



Visceral Geographies of Whiteness and Invisible Microaggressions

Shangrila Joshi¹

Graduate Program on the Environment
The Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA
Lab I Room 2024
2700 Evergreen Parkway NW
Olympia, WA 98505
tel (360) 867-6505
wynns@evergreen.edu

Priscilla McCutcheon

Departments of Geography/Geosciences and Pan African Studies
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292
tel (502) 852- 6844
pmccutch@uic.edu

Elizabeth L. Sweet

Department of Geography and Urban Studies
Temple University, Philadelphia, PA
325A Gladfelter Hall
tel (215) 204-2960
bsweet@temple.edu



¹ Published under Creative Commons licence: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works
All authors contributed equally.

Abstract

Drawing on data from focus groups, we demonstrate and analyze how racial microaggressions impact people of color, in unique and often traumatizing ways. We do so by including the eye opening stories of graduate students and faculty of color, taking seriously the call of critical race theorists to incorporate storytelling into scholarship. We argue that the experiences people of color undergo provide a unique perspective on visceral geographies in part because their voices are silenced; reacting internally is often the only safe response in an overwhelmingly white discipline. By starting at the scale of the body, we combine theories on visceral geographies with theories of racial microaggressions to reveal how whiteness permeates geography at multiple scales and spaces. We also examine the visceral within intellectual spaces of geography as a discipline and geography departments. We further explain how intersections of race, gender, and sexuality influence the visceral reactions of people of color to microaggressions in geography departments. Our findings demonstrate how racist behaviors take up space in departments, in the process of intellectual production and in the bodies of non-white geographers.

I have the impression that, as an institution, geography is nearly as white as an enterprise as country and Western music, professional golf, or the Supreme Court of the United States. It seems to me that even in comparison with other academic disciplines, geography and people of color are not particularly interested in each other. If so, we need to ask, is this a problem for geography?"

(Delaney 2002, 12).

Introduction

Improving the climate for racial diversity and inclusivity is crucial to creating the conditions that facilitate greater participation by groups that have been historically underrepresented and or marginalized in U.S. universities. In recent years geographers have increasingly paid attention to the mutually constitutive relationship between campus climate, departmental climate and diversity in geography departments (Kobayashi 2013; Delaney 2002; Peake and Schein 2000; Kobayashi and Peake 2000; Wilson 1999; Kobayashi 1999). While research shows people of color are underrepresented in geography departments, there is little qualitative work revealing less obvious reasons and tensions behind why these groups remain underrepresented despite efforts to diversify the discipline. Few studies in geography examine racial dynamics within the spaces of geography departments or utilize geographical theories and inquiry to understand these dynamics.

Our paper begins to fill these gaps by offering a geographic understanding of the lived everyday experiences of members of underrepresented groups within the

spaces of geography departments. Based on a pilot study, which included a survey and two focus groups, we identify the multiple scales, spatial nature, and forms of racial microaggressions within geography departments. While we argue that geography continues to be a white space both intellectually and physically, we pay particular attention to the body, using innovative ways to see the body as a geographical space via visceral geography (Hayes-Conroy 2010). By uncovering the ways in which members of geography departments experience racial microaggressions in their everyday lives and how these experiences are embodied, we expand the growing scholarship on visceral geography (Hayes-Conroy and Martin 2010; Hayes-Conroy J. and Hayes-Conroy A. 2010; Hayes-Conroy A. and Hayes-Conroy J. 2010; Waitt 2013; Sweet and Ortiz Escalante 2014; Misgav and Johnston 2014).

Visceral geography provides a theoretical and methodological basis for merging embodied, experiential aspects of microaggression with broader political-economic and political-territorial concerns. 'Visceral' geography refers to how bodies *feel* internally *in relation with material social space*. The relational aspect of the concept is key, as it enables us to fuse seemingly individual concerns of the experiential/biological body with cultural patterns, social hierarchies, and economic structures (Hayes-Conroy and Martin 2010, Hayes-Conroy J. and Hayes-Conroy A. 2010, Hayes-Conroy A. and Hayes-Conroy J. 2010). In short, the body provides both the analytical space where broader social patterns and structures meet and the material space where their impact is felt.

We use visceral geographies to bare the embodied impacts of microaggressions on brown and black bodies in the spaces of geography departments. We further combine theories of visceral geographies with theories of racial microaggressions and black geographies to expose how whiteness permeates geography at multiple scales, and how microaggressions affect people of color in unique and often traumatizing ways. Racial microaggressions are not overt racist acts and sometimes occur without the perpetrator or even the victim being aware of them. Therefore, we heed the call of critical race theorists to tell the stories of people of color to truly comprehend how racism works (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). Within these stories often emerge similar patterns, revealing the deeply emotional effect of racism on bodies of color. We add to literature on visceral geographies by theorizing the ways in which racism contributes to the visceral reactions of people of color to microaggressions. We argue that people of color provide a unique perspective on visceral geographies in part because their voices are silenced and reacting internally is often the only safe reaction in an overwhelmingly white discipline.

The paper will proceed as follows. First, we lay out our conceptual framework in which we integrate theories on whiteness, critical race theory, and visceral geographies. Second, we detail our methodology that included surveys and focus groups. For the purposes of this paper, we primarily use information from our focus groups, which reflects our commitment to storytelling, a key

component of critical race theory. Third, we present our analysis based on three key themes: presumed incompetence, policing racial identity, and spaces of microaggressions in geography. We urge active listening to the stories and hope to generate momentum for gathering even more.

Conceptual Framework

Whiteness

Race is a social construction, although as Price (2010) notes, race is “one of the most powerful fictions framing American society” (159). Racially constructed social categories have very real material and emotional consequences that effectively privilege some while oppressing others. Gilmore (2002) brings to light the spatiality inherent in the social construction of race. Place and in particular scale matters in how race and racism are experienced. Our research acknowledges that while race is socially constructed, we live in what Morrison (1992) calls a “wholly racialized world” in which bodies of color constantly navigate white spaces. Whiteness, as Ahmed (2007, 154) notes, “becomes... ‘like itself’, as a form of family resemblance.” By extension, the spaces of geography are characterized by white supremacy even if this may be invisible to some geographers (Berg 2012). However “whiteness is only invisible for those who inhabit it, or those who get so used to its inhabitation that they learn not to see it, even when they are not it” (Ahmed 2007, 157). Our paper is part of a process to make visible this world and document how whiteness often operates in geography departments. We are claiming that geographers of color are forced to negotiate a hostile landscape (Ahmed 2007) and what Fanon (1986) calls the “historic-racial schema,” a kind of bodily undergirding of whiteness within non-white bodies (111). This spatial component is unique and important, because while visceral geography allows embodied feelings, emotions and sensations to be documented through food (Hayes-Conroy etc), dance and queerness, (Misgav and Johnston 2014) and the broader gendered meaning of sweat (Waitt 2014), we are demonstrating how racist practices are impacting the production of space in departments and bodies.

