Mad Men*, Draper is considered a giant of the industry with peers often seeing his process as artistic and magical. Draper himself extols the creative virtues of advertising eschewing research and data as irrelevant. At the same time, Draper’s cynicism about the very emotions he seeks to stir is evident by the line, “What you call love was invented by guys like me, to sell nylons.” Draper’s cynicism alludes to the awareness of his artistic process within a larger capitalist system where his creativity, however impressive and rewarding, is meant to simply sell products.

This dual nature of Draper’s job is intensified by (is it acceptable to write “spoiler alert” in an academic text?) his literal dual personality. Draper is actually Dick Whitman who, after the real Draper’s death, assumed his identity. While this assumed identity and Draper’s continual denial of his real past is a fascinating plot point, its interest here is only secondary to the other dual life he has, the artist and the ad man.

Draper’s lack of an actual past only adds to the mystique of his character for others on the show. As one coworker remarks, “Draper? Who knows anything about that guy, no one’s ever lifted that rock. He could be Batman for all we know.” This mystique plays into what others see as a mythical, magical process for not only coming up with aesthetically pleasing ad campaigns, but then convincing the companies during the pitch session that they want these campaigns at all. As I will argue later, it is also essential for Draper’s ability to remain within a world with which he is not at all comfortable.

The other world that Draper feels both a kinship and unease with is the burgeoning counter culture movement during this time period. Throughout the show’s run, Draper is a serial adulterer with various women from various backgrounds. During the first few episodes, we meet Draper’s mistress (Midge Daniels) first, then his wife (Betty Draper). Midge lives in the Village and is an artist, her scene is other artists, musicians, and bohemian types and Don seems to enjoy dropping in from time to time and engage in philosophical discussions with her friends to indulge his inner artist while at the same time flaunting his privileged position of “ad man.” The following exchange demonstrates this:

Midge’s Friend: Dig. Ad man’s got a heart.

Midge Daniels: The grown-ups are talking.

Midge’s Friend: Don’t defend him. [to Don] Toothpaste doesn’t solve anything. Dacron sure as hell won’t bring back those ten dead kids in Biloxi.
Don: Neither will buying some TOKA Y wine and leaning up against a wall in Grand Central pretending you’re a vagrant.

Midge’s Friend: You know what it’s like to watch all you ants go into your hive? I wipe my ass with the Wall Street Journal.

Woman: How come every time we have a party the ladies have to sit and listen to the men talk?

Midge’s Friend: Look at you. Satisfied, dreaming up jingles for soap flakes and spot remover, telling yourself you’re free.

Don: Oh, my God. Stop talking and make something of yourself.

Roy: Like you? You make the lie. You invent want. You’re for them... not us.

Don: Well, I hate to break it to you, but there is no big lie. There is no system. The universe is indifferent.

Midge’s Friend: Aww man, why did you have to say that?

Roy: You can’t go out there, the cops.

Don: I can…you can’t.

The point here is that Don finds himself between two worlds, both of which he can never fully be a part of due to his split persona. And yet, each half allows him movement within its opposite world. Draper’s business side makes him more attractive to women, for example, and grants him privilege to move easily in and out of the lives of those he has a connection to, while, as mentioned before, his artist side makes him a valuable asset for the companies of which he is employed. This calls to mind Spivak’s (1993) in terms of how access is granted in some arenas, but full acceptance is denied because the thing that grants one access is attached to that which makes one still “other”.

In the end, as Buzzanell and D’Enbeau (2013) discuss, Draper represents the ability to make ordinary work within an ad agency “meaningful work.” Meaningful work is work that acknowledges or impacts one’s own being and existence in some way beyond wages. In other words, a person feels called to do work for a higher purpose beyond the apparent demands of the job itself. It is the concept of meaningful work that I wish to explore by using Don Draper as a model to discuss the teacher as artist.

Let us go to the bar. Wolf and Hound, in Kitsilano, on Broadway and Alma, an Irish Pub owned by a Pakistani man where I play soul music once or twice a month. I asked my students one night, “What is it about Mad Men? I think I love it, but I just don’t get it. I’m not even sure what I’m watching.” Then I lit up a Lucky Strike and squinted through a collected haze of smoke and sipped my cool light beer, a respite from a day of hard liquor. (Aside: I of course didn’t really do that, but the imaginary progression describes something about the affect of Mad Men that is
perhaps its most constitutive element.) Again I asked my students, “What is Mad Men even about?” One of them, a middle-aged German woman, said softly as if she was exhaling, “All the smoking, I just adore it. Everyone smokes.” Everyone seemed to agree, even those who didn’t smoke and didn’t like smoking. There was something about the “smokiness” of the series that had to do with what it was about. “The clothes,” another student said. The mood at the pub table moved into something almost pensive but not ponderous. It was as if there was a sense that the world of Mad Men—not the literal, historical, or political world, here I mean the phenomenological real world—was gone forever. We seemed, some more than others (I felt I was observing but being drawn into the moment at the same time), we seemed to be smoking on the unfiltered cigarette of nostalgia, imported from Greek epic verse.

The connection between Mad Men and education or Don Draper and teacher as artist are not entirely tenuous. Admitting that there is some intellectual heavy lifting to make the connections, it is helpful to start where the show actually intersects with education. In a five-episode story arc of season three, Don begins an affair with his daughter’s (Sally) former teacher, Suzanne Farrell. Throughout the show and sometimes while married, Draper has sexual encounters with a variety of women and his complicated relationship with women is a recurring theme of the show. While the relationships themselves vary in terms of length and depth, and therefore importance, they tend to all tie together with Don’s childhood (as Dick Whitman) in which he spent most of his life in a brothel. Reifying Don’s dual professional life, his personal life’s duality is symbolized by his traditional, domesticated relationship with one set of women and his illicit affairs with objectified and highly sexualized women. While not the focus of this paper, this duality is of particular interest as it relates to Don choosing to start an affair with a teacher. Perhaps, in seeing the dual nature of a teacher, Don sees a kinship.

Grumet’s (1988) work elucidates the duality of teaching as it relates to gender. Ultimately, the profession of teaching, as constructed by a patriarchal society, was to exploit “maternal” qualities as a means to indoctrinate students into a hegemony that oppresses women. As such, women who were teachers found themselves in a duality that meant to question the construction of gender was to question their role in reifying such a construction through their teaching. Grumet seeks to break this connection and writes: “Stigmatized as “women’s work,” teaching rests waiting for us to reclaim it and transform it into the work of women” (p. 58). Grumet speaks to a process in which the emancipation of women is directly tied to a move from teachers engaged in the process of schooling to one of true education—from indoctrination-as-instruction to teaching-as-artistry. Ayers (2010) posits such a duality as a moral choice that all teachers must make, do we encourage conformity or truly
educate? If we are to believe Althusser (2006), such a move is nearly impossible due to schools’ roles as ideological state apparatuses. Althusser aside, Tyack and Cuban (1995) speak to the “grammar of schools” that make true change difficult at best and Kliebard (2004) outlines the difficulties of one particular version of US curriculum winning out over others. All this being said, Don is witness to the duality of teachers, first meeting Suzanne in a meeting to discuss Sally’s bad behavior thereby fulfilling her role of “schooling” and later becoming more attracted to her when he watches her at a school field day, dancing with children and thereby symbolizing a certain type of idealism. Over the course of their relationship, Don finds a kindred spirit who sees herself as complicit, but trapped in a society of which she does not belong. She, as many teachers do, yearns to be more than a simple bureaucrat pushing children towards conformity and wants to express herself in the artistry of teaching.

When we look at the language of schools, from policy to administration to teaching, there is something very similar, if not identical to Mad Men going on in a vague and perplexing way. For all the defense and offense of and about schooling, there is an equal volume of haziness about the aboutness of schools. Schools have mostly lost their bathroom smoking—with the recent exception of the Juule—and classrooms in universities no longer have their lecturing smokers. It may seem that the smoke has cleared, but the truth may indeed be the reverse, just as today’s longing for smoke happens in bars where smoking is outlawed. Today, many lament the loss of teacher agency and blame neoliberalism for privatizing public schools into shells of their former progressive selves. This, of course, is highly oversimplified—however pious it is to feel deeply about such oversimplifications—but the school narrative has more depth when considered through the hazy question of what Mad Men might be about. Office fiction often does this, but Mad Men’s nostalgic seriousness may do it in a different way. No one longs for Dilbert. We laugh at Steve Carell. If this unique smokiness from Mad Men were to translate into the sacred realm of schooling we might find that its mystique forces us to admit that we don’t really get what schools are. I mean, sure, there is the history, the politics, the assumptions, the kids, the teachers, the state, the lack of cigarettes and danger, and the shootings. I get that much. But in Greece, Spain, Russia and more, schools are taking shape while facing some stark and concrete challenges. They are post-economic. The youth go to school for something other than jobs. There are no jobs to be had, but people go regardless, some by law, others by choice, but no one can say what for. Neoliberal austerity and collapse does not seem to be deterring the school; schools may not be as fragile as capitalist ideology would have us believe. Across the global south, by contrast, many youth have never wanted to attend school, and continue to avoid schools altogether, despite sanctimonious Church and State efforts. So there is nothing so fragile nor so durable as “the school.” If there is anything to this thing we call school, and I hope that can agree that there really should be at least something, then perhaps we should take a closer look at Mad
Men and the love of vinyl records. The smoke we hear that is cloudy and warm, that burns slowly, like a Dunhill cigarette.

To be clear, I want to state what this paper is not. It is not an attack on the notion of teacher as artist. As someone that continues to view his teaching as an artistic endeavor, I obviously identify myself as such. I do think the teacher as artist must be problematized, however, to fully understand its role in the furthering of neoliberal education reform. As I have stated elsewhere (Huddleston, G., 2016a, 2017), the true power of such reforms are not their effectiveness in solving problems within the US public education system, if this was the case they would cease to exist, but rather their ability to become embodied by the actors within said system. Building off Puar’s (2007) conception of bodies as contagions, I wonder if the teacher-as-artist is an inoculation or does it make us more prone to become infected by neoliberalism? I have often remarked that the liberating and simultaneously frustrating feeling of “no one in the administration cares what you do” marked my experience as a high school theatre teacher. In other words, because I taught a subject that was not tested, few of my superiors were concerned about both the classes I taught and the plays I directed. Unless a parent complained about the curriculum, I was free to do what I wanted. Combined with a culture often apathetic towards theatre in general (especially in our sports obsessed school), I was an artist nation unto myself. I was frustrated, however, that our work as a theatre program was not given its deserved attention and my student’s talent and ability was not appreciated. Case in point, we were not allowed to have a Friday night show of our Fall musical as it conflicted with the football game. While this status sheltered me from the No Child Left Behind deforming of my school, it also granted me permission to disengage from the battle and content myself with my role as the artist in the back of the room only calling attention to myself when it served my purposes.

The teacher as artist has long been framed as haunting presence alongside teacher as professional or teacher as scientist. hooks (2014), Greene (1995), Dewey (2005, 2008), and Freire (2000), saw the aesthetic side of a teacher as essential to bring a sense of fluidity to the more static notions of teaching and learning. It filled the gaps of what a teacher had to do with what a teacher was inspired to do. It helped to explain and justify what some (including myself) come to call “teachable moments” when inspiration meets opportunity. Just writing those words fill my mind with moments from my own teaching that I felt were magical—goose-bump inducing. But were they? My judgement of those “teachable moments” as magical are only based on my interpretation of what was taught, and more importantly, what was learned. And yet, my experience as an actor works to confirm the magic as real because they felt so similar to the times I was on stage and knew I had the audience in the palm of my hand.

The usual analytic route is to use pop culture to make sense of schooling and curriculum, but in this case the direction must be reversed phenomenologically. At that pub table, sitting with graduate students over beer and appetizers and some-
thing approaching ordinary talk, there was a collective sense that this moment was our *Mad Men*, this time and place that seems fleeting if not gone in the institution we live and work in, the university, but long gone—in fact now extinct—in the schools of children and teenagers. In *Mad Men* we see the smoke that we do not see anymore because the absence of smoke is true emptiness, just was the Golden Age of television celebrates the recent escape from this emptiness that surrounds us as we listen to a zombie speak to us about education when we’d all rather watch them on Netflix.

In any case, the role of teacher as artist is often discussed as a safe place to shelter those of us who find the other work of teaching to be debilitating and dreadful. Again, it presents a chance for us to do what we want to do, not what we have to. And while all these things can be true, it can also be true that we do considerable harm when we wrap ourselves in the cloak of the artiste. As Taubman (2009) discusses, we teachers and educational researchers must be held accountable for our role in the growth of the very reforms some of us rail against. By positing our work as either artistic or valuing the teacher as artist, could we be in danger of reinforcing it’s position as only worthwhile in service to the production of knowledge as capital in the form of standardized test scores? I think it directly depends on what type of artist we are discussing.

Taking a cue from Spivak (1993), I contend the teacher-as-artist we typically discuss is one firmly planted in the margins of the U.S. public education system, with the center being teacher as bureaucrat, checking boxes in a continually overwhelming audit culture (Apple, 2001). This teacher as artist is like Draper as artist, a privileged position that allows one to hide in the margins and never really engage in what Derrida calls a deconstructive “event” (Caputo & Derrida, 1997). This artist relies upon artistry as a means to stay within the education system so that the privilege of being a teacher allows a continual retreat from the sea of troubles represented by neoliberal education reform. It is not as though this teacher as artist is excluded from the new free market frontier of public education, to a certain extent it is valued. Look at the rhetoric surrounding said reforms. Words such as “powerful,” “special,” “impactful,” “magical,” and “love of learning” make the discussion of teachers sound like a superhero origin story and tap into the same descriptors often associated with teacher as artist. In other words, the place at the neoliberal table for the teacher-as-artist may not be at the head, but it is set and ready for us to dine, even if we are occasionally rude. At this table, we are the crazy uncle, tolerated, but accepted and welcomed.

