

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248986836>

Theory in the flesh: Toward an endarkened epistemology

Article in *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* · March 2003

DOI: 10.1080/0951839032000060617

CITATIONS

34

READS

934

1 author:



[Aida Hurtado](#)

University of California, Santa Barbara

63 PUBLICATIONS 1,193 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



[Hypatia](#) [View project](#)

Theory in the flesh: toward an endarkened epistemology

AÍDA HURTADO

University of California, Santa Cruz

In her article “The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen: Examining an endarkened feminist epistemology in educational research and leadership,” Professor Dillard delineates a set of proposals for the study of educational inequity. Professor Wright in his response, “An endarkened feminist epistemology? Identity, difference and the politics of representation in educational research,” comments on Professor Dillard’s proposals and furthers her analysis by an integration of the cultural studies literature. The author enjoins this conversation in this article by reviewing the proposals by feminists of Color to further social justice in solidarity with Professor Dillard’s analysis. In particular, feminists of Color are examined, expanding the definition of “data” to include artistic production such as poetry, personal reflections, and autobiographical essays. The integration of spirituality as it relates to secular teaching is another innovation proposed by various writers. Feminists of Color have also chosen to construct theory and a political agenda for achieving social justice rather than only engaging in intellectual debates that deconstruct existing paradigms. Professor Dillard is part of a cadre of feminist writers who advocate radical changes in the academy to eradicate educational inequity.

Introduction

Nothing in the world made me angrier than inaction, than silence. The refusal or inability to do something, say something when a thing needed doing or saying, was unbearable. The watchers, the head shakers, the back turners made my skin prickle. (Davis 1974, pp. 93–94)

In 1981 a primordial scream of rebellion and claiming of intellectual and existential space was launched in the groundbreaking book *This bridge called my back* edited by Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa. It captured a rolling roar that had been in the making for decades as women of all colors struggled to find a space in the musty and highly policed halls of academe. The writers in this anthology wanted to make their claim in the intellectual landscape of the U.S. on their own terms. They rebelled against existing paradigms that required the dissociation of their lived experiences in order to claim the label of intellectual, public or otherwise. Instead, they transgressed boundaries of genre, of method, of content, of disciplines. They claimed fragmentation and hybridity not as a methodological development or an intellectual intervention, but as best representing their lived experience. Theory, they claimed, should not come from written text only, but from the collective experience of the oppressed – especially that of women of Color. Theory, they continued, is for the purpose of ultimately accomplishing social

justice that will lead to liberation. Theory should emanate from what we live, breathe, and experience in our everyday lives and it is only in breaking boundaries, crossing borders, claiming fragmentation and hybridity that theory will finally be useful for liberation. Claims that have finally been heard within the academy and 20 years later are beginning to be “whispered” into the major scholarly outlets.

Professor Dillard’s proposals for a committed social science that leads to social justice emanates from this long line of dissenters who slowly, but rather loudly, staked a claim in the academy and outlined a political agenda for committed intellectuals to accomplish. Professor Dillard’s territory is the educational arena – one that she knows well and one in which she has invested her professional career in forcing it to respond to the needs of students who have been made invisible – poor students, students of Color, women, reentry students – all those who have not traditionally participated in the educational riches of the United States. She claims that the experiences of these students have not informed our theories, methods, and policy concerns to accomplish social justice. Furthermore, their lived experiences will continue to be ignored or distorted if we do not radically question and deconstruct our existing methodologies. The debate is no longer about quantitative versus qualitative methods; the debate is about method itself – the philosophical underpinnings of what we choose to ignore by only engaging in this false bifurcated debate. Her claims are much more profound than the debates that currently exist in the academy around method, deconstruction, fragmentation, and social justice. Hers is a poetic challenge to swim deep beneath the surface of what we kick around in the academy and to ask ourselves what possible truths we are ignoring by skimming the surface of social justice. Professor Dillard is a deep-sea diver emanating from the depths where many feminists, especially feminists of Color, reside.