Whiteness, according to Frankenberg (1993) manifests itself in three different ways: 1) as structural advantage; 2) as a way of knowing; 3) and as normalizing. Structurally, whiteness is engrained in the political and economic functions of the world. Omi and Winant’s (1994) theory of racial formation emphasizes the “socio-historical process” (55) of race and racism. Whiteness is not a recent phenomenon and has been naturalized in society over time. Whiteness is also not reduced to white bodies; rather “spaces can take on the very ‘qualities’ that are given to such bodies” (Ahmed 2007, 156). The institutionalization of whiteness in the state – and we argue in the academy – is needed to maintain a racialized hierarchy of power (Goldberg 2001). Racial privilege creates and institutionalizes “geographies of power” that allow white bodies to move freely and geographically inhibits black

bodies (Delaney 1995). While this is apparent for obvious “geographies of power” such as slavery and Jim Crow, we argue that this is also true for less obvious geographies of power, manifested through racial microaggressions, with often-invisible lines and boundaries within geography departments.

Whiteness is a way of knowing that not only applies to white people, but people of color (Frankenberg 1993). Harkening back to Omi and Winant’s (1999) theory of racial formation, we argue that whiteness can be understood as everyday experiences that at times operate unconsciously. Visceral geography gives geographers a unique way to understand whiteness and the privilege of the white body. “Visceral geography” renders the body as the geographical space of inquiry, paying particular attention to how bodies feel internally – sensations, moods, physical states of being – in relation to surrounding spaces and people that inhabit them. Visceral geographies help us to contextualize what Carroll (1999) terms “mundane extreme environmental stress,” a powerful yet difficult to recognize experience that pervades the everyday lives of people of color. Visceral geography provides people of color a distinctive way to examine their reactions to and experiences with white privilege, by encouraging them to acknowledge their innermost fears and thoughts, often masked and ‘re’presented as normal to outsiders. hooks (2008, 339) reminds us that black bodies assume a “critical ethnographic gaze” towards white people as a survival mechanism to navigate a hostile landscape. A “critical ethnographic gaze” is sometimes unconsciously formed by visceral reactions to whiteness that are difficult to pinpoint, but equally important. Visceral geographies give scholars a unique way to theorize white privilege.

Whiteness privileges white bodies by assuming a set of normative values that all people should adopt; these values are seamlessly conflated with U.S. culture, rendering whiteness almost invisible, yet always present and powerful (Lipsitz 1995). People of color, however, can never enjoy the privileges of whiteness, even if they adopt specified cultural norms that are consciously or unconsciously prescribed by whites (Slocum 2006; Kobayashi and Peake 2000; Lipsitz 1995). White supremacy permeates geography, a discipline “founded on privilege and hierarchy” (Berg 2012, 9). Whiteness creates geographies of power that inhibits people of color from moving freely within the discipline. Whiteness dictates a set of normative values that decides who is a geographer, what topical areas are deemed acceptable for geographic inquiry, and what scholarship is included in the canon of geographic literature. Minorities within the discipline struggle to claim space amidst unabashedly whitewashed landscapes, and even the existence of bodies of color (often scattered around geography departments) does not negate the whiteness in geography departments. Critical race theory can help link the structural elements of whiteness with individual experiences of them.

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) came out of the Civil Rights movement, and is further grounded in legal studies and feminist studies (Crenshaw et.al 1995). Derrick Bell, a lawyer, Civil Rights activist, and educator vehemently believed that the Civil Rights movement called for action. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) note that CRT “not only tries to understand our social situation, but to change it. It sets out not only to ascertain how society organizes itself along racial lines and hierarchies, but to transform it for the better” (3). In their seminal work *Critical Race Theory*, Delgado and Stefancic (2001) identify six major tenets of critical race theory: 1) race is a social construction; 2) race is an ever-present feature of modern society; 3) racism has material benefits for elite whites and psychological benefits for poor and working class whites; 4) racialization of groups varies across time 5) racial groups are not homogenous, but rather made up of groups of individuals with other markers or their identity that intersect; 6) narrative and storytelling are important to understanding and addressing the experiences of the racialized. For the purposes of this research, we focus on the last two tenets: intersectionality/individualism and narrative.

Critical race theorists believe that the study of race and racism should not preclude individualism or intersectionality, as they operate through a ‘matrix of domination’ (Collins 2000). Collins (2000; 1999), a noted black feminist understands identity and oppression as multi-layered, operating differently across space and time. Collins’ ‘matrix of domination’ refers to the overall organization of power – operating at macro, meso, and micro levels – in any society (8). This study seeks to understand the experiences of people of color not as a homogenous group, but as a group with similar and distinct experiences. The quote below perhaps puts it best:

Do all oppressed people have something in common...on one level, the answer is obvious. Of course all oppressed people have something in common – their oppression. But the forms of that oppression may vary considerably. And if those forms, and the results they inflict on daily lives, vary, it follows that the needs and political strategies of groups fighting for social change will differ from group to group (Collins 2000).

The makeup of our focus groups exemplifies the importance of intersectionality. The majority of focus group participants identified themselves as black or African American. While race tended to be an overarching factor, our participants examined the unique impact of race as it intersected with other axes of difference – gender, sexuality, age and class. For example, some participants noted racial exclusivity in queer geography spaces and the feeling of being tokenized based on race. As we explore in more detail later, our female participants (the vast majority), believed that racial microaggressions affected black women’s bodies in unique

ways. In order to comprehend the multi-layered and intersecting experiences of people of color in geography, hearing their stories in their own words is crucial.

Whiteness allows for some groups' narratives to be deemed the objective truth. In many cases, the narrative of people of color is unheard, ignored, or deemed as a fictional fantasy. As Stone-Mediatore (2002) explains:

At the same time, stories are also social practices that are regulated by the institutions that produce, legitim[ize], and distribute knowledge. Viewed in this light, the stories that are available for interpreting our worlds are not determined entirely by social institutions, but they are inevitably influenced by (and can potentially influence) those institutions (132).

That is, "white people tell stories too," (Delgado and Stefancic 2001, 47) based on their experiences, yet are often held up as objective truth. Critical race theory privileges the voices of people of color in hopes of enacting change. In *Presumed Incompetence*, (Gutierrez y Muhs et.al 2012) the authors argue that there is little research that actually documents the stories of people of color in academia. We know that people of color are underrepresented in academia and in geography. Through these stories we explain 'why.' Storytelling "packs an emotional punch and provides the psychological detail necessary to understand a person with different life experiences" (Gutierrez y Muhs et.al 2012, 2-3). Geographers understand the power of language and narrative to negotiate spatial processes (Cronon 1992; Tuan 1991). Tuan (1991) notes that while "speech alone cannot transform nature...it can direct attention and make the invisible, visible and real" (2). Our focus group participants expressed that whether or not they felt hyper-visible or invisible, their voices and experiences went unheard. Narrative storytelling helped us understand how bodies of color navigate spaces of whiteness within geography departments and the visceral impacts of that navigation process.