Jackson and Mazzei (2011) have used the same Spivakian analysis to discuss how race plays in the relationship between the center and margins of the teaching profession, more specifically in the academy. What *Mad Men* and Don Draper bring into focus, however, is how arts reifies notions of who a “teacher” is. As mentioned earlier, many have posited the arts as a potentially liberating experience for both the teacher and the student. Spivak (2012) herself speaks to how literature could
be used to examine oppression, power, and liberation. Greene (1995) positions the arts as potentially liberating because she sees it as a key way for a person to achieve the fullest potential of her existential self. While this analysis does not refute completely the potentiality of the arts in the world of teaching, it does seek to problematize it by examining three scenes from the Mad Men series: The Carousel Pitch, the Hershey’s pitch, and the final scene in the last episode.

**The Carousel Pitch**

The final episode of season one, “The Wheel”, finds many of the storylines coming to a resolution, or at least a resting point. One of those storylines is the advertising firm for which Don works pushing for higher qualities clients as a means to raise its status. One of those potential clients is Eastman Kodak who are unhappy with the campaign for its latest product, the Wheel, a slide projector. The “pitch” scene, in which Don describes his idea for an advertising campaign starts with executives sitting down and stating they know it’s hard to market something called the wheel, the world’s oldest technology, as it doesn’t seem new enough. This remark triggers the following monologue from Don:

Well, technology is a glittering lure. But there is the rare occasion when the public can be engaged on a level beyond flash, if they have a sentimental bond with the product. My first job, I was in-house at a fur company, with this old-pro copywriter, a Greek named Teddy. Teddy told me the most important idea in advertising is new. Creates an itch. You simply put your product in there as a kind of calamine lotion. But he also talked about a deeper bond with the product. Nostalgia. It’s delicate, but potent. Teddy told me that in Greek, “nostalgia” literally means “the pain from an old wound”. It’s a twinge in your heart far more powerful than memory alone. This device isn’t a spaceship, it’s a time machine. It goes backwards, forwards, takes us to a place where we ache to go again. It’s not called the wheel. It’s called the carousel. It lets us travel the way a child travels. Round and around, and back home again, to a place where we know we are loved.

Don’s pitch is effective. Everyone in the room is moved, including an associate of Don’s who starts to cry and leaves the room. The executives from Kodak-Eastman waste no time calling from the lobby to say they have cancelled meetings with other advertising firms and want to hire Don’s.

This scene helps to understand that for all the talk of the lessening roles of teachers in the classroom, especially as it relates to control of the curriculum, teachers still play and are placed in crucially located role as it relates to students and to the curriculum. Don’s selling of the slide projector as “The Carousel” offers insight into how the placement of the teachers reinforces our ideas of teacher-as-artists.

When watching the scene, it is notable to see how the characters stage the pitch meeting. An ongoing theme of the series is how potential clients are “setup” to be as receptive as possible to Don’s pitch. Clients are usually fed a good meal,
the account managers go on and on about Don’s magic that they are about to witness, they are brought into a nicely appointed boardroom, Don is introduced by means of some humorous small talk, and then he lets loose as only he can. In other words, everything is done to cultivate the spotlight for Don and set himself up to deliver on a magical performance. The key point in understanding the teacher as artist is the placement of Don’s performance as it relates to the clients and the clients’ product.

The main goal of Don’s pitch is to reintroduce a product to clients that already know it well. In the case of the projector, the representatives from Kodak have spent months in meetings about the product, how to develop it, push it along to production, why they see it as an a lucrative productive for its potential customers, etc. They “know” this product inside and out, so it is up to Don to sell them on his radically different vision for how the product should be marketed. Don is squarely placed between a “new” product that he has now transformed and the potential clients, the onus is on him to unveil it in a performative, artistic manner. In this sense, Don and his performative pitch have become intertwined with this transformed product as one piece of art. For teachers, it is the same, as they are placed squarely between their students and the curriculum—expected to present something as transformed from what students already knew or how students would have experienced it if encountered on their own.

A teacher in such a centrally located position between the student and curriculum is nothing new. Kliebard (2004) points out how the different factions of curriculum development in the United States often vacillated between the two poles, placing the teacher not necessarily in the middle but towards one pole or another. Dewey (2008), however, was committed to the teacher in a position, while perhaps not equally from one side or another, in a “sweet spot” between the student and the teacher. Dewey saw the teacher as constantly finding her place between student and curriculum, carefully weighing the child’s interest, abilities, and weaknesses against what society decided as important. He bemoaned any approach that he saw as favoring one side over the another as he saw the teacher as essential to constantly judging the contextual to decide what to teach and how.

Ayers (2010) expands the point by elucidating what Dewey was getting at, that the curriculum is not inert, but contained society’s wishes for how an individual was to be enculturated. Ayers saw teachers in a moral position in which they would often be put in a position to choose between what society wanted students to be and what the teacher saw as the best interests for the student. In this sense, both Dewey and Ayers saw the stakes as high, not unlike how Draper and his co-workers saw the stakes in landing a potential big client. Dewey (2013), not one for hyperbole, stated as much when he said, “The teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God” (p. 40).

But how to do this? How does teacher occupy this position? A scientific approach is definitely one option in which a certain amount of research is needed for teachers to find the balanced position between student and curriculum. One could
study child psychology to understand her students better, gain a significant amount of content knowledge by studying, and find the best methods for delivering such knowledge to students. However, there has always been another way and Don's philosophy about his job points to it. Don is in the business of telling people why they want to buy a product, so he sees his potential clients as no different. For Don, he doesn’t need research to tell him what he needs to do, he relies on his artistry as a means to sell. The way society views teachers and how they view themselves is no different. One can look at various popular culture iterations of teachers to see a magical, mystical artistry as central to the teacher archetype. For Don, the artistry works, Kodak signs on as a client and the firm is put in a position for success. In the case of the teacher, artistry is often posited as a positive, a mystical process by which a teacher can occupy the liminal space that Dewey describes or tackle the moral paradox of which Ayers speaks. It is powerful, and as will be discussed later, is is easy to co-opt.

The Hershey’s Pitch

The last episode of season six finds Don at a crossroads. The firm has gone through numerous changes, including a merger with another advertising company. Don has continued his affairs, although now he has divorced his first wife, Betty, and is now remarried to his current wife, Megan. His drinking has also become a problem, leading to numerous lapses in judgement, including his daughter walking in on him having sex with another married woman and punching a minister at a bar leading to a night in jail. All the while, Don continues his artistry as the firm’s leading creative force, but his personal life is starting to affect his work resulting in a precarious position that culminates in the last episode of the season. What is telling about this story arc is it’s echoing of the other side of artistry, the dangerous, maddening side--the side of artist that society does not venerate but fully acknowledges.

Regardless of the larger picture of the artist that Don’s character arc alludes, the final pitch he gives at the end of season six is telling for how a specific version of the teacher-as-artist is allowed in the margins of the education system and how other versions are not. As will be discussed later, this means that perhaps one version of the teacher-as-artist is more likely to be co-opted than another. The scene in which Don pitches to executives from Hershey’s chocolate company gives us a glimpse of this difference.

The scene starts off very similar to the one previously mentioned. Executives from Hershey are brought into a boardroom and everything is set up for Don to do his usual artistic magic in delivering the perfect “pitch”. Don, as he has come to be expected, delivers and the Hershey executives are clearly impressed. However, this time, the magic Don conjures has worked against him and offered him a glimpse into the current travails in his life. The camera remains focused on a troubled Don
as the executives gush and the Don’s partners sing his praises, assuming they have another client in the bag. The scene then takes a turn:

Don: I’m sorry... I have to say this, because I don’t know if I’ll ever see you again.

Hershey’s executive: What?

Don: I was an orphan. I grew up in Pennsylvania, in a whorehouse. I read about Milton Hershey and his school in Torn Up Magazine, or some other crap the girls left by the toilet, and I read that some orphans had a different life there. I could picture it. I dreamed of it—being wanted. Because the woman who was forced to raise me would look at me every day like she wished I would disappear. The closest I got to being wanted was with a girl who made me go through her johns’ pockets while they screwed. If I collected more than a dollar, she’d buy me Hershey bar, and I would eat it alone in my room with great ceremony. Feeling like a normal kid. It said “sweet” on the package. It was the only sweet thing in my life.

Hershey’s executive: You want to advertise that?

Don: If I had my way, you would never advertise. You shouldn’t have someone like me telling that boy what a Hershey bar is. He already knows.

It here that we see Don rendered vulnerable because his of artistry, usually used only as a means to sell product, has offered him a fleeting look at something more tangible—possibly even more true. At the very least, at this moment, Don finds himself seeing how he usually applies his craft as meaningless—as artifice. By recognizing a past moment when a candy bar meant so much to him personally without the aid of an advertising campaign, we see the true talent of Don’s work which is not the ability to sell things to people, but to recognize how things become meaningful in the lives of the ordinary. As we find out later in the episode, this type of talent is useless to his partners, his firm, and to society at large.

Towards the end of the episode, Don’s partners call him into the office and ask him to take a temporary leave of absence. His personal behavior over the last few months has become a problem, mainly because it has resulted in the loss of clients due to his shoddy work. The Hershey’s pitch crystallized for Don’s partners what they had suspected, his artistry could no longer justify his presence in the firm. The episode ends with Don taking his children to the brothel, now completely run down and in a crumbling neighborhood, to show them the house in which he grew up—not as a result of his epiphany in the boardroom.

Similar to the Don in the first scene, the typical teacher-as-artist holds an accepted, if not exalted, place within schools. However, there are limits on that artistry and as soon as a teacher relies on artistry that is either considered useless, or perhaps, even dangerous, they are just as likely to be excommunicated as Don was from his firm. Ironically, as with Don gathering some type of insight into his own life, the teacher-as-(dangerous) artist, could be the type of instructor students
deserve because of the inherent power. I believe there are anecdotal examples of such expulsions, when teachers artistry offers powerful educative moments for students only to find that such moments are not wanted because they do not fall within the confines of traditional schooling. More recently Ta-Nahesi Coates (2015) writes of how teaching artistry that powerfully engages students to think beyond the confines of what society expects and accepts is often marginalized and quarantined.

This nostalgic pastiche of mourning and curious delight from a distance grasps at what has been called the curricular question, “What knowledge of is of most worth?” The knowledge worth its very existence is the one, it seems, that has a certain poetic transmissive capacity to replicate a dream world of affect, color, and smoke. But the smoke ultimately, in this appearance, is empty. I am afraid that the aesthetic core of Mad Men is a sort of nihilism that in this case has always been part of the American psyche with respect to officework and surely the grim preparation for officework literacy we find in schools. Indeed, on this reading, Mad Men is nothing more than the result of the compulsory schools campaigned for in the 1930’s by the Common School movement, and vaguely satirized by Melville’s anarchic Christological protagonist, Bartleby. This may seem remote to discussions of schooling, but the phenomenological route is obvious and direct. Indeed, there is perhaps no greater caricature of itself in this regard than the school of today—everything we hate about our mendicant and sycophantic lives collect and culture there in a haze of empty smoke that dropouts refuse. In fact, Mad Men is a fairly modest bit of nostalgia by comparison to the drama of the ritualized school, universally understood and recognized, albeit only longed for in my cases and places.

Conclusion: The Coca-Cola Pitch

The final season of Mad Men sees a continuation of Don’s character arc from the end of season six. While his personal life continues downward (Don and his second wife, Megan, eventually divorce), he works hard to recapture his status in his professional one. The details of both his personal and professional lives are not entirely relevant to this paper, save that after some maneuvering, Don finds himself back at work. The difference is that due to some changes at the firm, he is no longer a big fish in a small tank, but rather a relatively small fish at a larger corporation (McCann Advertising) that has bought out the smaller firm. As a result, Don finds himself conflicted because while he is back at his job, he finds life at a larger firm to be unfulfilling when he attends a business meeting with all the other creative directors at McCann. Don is no longer special, but now just one of many. As the researcher tasked with introducing research about the target audience of a new “light” beer drones one, Don gets up and walks out to start another mission to find meaning in his meaningless life. When the CEO of McCann asks Don’s co-worker who knows him best, Roger Sterling, “Where the hell is Don? He walked out of
As the last few episodes progress, Don continues a downward spiral and finds himself, after a trek across country, at a new-age retreat. At one point, Don is so downtrodden he seems to consider suicide, but after attending a self-help session he starts to turn his life around. In the series’ final scene we see Don on a cliff in a meditative pose and he serenely chants—seemingly at peace with the world. As the camera zooms in, Don slightly smiles. If the series ended here, one could make an argument that Don has embraced his artistic side, refusing to use such qualities within the larger capitalist machine. However, the episode is not over. As the scene fades out on Don, we hear music and the episode ends with the “I’d like to buy the world a Coke” ad. The implication that Don’s newfound insight and inner peace has led to him create one of the most famous ad campaigns in marketing history. His quest for inner peace did not pave the way for an escape from his professional life, but rather a triumphant return.