What exactly are these tumultuous deep-sea divers claiming as “different” from exiting paradigms? Why do they consider themselves to be offering something beyond what cultural studies, ethnic studies, and to a certain extent women’s studies offer us? What difference does a different epistemology, an endarkened epistemology, make?

Questioning the nature of “data”

Part of the “*Grito de Independencia*”¹ has been to liberate the notion of what constitutes “data.” Traditional methods alone – be they qualitative or quantitative – cannot capture the multiple realities of people who have not been studied systematically as part of building these methods. Existing data-gathering tools restrict what we examine as well as how we examine it. Researchers as a group come from particular socioeconomic and racial and ethnic experiences that severely limit how they study people of Color and women in this society. Although textbooks argue that new research emerges from theoretical paradigms that build on each other and that methodological developments piggyback on this flow of ideas, the reality is that who researchers are and how they grow up is as equally important for what they choose to study and how. Feminists have claimed that “man-made” language (Spender, 1980) and “man-made” categories (Henley, 1986) rendered many of women’s concerns invisible, relegated to the personal sector, and not worthy of study. Race theorists (Bell 1992; Williams, 1993) argue that discourse itself is limited by its racializing bias, making it necessary to develop a technique of

storytelling to subvert the logic of legal discourse, spotlighting the nonconscious nature of race bias. Feminist scholars (and others) argue that poetry, literature, and biography can be sources of data – not just fiction (Quintana, 1996). Furthermore, readings of visual representations and art can be indicators of social production and reproduction (Fregoso, 1993; Gaspar de Alba, 1998). The hybridity of approaches are not advocated to produce a tower of Babel, resulting in everybody having their “own journal,” but, rather, they argue that nonhybridized approaches slant reality in directions that silence the voices of those that do not fit their paradigms. To let the “other” speak requires the invention of multiple methods that subvert racist, heterosexist, and imperializing language. As Toni Morrison indicates, “The kind of work I always wanted to do requires me to learn how to maneuver ways to free up the language from its sometimes sinister, frequently lazy, almost always predictable employment of racially informed and determined chains” (1992, p. xi).

Professor Dillard uses multiple sources of data in her own theoretical essay to demonstrate the power of “lived experience” giving us *insight* into the racialized dynamics of higher education. Her use of a memo, poetry, and a personal essay provides a multifaceted, multidimensional view of the phenomenon she is analyzing. The use of nontraditional sources of data is not whimsical or without a purpose. Qualitative interviews and/or structured questionnaires alone would not necessarily communicate how it *feels* to be marginalized in institutions of higher education. Her use of data is not to prove a causal connection between variables, to demonstrate a correlation, or even to provide a description of a phenomenon. Many who adhere to a feminist paradigm question the purpose of positivist science where the goal is to predict behavior by discovering causal connections between variables. Instead, the purpose of *social* science is to understand processes that will lead to insights increasing the probability of a more just society for all. As Donna Haraway proposes:

Feminists have stakes in a successor science project that offers a more adequate, richer, better account of a world, in order to live in it well and in critical, reflexive relation to our own as well as others’ practices of domination and the unequal parts of privilege and oppression that make up all positions . . . So, I think my problem, and “our” problem, is how to have *simultaneously* an account of radical historical contingency for all knowledge claims and knowing subjects . . . a no-nonsense commitment to faithful accounts of a “real” world, one that can be partially shared and that is friendly to earthwide projects of freedom, adequate material abundance, modest meaning in suffering, and limited happiness. (1988, p. 579)

Social science, especially educational research, should not exclusively describe, predict, and “modify” educational institutions; progressive scholarship should transform them through the process of consciousness raising about the invisibility of educational inequality.

Why spirituality?

A just society entails making a home for whole human beings in every aspect of human activity. Feminist frameworks (among others) claim that ignoring the spirit

leads to illness – both physical and psychological. Although most feminists agree that all knowledge is partial, and that fragmentation is a direct result of existing hierarchies in society, the goal is toward a holistic understanding of human beings at all levels. Denial of emotion, spiritual needs, and nurturance leads to both physical ailments as well as social destruction. However, there is no paradigm for restructuring public institutions of higher education to be more responsive to spirituality, especially in secular expression.