Microaggressions

One of the compelling narratives of whiteness shared by people of color residing in the US is that of racial microaggression, a term first coined in 1969 by an African American professor of psychiatry and education, Chester Pierce. Pierce defined microaggressions as "subtle, stunning, often automatic, and nonverbal exchanges, which are 'put downs' of Blacks by offenders" (Pierce 1978, 66). Asian American psychologist Derald Sue developed and popularized the concept further. According to Sue et al (2007, 273),

Racial microaggressions are brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group These exchanges are so pervasive and automatic in daily conversations and interactions that

they are often dismissed and glossed over as being innocent and innocuous.

Racial microaggressions elicit a visceral reaction from most people who experience them. As one focus group participant eloquently said,

For me they are a feeling, I feel them, and it is hard to put that feeling into words sometimes. The overt discrimination is not a feeling, it is an act of injustice and it is easier to put that into words. But microaggression is a feeling, and it is really a feeling of being stabbed.

Yet, racial microaggressions are typically carried out unconsciously by the perpetrator, who in turn, is not only oblivious to the effect on the receiver, but also prone to be offended by the insinuation that he or she has been implicated in an act of racism. As a result, it can be difficult to talk about the experience with a white person. Sue et al (2007) suggest this is because white and non-white persons experience different racial realities that make it difficult to see or experience such an interracial event independently of their individual realities. Since perpetrators can reject an incident of racial microaggression as non-racial, effectively canceling the experience of the victim, the latter is prone to second-guessing themselves and often needs other people who can relate to similar experiences to validate theirs. These narratives allow us to pull out uneven, diverse and/or complex stories about microaggressions and whiteness that illuminate the overarching workings of race, racism and visceral geographies.

There has been a significant growth in literature on racial microaggressions. Some scholars have developed ways of categorizing microaggressions (Sue et. al. 2007), others have tried to document their impact on communities of color in higher education (Yosso et al 2009; Clark et. al. 2011; Gomez et. al, 2011; and Solorzano et. al. 2000). Sue et al (2007) proposed a taxonomy of microaggressions comprising three distinct forms – the more aggressive microassaults (distinguished from overt racism due to the anonymity of the perpetrator), the subtle yet racially demeaning microinsults and the arguably most commonly occurring form - microinvalidation. Microinvalidation refers to the questioning or delegitimization of the ideas, identity, existence and/or experience of the non-white body.

Racial microaggressions have been used as a theoretical lens to understand and situate the experience of students of color including African American undergraduates (Solorzano et al 2000), Latino/a undergraduates (Yosso et al 2009), Native Americans (Clark et al 2011), and graduate teaching assistants (Gomez et al 2011). Solorzano et al (2000) attempted to study the linkages between racial stereotypes, cumulative racial microaggressions, campus racial climate and academic performance of African American undergraduates, using CRT as a theoretical foundation. Overall racial microaggressions have been found to impact students negatively, producing emotions of self-doubt, frustration, vulnerability, isolation and resentment that in turn affected academic performance. Confronting microaggressive behavior was found to create immense stress and anxiety. The key

coping mechanism was the creation of counter spaces of supportive communities in academic and social contexts. Solorzano et al (2000) emphasize the importance of naming the injuries inflicted by racial microaggressions, both for purposes of validation and responding appropriately to these behaviors.

These studies indicate that a well-intentioned department with goals to promote social justice is not enough. Gomez's (2011) interviews reveal that non-white students perceived a mismatch between the stated goals of promoting social justice within their departments and the (lack of) interest in engaging in conversations about these concepts in the context of the racial differences within the department. This perspective is useful for us to consider as we ask questions about the existence and practices of microaggressions in geography departments that typically also do considerable work in examining race and racism in American society, as well as issues of class, ethnicity, indigeneity and marginalization in international contexts.

Spatiality of Microaggressions

In this section of the paper, we demonstrate how the racialized experiences of geographers of color underpin the production of space at multiple scales, and how geographers of color navigate these spaces. While previous scholarship deems racial microaggressions to be largely invisible, we complicate this argument by showing how microaggressions manifest themselves in space and place. Microaggressions are experienced through bodies of color, producing visceral reactions, physical and emotional effects. Bodies of color impacted through microaggressions then move through academic circles and classrooms, where they are both invisible and hypervisible. Ahmed (2007) describes her experiences with hypervisibility when she walks into university meetings, saying the "arrivals [of bodies of color] tells us more about what is already in place than it does about who arrives" (157). The spatiality of such experiences is our primary focus, and the multiple ways that whiteness and microaggressions demonstrate uneven access to intellectual life.

We further rely on Lefebvre's (1991) spatial triad and theorizations on black geographies to adapt the concept of microaggressions from a psychological perspective to a spatial and material one. In the *Production of Space*, Lefebvre (1991) identifies representations of space, representational spaces and spatial practices, all of which operate as a dialectic. Representations of space are the spaces of planners (Lefebvre 1991), and are "conceived rather than lived" (McCann 1999, 172). Interpretation lies at the heart of representational spaces, where artists, poets, and illustrators interpret spaces based on their experiences. Finally, spatial practices describe the day-to-day routines of everyday people (Lefebvre 1991). Lefebvre's (1991) understanding of spatial practices helps us to contextualize the experiences of people of color in geography departments. McCann (1999) notes how an individual's social practices "secrete their own social spaces" (172). We

seek to understand the everyday routines of people of color, and microaggressions occurring within that context.

Black geographies further guide our understanding of how bodies of color navigate the spaces of geography departments, creating “alternative ways of imagining the world” (McKittrick and Woods 2006, 5) – while not divorced from whiteness, these alternative visions do reveal how geographers of color experience departments in distinct and often hostile ways. The majority of our focus group participants self-identified as black women and their stories reveal a constant struggle to create and claim space. McKittrick (2007) says, “if we pursue the links between practices of domination and black women’s experiences in place, we see that black women’s geographies are lived, possible and imaginable.” Through our understanding of black geographies, we are able to ask, “how do racial microaggressions and visceral geographies intersect to make the social and material spaces of geography departments for people of color?” Through storytelling and documenting the everyday narratives of underrepresented groups in geography, we see from their vantage point the racialized landscape of geography departments. These stories push us beyond the labeling of geography departments as hostile to people of color. They provide alternative ways of reconfiguring the space of the department.

Ironically, racial microaggressions may occur even amidst geography departments with scholars who conduct research on race. Geographers may examine race, racial phenomena and (neo)colonialism in their scholarship, but doing so does not necessarily imbue them with powers to be introspective of their own complicity with racial or colonial dynamics in their everyday lives (Joshi, forthcoming). It is imperative that white geographers be able to apply the same critical lenses with which they study the world outside the ivory towers, to be reflexive about their own practices and habits within the white spaces of geography departments they comfortably inhabit (after Ahmed, 2007). When scholars presume competence in multicultural proficiency, they become oblivious to their own racialized habits, thus making their racism invisible to themselves.