This final scene exemplifies how thinking of one’s life in the mode of an artist might not offer escape from a system of suffering. If Don’s example is any indication, the embrace of the artistic might make one further susceptible to stay in such a place. Jagodzinski (2016) deals with such a possibility in his critique of Slattery’s (2012, 2016) work around postmodern aesthetics. While jagodizinski’s piece deals with larger contexts of globalized capitalism as it relates to the differences he sees between Slattery’s use of the term, proleptic, and his own interpretation of said term within a larger eschatological framework, I want to focus on his secondary focus, “to query art (or arts) by those who support arts based research as it is hegemonically and anthropocentrically defined as a cure to what is set up as a failing educational system of assessment and accountability” (p. 10). Instead of arts based research, I wish to examine the heretofore discussed scenes from Don Draper’s life and the “teacher-as-artist” in this similar light. The link can be seen in the following quote from jagodzinski in which he first troubles how moments of spiritual awakening, either through religion or aesthetics, is problematic precisely because it has become so accepted in a capitalist globalized world:

The worry here is that this ‘born again’ phenomenon has become globalized. Its viral spread through social media can also easily be interpreted as proleptic eschatology: here the future is seemingly open (in utopian terms), there is hope, there is a centering of identity (I belong), and a jouissance of being alive despite living in a ‘corrupt’ and unjust world, as when Catholic youth meet in religious jamborees to ‘see’ the Pope. They seek immediate experience and the enjoyment of religious fervour. Time stands still; it is an event. (p. 12)

Jagodzinski could easily be talking about Don in the final scene of Mad Men. By mapping on the experience of being an artist onto an already corrupted spiritual salvation, jagodzinski posits that art as rebellion only furthers the aims of globalized capitalism. He writes:
My point however, is that this exclusive exceptional smooth space of artistic rebellion, which is disruptive in its resistance, simply supports capitalism’s “creative destruction”. Capitalism has no program, no social or political project beyond producing, circulating and accumulating capital. It is schizophrenic as Deleuze and Guattari put it. It has to absorb and integrate all new forms of dissent for continuous growth. (p. 19)

Overall, a teacher envisioning their job as “artist” could have pedagogical and curricular benefits for her students, but as a means to create sanctuary in the larger neoliberal landscape of high-stakes standardized testing and accountability through an act of artistic rebellion, little faith or hope should be placed in the smoky haze of American despair.

Note

Although, Althusser himself leaves room for a small possibility due to the duality of teachers.
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Cloned This Way

Emphatic Dissonance and Mixed Messages in the Representations of Non-Heterosexual Sex Acts in Three Television Series

Vincent W. Youngbauer & Joseph R. Jones

Abstract

The United States has experienced increasing social and political acceptance of LGBTQ culture. This increasing acceptance has been accompanied by increased representations of LGBTQ in popular culture, particularly television, and, in the case of this work, fictional narratives. While there are certainly representations that are worthy of the term “trailblazing” in their treatment of LGBTQ relationships, many seem to be included in plotlines for shock value. This article discusses and explores three questions: First, what impact might media representations have on heteronormative understandings of LGBTQ culture? Second, does acceptance of LGBTQ culture follow any sort of historical trajectory that is similarly evident in other examples such as with changes in the representation of race over the history of television? And third, how might the representations reviewed in this article affect the struggle for LGBTQ rights?

Introduction

The United States has experienced an increase in social and political acceptance of LGBTQ culture. In fact, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that same-sex marriage is legal in all 50 states (Obergefell v. Hodges, 2015). Increasing...
acceptance has been accompanied by representations of LGBTQ in popular culture, particularly television, and, in the case of this article’s focus, fictional narratives. Representations of non-heterosexual identities have come far since Billy Crystal’s portrayal of the first openly gay (or bisexual) character in the situation comedy Soap on ABC between 1977 and 1981. Representations of LGBTQ in television are at an all-time high. While there are certainly representations that are worthy of the term “trailblazing” in their treatment of LGBTQ relationships, many seem to be included in plotlines for shock value. These representations provide heterosexual viewers a voyeuristic gaze into a world about which they may know little; in this sense they may be framed as educational, whether that education is intentional or not, and whether that education is accurate or not. What kinds of messages are being sent and how are they being received? Furthermore, what is the impact these representations might have on viewers in their general understanding of LGBTQ culture, and their specific understanding of gender identity and sexual orientation?

This article discusses and explores three ideas. First, media messages have an effect on people’s beliefs whether they portray accurate representations or not, and are independent of intended outcomes. Therefore, we ask, what impact might media representations such as the ones reviewed here have on heteronormative understandings of LGBTQ culture? Second, is there a chronology of understanding—described here as emphatic dissonance—an acceptance of LGBTQ culture that follows any sort of historical trajectory that is similarly evident in other examples such as changes in the representation of race over the history of television? Finally, how might the representations reviewed here impact the struggle for LGBTQ rights?

This article critically analyzes and troubles three contemporary television series in which representations of LGBTQ are woven into the plotlines—BBC America’s *Orphan Black*, Showtime’s *Penny Dreadful*, and NBC’s mini-series *Aquarius*. Although not exclusively about LGBTQ identity or culture, the presence of these representations in these shows has varying impact on the main storylines. What is interesting to note is the disparate nature of the representations, and what they may hold for the LGBTQ civil rights movement in general. While not a subject of this work, it is worth mentioning that these shows exist in three different censorship divisions—that is there are different censorship requirements for network television (NBC’s *Aquarius*) than there are for the expanded cable shows (BBC America’s *Orphan Black*), and premium cable (Showtime’s *Penny Dreadful*).

We are not interested in discussing the intent of producers, screenwriters, or directors, nor is this work concerned with discussing whether or not these shows intended to be culturally accurate. We argue, rather, that having grown up in heterosexually dominated or heteronormative culture, the writers and directors simply had no choice but to perpetuate the narrative in which they were submerged, as products of the system of perpetuation of the cultural norms and assumptions that are in turn, promoted in their respective narratives. While these shows are all works of fiction, and again, do not claim to be authorities on LGBTQ
representations, they nevertheless have impact on viewers’ understanding of real life LGBTQ relationships.

The shows discussed in this article were chosen for their variance in genre and levels of censorship. The authors recognize that it is likely that exceptions to the categorizations that we use do exist, and that a larger, more thorough examination of other existing popular culture representations of LGBTQ would be worthy of further study. We do argue, however, that these shows continue to perpetuate a hegemonic masculinity, which continues to inform how society views non-heterosexual identities. As such, we postulate these shows, and other popular culture venues, help aid in the construction of what we call empathetic dissonance, which is discussed later in the work.

While the authors employ the term empathetic dissonance as a heuristic, or a foil, by which to analyze the media representations discussed here, we certainly do not think that empathetic dissonance is a desirable outcome. That is, we view empathetic dissonance as a possible historic fact—something that is, not something that should be. In a perfect world, there would be no need for such paths to acceptance. One of the authors identifies as a heterosexual baby-boom-aged male and the other a GenX, non-heterosexual male. Our analysis takes place from the point of view of a heterosexual viewer for a specific reason that was the impetus for this work. We argue that most heterosexuals do not seek education centers to learn about the other. They receive information and knowledge from media representations such as those discussed here and from numerous others in an aggregate manner. Their understanding of the other is a more product of media exposure than any other source, and therefore, analysis of such media representations is logical.

Lastly, we discuss television; we do not wish to downplay the actual struggles that occurred in the real world during the time periods of this article. Whether art reflects reality or influences it is unimportant for this discussion, although both can be legitimately true. Nor do we claim that any media representations are accurate reflections of real life, a significant point of this discourse.

Popular Culture and Social Constructions

To premise our discussion, we briefly discuss the reality of an existing LGBTQ culture in United States society. LGBTQ culture is a set of beliefs, values, and acknowledgments among the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community (Tierney, 1997). It is a culture with a self-constructed set of social norms that members of the community have established, through which one must navigate to function appropriately within LGBTQ community (Tierney, 1997). For example, during the 1970s, gay men who wore handkerchiefs in specific pockets revealed attributes of their own sexual preferences. Moreover, LGBTQ is a culture that maintains a history of oppression and hatred, civil rights, and community activism. According to Nowlan (2007), LGBTQ culture can be traced throughout history, and included
events such as the Stonewall Riots, the AIDS epidemic, and the modern gay rights movement. In addition to the historical aspect of culture, Nowlan (2007) argued that LGBTQ individuals live and function within a community that has established a distinct culture with contributions to literature, art, film, history, and language.

As with other cultures, if one is not a member of the LGBTQ culture, it may be difficult to fully understand and function within the culture. As such, we posit outsiders construct their understandings of the LGBTQ culture through representations in popular culture. In modern Western society, popular culture plays a tremendous role in the social constructions of individual’s reality concerning other cultures. We also understand that LGBTQ is not singular and that within the community there are great variations of how identities are constructed. Exposure to cultural artifacts informs how individuals construct meaning about others. In fact, Wineburg (2001) discussed how repeated exposure to the film *Forest Gump* gave a high school student a skewed understanding of how Vietnam veterans were treated when returning from the war. This type of repeated exposure may be more effective in creating a collective national memory than any inculcation provided by nationalized public schooling. What we experience through popular culture blends with what we learn from formal schooling until we cannot be sure why we know it or where the information came from. Regardless, we are willing to accept the information a priori appealing to a universal sense of reason that is comfortable for the individual or for the group.

All of these considerations lead to what media effect scholars label as *cultivation processes*. According to Morgan, Shanahan, and Signorielli (2009):

Cultivation analysis focuses on television’s contributions to viewers conceptions of social reality... those who spend more time watching television shows are more likely to perceive the real world in ways that reflect the most common and recurrent messages of the television world. (p. 34)

This is of course important when addressing issues of representations of race, ethnicity, gender etc., and even of institutions and social issues. White and Black Americans, for example, are typically over-represented in media, representing 73-80% for Whites in primetime television and 14-17 per cent for African Americans while constituting 69% and 12% of US population respectively (Mastro, 2009). Crime investigations are typically “solved” within 60 minutes on a television show, but typically take longer in real life, or are never solved at all.

It is apparent to us that popular culture, especially television, can be the conduit that creates different understandings of a culture, whether those understandings are true or false. We postulate, therefore, that the three television shows discussed herein aid in three different social constructions of LGBTQ culture; thus, the construction opens up a cognitive space that promotes empathetic dissonance, which can create a more tolerant community. We again stress that “tolerance” is certainly not a *ne plus ultra* in terms of a societal goal; by definition the word implies that
one learns to live with something with which one does not agree or like. To obtain the more altruistic goal of societal acceptance, however, the authors believe that a stage of tolerance may be an unfortunate necessity in the process of acceptance. We discuss historical examples regarding race and popular culture but first describe the methodology employed in this analysis.

**Critical Hermeneutics**

The hermeneutical tradition is concerned with both the processes of understanding meaning of various texts and the production of strategies for textual interpretation. Central to the hermeneutical method is an appreciation of the complexity and ambiguity of human life. (Steinberg, p. 191). Hermeneutics can be used to trace the ways in which these TV shows position audiences politically in ways that not only shape their political beliefs but also formulate their identities (p. 195).

**Synopsis of Shows**

BBC America’s *Orphan Black* (Fawcett & Manson, 2013) is a science fiction story about a young woman named Sarah, played by Tatiana Maslany who finds out that she is one of several clones through a series of events; at our focal point there are eight clones, all played by Maslany. These clones are the work of a secret corporate/government project—the intent of which is part of the mystery of the plot. The clones were all placed in various environments in various geographical locations as infants and monitored throughout their lives. With the help of friends and three of the clones she has made contact with, Sarah and the others are trying to unravel the mystery of their existence.

One of the clones, Cosima, is openly lesbian, and thus far in the series has had two love interests. The show has included multiple love scenes between her and her lovers ranging from small acts of affection as kissing, hugging, and cuddling to more intimate sexual acts. It is clear that Cosima is not curious about same-sex relations as she considers herself lesbian and it is just as clear that so far the other clones are heterosexual; therein lies the conflict. If gender identity and sexual orientation are something one is born with, i.e., something that happens at a genetic level, how can this theory be supported in the world of clones? Should not all of the clones share the same gender identity and sexual orientation? One could criticize this observation as something the viewer has to “let go of” to enjoy any work of fiction; for example one must “let go of” known understandings of physics to enjoy a film or show that involves space travel across the galaxy. However, while these representations are arguably included for shock-value, the effects are subtle and cumulative and add to a larger understanding of the human condition, just as representations of family life with two parents are seen as normative. Also interesting, and confusing, is that Sarah was raised in a foster home and that her foster brother is gay. So, if she grew up in an environment with a gay male, and is
heterosexual, and her clone, Cosima, who shared the same genetic make-up is gay, why did nurture play a role in Cosima’s gender identity and not Sarah’s?

Showtime’s *Penny Dreadful* (Logan, 2014), is a horror/fantasy show in which the plot centers on a group of people brought together through circumstances to battle vampires (season one) and a group of satanic witches (season two) determined to initiate the biblical end of days. Set in Victorian England, the characters include creatures from folklore such as werewolves and vampires and from 19th Century literature such as Dr. Victor Frankenstein, and Dorian Gray. While this trope is not new (see the film and graphic novel series, *The League of Extraordinary Gentleman*), the creators’ muse was the penny dreadful stories of the 19th century—a genre known for serial fiction that used lurid narratives of violence, murder, sex, occult and generally any topic despised by mainstream Victorian-era England whose market was the semi-literate lower classes of the time. There are also references to historical events such as discussions about the Jack the Ripper killings in 1888.