It is here that Professor Dillard and others (Rendón, 2000) push us to enter waters which depths have been ignored. To claim the spiritual within the academy is blasphemous – it undermines the claims of “scientific” objectivity and leaves us bereft of method. Not to know how to best incorporate the spiritual into institutions of higher education does not mean we should not pose the question. It is in the open-ended challenge to engage in experimentation to find answers that I find Professor Dillard’s invitation most provocative. Not taking her provocation may result in the spiritual death of many of our students.

The choice to construct rather than deconstruct

Our weapon was the word. (Davis 1974, p. 80)

. . . Chicanas seize sociosexual power [to create] our own *sitio y lengua* [space and language]. [I move] from deconstructing male centralist theory about women to reconstructing and affirming a Chicana space and language in an antagonistic society. (Pérez, 1991, pp. 161–162)

Feminists of Color in their writings, whether consciously or unconsciously, claim an existentialist position of deconstructing by constructing. To claim victimhood would inadvertently reinforce the hegemonic belief in people of Color’s inferiority and inability to assert agency. Equally important, deconstruction can potentially lead to hopelessness and a nihilist position that nothing can be done. Instead, deconstruction is accomplished by proposing political solutions that they know (and at times openly acknowledge) are only partial, temporary, and do not attack the core of many social problems. That is, they forge against hopelessness not out of naiveté or ignorance about the existing cultural studies literature on deconstruction but, in fact, in reaction to what they see as a privileged analysis that allows intellectuals off the hook for even attempting partial solutions.

In fact, if feminists of Color had not taken this pragmatist position, their intellectual analysis would have never seen the light of day. When many of them were denied access to mainstream journals as well as white feminist journals, writers like Gloria Anzaldúa exhorted them to avoid complaining and instead create their own publication outlets. As she put it, “Some of the tasks ahead of us” are “to go beyond explaining why women-of-color aren’t writing more theory” to “strategizing about ways to get our work out” (1987, pp. xxv–xxvi). Many followed suit and created small publishing houses, in fact, that is how the groundbreaking book *This bridge called my back* was given birth. Even 20 years later, the latest edition of this book is about to be published by Third Woman Press, another small press owned by Professor Norma Alarcón, a Chicana. Others started small journals, created lithographs of their poetry, sold chapbooks, and even pasted their short stories in New York City subways. The important thing was for the world to hear their

hollering and to claim an intellectual space not by only complaining and deconstructing but by being fruitful and multiplying.

Asserting a modernist project

Necesitamos teorías [We need theories] that will rewrite history using race, class, gender and ethnicity as categories of analysis, theories that cross borders, that blur boundaries – new kinds of theories with new theorizing methods . . . And we need to find practical application for those theories. We need to de-academize theory and to connect the community to the academy. “High” theory does not translate well when one’s intention is to communicate to masses of people made up of different audiences. We need to give up the notion that there is a “correct” way to write theory. (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xxv)

Feminists of Color assume that the construction of knowledge is about power – not only to construct discourse but also to justify or leave untouched the material basis for the distribution of power. Consequently, eternal deconstruction inevitably (whether inadvertently or not) leads to maintaining the status quo. Feminists of Color choose to deconstruct by constructing rather than by only rejecting or by taking a nihilist position of fragmentation and inaction. Social justice, then, by its very nature of being political, is a modernist epistemological project.