What kinds of social spaces are produced within these departments where the study of race is often relegated to outside geographic phenomena? What kind of social spaces do underrepresented groups – sometimes the sole or a handful of non-whites in a ‘sea of whiteness’ – produce in response? Using narrative storytelling as a method helps us identify a range of material spaces within and beyond departments that are produced by racial dynamics. Some of these spaces may be spaces of comfort that signal belonging and acceptance while other spaces may create invisible but very present boundaries in the minds of people of color. In seeking to uncover the daily routines and lived experiences of geographers of color, we focus not so much on experiences of overt racism, even though focus group participants shared many such stories. Instead, we focus on the subtler and less visible incidences of microaggressions, as our intention is to make the apparently invisible visible. We focus on what we identify as the spaces and places of these

microaggressions so as to contribute a spatialized understanding of microaggressions. Key themes of racial microaggressions that emerged from the focus groups include: 1) Ineptitude as professor or student; 2) Racial stereotypes and the burden of representation; and 3) Geography as white space, ideologically and physically.

Methodology

We conducted two focus groups each of which had six people of color in October 2012 at the Race, Ethnicity and Place Conference. During the focus groups we provided participants with a brief description of microaggressions and asked them to describe their experiences with microaggressions, asking specifically how these experiences made them feel. Each focus group lasted about 2 hours and were recorded and transcribed. We also administered a survey completed by 56 geographers, about half of whom were people of color. The results and analysis of this survey will be published in a separate paper. This paper draws from the focus group narratives since this is where we found the most revealing stories of the production of racialized space. Narrative storytelling, a method emphasized in critical race theory, is an effective way of exposing power imbalances and oppressions, as well as resistance to these, based on the experiences of the oppressed (Sandercock 1995 and 2003).

In this paper therefore, we privilege narrative storytelling as an important and powerful method that enables us to effectively relate the experiences of brown and black bodies in the white spaces of geography in an effort to challenge the invisibility of and to explicitly demonstrate the viscosity of these white spaces. We worked diligently to create a safe space where focus group participants could share their experiences with racial microaggressions. The focus groups created a conducive environment for this narrative storytelling exercise. They helped the participants recall and reflect on actual microaggressions they experienced and their visceral reactions to them. Some participants expressed being so accustomed to suppressing these emotions that they did not know their effect until they recalled these instances during the focus groups.

Analysis

Show Me Your Papers: Proving Competence in Graduate School and the Professoriate

And when I come to this department, you will look at me and question me. Everyday okay, every day I have to prove to you and show you my transcript. ...My work... it's not as critical. You're really close to it, you're not detached, you can't be objective. You're too personally involved in it... always this secondary citizen narrative...

A common theme among focus group participants is the constant feeling of having to prove themselves to students and colleagues in both teaching and scholarship. In teaching, student evaluations were an important conduit for microaggressions (and overt racism). Anonymous course evaluations provide the space and opportunity for students to assault their non-white faculty. These assaults often come in the form of questions regarding the professor's ability to teach, or their "inappropriate focus" on race and gender for the class. Such comments were common on focus group participants' teaching evaluations. So while the faculty member's race may not be explicitly identified as a problem their pedagogical engagement with race is often challenged. Such devaluing of race in the curriculum makes this a microassault on faculty of color studying and teaching race.

While comments such as "she knows a lot for a negro" were reported on student evaluations, one focus group participant noted that some students did not wait until evaluations to show their disapproval of having him as an (African American) instructor. He reenacted his typical 'first day of class' experience at a predominantly white university where he taught GIS: "Hi, I'm Professor [. . .] and a couple people would walk out or ask, where did you get your degree?" He shared that many of his white students presume that African Americans are incompetent in teaching or knowing technical subjects at advanced levels. Time and again, he has had to prove his legitimacy as a professor to undergraduates with no prior GIS knowledge, or to defend his pedagogical methods, something he has never had to do at a Historically Black College and University (HBCU) where he currently teaches. This participant also reported his experience leading a GIS lab as an expert guest lecturer where students would bypass him to ask the white faculty (with no expertise in GIS) questions. According to Lazos (2012, 175), "whites and men start from a presumption of competence; minorities and women do not and have to deal with a multitude of unconscious biases that put them at a disadvantage." This claim is supported by empirical evidence that verifies stereotype bias based on race with all else being equal (Dasgupta et.al. 2000).

The steady onslaught of such microaggressions can be debilitating to junior members of the academy. However, when focus group participants looked to department heads or chairs for guidance when they encountered racism, their claims were sometimes questioned or outright rejected. One participant shared: "The chair and dean in majority institutions would always take the side of the students no matter how outrageous their claims ... They never believed that racism mattered or had anything to do with my student evaluations." Another participant described how students went to the dean and complained that her class had too much about race in it. The dean and chair reviewed the syllabus and concurred, advising the instructor to revise the curriculum to make race less prevalent. She later got teaching evaluations that said "she is obsessed with race." These experiences are in part encouraged by anonymity that enables such microassaults on faculty of color seeking to render them inept. While we understand the purpose

of having anonymous evaluations, the intended or unintended consequences of anonymity merit attention.

Instructors are unable to respond and have little recourse for countering such claims. Some focus group participants reported not approaching anyone in power about their concerns because they felt, based on previous experiences, that their concerns would not be heard. Importantly, these kinds of microaggressions elicit a powerful visceral response or anticipation. Some faculty of color reported not even being able to look at their evaluations without physically feeling their stomachs turn. The norm of whiteness existing at the scale of geography departments thus creates the presumption of incompetence of faculty of color as reflected in these microaggressions packed in student evaluations/actions, that in turn create visceral experiences of discomfort and anxiety felt at the scale of the body and in the halls of the department. Invisible racist practices are taking up space in bodies and buildings, as well as in the spaces of departmental relationships. This is an incredible paradox; invisible racist remarks and practices that we claim we cannot see are materializing in the production of space at the scale of the body, departments, and classrooms.

For geography graduate students of color, microaggressions play a role in inducing uncertainty and second-guessing. They are not necessarily uncertain about their academic competence, but instead about their peers' and seniors' perception of their competence, and whether or not they receive equal treatment relative to their white peers. One focus group participant noted that although she gets along with her advisor, she often wonders why her advisor has a closer relationship with her white advisees, and concludes that it may have something to do with their particular research interests. She recounted:

So I had a meeting with my advisor but she was on a conference call . . . with another graduate student and they are working on some collaborative project doing something . . . And it seems that the communication with some of the other students is a little bit more. I don't know if it's because I'm more independent.

Here the graduate student is trying to understand what she felt was distinct treatment from her advisor towards herself vis-a-vis her peers. She is second-guessing herself when trying to explain why she feels her relationship with her advisor is not as close as her white peers. Such experiences lead to internalized feelings of incompetence. What is happening here is in fact the enactment of a form of familiarity only accessible to whites in white space, what Ahmed (2007) characterizes with an analogy of 'peas in a pod,' "a shared space of dwelling, in which things are shaped by their proximity to other things," (p. 154). Again, the materiality of whiteness is visible to and felt by the non-white body.