The character Dorian Gray played by Reeve Carney is central to this work and is based on Oscar Wilde’s novel *A Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891). Through some work of the occult Dorian Gray has become immortal—the instrument of this immortality is an artist’s portrait of Gray. As years pass, the image of Gray in the portrait ages while the he does not. The story describes Gray’s decent into a libertine lifestyle and generally postulates that if faced with immortality, man is more likely to use that gift for bad than good. In the plotline of *Penny Dreadful*, Gray’s character is *irresistible* in beauty and charm to women and men alike. He lives a decadent lifestyle having numerous sexual partners, and is wealthy. In season one, he has a sexual encounter with a male character who has indicated his is heterosexual, and in season two he has been in a sexual relationship with cross-dressing male prostitute Angelique, played by Jonny Beauchamp, whose gender identity is as a woman and who is sexually attracted to men. Angelique reveals that she has always been this way and has suffered for it. Gray is not concerned about what others may think, and attends public functions with his new lover.*Penny Dreadful* airs on Showtime, the premium cable “status” of which allows for explicit heterosexual and same-sex sex scenes, adding to the voyeuristic shock value.

Throughout these heterosexual and same-sex sexual encounters we are given the impression that Dorian Gray’s motives for such behavior are of *boredom*. His motives for sex with any and all partners are that of adventure. As described in Wilde’s book, and works that include the trope of immortality, companionship is hard to come by. Your friends age—you do not; your lovers age and will die—you do not. It can therefore be argued that the subtle message here is that one may experiment with all types of sexual encounters simply out of boredom, i.e. a box that has not been “checked” on some sort of a life-experience card or bucket list. This representation is situated outside of what we assume about gender identity or at least outside of a permanent gender identity, and therefore raises interesting questions about the understanding of gender identity by the creators of, and con-
sumers of, such representations. It should be mentioned that discussion of Oscar Wilde’s intentions and allusions to homoerotica in his original book is outside the scope of this work. An Internet search will reveal ongoing discourse about those intentions and allusions.

NBC’s *Aquarius* (McNamara, 2015) offers yet another version of what gender identity and sexual orientation may encompass. Set in 1960s Los Angeles, *Aquarius* is a cop drama that centers on a police detective played by David Duchovny who is searching for the missing daughter of a former girlfriend who is now married to a high-powered attorney. As the story unfolds, it is revealed that the daughter has “joined” a hippie commune headed by Charles Manson, played by Gethin Anthony. We discover that this is not a coincidence as the attorney once defended Manson in a case that led to Manson serving prison time for a drug possession charge. The father defended Manson because they had a previous relationship where Manson supplied drugs and young girls for powerful political figures at parties hosted by the father’s law firm, and thus Manson received a lighter sentence for his silence so-to-speak. The implication is that, unknown to the daughter, Manson is using her in a revenge plot against the attorney father.

Representations of LGBTQ in *Aquarius* are complicated by the time period as is *Penny Dreadful*. There are numerous scenes of Manson’s “girls” kissing one another and having bisexual sexual encounters with him. While restricted by network television censorship rules, there is a viewer discretion disclaimer in the opening credits, and again, there is shock-value in these representations. Same-sex and bisexual relations are presented as “sign of the times” in that the hippie culture of the late 1960s was one of free love where a human being’s expression of love and therefore sex is connected to the universe at large. To Manson and his followers, these sexual acts are countercultural acts of rebellion and say more about political and social agency, and say less about personal sexual identity. However, this is even further complicated when it is revealed that the attorney/father had previously engaged in sexual relations with Manson, and, when going to the commune to confront Manson, has sex with him again. We see the well-visited trope of the heterosexual male with latent same-sex desires who, because of the time-period and his social and political status, cannot act on his desires. Manson’s actions—whether same-sex or heterosexual—are about “becoming free” and unmooring himself and his followers from the dominant culture. Furthermore, he uses the same-sex encounters with the attorney as fodder for blackmail and revenge.

**Discussion**

Five different versions of representation of LGBTQ surfaced in the three television shows previously summarized. In *Orphan Black*, a cloned woman is gay, but her clones are not—ergo same-sex attraction may be brought about by environmental variables since they all share the same genetic code. Yet Sarah, the main character
Sarah, grew up with someone who is gay, but she and all of the other clones the story has revealed thus far is not. *Orphan Black* seems to be confused as to whether nature or nurture has an effect on gender identity and sexual preference.

In *Penny Dreadful*, Dorian Gray has same-sex encounters because it is what he wants in that moment. It is a whimsical act that relieves the boredom that comes with immortality. Yet his lover was “born that way” and does not have same-sex encounters out of choice. For Angelique there is no choice.

In *Aquarius*, same-sex acts are represented in multiple ways. First, they are a byproduct of the hippie-peace-love movement of the counterculture of 1960s youth and are presented as natural in the commune organism where everyone shares everything. Second, same-sex acts are latent in all people, since the young girls of Manson’s commune seem to come to it naturally, and the attorney may have been living a lie as a heterosexual male. We might also consider that Manson’s character engages in same-sex and heterosexual acts as a means of manipulation. What is clear in all of these representations is the characters engage in same-sex experiences by choice. This is counterintuitive in a society where LGBTQ culture is seemingly more accepted.

**Emphatic Dissonance in Popular Culture**

The authors argue that the representations discussed above follow a typical arc in popular culture. Cultural shifts occur when the dominant social structure accept those social structures outside the norm, in this case structures related to LGBTQ culture, and that those shifts follow a seeming step-by-step process that we label *emphatic dissonance*. For any form of cultural shift to occur, representations must first reveal the stereotypes that the dominant culture already attaches to such cultures, i.e. stereotypes with which the dominant culture is comfortable. Later, representations evolve into demonstrating more complex structures that more closely represent the reality exhibited by those cultures. When these shifts take place, the dominant culture viewer—in this case, the heterosexual—can achieve a level of empathy and possible acceptance of what was previously an unaccepted culture. While some Queer Theorists may believe that sexual minorities should not be concerned with how dominant cultures view them, perhaps they should. Furthermore, the same logic follows that without those early stereotypical representations—albeit abhorrent—the evolution to emphatic dissonance would not take place.

The process of emphatic dissonance is not necessarily a clean process. In fact it is likely that the process includes considerable tensions and friction as viewers grapple with the new information presented in such representations. However, emphatic dissonance may be a positive process in that there seems to be a favorable impact on the cultural acceptance of subordinate cultures—albeit a seemingly time-consuming process.

We can apply this emphatic dissonance to LGBTQ representations in television,
in a show such as Will & Grace (1998-2006). Will’s (Eric McCormack) friend Jack (Sean Hayes), exhibits most of the stereotypes accepted by normative, heterosexual culture of the non-heterosexual male. His speech is somewhat effeminate as are his body language, gestures, and interactions with other characters, particularly the character of Karen played by Megan Mullally. Both Will and Jack are single in terms of relationship and many of the plotlines explore the trials and tribulations of their dating. The same can be said for the stereotypes present in the Hollywood film Philadelphia (1993) in which the main character played by Tom Hanks listened to opera music, hosted costume parties in which many of the male attendants were in drag, and held a white-collar, professional occupation. Those tropes afford a comfort level for heterosexual viewers that lays the foundation for emphatic dissonance to take place.

To follow the logical progression of emphatic dissonance, we can compare Will & Grace to Modern Family (2009-present). Contra to Will & Grace, the gay couple in Modern Family (Mitchell and Cam played by Jesse Tyler Ferguson and Eric Stonestreet respectively), are in a monogamous relationship, own a house, and have adopted a child. They wrestle with the expected challenges and celebrations of family life of a heterosexual couple. These storylines are combined with what the dominant non-heterosexual culture would consider normative storylines and dialogue. For example, the couple often refers to each other as “drama queens”. These representations could not exist, i.e. be accepted by the dominant culture, without those in Will & Grace occurring first. Furthermore, we would argue that Modern Family could not have existed successfully in the era that Will & Grace aired. Interestingly, Modern Family’s Gloria played by Sofia Vergara is on her own emphatic dissonance arc although at an earlier point. Gloria is portrayed as the provocatively dressed, broken English-speaking, Latina female stereotype often seen in popular culture (Mastro, 2009). This typical arc is witnessed in other shifts in American popular culture, most notably in representations of African Americans that have taken place over decades (Merritt, & Stroman, 1993). We could argue that the representations in Sanford and Son (1972-1977), or Good Times (1974-1979), both of which involved African American stereotypes, were necessary on the emphatic dissonance continuum. In The Cosby Show (1984-1992) the main characters of Cliff and Clair Huxtable are a doctor and a lawyer respectively, contrasting sharply with the occupations of the junk dealer in Sanford and Son and the laborer in Good Times. Of course, the stereotypical representations go beyond occupations and encompass language usage, portrayal of family life, etc.

To bolster this point, television producer and creator Norman Lear has stated in numerous interviews (see for example his interview with Oprah Winfrey available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f_Wo19518jI) that a meeting with leaders of the Black Panther Party influenced the development of The Jeffersons (1975-1985). The Jefferson family members were peripheral characters on Lear’s hit show All in the Family (1971-1979). Lear stated that he had already intended a
spin-off show for the Jefferson family, when he was asked to meet with members of the Black Panthers. Their complaint that while one of Lear's other creations, *Good Times* (1974-1979), was the only show on at the time in which a traditional African American family were the central characters where the father worked three jobs to support the family. Lear changed the setting for *The Jeffersons* title characters from owning one dry-cleaning shop and living in the same neighborhood as the Bunkers of *All in the Family* to owning several stores and living in a high-end area of New York City.

When considering the difference in the trajectory of emphatic dissonance between the examples of race and LGBTQ culture, it seems that the time necessary for emphatic dissonance to take place is abbreviated. This is to say, it seems that the time is accelerated, in that it takes less and less time for the effects to take place. In the case of race, emphatic dissonance did not end, for example, with *The Cosby Show*. Numerous shows have been, and are being produced challenging the dominant cultures understanding of race relations, LGBTQ culture, and now with disability as seen in ABC's *Speechless* (2016- present). *Speechless* is a situation comedy that deals with the daily challenges and celebrations of a family that has a son with cerebral palsy. It is also possible that the process of emphatic dissonance is never-ending. That is to say, full acceptance may never be achieved through the process and it is realistic to view prejudice, tolerance, and acceptance on a spectrum, like it or not. This by no means refutes the theory.

Through emphatic dissonance, individuals grapple with the subculture, often the “other,” in society. This grappling causes the individual to question his or her established beliefs about the “other.” In doing so, a new set of more tolerant or accepting beliefs emerge. Though the process requires the initial presentation of what can be considered unsettling stereotypes, emphatic dissonance may be necessary for many in the dominant culture to re-examine its belief systems concerning diverse populations.

**Conclusion**

Popular culture has increasingly depicted LGBTQ individuals’ lives through stereotypical representations. Although such stereotypes can be troubling, they serve a necessary role in engendering more tolerant beliefs about non-heterosexual identities. In the three examples discussed, the disparities in these representations become obvious. These representations can be catalysts for creating a space for education and for understanding and toleration to take place, in the space we label empathetic dissonance.
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The Spaces in Between

Foreign Language Education as Critical and Intercultural Education

Paola Giorgis

Abstract

This contribution will focus on a much needed critical and interdisciplinary reflection on fields which are too often treated separately, Foreign Language Education and Intercultural Education. Giorgis discusses the issue from the double perspective of a foreign language teacher and researcher, briefly presenting some data from a research study to then focus more in detail on a classroom activity designed to favour a critical awareness on both language and interculture. The author's own position of teacher-researcher allows her to address another fundamental issue: the urgency of co-working and integrated cooperation between academic research and factual school practice.

I. Presentation

From the Romantic concept of Volksgeist, to early studies in Linguistic Anthropology, to more recent investigations which have highlighted linguistic differences within the same culture, the notion that language and culture are intrinsically connected has often risen divergent interpretations. Given these premises, it is no wonder that Foreign Language Education has undergone several radical shifts, ranging from conveying an essentialist view of the target language/culture to a more nuanced, if not critical, view of the relation between language and culture. By breaking the “natural” link word-world, Foreign Language Education can unveil how
far it is cultural and situated, thus fostering the deconstruction of taken-for-granted individual and collective cultural identities, and of monocultural and nationalist frameworks. I advance that a critical and intercultural language education should be a priority in education policies at times of global migrations when people and languages meet at unprecedented scale, in order to challenge the prevailing narratives which label individuals and groups according to their lingualcultural backgrounds, and capitalize on fear for their reactionary agenda.

2. A Theoretical Overview

2.1 Foreign Language Education, Intercultural Education and Critical Pedagogies

Languages and language ideologies should be a core concern for intercultur for several reasons: for their capability of unveiling difference and advancing diversities, for being the place where individual and collective identities are mediated, shape and are shaped by discourses, and for their multifarious intersections with culture. While Western culture has devoted thousand pages of research and reflection on the relation between languages and culture, the connection between languages in general, and foreign languages in particular, and interculture has only a relatively recent, though significant, history of its own (Byram & Zarate 1997; Byram & Tost Planet 2000; Abdallah Pretceille 2008; Kramsch 2009; Dervin & Liddicoat 2013; Sharifian & Jamarani 2013; Witte & Harden 2015; Holmes & Dervin 2016), sometimes entwined with Critical Pedagogies (Phipps & Guilherme 2004; Norton & Toohey 2004; Dasli & Diaz 2017) as well as with critical reflections on language and identity (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004; Heller 2011).

Within the perspective of a much-needed integration between Foreign Language Education, Critical Pedagogies and Intercultural Education, two pronouncements by Kramsch (2009) are particularly relevant: ‘Foreign language education is the prime promoter of the foreign perspective’ (p. 192) and ‘The experience of the foreign always implies a reconsideration of the familiar’ (p. 5). Foreign languages favour the experience of Otherness at two levels: as an opportunity to encounter the Other (to become familiar with the unfamiliar), and as a way to re-apprehend the Self (to discover the unfamiliar within the familiar). These two levels are by no means opposite, but they rather nurture each other: according to Kristeva (1998), it is only by discovering ‘l’étranger qui nous habite’ [‘the foreign who lives inside ourselves’] (p. 9) that we can create our ‘condition ultime de notre être avec les autres’ [‘the ultimate condition to be with the others’] (p. 285). Observing, reading, speaking about the world through other words overtly discloses the cultural and situated relation between the word and the world, unveiling how far difference is a relative construction, and opening to different conceptualizations and worldviews: Abdallah-Pretceille (2008) thus defines a precise task for Foreign Language Education, sustaining that ‘L’apprentissage des langues étrangères est le lieu par
excellence (ou plus exactement, devrait être le lieu) de l’apprentissage de l’altérité’ ['Foreign Language Education is the ideal place (or better it should be the ideal place) for an education to diversity'] (p.8).