Postmodernism is a helpful plank from which to question all discourse and social categories. However, it becomes much less helpful as a framework to propose political action to change material conditions. Consequently, many feminists of Color are much more likely to use postmodernism to deconstruct and then shift (Sandoval, 2000) to an endarkened epistemology by using a variety of strategies such as a *mestiza* consciousness (Anzaldúa, 1987), strategic essentialism (Pérez, 1991), strategic suspensions (Hurtado, 1996b), crossborder crossing (Anzaldúa, 1987), crossborder existence (Hurtado, 1999), and conscientización (Castillo, 1994) to propose a political agenda to help those bodies crushed under oppression. Professor Dillard’s use of the personal essay by a “Black woman high school principal” (2000, p. 666) illustrates this point well. It is obvious that the principal understands from her own upbringing the arbitrariness of academic standards as her father admonished her that she had to perform “better [than our White counterparts] because we’re never good enough” and that “An education would help us deal with that” (Dillard, 2000, p. 666). The principal is also acutely aware of the struggles her Black students undergo in her district in comparison with her white students. However, she does not force Black students to fit the academic mold and pull themselves up by their bootstraps. But she also does not excuse their lack of academic achievement because of the enormous hurdles placed in front of them. Instead, she tailors her pedagogy specifically to their context *at the same time* that she helps them accomplish according to the standards she knows are arbitrary. It is not uncommon for many professors of Color (as well as others) to deconstruct the measures of academic merit, say standardized tests like the SAT, as not measuring innate academic potential. However, if standardized testing is the barrier to getting students of Color into college, then they push students to excel on these tests. Many professors of Color may not believe in the complete validity of the established standards, but if meeting these standards helps students of Color

achieve and avoids them falling off the face of the earth, then it is worth the struggle – they hold both notions of compliance and resistance simultaneously.

Claiming fragmentation, seeking coherence

A theory in the flesh means one where the physical realities of our lives – our skin color, the land or concrete we grew up on, our sexual longings – all fuse to create a politic born out of necessity. Here, we attempt to bridge the contradictions in our experience:

We are the colored in the white feminist movement.

We are the feminists among the people of our culture.

We are often the lesbians among the straight.

We do this bridging by naming our selves and by telling our stories in our own words. (Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981, p. 23)

Fragmentation is the nature of women of Color's existence since childhood. Audre Lorde (1984), Cherríe Moraga (Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981), Emma Pérez (1991), and Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), among others, have given eloquent testimony of their discovery during childhood of the hate reserved for women of Color both in public places and within their own families. As Audre Lorde (1984) so eloquently states:

I don't talk about the hate. I don't like to remember the cancellation and hatred, heavy as my wished-for-death, seen in the eyes of so many white people from the time I could see . . . I had no tools to dissect it, no language to name it. The AA subway train to Harlem . . . a woman in a fur hat. . . . She jerks her coat closer to her . . . she has communicated her horror to me. . . . When suddenly I realize there is nothing crawling up the seat between us; it is me she doesn't want her coat to touch . . . No word has been spoken. I'm afraid to say anything to my mother because I don't know what I've done . . . Something's going on here I do not understand, but I will never forget it. Her eyes. The flared nostrils. The hate. (1984, pp. 147–148)

The negotiation of self, however, is not only with outgroup members but with members of their own families. As Gloria Anzaldúa describes:

At a very early age I had a strong sense of who I was and what I was about and what was fair. I had a stubborn will . . . *Terca* [stubborn]. Even as a child I would not obey. I was "lazy." Instead of ironing my younger brother's shirts or cleaning the cupboards, I would pass my hours studying, reading, painting, writing. Every bit of self-faith I'd painstakingly gathered took a beating daily. Nothing in my culture approved of me. *Habia agarrado malos pasos* [I was following a deviant road]. Something was wrong with me. *Estaba más allá de la tradición* [I was beyond tradition]. (1987, p. 16)

Many women of Color have to negotiate the external negative evaluations based on their group memberships – race, gender, class, sexuality – with their internal sense of self. They are the quintessential postmodern subjects fragmented by the many perceptions of various constituencies, but to remain so is ineffectual and threatens

to paralyze them into non-action – a subject position many feminists of Color reject and coherence is sought not falsely but strategically.

Women of Color experience themselves *as human beings* and have a self that can be articulated, allowing them to have agency. They do not experience themselves as “floating signifiers,” as “dark others,” or “incoherent subjects.” As duCille poignantly queries: “Why are black women always already Other? I wonder. To myself, of course, I am not Other; to me it is the white women and men so intent on theorizing my difference who are the Other” (1994, pp. 591–592). Where, then, does the fragmentation and “double conscience” come in? I would argue that DuBois presaged the distinction later made by social psychologists between personal versus social identity when he spoke of a double consciousness as “two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one black body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder” (1961, p. 17). However, people of Color do not only have these “two unreconciled strivings” between how they see themselves and how others see them, but can also question others’ conceptions of them.