Policing Racial Identity: from the Ghetto to Hair

Racial microaggressions manifest themselves in myriad ways, but they are often based on biases and presumptions about the identity and sometimes the physical appearance of the person of color. One participant discussed his experience at a liberal white university, where he was not perceived to be 'black enough' because he was not from an impoverished background and his father held a Ph.D. He shared that other students and faculty members often ask if he had been 'in a gang,' and seem to expect a certain style of lecturing from him in the classroom. He is deemed as not black enough when he does not fit white people's stereotypical view of his race. His individuality and material reality are consequently invalidated by whiteness and its assumptions that pervade the space of a liberal white geography department.

At the other end of the spectrum is the stereotype of the authentic or exotic person of color who is expected to represent their group during seminars and other intellectual or social engagements. This places a tremendous burden and pressure on the token person of color to perform. One participant shared,

I'm the only black person there you know, and I am exotic because I am a black gay female. So whenever we're going through the articles and stuff, you know, "So bell hooks, it's your turn to talk." So one day I was like, "Look, I feel like all the attention comes on me whenever it comes to racial issues, sexuality, it's all on me... and I was like it's all very daunting," and I said, "I do not want to talk, because I thought my voice was frozen, I don't represent everyone. My experience must be always so authentic, I'm like, No!

Here the pervasiveness of whiteness and racial microaggressions in the classroom produced a certain kind of space that was isolating and heavy spatiality. Microaggressions were taking up space in the classroom and weighed heavily on her non-white queer body.

A consistent theme present in both focus groups was that bodies of color are often on display and scrutinized. Their identity is policed and deemed either not black/ethnic enough or too black/ethnic. Some microaggressions seem blatantly rude to the recipient, although they may be delivered as compliments. Many of the black women participants feel that whites give themselves authority to remark on their physical appearance. One focus group participant shared:

So I had this professor one time tell me I had a chance because my hair was pulled into a twist, I think I had a wig or weave, it was curly. So they're like, curly, this is so pretty. I like this so much better than the other hairstyle you had. ...What? What does that have to do with anything? I'm doing my work, the show goes on, whatever like, but you felt like you could just comment on that about me. It's so much better, but that's because it's a lot more acceptable, because other than

that it'll probably be just too militant and makes, you know, this is softening me. It made me more, you know, palatable. "Oh yeah." "I'm like... really?" "I mean I think of it, but it happened so much with hair, but it happens so much. Yeah, cuz it is magic, and people want to touch your hair before they cut, like what, you want to make a wish? ...Throw some money in there?"

Participants reported a level of performativity that is connected to their exoticized bodies of color, an exoticization seemingly required for them to be accepted by their colleagues. The women in the focus groups feel as though their appearance is inspected in a way that is uncomfortable, evoking a feeling of constantly being on display. One participant noted a colleague who, without permission, physically touched her hair saying that it resembled artwork. This notion of black women's dress and appearance in academia has received considerably more attention in recent years (Kupenda 2012; Ford 2012). In her article "You Betta Werk!: Professors Talk Style Politics," Ford (2012) interviews black female academics in a variety of institutions. In one interview, Treva Lindsay notes:

I feel pressure to "dress" professionally, while many of my white male counterparts do not feel a similar pressure. BUT, if I look "too fashionable," questions arise about my commitment to being a scholar...Ultimately, I know it matters "what we wear," and yet, the complexity of politics surrounding how we adorn ourselves continues to perplex me.

Lindsay's statement echoes the feeling of focus group participants who know that regardless of what they wear, their appearance is scrutinized and commented on in a way that invades their personal space. During a meeting with an administrator, one native American woman was wearing a squash blossom necklace. An administrative staff member asked if she wore that everyday. We argue that such 'compliments' about women of color's appearance, intentionally or unintentionally, are cloaked in microaggressions in a historical context where women of color's ownership over their bodies has never been respected (McKittrick 2006). As Kupenda (2012, 21) notes, "for a black female academic to choose to protect some aspects of her life as private – not for display to the casual white colleague or administrative observer – is still a radical step." Here again microaggressions are defining the space of departments and working insidiously on non-white female bodies.

The above discussion of dress, hair, and stereotypes in academia is not restricted to departments with no multicultural understanding. In fact, some participants felt the most on display when they were around colleagues who claimed some racial competency. Such aversive racism – when a person sees themselves as colorblind or anti-racist, yet in their everyday interactions engage in racial microaggressions that offend, insult, or invalidate the experiences of persons

of color – creates a particularly troubling and ironic space of white normative “historical-racial schema” that takes up residence on non-white bodies.

Geography as White Space: Physically and Intellectually

Geography is a white space in part because there is no critical mass of people of color within the discipline. Such underrepresentation is experienced and interpreted as invalidation. As one participant said, “...you know where 15% of faculties are [people of color] in this nation ... where am I supposed to get my examples from? It’s really hard.” Another said, “I mean I didn’t really know what the discipline was until I was at a conference, and it was like ten thousand white men and two people of color.” Underrepresentation can be experienced as a microinsult, people of color may feel as though they are in a fishbowl at meetings, stared at by other participants. The lack of people of color also has effects on instructors of color in the classroom, who report being looked up and down on the first day of class during class introductions. The lack of critical mass frequently results in isolating experiences for the few people of color that do find their way to geography departments. Microaggressions assume the form of important exclusionary practices that contribute to the social and physical isolation of people of color in predominantly white departments. Such isolation in social spaces can have significant repercussions for the professional development and success of persons of color, especially if they do not have mentors and a strong support system outside of academia (Rockquemore, 2012).

The physical space of geography departments was not always the most isolating space for focus group participants; instead, the social spaces that geographers inhabit in their everyday lives proved to be more unwelcoming. The majority of focus group participants identified ‘happy hour,’ a space meant to be relaxing, as an unwelcoming social space. They reported feeling isolated, unwelcome(d), and uncomfortable. Significantly, participants view these social spaces as networking opportunities where political currency is exchanged, spaces central to their professional development. One participant stated:

I’ve an interesting example, because I didn’t expect to be around alcohol around my professors and colleagues. I was shocked, because it was the first day at AAG I was like, What in the world? And people were getting away with it, and I was like... I didn’t even know what to think or do or say.