Starting from the two fields of Intercultural Education (Dervin & Liddicoat 2013) and Critical Linguistics (Piller 2007), the authors lament the separation between Language Education and Intercultural Education to reach the same conclusion. Dervin and Liddicoat (2013) affirm that language has long been the ‘unnamed dimension of the intercultural’ (p. 8). Language education ‘can contribute to educating for diversity’ (p. 1), moving ‘away from an educational approach which consists of building up facts about a “target culture” (…) to one in which the language learner as language user and intercultural mediator are foregrounded’ (p. 4). Therefore, as ‘Intercultural education is fundamentally an investigation of the intersections of language and culture in that language and culture shape processes of meaning making and interpretation’ (p. 9), Intercultural Education should be considered ‘as an activity which is fundamentally based in language’ (p. 9). From the other side, Piller (2007) sustains that an attention to language dynamics can help Intercultural Education to question critically its own paradigm. According to her, the critique of culture as an essentialized construct has often failed to notice that interculture can also be essentialized: she sustains that ‘some misunderstandings that are considered “cultural” are in fact linguistic misunderstandings’ (p. 215), and that cultural interpretations of linguistic mis-communications often serve ‘to obscure inequality and injustice’ (p. 215). To avoid falling into the trap of ‘a range of a priori assumptions about “culture” and “language”’ (p. 217) it is necessary to consider linguistic processes and practices in relation to the context and the speakers’ access to linguistic resources, addressing the fundamental issue of inequalities in language, and focusing on the situated conditions that can favour, limit or hinder intercultural communication.

2.2 Foreign Language as an Intercultural Experience

As I speak about foreign language as an intercultural experience, I need to clarify what I mean for “intercultural” and “experience”. In the last decades, “interculture” has become a hit word which has gone through several definitions and interpretations. A multivoiced analysis which illustrates the discussion among different scholars can be found in Alexander et al. (2014), where each participant offers her/his own interpretation of the word; other important references can be found at: https://centerforinterculturaldialogue.org. Addressing the educational field, I mainly refer to Gobbo (1992, 2008, 2011) and Abdallah-Pretceille (2005, 2006) as the questioning of one’s identity in relation to others, so that the mutual practice of being able to meet and interact with other cultures becomes the exercise of problematizing one’s own(s) as well. The mutual encounter with other cultures, then, is able to offer a different perspective on one’s culture(s) too, making visible what is usually hidden in the folds of the familiar. Indeed, the word “interculture”
combines the idea of “culture(s)” with that of “inter-” referring to a condition of in-between able to develop a multiperspectival vision of both the self and the others. “Experience” is defined in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (https://www.merriam-webster.com/) as ‘a practical knowledge, skill, or practice derived from direct observation of or participation in events or in a particular activity’, that is a knowledge derived ‘by direct observation or participation’. I therefore take “experience” by no means as a generic word, but rather as a fundamental combination of knowledge, appropriation and use. In the context of this discussion which deals with language education, when I refer to the “experience of a foreign language” made by students, I precisely point to the fact that students learn English at school, but they also appropriate it from bottom-up, and use it for their communicative purposes. Thus, the foreign language is not only a knowledge imparted as top-down, but becomes an experiential knowledge.

2.3 English Language Education: Global and Local Issues

At the intersection of global phenomena and local appropriations, of norms and variations, of homogenization and subversion, English language has triggered fierce debates on the linguistic, sociocultural, political, ideological and pedagogical implications of its widespread, but also on the potentially creative and critical appropriations that it can elicit. Globalized English has been defined ‘linguistic imperialism’ (cf. Phillipson 1992), and, according to Luke (2004), TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) is ‘a pedagogical site and institution for educating the racial and linguistic Other’ (p. 25). Yet, over twenty years ago now, Pennycook (1994) sustained that the worldliness of English ‘can indeed be appropriated and used for diverse ends (…) offering interesting possibilities for the spread of alternative forms of culture and knowledge and for new forms of communal action’ (p. 321), and that English Language Teaching (ELT), if dealt critically, can become the educational site to teach back, and ‘engage in a critical, transformative and listening pedagogy’ (p. 327). The situation is then far more complex than a one-way-flow: the English language does not move any longer following a one-way centre-periphery model, but it rather possesses a polycentric quality, and it is actually what used to be the former periphery to modify and innovate the language. Intersecting this debate, in the last decades the notion of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), (Seidhofler 2011), has offered new perspectives to what we have been considering the characteristics of a language so far. According to its traditional definition, ELF is a language spoken by non-native speakers coming from different mother tongues. That does not mean that communication automatically occurs on equal grounds, since socio-cultural differences are not magically wiped out: indeed, many studies clearly show how they emerge, raising ethical and political issues which cannot be overlooked, in particular when such differences manifest in asymmetrical relations such as those, for example, between Italian police officers
and refugees (Guido 2008). However, from an educational point of view, the features foregrounded by ELF can be used for a critical reflection on language varieties and bottom-up appropriations of the language, and on how speakers re-create language by using it in different contexts and with different interlocutors according to their communicative needs. Within this perspective, several connections can be made between a critical approach to ELF and interculture. According to Giorgis (2013a), since ELF transcends the notion of the “nativeness,” it intersects interculture on a common ground: ELF and interculture are both in/formed by different cultures, and therefore they can represent the ideal site to observe how individual and collective representations of culture and identity move through language affiliations and appropriations. By pointing out the dynamic and negotiated quality of language (Holmes & Dervin 2016), ELF also evidences the fact that students are both learners and users of English, interrogating the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) class, and often exposing divergences between the language taught top-down by teachers and the language appropriated bottom-up by students (Giorgis 2013b). To comply their educational duties, teachers are inevitably called to mediate between language-model and language-use: Dewey (2012) points out that they are asked to respond both to the ‘professional responsibility to advise students on how to be successful in language tests’ and ‘to their personal responsibility to the communicative needs of (…) students as language users’ (p. 161). The solution would be for teachers to develop a more flexible approach to language pedagogies, working on an and/and approach rather than on the mutual exclusion of ELF versus EFL. In the Italian context, for example, some studies have begun to reflect in that direction (Giorgis 2013a, 2013b, 2014a; Vettorel 2015; Lopriore 2016); however, the debate hasn’t reached the classroom practice yet for several reasons—e.g., curricula, traditional course books and evaluation tests—but also because the teachers’ formation and in-service professional training programmes tend to offer more and more innovative pedagogic methodologies, though fail to put their hands onto the complex issue of language transformation, varieties and appropriations—all issues which, in particular for English language education, are crucial.

3. The Study: Hypothesis, Participants, and Findings

During my professional practice of teaching English Language, Literature and Visual Arts in Italian high schools, I have had the opportunity to notice several episodes which foregrounded how the experience of a foreign language can impact on, and reframe, individual and collective identities. The episodes elicited some questions which, in the years 2010-2012, constituted the guiding line of my Ph.D. research study in Anthropology of Education and Intercultural Education. The research was focused on the relation between language and identity, and on the impact on language and identity of cross linguistic interactions between adolescents from different linguacultural backgrounds. On the one hand, the episodes I had seen
incited me to analyse the multifaceted relation between the languages we speak and our perceptions and representations of the self and the others. On the other, observing how adolescents spontaneously adopt, mix and cross languages to adapt them to their communicative needs, allowed me to realize how Foreign Language Education could be used to develop a critical awareness on language and language ideologies, favouring the dismantling of pre-given assumptions on individuals and groups, in order to promote intercultural communication between individuals from different linguacultural backgrounds. On such premises I based the hypothesis of my research, being particularly interested in finding out the intercultural potential of a language foreign for both Italian and non-Italian students, as is the case of English in the Italian context.

The research was carried out in two different high schools in Turin, a city in the northwest of Italy; the schools were different for curricula (Liceo Scientifico, a school which prepares for academic studies, and Istituto d’Arte, a vocational school with an art curricula), as well as for the sociocultural and linguacultural background of the participants. The study, which involved sixty-two students (none of whom were one of my students or former students) from five different school classes, was based on field observations, followed by a quaniti-qualitative written interview and two back-talk focus groups. All data were analysed, interpreted, discussed with participants, and then re-interpreted; the research was published in a monograph (Giorgis 2013a), in several chapters and articles (Giorgis 2013b; 2013c; 2014a; 2014b; 2016), and presented at international conferences. I will only note here the most significant data. From the analysis of quantitative data, it emerged that the majority of students (45/62 = 72.58%) do not consider the English language as a foreign language (though it is institutionally defined as such in Italian schools) but rather as a contact language which signals affiliation to specific groups of peers connected to transnational youth cultures (music, in particular hip hop; online blogs or games; social networks; etc.), or which is used to establish a special and intimate relation with a specific friend or relative. Data showed no gender difference in these linguistic practices, and both female and male students alike lamented the gap they perceive between the language they are taught top-down at school, and the one they appropriate bottom-up for their daily interactions, either in face-to-face or in virtual communications.

Though the research was mainly intended to examine the impact of English as a language unfamiliar to both Italian and non-Italian students, analysis of qualitative data also suggested different perspectives. From the discussions in the back-talk focus groups, the use of English as a language in common among peers (or, in some cases, with adults of choice) emerged as a means to include or exclude from communication. An-other language can create conditions for mutual recognition and for a sense of belonging to the same in-group community; consequently, a foreign language in common can be used not only as a means to blur borders, but also to set new ones, which let someone in, or leave someone out, according to specific choices made by the speakers. The impact on identity surfaced as well: the
experience of a non-mother tongue and of cross-linguistic interactions emerged as practices able to elicit different perceptions and representations of self and the others, to reframe individual and collective identities, and to create the opportunity for new group affiliations. Adopting and mixing languages follows different lines and patterns, where the representation of personal and collective identities, and the creation of in-groups and out-groups, are practices which depend on the context, the aim of the communication, and the people whom the adolescent wishes to include or exclude. The patterns and the lines of the interactions also perform different functions: young people code switch to a different language to create a special affective link with someone, or to protect their intimacy—for example, to share secrets with their boy/girlfriend or best friend—as well as to mimic/appropriate/subvert hierarchies, such as a counter-act to power on adults and teachers.

4. Back to Classroom

After having defended my PhD, I went back to classroom practice. In only three-year’s time, the school population had changed: all the students I knew had left—the majority had concluded their studies, a few had dropped out—and the new students possessed different characteristics from the ones who had participated in my study. In a rather short interval, two major changes had happened. The first, was a relevant social and territorial consolidation of the population with immigrant background: students with foreign background belonged no longer to what is known as generation 1.5 (young people who are born in their home countries and, at some stage, join their parent/s in the country of arrival), as they were, for the most part, born in Italy. English had ceased to be, as it had been in the recent past, a bridge-language between their mother tongue and Italian, often favouring a first step for communication and inclusion; yet, it was still a language which was foreign for all students, both of Italian and of non-Italian origins, and therefore it still represented a territory in-between different lingualultural belongings, and was frequently used as a lingua franca between peers. The second major change was the so called “Educational Reform” brought along by the Berlusconi’s Government, a highly trumpeted optimization of the Italian school system, which, following a neo-capitalistic agenda, actually meant severe cuts to the school curricula and administrations. Moreover, in perfect Newspeak, the whole operation consisted also in renaming the schools: for example, the name of the school where I used to teach, Istituto d’Arte (Art Institute), was suddenly upgraded into Liceo Artistico (High School of Arts). That impacted on school population too: the word Liceo, a high school which prepares for academic studies, generally intimidates students coming from low socio-cultural backgrounds or with a recent history of immigration, as they (and their families) tend to choose more practical studies—e.g., vocational schools or institutes – hoping that such a formation will be less frustrating in terms of school success, and that it will buy them a ticket to the labour market (Sansoé 2012).
4.1 Teaching-Learning as Action Research

In three-years’ time I had changed too. Not only had the doctoral study allowed me to acquire theoretical tools in completely different fields from my original academic studies, but it had also offered me a luxury which is too rarely granted to teachers and practitioners: the opportunity to see and reflect on one’s practice from without. From within, the study grounded my critical vision of school as a multi-layered and complex environment constituted by many different cultures, where knowledge, languages and pedagogies are never neutral or apolitical (cf. Pennycook 1994), and where practices and dynamics are elements which interrogate, inform—and are informed by—broader issues. By representing the connection between the micro and the macro contexts, reflexivity in particular can help locating both the teacher and the students in wider social relations and contexts, promoting educational models able to situate between grand theorizations and empirical flattenings (Anyon & Dumas 2009). At the junction between micro and macro levels, as well as between reflection and action, stands Action Research. Though not solely confined to education, Action Research has greatly impacted pedagogical practices, often converging with Critical Pedagogy (Freire 1970, 1973, 1998; Simon 1992) in addressing issues of power connected with knowledge and advocating a participatory critical approach. Since they both consider knowledge and transformation as connected, they engage students to question pre-given assumptions and develop their potentials with the purpose to empower them to act, in order to produce a transformation in the direction of social action and justice. Being collaborative research-practices, they recognize that teaching and learning are complementary experiences: therefore, they value the students’ experiential knowledge as an important element to enhance participation and discussion, and encourage them to appropriate critically their learning—in Freire’s words (1998), to become ‘re-creators of what they learn’ (p. 30). It is along these guiding lines that I have tried to develop my professional practice, encountering some difficulties as, on the frontline, it not always easy to integrate action and reflection, but engaging in stimulating a dialogue and, possibly, a transformation. The main track for all the activities has been to combine my professional and institutional duty of teaching English as a Foreign Language with what I learnt during my PhD years to co-construct with the students a critical awareness on languages, cultures and identities.