Social psychologists make the distinction between two aspects of identity – personal and social identity. Tajfel and others posit that *personal identity* is an aspect of self composed of psychological traits and dispositions that give individuals personal uniqueness, whereas *social identity* is those aspects of an individual’s self-concept that derive from one’s knowledge of being part of groups, together with the value and emotional significance attached to those memberships (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social identity by its very nature is derived from society and culture and therefore is largely socially constructed and fluid, whereas personal identity is derived from intrapsychic influences, many of which are socialized in families (however they are defined). From this perspective, we have a great deal in common as human beings because our personal identities entail certain universal processes such as loving, mating, raising children, and doing productive work. These processes are universal components of the concept of self. Personal identity is much more stable and coherent over time than social identity. Most individuals do not have *multiple* personal identities, nor do they change from social context to social context. Social identity, in contrast, is highly variable and susceptible to structural forces like race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality. The constriction of choice and opportunity in U.S. society is largely determined by membership in derogated social groups that restrict access to resources like jobs and education. Although all people have multiple social identities, according to Tajfel, only stigmatized social identities (e.g., being a woman, poor, of Color) require psychological work to meet individuals’ need to feel positive about the communities they belong to. Nonproblematic social identities do not require psychological work to make congruent the internal perception of self and the stigmatized view of others. In other words, fragmentation and the struggle to make oneself whole happens primarily when social identities are devalued

Professor Dillard’s call to arms to a coherent view of self is not to deny, ignore, or elide the effects of fragmentation; it is a recognition that coherent *personal* identity is necessary to embody agency at the same time as fragmentation because stigmatized *social identities* can be used to build a multidimensional, multilayered endarkened epistemology. Many white feminists and feminists of Color have used several terms to speak of these fragmented social identities as the source from which power relations can be deconstructed. The oppressed have watched the

dominant and from that standpoint they can have greater insight into the socially constructed nature of power relations. Fragmentation of social identities is not perceived only as a source of pain, nor is false coherence sought, but rather it is from the interstices of multiple group memberships as expressed in the concept of intersectionality that can generate epistemological insights. The more stigmatized social identities are, the greater the potential to *see* the different facets of oppression. So why not rank all these different social identities? Why is gender not more or less important than race? Power is relational (Hurtado, 1996a). Which social identity will be more salient depends on the context, and successful feminists of Color have to learn to maneuver the different manifestations of oppression depending on the context. It is this multifaceted social existence based on social identities, not personal identity, that professor Dillard is trying to theorize for the benefit of making our institutions of higher education more responsive to those who do not fit our notions of coherent social identities aligned with the goals of the academy.

An endarkened epistemology to revolutionize the academy

I introduce here the word, Xicanisma, a term that I will use to refer to the concept of Chicana feminism. In recent years the idea of Chicana feminism has been taken up by the academic community where I believe it has fallen prey to theoretical abstractions. Eventually I hope that we can rescue Xicanisma from the suffocating atmosphere of conference rooms, the acrobatics of academic terms and concepts and carry it out to our work place, social gatherings, kitchens, bedrooms, and society in general. (Castillo, 1994, p. 11)

I have reviewed different aspects of knowledge production that would be changed by following Professor Dillard and other feminists' proposals – from revising what we consider “data” to considering spirituality as an integral part of the educational process, to conceptualizing identity as multidimensional and multipositioned, to weaving in and out of modernist (constructionist) and postmodernist (deconstructionist) frameworks. However, I read Professor Dillard's proposals as pushing us to an even deeper examination of how and why we produce knowledge. The academy is notorious for producing intellectual debates that engage small constituencies for short periods of time. The life span of the most heated ones is about 5 years and even shorter for the less controversial ones. Among these areas of study that have come and gone are: multiculturalism in the university curriculum (Gordon & Newfield, 1996), racial differences in IQ (Herrnstein & Murray 1994), and the study of whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993). Careers are built by generating one of these debates and being catapulted to prominence. The cycle of deconstruction as a means to make a splash many times circumvents issues of advocacy, influencing policy, or providing direction for practitioners and activists. The engagement with the academy and knowledge production Professor Dillard proposes is radically different. It is here that the core of her proposal highlights the difference that a different epistemology makes.