This focus group participant identified alcohol involved social gatherings as a space that she must participate in, but also a space of discomfort due to the consumption of alcohol. In addition to experiencing such isolation in social settings, people of color have the added burden of being blamed (explicitly or implicitly) for being aloof, even when such perceived aloofness might be a defense mechanism against microaggressions. One participant shared her story of being

invited to social events only to be rendered invisible – an experience everyone in the focus group affirmed:

So we go to these major conferences and usually everybody's in their clique So we go to [their] the party, and you know, looking around at people in their little cliques. ... And I'm in the program, okay, but I'm not. I'm still a stranger I'm talking to people, . . . and so there is a sense of isolation. So I'll get these comments, why don't you come around? We don't see you at our event. We have these parties, we have these get-togethers, we don't see you. Where have you been? You have been isolating yourself. ... They look at you like you are emotional... And when people visit the program, you're up... hey, come on over.
The only person of color in the department

People of color thus often felt invisible or hyper-visible in geography's social spaces. While the above respondent (who felt invisible) did understand the need to network, she reported feeling dismissed when attempting to meet other people and discuss research interests. Even in cases where others approached her about her research interests, she felt that they were not truly interested in her work, but instead only did it as a courtesy. Social interactions are important not only for scholars of color to achieve their academic goals, but for personal fulfillment in the long run. The above quote clearly demonstrates that she did not feel as though she belonged, but rather felt out of place in the white space of geography. Following Ahmed (2007, 157), these experiences are outcomes of the institutionalization of whiteness “which makes non-white bodies feel uncomfortable, exposed, visible, different, when they take up this space.”

Even more telling of the “historical-racial schema[’s]” endurance in geography departments are the experiences of participants when seen in groups of people of color in such social spaces: “If we were seen even talking to each other, they would be like, “What are they doing...? What are you guys plotting? You guys are all sitting together. Are you guys plotting something? Are you plotting to take over the ship?” The clear and repeated reference to revolting slaves on a slave ship reinforces the power relations of non-white bodies in white spaces. Here the materiality of the power of whiteness is clearly taking up considerable space.

Intellectual white space

Similar to many academic disciplines, geography is a white space in part because critical scholarship about or authored by scholars of color is not considered to be foundational work in the discipline. This may be due to a low critical mass of such work or a lack of willingness to include other perspectives. Consequently, students do not get exposure to critical works that perhaps a faculty of color would assign or deem critical and important. Moreover, when issues of difference are brought up in seminar settings, race may be excluded or deemed unimportant. Below is one participant's account, worth quoting at length, of a class where the

initial excitement of the professor's eagerness to address difference quickly wore off:

This professor's class is the first class where those issues of race, class, gender, and sort of the intersection between them are taken up...and we're in a department that talks a lot about disparities and I don't understand how you can talk about disparities without talking about race. It seems ridiculous to me, umm...but sort of the language that was used by my fellow classmates as to what was considered valuable contributions to classroom discussion were not from other scholars who were people of color or women. You'd have to quote Foucault and you'd have to quote sort of this more abstract theoretical people and places that I honestly don't personally relate to, and so when I was there I wanted to talk about Patricia Collins and they were like, Where are you going with this? This is a very specific and particular way of being, and we just don't get it, don't understand it, or don't see the value in it. And so that always... I was always very quiet in classes because I never felt like my contributions or the ways that I think about the world, the things that I think are important to talk about in the world that they would be valued in the context. In class we were talking about disparities, inequalities in public policies, there were all of these things just weren't part of the discussion, I thought that was problematic. . . . I think that when you look at the syllabus it's very clear this is not a priority for the professor.

In the above example, publications from Patricia Hill Collins and other scholars of color were excluded from a course focused on race, class and gender. The same focus group participant noted that when her instructors did engage with inequality and racism, they chose to focus on the "Third World," presumably because it was safer, instead of racism operating in the U.S. The tendency is seemingly to avoid topics where the complicity of the white scholar might be questioned; resulting in the dominance of white intellectual space. Focus group participants were hopeful that with an increase in critical writings by scholars of color and about people of color, there would be greater inclusion in courses and research. However one focus group participant noted "after being in this field for 22 years, I think the thing that is still most difficult for me, is that it doesn't get any better."

The peer-review process in publishing is yet another place where focus group members expressed feelings of invalidation, and discontent with the forms of knowledge valued. All people of color do not conduct research about race or racism, however for those who do, their contributions have sometimes been undermined due to perceived subjectivity – a microinvalidation for students and professors of color. For example, one participant recalled getting reviews back on a manuscript about women of color. While two reviewers suggested the article be accepted with minor revisions and the other revise and resubmit, the white editor rejected it claiming the reviewers' positive assessments for publication were not

justified. The editor did not think the reviewers realized how critical they had been of the manuscript in their reviews. “It felt so personal, the letter was condescending in that it said I probably did not realize what a gift the editor was giving me by rejecting my manuscript and tearing the paper apart.” In their view, these spaces of intellectual production are dominated by white scholars (often male) who serve as methodological and theoretical gate-keepers in determining what is valid knowledge and what is not; as such there is a structural impediment to consider knowledge generated from post-positivist epistemologies and methodologies – emanating from particular positions – as valid knowledge, ultimately leading to difficulty in publishing in these white spaces.

The blind peer review process enables scholars in power to hide behind anonymity (as students do in course evaluations) and to denigrate the works submitted by geographers of color who do work about race, gender, class and sexuality in ways that sometimes question their relevance for geography. So although geography as a discipline is often described by the aphorism ‘geography is what geographers do,’ and as past President Thomas Baerwald has affirmed, “Geographers can study anything,” (Baerwald, 2007, 3) these experiences illustrate that geography is still predominantly what white geographers do. Focus group participants felt that there is a culture of academic publishing where insider information gets transmitted informally among white scholars. Such transmission is a part of the socialization process that graduate students of color, particularly those who are first generation, are typically left out of. Focus group participants suggested that departments, universities and even the AAG are all complicit in the perpetuation of this unequal status quo, and greater transparency was seen to be crucial for preventing these microaggressions in the spaces of peer review.

Cumulative Effects of Microaggressions and the Visceral

The day-to-day experiences of geographers of color in our focus groups reveal consistent themes of scrutiny and marginalization in geography departments, leading to long-term negative consequences. The cumulative impact of dealing with a wide range of racial microaggressions on a daily basis should not be underestimated. Carroll (1998), who examined the experience of African Americans has labeled the stress of everyday life in an unwelcome / hostile environment as:

Mundane extreme environmental stress; mundane, because this stress is so common and is so much a part of our day-to-day experience that we almost take it for granted; extreme, because it has an extreme impact on our psyche and worldview, how we see ourselves, behave, interact, and so forth; environmental, because it is environmentally induced and fostered; stress, because the ultimate impact on African Americans is indeed stressful, detracting, and energy consuming (4).

Research has shown that in addition to African Americans (Solorzana et al 2000), the impact of racial microaggressions is also significant for Asian Americans (Wang et al 2011), Latino/as (Yosso et al 2009) and Native American groups (Clark et al 2011). Feelings of racial anger, frustration, mistrust and compromised self-esteem engendered by a steady stream of racial microaggressions have consequences beyond general psychological well-being. Sue et al (2007, 273) suggest that microaggressions result in impaired performance in various settings for persons of color “by sapping the psychic and spiritual energy ... and by creating inequities.” The mental, emotional and physical strain experienced as a result of cumulative mundane extreme environmental stress has been likened to William Smith’s (2004) concept of ‘racial battle fatigue’ (in Yosso et al 2009, 661). Our research confirms this, especially based on the perspectives shared by our focus group participants who are senior geographers in the academy and expressed fatigue and tiredness at incessantly trying to combat racial microaggressions. As a senior female geographer put it,

I think everybody in the academy, every woman especially, experiences those things. But I think they land on the black or brown woman’s body in a certain way, because they are combined with all the other microaggressions that that body is absorbing. And, it produces what people see as aloofness.