4.2 The Activities: How Foreign Language Can Work for Interculture—and Vice Versa

All the activities carried out with the students had a double intent: to utilize the foreign language for interculture and interculture for the foreign language with the one major comprehensive aim of developing the students’ critical awareness. The first intent was to use the foreignness that foreign languages foreground to reflect on pre-given assumptions on languages and cultures—one’s own included. Exercises
were therefore structured to initiate from the students’ knowledge to lead them by degrees out of their familiar comfort zone, and to stimulate doubts, questions and discussions able to open up to new perspectives. Such a practice is also advocated by the publication of the Council of Europe, *Developing Intercultural Competence Through Education* (2014), which invites teachers to ‘provide opportunities for challenging one’s assumptions through comparison and analysis’ (p. 29), to help students reflect ‘back (…) so that they may question their own practices, values and beliefs’ (p. 30) and reminds that ‘comparison, analysis and experience need to be accompanied by time and space for reflection and the development of critical awareness and understanding’ (p. 30). During these activities I viewed the classroom as an ethnographic field, where students were encouraged to become researchers of languages and cultures, and sometimes invited to produce short auto-ethnographies as an opportunity for reflexivity.

The second intent was to offer meaningful and contextualized activities to elicit students to use the foreign language to communicate and exchange ideas and opinions: diverting the target from the “English Language lesson” allowed students to feel less judged and more relaxed in using the language. The fact that English was foreign to all students presented several advantages. In the first place, it put all students, both native Italian and non-native Italian, in the same condition of disadvantage—or, better, disadvantage in access to language repertoire depended on factors which had nothing to do with national or ethnic descent. Then, as it is often reported in literature (Kramsch 2009; Witte & Harden 2015), by detaching students from their mother tongue, the experience of a foreign language can allow them to develop a meta-linguistic awareness of how far linguistic and cultural features are situated and constructed, ‘opening up linguistic and intercultural spaces, that is, the de-familiarization and alienation of the familiar, taken-for-granted ways of talking, thinking, feeling and behaving’ (Witte in Witte & Harden 2015, p. 20). Giorgis (2013a) also sustains that, by detaching students from their usual language, the new linguistic and symbolic territory of the foreign language decentres them from their usual self too, allowing them to explore new identities, and that, by separating the students’ personal and social self, the foreign language often consents them to recollect and report in a freer and less emotional way ideas, opinions, personal stories and events. A last note from the teacher’s perspective: by helping students developing a critical awareness, teachers can also reflect on their educational practice and, paraphrasing Freire (1998), understand that they can be(come) not only cultural workers, but *intercultural workers*.

### 4.2.1 An Activity: Intercultural Citizenship (5th year; students’ age: 18-19)

The project was part of an interdisciplinary work on Plural Citizenship developed jointly with the colleague of Philosophy. The project aimed at developing an intercultural awareness in the students as a process for becoming ‘citizens of the
world”—individuals who are conscious of the all diversities which constitute our common world, of the problems and the opportunities that these diversities bring forth, and how we can deal with them. I developed my part of the project from the intercultural perspective of approaching Otherness and Diversity from one’s own otherness and diversity. This section was linked to the subsequent part, a historical analysis of the twenty-century’s genocides presented by the Philosophy teacher, where ethnic mass crimes were introduced as linked to the lack of recognition and the dehumanization of the Other. The project then followed with some encounters with refugees and asylum seekers, and it involved a reflection on how globalization and neo-capitalistic agenda are creating new forms of injustices and discriminations.

As discussion was to be held in English—a non-mother tongue for all the students—I prepared a set of words and expressions which I gave students in advance to facilitate their interventions. These words and expressions were mainly terms describing identity traits (e.g., personality adjectives), or locutions related to giving or asking opinions, expressing agreement or disagreement, etc. (e.g., ‘I think that…’, ‘In my opinion…’, ‘What do you think about…?’). During the lessons, I also proposed a series of questions inviting students to reflect upon them, and/or to bring forth questions of their own. Indeed, the activity was not aimed at offering answers, but rather at eliciting questions and doubts, and problematizing the taken-for-granted.

• Stage 1. Vision of the TED talk The Danger of a Single Story (2009) by the Nigerian author Chimamanda Adichie (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9Ihs241zeg): reflection and discussion on the “danger of a single story”—i.e., how “a single story” not only frames the others, but ourselves too;

• Stage 2. Multiple Me: starting from a track line of words on the different perception and representation of how individual identity profiles change according to the situation, context, interlocutors, age, gender, intention, expectations, etc. several questions and reflections arose: to how many identities and cultures do we belong to/affiliate with? how do we perceive or represent our own identity, as well as others’, according to the language we use?;

• Stage 3. The Stereotypes: a) how “others” see “us” (videos on stereotypes on Italians): reflection and discussion: are “we” like this? do “we” recognize ourselves in these portraits? b) how “we” see “the others” (video on overturning the perspective); the creation and reproduction of stereotypes by the media: reflection and discussion;

• Stage 4. Multiple Others: the Other as the bearer of multiple identities and belongings; diversity as a multidirectional, situated and relational construct;

• Stage 5. Intercultural Communication: how to educate and develop an effective intercultural communication: reflexivity, awareness, decentering, flexibility; using problems, misunderstandings, misinterpretations, etc. as resources; learning from failure.
For brevity, I will report here only some of the Stages afore outlined.

• **Stage 1**

  In *The Danger of a Single Story*, the Nigerian writer Chimamanda Adichie reminds us of the importance of not framing others into one single story, which, at turn, demands that we ourselves are not to be framed either—both by others and by us too. Stereotypes are precisely “the single story”: it is not that stereotypes are wrong, but they are partial, so they can just tell a part of the whole story of an individual. Adichie’s talk had a great impact on the students: during her talk, I looked at their faces, and they were totally captured by what she was saying. As it always happens when a person tells an unfeigned story, I realized how adolescents have a special radar for authenticity and a profound hunger for truth and dignity—and, with a twinge, I also felt how often we adults fail to nurture that hunger. At the end of the video, students were deeply touched, but they were smiling too. For the next lesson, they were asked to prepare the framework for a discussion on what is “the danger of a single story”, starting from a series of questions I wrote on the blackboard. But they also watched the video again at home, often showing it to their parents and friends.

• **Stage 2 Multiple Me**

  During the next lesson, discussion was very vibrant and participated. All students had something to say on “the danger of a single story”, and even the ones who were less proficient in English contributed. All interventions revolved around the consideration that taking things for granted for others also means taking things for granted for ourselves. This debate led us to discuss about the Multiple Me: who I am in different contexts, with different people, or with the same people in different contexts, and we considered differences of gender, interlocutors, expectations, intentions, etc. and how they impact on our interactions with others. For example, a girl who plays rugby in two different teams reflected on her different traits of identity according to the team she plays with, as in one team she is the eldest (a point of reference for the others, she gives suggestions and advices), while in the other she is the youngest, and so she has to listen and obey to her elder teammates. Another girl declared how differently she perceives herself, and is perceived, by her mother, her boyfriend and her friends – and also noted that it depends on which friends she is with. Many other examples were brought forth, all highlighting reflections on the situated and multiple quality of the identity traits.

• **Stage 3 Stereotyping—per via negativa**

  One of the most important (and dangerous) characteristic of stereotypes is that they are invisible. We take for granted, or assume as an undisputed and undisputable
truth, what, at its best, is a simplified and partial reading of complex stories, and, at its worst, a deliberate construction to perpetuate discrimination, prejudice and injustice. And, of course, the most invisible stereotypes are the ones that regard the “group” we belong to or associate with. For this reason, I decided to work with the students per via negativa—that is, instead of starting by presenting stereotypes on other nationalities and ethnic groups, I began offering stereotypes on Italians, as the class was formed by Italian born students, except for a girl born in Egypt (but with Italian citizenship, as her father was an Italian-Tunisian). It is to be noted, though, that the overall adjective “Italian” does not describe well the diversified reality of most Italian school classes, as many students come from different regional and linguistic backgrounds.

The web offers great examples on stereotypes, and some of them are really funny, as they work on exaggeration not only to get a smile, but, sometimes, also to make people reflect on the mechanisms of stereotyping. (Incidentally, that offered us also the opportunity to revise rhetorical figures we had previously studied, noticing how exaggeration can sometimes be so amplified and paradoxical to become a caricature, and therefore convey the opposite meaning). Here are some examples I presented to my students:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uhkdEG-2AIk: in this video a young man enacts all the most stereotypical Italian activities: he eats spaghetti and drinks red wine, handles a woman with a macho attitude, etc., while a typical traditional Italian music, tarantella, is playing in the background;

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dCQ0batArbc: this is an episode from Family Guy, a famous politically incorrect cartoon with often explicit contents. In this episode, the Griffins are in Italy, and this is the occasion to serve some other stereotypes: men kissing each other, scenes of jealousy and connections with Mafia;

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VapOQdG9Akc: this is another episode from the same series which is overtly entitled ‘Italian stereotypes’. Here, there are men constantly shouting and gesturing at each other, others are cutting the queue line, and Peter Griffin, the main character, wants to buy some salami but gets involved in an animated discussion with the Italian moustached butcher;

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AtLNF-ehOn8: in this video, two young men, one German and one from the US, discuss Italian stereotypes. Starting from their own experiences in Italy, they reinforce some of them (e.g., the food culture, espresso, etc.) and call into questions others (they generously acknowledge, for example, that not all Italians are connected with Mafia);

http://takelessons.com/blog/italian-stereotypes-z09: the title of this text-and-video is eloquent: ’Ten Common Italian Stereotypes that Are actually True’. All most common stereotypes on Italians are here listed and confirmed: Italians love pasta, mamma, football and Opera. And they are always late.

I then wrote a list on the whiteboard of the ten most common stereotypes of
Italians I found on the web—e.g., Italians always wear sunglasses; Italians only wear Prada, Gucci and Armani; Italians are all connected with Mafia; Italians eat pizza and pasta every day; etc. While watching the videos and, later, reading the stereotypes, the students’ reactions were quite loud and similar: ‘I am not like this!,’ ‘I am never late!,’ ‘I do not shout all the time!,’ ‘I don’t like pasta,’ ‘It’s not me!,’ Indeed, it’s not me. So, we reflected on these words, taking them one by one: it is-not-me. Who is “me”? how many “me-s” do make “I”? And we discussed on how stereotypes often use words such as “all,” “always,” “every,” terms connected with concepts of wholeness and timelessness presented as given and undisputable statements, which fail to register complex and fluid individual diversities, framing them instead into a general and fixed portrait.

• **Stage 4. Multiple Others**

After working with stereotypes on how “others” see “us,” we were ready to move to how “we” see “the others.” I introduced the topic by showing them a silent video of a dark-skinned young man who, on Saint Valentine’s Day, walks across Milan with a bunch of red roses in his hands. He passes several couples, and they all refuse his flowers with a brisk gesture of the hand. He enters a restaurant, and both a waiter and a customer do the same. Then, the young man finally reaches a table where a girl is waiting for him, and he offers the bunch of roses to her. The video is very interesting, as it overturns expectations: the young man is not a flower vendor, but a lover who is bringing flowers to his girlfriend (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cl437zT62X4&feature=youtu.be). Students were really impressed by the video, and one girl also suggested a video on a similar topic: a Black man is walking behind a White woman who gets frightened by his presence; so, she starts rushing and is almost run over by a car, but she is eventually saved by the man himself. I asked the students to think about personal experiences when their own expectations on others had been overturned, both in a positive or less positive way, and what they had learnt from this change of perspective. Some students asked me whether these overturns had to do only with “culture,” or whether they could involve other situations too. I asked for their opinion, and after a short discussion we agreed that we could think to episodes which could both involve or not involve cultural elements.

During the seminar, we began realizing that Intercultural Communication is not a practice one can learn from a list or from the book, as it involves complex dynamics which can have positive outcomes, or may result in a complete fiasco for many different reasons and causes. The concept of failure has to be taken into account in discourses on Intercultural Communication as an opportunity to reconsider the context or the situation from another perspective, to grasp other meanings and, at the same time, to learn about ourselves too. There is indeed a wide literature on the importance of failure and of cultural *gaffes* as fundamental events in intercultural studies: anthropologist Setti (2015) remarks that “(…) *sperimentare*
la gaffe, l’equivoco o la “figuraccia” ironicamente, è un processo fondamentale per gli etnografi affinché imparino dagli “altri” [‘experimenting ironically gaffe, misinterpretation or poor figure is a fundamental process for ethnographers to be able to learn from the “others”’] (p. 100).

With these considerations in mind, at the end of the seminar I presented a quote from the performance artist Marina Abramovic. In her beautifully striking autobiography (2016), she gives a definition of failure which, to me, sounds as the most constructive attitude to approach interculture (and life in general, actually):

Failures are very important (…). If you experiment, you have to fail. By definition, experimenting means going to territories where you have never been, where failure is very possible. How can you know you’re going to succeed? Having the courage to face the unknown is important. I love to live in the spaces in between, the places where you leave the comfort of your home and your habits behind and make yourself completely open to change (p. 155, italics mine).