Feminists of Color are motivated to produce knowledge from the position of the “politics of urgency.” Theirs is a commitment to changing social conditions *now* by whatever means necessary. Most have been trained in the most prestigious graduate

programs in the country and most are also the first in their families to attend institutions of higher education. Their outsider status made many of them skeptical *at the same time* that they were trained in dominant paradigms. Kuhn (1962) predicted that scientific revolutions were more likely to be instigated by marginals precisely because of their status as outsiders within (Collins, 1991). Many feminists of Color refuse to follow the usual trajectory of knowledge production by engaging in academic debates *independent* of social justice issues. Endless debates within the confines of existing theories run the risk of inaction. Instead, they are informed by these debates, but try to rescue through a bricolage of methods, concepts, and theories an action plan of potential solutions. Rosa Linda Fregoso aptly captures the process by which feminists of Color articulate their positionality in reference to all the intellectual traditions that inform their method:

I first re-claim a nationalist intellectual legacy that has a long history in the U.S. Southwest. I trace my genealogy to the nineteenth century when the population of Mexican origin first confronted Anglo-white immigrants who would later conquer the U.S. Southwestern territories. This indigenous intellectual legacy of symbolic cultural forms and practices includes written essays, folk songs, music, and poetry. I have come to understand these social symbolic acts in their mutual determinations and interrelations with historical forces, as cultural forms mixed with and within relations of power. In its nationalistic tendency to ignore questions of gender and sexuality, my legacy reaches its impasse. Second, I draw from feminism's critical discourse on film, in particular its insights on the role of cinema in the construction of gendered subjectivities, that is, the relationship of human gender to representation. I retreat from feminist film discourse when it lodges itself in a male/female binary, thus eliding racial, class, and sexual subjectivities: the crucial differences among women, rather than simply between men and women. Third, from poststructuralism I have learned about subject formation and difference. Its shortcomings include the lack of rigor in theorizing about the subject positions of non-Western subjects. More often, in Euro-American incantations of poststructuralism, "difference" is a new word for the good ol' American concept of pluralism. As a critique of Eurocentrism, the critical discourse on postcoloniality has been helpful. But it too has certain drawbacks, especially when its nationalism is informed by earlier geopolitical configurations of the nation-state. Postcolonial intellectual angst, say, its sentiment of "transcendental homelessness" (to quote Saidiya Hartman) is particularly useless for "subalterns" like myself who feel pretty much at home in the "belly of the beast" (the U.S. of A.). (1993, pp. 21–22)

Fregoso, like other Chicana feminists, claims disruption as method (Arredondo, Hurtado, Klahn, Nájera-Ramírez, & Zavella, 2003; Hurtado, 1998, p. 135). They do not absolutely align themselves with any one particular intellectual field, but instead dovetail in and out of various intellectual frameworks to glean the most important contributions and from that position construct their own paradigms. At the same time that they participate in these frameworks they also stand back and speak out against what does not fit in their own historical and social experience. Fregoso claims "a nationalist intellectual legacy," a "feminism's critical discourse," and "poststructuralism," but at the same time she deconstructs all their shortcomings and "re-claims" her own "hybridized eyes" with which she "re-view[s]"

and re-read[s] Chicano films. For as these cultural forms are hybrid productions, so too is my cultural studies approach a *mestizaje*, a *bricolage*" (Fregoso, 1993, pp. 21–22).

Professor Dillard continues this intellectual project by outlining guidelines for this type of engagement with knowledge production rather than simply a continuance of the debates around qualitative versus quantitative methodologies. Instead, she goes beneath these debates and contributes to a larger epistemological project that is collectively being built by endarkened subjects to produce "interstitial feminisms" (Pérez, 1999), "oppositional consciousness" (Sandoval, 2000), "liminal" paradigms (Lugones, 1990) – all attempting to subvert rather than perpetuate debates that sabotage the potential for political action.