The impact of racial microaggressions goes beyond the recipients of these behaviors. They also have implications for the (white) perpetrator, as microaggressions – unless they are named and interrupted – can prevent white people from perceiving a different racial reality, and consequently create impediments to harmonious race relations (Sue et al 2007) while enabling them to continue to believe in a false meritocracy. Microaggressions are by design difficult to pinpoint, but through this study we attend to the spatial workings of oppression that allows us to see the creation of toxic spaces in geography departments and how this toxicity is placed viscerally on the geographies of black and brown bodies within these departments. We hope that doing so will benefit people of color and white people in the discipline.

Our study also has implications for a racialized understanding of visceral geography. It contributes to the existing literature by looping the visceral back into the actual intellectual space of geography, the bodies of geographers, and the spaces of geography departments. By interrogating the embodied experiences of people of color in geography departments we provide a context within which to understand how race operates within geography departments at the scale of the body. Visceral geographies remind us that multiple scales of oppression influence the body’s reactions, and “attention to the visceral is crucial for understanding power and oppression” (J. Hayes-Conroy and A. Hayes-Conroy 2010, 1276). Situating our work within critical race theory we privilege stories of the embodied experiences of people of color in geography departments. Through an in-depth analysis of the microaggressions experienced by the participants in our study we

are able to theorize how race and racism operate in geography departments. We make visible the everyday realities of embodied racial microaggressions experienced within geography, as expressed in focus groups. We add to literature on visceral geographies by theorizing the ways in which racism and racial microaggressions elicit visceral reactions of people of color. We argue that people of color provide a unique perspective on visceral geographies in part because their voices are silenced and reacting internally is often the only safe reaction in an overwhelmingly white discipline.

The Space In Between: Mapping a New Direction for Geography Departments

In this paper, we utilize data from focus groups to understand the dynamics of the production of white space and resistance to it via exploration of the impact of microaggressions on the body, taking seriously the call of critical race theorists to incorporate narrative storytelling into scholarship. We do so by including the eye opening stories of graduate students and faculty of color. Through the stories we visualize and spatialize the interconnectedness between visceral reactions to racial microaggressions and structural factors contributing to these reactions. Geographers take great interest in places and regions beyond the homeland or comfort zone, and critical geographers oftentimes root for the subaltern in the global context. Yet this sensitivity for the globally oppressed does not always carry over to the spaces closer to home – the very departmental spaces in which they live their everyday lives. Our focus groups exposed perceptions of such critical geographers as being concerned with issues removed from their own everyday environment where their privilege may be implicated. One of our focus group participants had a very apt phrase for referring to the form of racism perpetuated by such individuals: “Have a nice day racism – white, liberal, still a hard-core racism.” Academics and students must therefore engage in critical reflexivity that deconstructs and then reconstructs their racialized habits within the departments they inhabit in relation to their colleagues of color. Focus group participants seemed to hold critical geographers to a higher standard based on their critical engagement with axes of difference. Yet their conferences continue to be dominated by white bodies in white spaces, for instance the 2014 Critical Geography Conference at Temple University. How can white geographers in general and critical white geographers in particular – who are ostensibly committed to challenging various forms of oppression in the world – interrogate their own privilege and complicity with the production of white space?

While there is much work to be done, we are cautiously optimistic. If geography departments are indeed committed to broadening participation, they must establish short and long-term goals to create a critical mass of people of color in geography departments. Beyond a focus on recruiting and retention of bodies though, geography departments must begin to transform. An increase in numbers is not sustainable if the department remains hostile. Geographers should pay particular attention to not just overt acts of racism, but also subtler othering

practices that isolate and put on display the few people of color that typically exist in such departments. We suggest that geography departments committed to broadening participation view the white spaces of geography departments as both material and socially constructed, and draw attention to the ways in which seemingly invisible microaggressions are very visible on the department's landscape.

For many, a natural reaction to an article such as this may be to ask: "what can we do?" While we understand the plea for concrete suggestions, we are making a conscious choice to refrain from offering such suggestions at this stage. We do not wish to trivialize our critique of geography as a white space by simplistically concluding with a 'how-to' list. This might offer the false suggestion that, if followed, such a list would cure whiteness in geography. This article is meant to be a theoretical critique rather than a prescriptive proposal. By interrogating visceral geographies of racial microaggressions, we present an image and tell a story of geography spaces as oppressive and uncomfortable for geographers of color. We have argued in this paper that geography has not yet seriously considered this problem. Only after serious consideration can we move to the next step of how to address it. Ahmed (2007) reminds us that:

To respond to accounts of institutional whiteness with the question 'what can white people do?' is not only to return to the place of the white subject, but it is also to locate agency in this place (164).

Acknowledging whiteness in geography does not mean placing agency solely with white people in white spaces. People of color are in these spaces and the stories that we detail above are just a sample of stories reflecting the whiteness of this space.

If we were to offer some – albeit tentative – suggestions for geographers and geography departments, we would suggest actively listening to the above stories and then acknowledging the importance of gathering even more. We agree with Ahmed's (2007, 165) assertion that "if we want to know how things can be different too quickly, then we might not hear anything at all." Moreover, a desire to move quickly could indicate "resistance to hearing about racism" (2007, 165). We cannot desire to change what we have not adequately seen, felt, named, and discussed.

This research was difficult, but important. The subject matter is uncomfortable to talk about for us, the authors and our focus group participants. Yet any such difficulty or discomfort arguably pales in comparison to the 'mundane extreme environmental stress' (Carroll, 1999) geographers of color face on a daily basis when they go to work each day. We therefore ask our readers to carefully and reflexively listen to the narratives shared generously by geographers of color – stories of marginalization, humiliation, and alienation. Only then, can we collectively start to envision how geography can move from a place of dominant white space to a place of genuine inclusivity, diversity, and equal opportunity.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to thank the organizers and participants in the 2012 ‘Catalyzing Research on Geographies of Broadening Participation’ scholarly retreat for our productive time together, and for giving us time and space to meet one another. We also received a small grant to support this research from the National Science Foundation via the Association of American Geographers, for which we are thankful. We would also like to thank focus group participants at the 2012 *Race, Ethnicity and Place Conference* for agreeing to share their candid and often painful stories with us. Finally, we appreciate and want to acknowledge Katherine McKittrick’s thoughtful, insightful and thorough review of this article.