Intercultural Communication is indeed the experiment of a mutual relation in the spaces in between: there are some practices and even some procedures which can be followed, but at the end of the day what really makes it work is our availability to explore new territories, to leave certainties behind (and maybe most of all those which regard ourselves), to explore new territories, to be open to change, to encounter new questions, doubts and, in the good days, even solutions. Yet, this experiment has no guarantee of a happy end: so, we should also permit ourselves to be ready to deal with our impotence and frustration, and, in case, to be ready to encompass failure, not seeing it as an end but rather as a different starting point.

4.2.3 A Comment on the Activity

In the last years, I have been carrying out several activities as such above, presenting them to students either in an indirect way or per via negativa, that is from the opposite end. In my experience, this is an effective educational approach as it allows students to follow their own path of research and it makes them the protagonists of their learning. Through analysis and comparison, students can realize by themselves the relations, the similarities and the differences between things and dynamics: knowledge comes from a personal— though guided—critical reflection, and then becomes part of the person’s experience. Such an unconventional approach can sometimes confuse students, as school assignments are usually characterized by a specific one-way quality. Therefore, I had to plan carefully all passages of the activity to help students move out of their comfort zone by degrees; yet, I also had to be flexible, considering and developing suggestions or objections which the students might advance during the lesson. Thus, these activities also evidenced the very clear and simple notion that any lesson is always and primarily a dialogue and a co-constructed activity.

The main concern of all the activities was the development of critical aware-
ness also in the perspective of a pro-active transformation, as advocated by Critical Pedagogies and Action Research. Yet, critical awareness is a process which demands much time, and results might not be seen or expected in the short run. Besides being an individual lifelong process, critical awareness is a very personal one: not only do some people need more time to reflect, compare, and critically evaluate facts, elements and dynamics, but a critical approach begins with problematizing one’s own ideas and opinions, an activity which can be uncomfortable for many.

In our activities, some students immediately engaged in seeing things from a different perspective, while others were more reluctant, or simply needed more time, to exit from their comfort zone. My task was that of mediating several different standpoints, accompanying students along new paths of reflection and of a discussion respectful of different points of view. In all of this process, foreign language was not only a means: as critical awareness implies reconsidering what we take for granted from a different perspective, saying things in a different language did help students see things differently—and themselves too: some students observed that they felt more open and confident in expressing their opinions in a non-mother tongue. Linguistic achievements were also a part of the goal, as while making connections and distinctions, and expressing their point of view, the students exercised and improved the foreign language. A final note: this kind of activity requires much of school time, it often competes with institutional programmes waiting to be accomplished, or is suddenly interrupted by the school bell announcing the next lesson. Such a basic consideration lead us to bear in mind that in the perspective of a critical and intercultural approach to foreign language education, several steps should be made—for example, curricula should be reconsidered, school time should become more flexible, and teachers’ formation as well as in-service teacher training programmes should not only focus on new entertaining teaching methods, but be braver, and also address critical and theoretical issues.

Conclusion

These activities tell us that foreign language and interculture can fruitfully and mutually work together in a critical perspective. They also tell us that theoretical reflections and practices go together, and literally nurture each other. Ethnographic studies have bravely built bridges between the two; yet, theory and practice continue to be divided: on the one hand, academics produce brilliant educational theories which too often fail to grasp the complexity of the actual educational environment, a multilayered net of relations and cultures and a constant work-in-progress; on the other, teachers and practitioners feel they are left alone on the frontline, literally compressed between too many tasks and roles (educational, professional, ethical, social, relational, institutional, bureaucratic) to have time to reflect on their practice to see the theory which breathes within it. As a teacher and independent researcher, I have the privilege to know the best (and the worst) of both worlds: from my own
position in between spaces I cannot but advocate for the fundamental and necessary co-working between academics, researchers, educators, teachers and practitioners, as it is only by this collaboration that we can build up more just and equitable conditions and opportunities for our students, our communities, and ourselves too.

Note

1 Some parts of 2.1, 2.3.3, 2.4, and the Activity presented in this article are a shortened version of those items from Giorgis (2018), Meeting Foreignness, Lexington, Rowman, & Littlefield. The author wishes to thank the publishing house for allowing this reproduction.

2 The back-talk focus group is a follow-up tool which “consists in drawing together research participants to discuss research findings” (Frisina 2006). It is meant to stimulate the reflexivity of the researcher, to empower participants, and to disseminate results in a responsible and cooperative way.
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Abstract

What does water mean to contemporary society today? This paper is interested in water and race; Blackness specifically, wherein the Middle Passage (Mid-Atlantic Slave Trade) marks the beginning of a fraught and complex relationship between African-Americans and water...typified many might argue by Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath in 2005. This article looks backward at water’s ability to destroy and to create through lenses focused on race and art: something akin to water as a symbol of America’s complicated relationship with race. Using cultural texts such as art and film this piece works to unsettle the intimate connections of power, gender, and sexuality and offer alternative cartographies of empowerment and survival with regard to racialization and water.

Introduction

…the main character in the drama of Hurricane Katrina was water. Water is fluid; strong and flexible, it can cause great destruction and withstand great challenges. In Eastern spiritual traditions, the strength and fluidity of water is revered. A rock may crumble, a tree may fall, but water will become one with the wave. Water can also flush out hidden debris, and clear out the dirt that soils personal and collective histories. (C. Marzo, 2006)

What does water mean to contemporary society today? From the Dakota Ac-
cess Pipeline—a land dispute between the government and the water protectors, emanating from the current political regime’s disavowal of global warming and climate change coupled with corporate avarice that would mine oil at the expense of indigenous people and their legally protected lands, to the crisis of lead poisoned water in minority/predominantly Black communities in Flint, Michigan (…because Flint hasn’t seen enough human denigration over the past several decades) communities, to the 2016 film Moana, wherein corporate media giant Disney attempts to deploy its conscious take on Hawaiian culture to tell kids that “water is life,” water is (rightfully) at the epicenter of many global concerns and social issues. Water is indeed life and without it humanity would perish; from a religions symbolic standpoint, water holds the power to cleanse and purify.

This article, however, is interested in water and race; Blackness specifically, wherein the Middle Passage (Mid-Atlantic Slave Trade) marks the beginning of a fraught and complex relationship between African-Americans and water…typified many might argue by Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath in 2005. This paper looks backward at water’s ability to destroy and to create through lenses focused on race and art: something akin to water as a symbol of America’s complicated relationship with race. Remembering, in the Morrisonian (Beloved, 1987) sense of the word—as the process of complex reflection or returning to memories in ways that affect the experience of the present—illuminates Hurricane Katrina’s powerful revelation of conditions governing the continued marginalization of the Black body. In thinking about representations of Hurricane Katrina, we have products like the film Beasts of the Southern Wild, that offer misery and suffering packaged uncritically as victory over circumstance with no political imagination for challenging the national conditions that devalue Black lives. If we allow our rememories to transport us further back, before and beyond Katrina, to the Middle Passage, the last leg of the slave trade that traveled across the Atlantic Ocean from West Africa to the New World, a history of violence and slavery emerged from this crossing, which led to the birth of race-based subordination in the United States. Today this history is inscribed on our bodies consciously and unconsciously and Tom Feelings (1995) in The Middle Passage: White Ships Black Cargo calls this “race memory” a concept that connects to Toni Morrison’s “rememory.” Race memory reaffirms the belief that “bodies do not exist outside of history, for it is produced in and through it” (Grosz, 1994, p. 148). Grosz suggests our bodies are inscribed on and perform history, which means our lived experience is complicated by past historical events. This inquiry, therefore, will focus on the productivity of history and its effects on recent (Katrina and post-Katrina era) experience through the legacies of colonization. Using cultural texts such as art and film I hope unsettle the intimate connections of power, gender, and sexuality and offer alternative cartographies of empowerment and survival with regard to racialization and water.

Here I revisit and investigate the film Daughters of the Dust (1992) by Julie Dash (recently proliferated by Beyoncé’s 2016 multimedia production Lemonade)
and the artwork of contemporary artist Kara Walker. Both artists, Dash and Walker, use Black feminist formations to explore the antebellum South through different lenses based on their own unique agenda. Dash depicts the Peazant family who is transition—negotiating the scars of the past with present and future, while Walker’s work reinvents satirical moments through installation and painting that explore the exchange of power within the master/slave dichotomy. Kara Walker and Julie Dash take up historical moments and endow them with the language of race, gender, and history via artistic representations that extend concepts of power as determined by Foucault. It is necessary to outline several key ideas from Foucault’s seminal texts, as critical theory helps to disaggregate and understand the entanglements of power relations around race and water enmeshed in these texts.

Discipline & Punish (1977) is Foucault’s detailed genealogy of the ways in which the body became the index of the soul, the bearer of habitus—who you are can be read through how you behave, which is enacted/performed by the body. This idea is re-traced by Foucault against the backdrop of the history of tortures and bodily responses to such torture, as the responsibility of the individuals within a given society. Particularly, Foucault examines the shift (via what he terms “technologies of the self”) of the human capacity to endure punishment and internalize and almost embrace the self-inflicted subjugation implied by self-governance, which the new torture/punishment, known as ‘discipline’ demands. Particularly, these ideas look further into notions of agency and power through the body as indicator of habitus, and as conduit for the ‘technologies of the self’ that continue to re-inscribe themselves in, on, and through the skin. These powerful social behaviors and the subject positions produced therein, become complicated even further when Foucault begins to introduce race through biopower.

In Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976 (1997) Foucault outlines the historical evolution of subjugation through a network of power relations. For Foucault, subjugation does not have one single starting point rather it’s a multiplicity that needs to be studied as “relations of force that intersect, refer to one another, converge, or on the contrary, come into contact and strive to negate one another” (p. 266). These “relations of force” are essentially historical-political discourses that carry some claim of truth, which are used as a weapon to control the individual in society. This weapon, named by Foucault as biopower, is the development and understanding of race as a category that can be placed into a hierarchy.

Foucault (The History of Sexuality, Volume I) goes on to discuss how the current utility of race—in, on, and through the body, as a means of shoring up political power, began to take on new iterations during the second-half of the nineteenth century, though of course race and difference pre-date this—hence the subject of Walker and Dash’s work, as previously described. However, Foucault discusses his mapping of race (and demography) in relation to sexuality stating, “racism took shape…and it was then that a whole politics of settlement, family, marriage, education, social
hierarchy, and property, accompanied by a long series of permanent interventions at the level of the body, conduct, and everyday life, received there color and their justification from the mythical concern with protecting the purity of the blood and ensuring the triumph of the race” (1978; p.149). Recognizing ‘race’ as a marker of difference is not only obvious, but almost pointless without consideration of the multiple functions and material consequences (then and now) that are created by and continue to work along racial formations. According to Foucault, “bio-power” can and does produce a “hierarchy of race” can subdivide humanity into good and bad categories—creating binaries, but more importantly a number of configurations within these very binaries.

The configurations between established binaries and divisions along power-lines are what is at play—and what is at stake in the artworks by Kara Walker and Julie Dash that are theorized in this paper. By extending Foucault’s concepts of power and technology combined with Morrisonian rememory, these works culminate as an insurrection of subjugated knowledges that restructure history and embodied experience. Furthermore, an extension of Foucault paired with rememory as explored through these Black feminist artworks offer different ways to conceptualize historic understandings of racialized survival whose unspoken presence lives with and continues to unfold around and within us. Dash captures the essence of what it means to survive and what survival entails; Walker reinvents survival with historically missing moments that resonate in current conditions of race-power dynamics in contemporary life in the U.S. Metaphorically, these artists trouble and muddy the waters of the legacies of the Mid-Atlantic slave trade against a post-Katrina landscape in ways that powerfully resonate in this moment of water protectors, the movement for Black lives (M4BL), post-human conditions in Flint, and the ongoing, complex relationship between water and race.

Kara Walker’s Remaking of History Through Art

I make art for anyone who’s forgot what it feels like
  to put up a fight whose forgot what pure sins about
when pigs are out
I make art….
at makes me…
at makes me xeeex
so giddy

—Index card writing by Kara Walker.

The artwork of contemporary artist Kara Walker both compliments and complicates the work of Julie Dash. In this inquiry Walker’s work extends our exploration of race to include visceral images of racially motivated violence and abuse. Walker creates satirical images based on historical fact, as well as historical fantasy, to play with notions of power-relations according to gender and sexuality. These
constructions lend themselves to a Foucauldian reading in the sense that they construct alternative discourses that disrupt dominant versions of historical realities. She does this by studying race in America through film, installation, painting and mixed media. Walker is most known for her silhouettes, which are cut out of large sheets of black paper that depict men, women, and children in complex power relationships that are usually sexual and violent in nature. Her explorations of power are based on the master/slave dichotomy of the antebellum South. Walker problematizes the notion of giving and receiving in this dichotomous relationship and is blurring the boundaries between various bodies including the young and old; male and female; child and adult. These couplings produce grotesque and abject visual images.

Charles Molesworth (2008) in Kara Walker: Her Enemies and Her Brothers asserts, “Walker places her artistic trust in the notion that racism and slavery are variations of a third thing: subjugated identity” (p. 6). Therefore, can her work emancipate our own enslaved identity? And does her work have a positive influence on race relations in America?

Walker intimates that her work “gives the illusion of past events, the illusion that it’s simply about a particular point in history and nothing else.” Through the illusion of history Walker creates panoramas in a gallery setting of stereotypical images embedded with a perverse twist of Antebellum South. In Insurrection! (Our Tools Were Rudimentary, Yet We Pressed On) 2002 an entire narrative unfolds on the walls of the Guggenheim Museum. Walker states, “the idea at the outset was an image of a slave revolt in the antebellum south where the house slaves got after their master with their utensils of everyday life, and really it started with a sketch of a series of slaves disemboweling a master with a soup ladle. My reference, in my mind, was the surgical theatre paintings of Thomas Eakins and others.” Here Walker has ‘raced’ each body that is depicted in the slave rebellion through the black silhouette. In this counter-narrative demonstration of biopower, the flesh of each body can be understood as either black or white through their subject positions/loci of power, since (essentially) Walker has made them all “appear” black.