These tactical moves by feminists of Color are accomplished at great peril of being expelled from the academy, ridiculed by many scholars, and accused of interest-group politics. The refusal to engage *only* academic debates, adhere to *only* one discipline, question the nature of data, ascribe to multiple methods, and pursue spirituality as an integral part of knowledge production is not an easy path or one that is richly rewarded. Feminists of Color are fully aware of these perils and consciously have chosen to be shunned if necessary for their *rugir* [raging] to be heard. Many of these academic warriors have succumbed in the process as they were denied tenure, demoted to lecturers instead of tenure track positions, or banished to student affairs divisions because their status as scholars was questioned. Others straddle and work triple shifts, one as scholars, another as teachers, and yet a third as activists. It is here that we see the largest number of causalities as they succumb to physical illness and die early deaths (cases in point: Audre Lorde, Barbara Smith, and Leticia Galindo, among others).

Professor Dillard pushes us to embrace this struggle and to begin the arduous task of building a different epistemology that will recognize our endarkened selves and their relationship to whiteness. She has done it at great personal peril and shows us how not to be afraid. We have nothing to lose except knowledge itself.

Note

1. "The scream of independence" was given by Father Hidalgo in 1810 and started the Mexican Revolution to fight for liberation from Spain.

References

- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands – la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1990). *Making face, making soul/haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press.
- Arredondo, G., Hurtado, A., Klahn, N., Nájera-Ramírez, O., & Zavella, P. (2003). *Chicana feminisms: A critical reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Castillo, A. (1994). *Massacre of the dreamers: Essays on Xicanisma*. New York: Plume Book.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.
- Davis, Angela Y. (1974). *With my mind on freedom: An autobiography*. New York: Bantam.
- Dillard, C. (2000). The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen: Examining an endarkened feminist epistemology in educational research and leadership. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(6), 661–681.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1961). *The souls of Black folk*. New York: Washington Square Press.

- duCille, Ann. (1994). The occult of true black womanhood: Critical demeanor and black feminist studies. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 19(3), 591–629.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fregoso, R. L. (1993). *The bronze screen: Chicana and Chicano film culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gaspar de Alba, A. (1998). *Chicano art. Inside outside the master's house. Cultural politics and the CARA exhibition*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gordon, A. F., & Newfield, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Mapping multiculturalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599.
- Henley, N. (1986). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Free Press.
- Hurtado, A. (1996a). *The color of privilege: Three blasphemies on feminism and race*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hurtado, A. (1996b). Strategic suspensions: Feminists of color theorize the production of knowledge. In N. Goldberger, J. Tarule, B. Clinchy, & M. Belenky (Eds.), *Knowledge, difference and power: Essays inspired by women's ways of knowing* (pp. 372–392). New York: Basic Books.
- Hurtado, A. (1998). Sitios y lenguas: Chicanas theorize feminism. *Hypatia*, 13(2), 134–159.
- Hurtado, A. (1999). A crossborder existence. In A. Stewart & M. Romero (Ed.), *Women's untold stories: Breaking silence, talking back, voicing complexity* (pp. 83–101). New York: Routledge.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.
- Lugones, M. (1990). Hablando cara a cara/speaking face to face: An exploration of ethnocentric racism. In G. Anzaldúa (Ed.), *Making face, making soul/haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color* (pp. 46–54). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press.
- Moraga, C. & Anzaldúa, G. (1981). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.
- Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pérez, E. (1991). Sexuality and discourse: Notes from a Chicana survivor. In C. Trujillo (Ed.), *Chicana lesbians: The girls our mothers warned us about* (pp. 159–184). Berkeley: Third Woman Press.
- Pérez, E. (1999). *The decolonial imaginary: Writing Chicanas into history*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Quintana, A. E. (1996). *Home girls: Chicana literary voices*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Rendón, L. (2000). Academics of the heart: Reconnecting the scientific mind with the spirit's artistry. *Review Of Higher Education*, 24(1), 1–13.
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. London: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Williams, P. J. (1993). *The alchemy of race and rights*. London: Virago.