References

- Ahmed, S. 2007. A phenomenology of whiteness. *Feminist Theory*, 8(2): 149-168.
- Baerwald, T.J. 2007. President’s column: The interdisciplinary opportunity. AAG newsletter, 42(7): 3. Retrieved November 10, 2014
<http://www.aag.org/galleries/presidents-columns/PresBaerwald200778.pdf>
- Berg, L. D. 2012. Geographies of identity I: Geography–(neo) liberalism–white supremacy. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(4), 508-517.
- Carroll, G. 1999. *Environmental Stress and African Americans*. Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Clark, D. Anthony et al. 2011. Documenting Weblog Expressions of Racial Microaggressions that Target American Indians, *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*.
- Collins, P.H. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Collins, P. H. 1999. Producing the mothers of the nation: Race, class and contemporary US population policies. *Women, citizenship and difference*, 118-29.
- Crenshaw, K. 1995. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*. New York: The New Press.
- Cronon, B. 1992. A Place for Stories: Nature, History and Narrative. *Journal of American History*. 78(4): 1347-1376.
- Davis, D., Dorsey, J. K., Franks, R. D., Sackett, P. R., Searcy, C. A., & Zhao, X. 2013. Do Racial and Ethnic Group Differences in Performance on the MCAT Exam Reflect Test Bias?. *Academic Medicine*, 88(5), 593-602.
- Delaney, D. 1999. *Race, Place and the Law: 1836-1948*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Delaney, D. 2002. "The Space that Race Makes." *The Professional Geographer*. 54(1): 6-14.
- Delgado, R. and J. Stefancic. 2002. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: NYU Press.
- Ford, T. C. 2012. You Betta Werk!: Professors Talk Style Politics The Feminist Wire (blog) August 28, 2012 <http://thefeministwire.com/2012/08/you-betta-werk-professors-talk-style-politics/>
- Frankenberg, R. 1993. *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fanon, F 1986. *Black Skin, White Masks*. London, Pluto Press
- Gilmore, R. 2002. Fatal Couplings of Power and Discipline: Notes on Racism and Geography. *The Professional Geographer*. 54(1): 15-24.
- Goldberg, D.T. 2001. *The Racial State*. Indiana: Wiley Blackwell.
- Gomez, Mary Louise. 2011. Microaggressions in graduate students' lives: How they are encountered and their consequences, Teaching and teacher education.
- Hayes-Conroy, A. and Hayes-Conroy, J. 2010. Visceral Difference: Variations in Feeling Slow Food. *Environment and Planning A*. 42(12) 2956 – 2971
- Hayes-Conroy, J., & Hayes-Conroy, A. 2010. Visceral geographies: mattering, relating, and defying. *Geography compass*, 4(9), 1273-1283.
- Hayes-Conroy, A. 2010. Feeling Slow Food: Visceral fieldwork and symmetrical research relations in the alternative food movement. *Geoforum*. 41(5) 734-742
- Hayes-Conroy, A. and Martin, D. G. 2010. Mobilizing Bodies: Visceral identification in the Slow Food Movement. *Trans. Inst British Geography*. NS 35 269–281
- hooks, bell. 2008. Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination. in *The Cultural Geography Reader* (edited by: Timothy Oaks and Patricia Price). New York: Routledge.
- Joshi, S. Forthcoming. Postcoloniality and the North-South binary revisited: the case of India's climate politics. *International Handbook of Political Ecology*. Raymond Bryant ed. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Kobayashi, A. and L. Peake. 2000. Racism out of Place: Thoughts on Whiteness and an Anti-racist Geography in the New Millennium. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 90(2): 392-403.
- Kobayashi, A. 1999. Race and Racism in the Classroom: Some Thoughts on Unexpected Moments. *Journal of Geography*. 98(4) 179-182.

- Kobayashi, A. 2013. Critical “race” approaches. *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, 57-72.
- Kupenda, A. M 2012. Facing Down the Spooks (essay), in book, *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*, Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. Gonzalez, and Angela P. Harris, eds. Utah State University Press
- Lazos, S. R. 2012. Are Student Teaching Evaluations Holding Back Women and Minorities?: The Perils of “Doing” Gender and Race in the Classroom in *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*, Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. Gonzalez, and Angela P. Harris, eds. Utah State University Press pp.164-185
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Lipsitz, G. 1995. The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: Racialized Social Democracy and the White Problem in American Studies. *American Quarterly*. 47(3): 369-387.
- McCann, E.J. 1999. Race, Protest and Public Space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S. City. *Antipode*. 31(2): 163-184.
- McKittrick, K. 2006. *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle*: Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McKittrick, K. and C. Woods. 2007. *Black Geographies and the Politics of Place*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- McKittrick, K. 2011. On plantations, prisons, and a black sense of place. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(8), 947-963.
- Misgav, C., & Johnston, L. 2014. Dirty dancing: the (non) fluid embodied geographies of a queer nightclub in Tel Aviv. *Social & Cultural Geography*, (ahead-of-print), 1-17.
- Morrison, T. 1992. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Omi, Michael and Winant, H. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. (2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.
- Peake, Linda and Schein, R. 2000. “Racing geography into the new millennium: studies of Race and North American geographies.” *Social and Cultural Geography*. 1(2): 133-142.
- Peet, R. 1985. “The social origins of environmental determinism.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 75(3): 309-333.
- Pierce, C. M. (Ed.). 1978. *Television and education*. Sage.
- Price, P. 2010. “At the crossroads: critical race theory and critical geographies of race.” *Progress in human Geography*. 34(2): 147-174.

- Rockquemore, Kerry Ann. 2012. Will You Be My Mentor? National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity. June newsletter.
- Sandercock, L. 1995. Voices from the Borderlands: A Mediation on a Metaphor. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14, 77-88.
- Sandercock, L. 2003. Out of the Closet: The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice. *Planning Theory and Practice* 14, 11-28.
- Slocum, R. 2006. Anti-racist Practice and the Work of Community Food Organizations. *Antipode*. 38(2): 327-349.
- Solorzano, D. et al. 2000. Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate: The Experiences of African American College Students, *The Journal of Negro Education*.
- Stone-Mediatore, S. 2002. *Reading Across Borders: Storytelling and Know ledges of Resistance*. New York, NY, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sue, D. W. et al. 2007. Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life, *American Psychologist*
- Sweet, E. L., & Escalante, S. O. 2014. Bringing bodies into planning: Visceral methods, fear and gender violence. *Urban Studies*, online first 0042098014541157. 1-20
- Tuan, Y.F. 1991. Language and the Making of Place: A Narrative-Descriptive Approach. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 81(4). 684-696.
- Waite, G. 2014. Bodies that sweat: the affective responses of young women in Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 21(6), 666-682.
- Wang, J. et al. 2011. When the Seemingly Innocuous “Stings”: Racial Microaggressions and their Emotional Consequences, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Wilson, B. 1999. Teaching race in Geography: The Uses of Historical Analysis. 98(4) 182-185.
- Yosso, T. J. et al. 2009. Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate for Latina/o Undergraduates, *Harvard Educational Review*.