By inscribing race/color on the body in reverse-fashion, Walker flattens out difference to call specific attention to the boundaries of racial identity. Where does it begin and end? Does it? By calling attention to the bodily relationships emerging in this narrative we can begin to address the rebellion against slave domestication. A group of individuals young and old attack a man, then a man with a top hat is being mounted by a slave, and a southern belle—who seems to have four legs—is watching in horror, as these events unfold. What are these raced-bodies invoking? What discourses emerge if we force ourselves to continue to look? As spectators of these scenes we see Walker’s inability to separate race and sex as co-conspiring discourses whose entanglement produces an image-based conception of Foucault’s notion of biopower.
Julie Dash’s Daughters of the Dust: History Reconfigured

I wanted to take the African-American experience and rephrase it in such a way that, whether or not you understood the film on the first screening, the visuals would be so haunting it would break through with a freshness about what we already know.

—Julie Dash, Interviewed by Kevin Thomas

Daughters of the Dust takes place on the Sea Islands of the Gullah off the coast of South Carolina and Georgia. Today these islands are populated by descendants of enslaved Africans who came to the New World from West Africa via the Middle Passage. These communities have been able to retain some of their African culture, religion, social, and linguistic customs that white slave owners tried to destroy. In the film, set in 1902— at the turn of the century, Dash uses feminist perspectives to focus on the Peazant family. The narrative takes place on the family’s final day on Ibo Landing, the eve of their migration north. We witness a reunion that brings together the family members who have remained on the island, and two women who left—Yellow Mary (and her lover Tula) and Viola, who brings along Mr. Snead—a photographer brought to the island to document the family reunion. This family is led, protected, and guided by Nana Peazant. She has been able to instill dignity and meaning into the lives of her children and the extended family while living on Ibo Landing. Nana embodies the African traditions of the past and its legacy…present incarnations and possible future directions; it is the future that is story is about. Crossing the water to that future, the Peazant’s will have to heal their past experiences of rape and subjugation on a communal level.

Eli Peazant, the son of Nana Peazant, wants the family to leave Ibo Landing to join the “Great Migration” that took place in American in the early 1900’s. This migration was seen by many black Americas as an opportunity to find a better life that would allow them to leave the racialized Deep South. For the younger family members of the Peazant family, staying on Ibo Landing keeps the history of oppression alive; therefore, they want to re-cross the Atlantic Ocean. This crossing could symbolize a rebirth, but before the family can make this journey history and memory will be revisited. The rememories of each individual and the collective community will be brought forward to unsettle their subjugated experience. This leads us to ask, “How can this family transcend the scars of the past?” In Skin Memories (2001) Jay Prosser asserts:

Skin re-members, both literally in its material surface and metaphorically in resignifying on this surface, not only race, sex, and age, but quite detailed specificities of life histories. In it colour, texture, accumulated marks and blemished, it remembers something of our class, labour/leisure activities, even (in the use of cosmetic surgery and/or skincare products) our most intimate psychic relation to our bodies. Skin is the body memory of our lives. (p. 52)
It is this rememory I want to explore in *Daughters of the Dust*. How does the collective memory of the Peazant family reveal their historical melancholia that is based on a communal experience of racism and subordination? How have each of these family members internalized this oppression? Further, for the Peazant women, they themselves have been subjugated through their bodies and have struggled to properly mourn the violence and dehumanization that they have individually and collectively experienced. The period of one day that we witness in *Daughters of the Dust* is the reckoning of this history. Not only does this mark the history of one family, but the history of an entire community—a community whose bodies and memories attest to subjugation and survival.

For Foucault “…it is always a body that is at issue…its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission.” (1995, p. 25) Through Dash’s work we see the bodies of the Peazant women/family coming to terms with both docility and submission, at both the personal and collective level. For example, we see the older Peazant women engage in a collective remembering of their former slave work. Dash brings us into a quiet, intimate space in the woods filled with large tubs, barrels, and bricks. Here the women are convened in a circle, working with hot water and indigo dye, adding dark blues and purples to white fabrics. Their collective quiet indicates the importance of this labor—a precision labor that affords the ability to avoid repercussions, if done well. In addition to displaying the bodies laboring for their survival, we also see the effects of this particular work on the flesh; as a result of direct bodily contact with the indigo dye, the women’s skin has been marked, permanently, the skin on their hands a bright blue. These blue hands visually testify to the internal condition of the slave soul—a soul that remains contingent upon a particular (shared) history. The blue hands signify a collective memory that continues to reproduce the power slavery had over this community. And this captures Foucault’s “technologies of the body” where the body becomes that object and target of power. Through this scene, Dash reveals a particular moment in slavery whereby “the body becomes the surface of the mind” (Luke, 1995). Further, this speaks to how discipline is internalized through power-relations, and is then made visible on the outward surfaces of the body itself—revealing the ‘habitus’ of slavery.

Dash continues marking bodies in *Daughters of the Dust* in terms of the environment as well as the on the bodies of human subjects. The geography of her story bears the consequences of slavery- marked specifically by the island, the water, the ways in which the Peazant family has been able to recover and resurrect their African history (roots) while simultaneously, forcibly engaging their colonized work. We see these worlds collide, visually, through the character’s Victorian dress in contrast to the simple clothing—plain dresses and aprons worn by the women who have stayed on the island. Even while Nana Peazant speaks of the African ways and spirits, her attire speaks of the body colonized. Additionally, while African adornments cloak the simple dwellings of the families and the bottle tree marks
ancestral memory, this island recreation of Africa, Dash foregrounds the island as a site that has and continues to be penetrated—both literally, and figuratively by slavery and colonial legacies. The Bible, the photographic equipment brought to the island, and the rape of Eula, symbolize the manifestation of this hybridized cultural circumstance. When Viola Peazant reaches Ibo Landing with Mr. Snead, she has her Bible in hand and through dialogue with her island relatives, conveys her Christian faith. She is unable to reconcile her new faith with the spirituality of Africa and the past, as presented by Nana. Her appearance marks her as a proper citizen of the mainland, while also situating her within the family’s genealogy and their island history. This complexity reveals the terrain for which Dash uses a range of black (diasporic) identities, within a singular family, to explore.

Dash makes plain that Black bodies in Dash’s work represent both familiarity and otherness. Because Foucault’s recognition of race as bound up within the power-dynamic, the Peazant family, a female majority, must reckon with what their blackness means in a number of contexts that cross through what feminist theorist Patricia Hill-Collins (2000) terms “the matrix of domination.” This refers to the relational sphere through which race, gender, patriarchy, class, history (and so forth) pass, meet, cross, and intersect in a variety of ways (material and figurative) in order to explain power and experience.

By interpreting Daughters of the Dust as a tale of racialized bodies, mainly women’s bodies, escaping from and bound to slavery and the aftermath of colonization, Foucault’s biopower serves as both preface and foreshadowing to the conclusion presented by Dash: those who remain on the island are not going to be any more or less free from the implications of skin color and the body—external and internal, than the family members who choose to re-cross the water towards a new future. Water is the force moving like power, to shift Black knowledge, memory, thoughts, and bodies to different spaces; however, the experiential contexts for these bodies may change, the are reproduction of their status as marginal is maintained by the structures whose survival relies on them to be depicted as such.

Educational Implications

Since race is and will continue to be present literally and symbolically, as a topic of social discussion, the creation of art, and the outward signifier of ‘difference’ at the most basic level, this work, while one of philosophy, aesthetics, and feminism, is also a work of education. When students enter the classroom they are shrouded in history: she [the student] enters a politics of discourse. She [the student] enters that discourse from a different location than does the male learner. (Walshaw, p. 55) Daughters of the Dust illuminates this point: women experience life (including race, remembering, and embodiment) from perspectives that differ from men’s and what’s more, differ from each other’s as we see within the Peazant family. While female narrative is privileged in this telling of collective wounds,
scars, and choices, Dash manages to keep as a focal point, the merging of cultures toward a form of reconciliation between present and past that allows for survival based on a “pedagogy in the making” (Ellsworth, 2003) of sorts.

From a Foucauldian perspective Dash’s film invokes subjugated (body) knowledges in the telling of this re-imagined history, as a dominant influence over the valuation/devaluation of “black life” according to a microcosm of biopower. These (de)valuation practices changed from one generation to the next. This film offers a productive counter-discourse on what it means to survive and can be used as a tool to educate others. In conjunction with Walker’s subversive contributions and read through Foucault, the possibility exists that by engaging with these works a distinct, interdisciplinary, way of looking at race emerges; this enables new conditions for teaching and learning.

Walker’s work also must be confronted from educational and pedagogic spaces. Because Kara Walker displays race-relations that incorporate children as objects shuffled between race, innocence, victimization, and powerful agency that expands and deconstructs Foucault’s biopower argument. In conjunction with Walker’s subversive contributions (and read through Foucault and Morrisonian re-memory) affective domains are challenged and histories are disrupted (as is the present) in ways that allow for necessary, sustained discomfort which constitutes a new way of uncovering and seeing a past rendered invisible yet are detrimental to our understanding of contemporary U.S. race relations or the racial dynamics that Saidiya Hartman (2006) refers to as “the afterlife of slavery.”

These works reflect the very history of the students we teach. In classrooms everywhere a contemporary history is unfolding in concrete and intangible ways that whisper, cry, scream, and speak in both the hidden and visible curriculum. Social dynamics and power relations are ever-present and evolving toward imaginings of multi-culturalism side-by-side with colorblind discourses that not only contradict one another, but would obscure the importance of finding new paradigms by which to engage the politics of race and the difficult dialogues that bodies require. Black Lives Matter and DACA are race in America and water is life and it is all happening so quickly that history/ies must be recovered and tools for excavation must include critical theory, sociocultural studies, social justice conversations and rememories that allow us not only to know and understand but to feel. As bell hooks (1994) reminds us in *Teaching to Transgress*, “no education is politically neutral.” With this recognition in mind, the classroom spaces can be powerful when connected to difficult and complex works, like Walker’s and Dash’s. Black feminist knowledge via productions and artifacts that push for consideration of deliberately silenced, marginal or hidden voices are necessary in our educational spaces if we are to construct the critical conversations that are necessary to help students connect their/our past and present in ways that allow for transformational visions of the future. Such works have the potential to take something like the element of water (multi-faceted symbolically and essential materially) and use it to guide us on a
journey of race relations that connects several continents through the power of the visual, the historical and the counter-narrated. Using water as a (mutual) entry point and point of departure for U.S. race relations (specifically Blackness) these artists unsettle and challenge colonial logics and the politics of domination through discourses of accountability, and reckoning and through pedagogies of rememory and critical remaking.

**Conclusion**

Foucault’s scholarship recognizes the roles colonization and war have played in the maintenance of (an imagined) pure and healthier society. This notion of a society maintained by racial purification (as well as stream-lined sexuality, normative behavior brought about by disciplinary measures on the body, etc.) is directly at odds with the actual conditions by which bodies—gay, trans, white, female, black, disabled, etc. in and with which we have and continue to live. Paired with Walker and Dash, his work reveals the inter-connectivity between past usages of race through biopower and the current subjugation of blacks in the U.S. Now more than a decade after Hurricane Katrina and in the wake of the Obama presidency—and all of the issues underlying and giving rise to multiple social movements (collectively known as the Movement for Black Lives/M4BL) clearly race still matters. Through the discursive functions and contemporary implications of multiculturalism and colorblind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) the disciplining of black bodies can occur without calling attention to race...as in Hurricane Katrina and in the ongoing endeavors of the prison industrial complex, efforts to control the food available to SNAP recipients, the repeal of CHIP low-income health insurance for children, lack of attention to water poisoning in Flint, MI, and so forth—all of which effect Blacks at disproportionate levels given their minority status in terms of their presence in the overall population. Such conditions, given the particularly compelling saga of Hurricane Katrina, lead to a revisiting of Foucault’s notions of race and survival in this time of advanced biopower.

From a Foucauldian perspective, it could be argued that the world is not getting ‘better’ just ‘different’—and as determined by Walker and Dash the contemporary politics of race illustrate just that. By manipulating events through imagined histories- recontextualizing historic artworks and documents and by inserting the customs and knowledges associated with racial identities emanating from cultural practices into the gaps that are intuitively felt (if not directly perceived) through rememory and critical-making, Walker and Dash map a relationship between slavery in the American south and current race relations, against a political landscape that traffics in alternative facts, suppression and imperialist logics. Furthermore, their work suggests that Black women and women of color (in particular) are still adding intriguing and must-see/must-hear information to the discourse(s) of race: past, present, real and imagined.
In terms of Blackness and African-American identity/ies in the context of the United States, water has been central, not only in shaping the events that have entered into social memory as Hurricane Katrina but to Julie Dash’s film and to Kara Walker’s art; and perhaps most importantly, water serves as the conduit between the legacy of slavery and its afterlife in America. Water also grounds this work in that it resembles Foucault’s analytics of power. While power finds its way into, out of, and in-between the film Daughters of the Dust and Walker’s installations, the power attaches itself to race and sexuality, whereby the struggle for survival or is made visible and rendered intelligible. For the mind to enter into this dark water—to remain submerged there for a time, not drowning or crossing or sinking, but floating-covered and conscious, to emerge with new knowledges produced therein is the space for which we must, as educators, advocate and participate in constructing.
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