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Abstract

Discourses around the exclusions of racialized and Indigenous students from schooling often follow familiar scripts of deficiency that perpetuate white supremacist and colonial logics. Policy-driven attempts to address inequities in schooling have not led to transformative change. Instead, through the institutionalization of multiculturalism and 'inclusivity', the school site legitimizes the colonial state through depoliticizing Indigeneity and 'difference'. This thesis focuses on the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) as a site to analyze how white supremacy and colonization are legitimized and reproduced through schooling and the actions of white people. I employ Critical Discourse Analysis and anti-racist and anti-colonial theory to engage with Ontario Ministry of Education and TDSB policy and curriculum documents. This thesis considers ways to reconceptualize the purpose of schooling to dismantle the white supremacist and colonial status quo.
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Chapter One: Introduction

In the recent past, we have seen the incorporation of equity and anti-racism language into mainstream documents including organizational, governmental, and corporate policies (Ahmed, 2004, 2006; Dion, 2009; Dei, 2011; James, 2012). While the employment of terms like 'equity' and 'anti-racism' are now prevalent, this has not necessarily translated into progressive action or fundamental change. In fact, the institutionalization of these ideas, dependent on the way they are framed and talked about, can function to limit engagement with institutional and systemic racism and colonization. As Sara Ahmed (2006) argues, they often "work by not bringing about the effects that they name" (918, italics in original). Put differently, the existence of these speech acts is often considered to represent success in bringing about what they name. As such, claims to anti-racism can, ironically, prevent or limit the conversation about white supremacy and colonization. This is important since widespread misuse, especially through cooptation and institutionalization, can change how people understand these terms. Furthermore, what is at stake is not only a shifting definition but also the declawing or sanitizing of complex and important tools of resistance. Before discussing these ideas further, however, the following section acknowledges my goals in pursuing these arguments as well as how I fit in to the conversation to which I wish to contribute.

Learning Objectives and Positionality

The ideas presented in the following chapters, that white people are inherently racist as a result of the ways white supremacy relies on white bodies, may contribute to our understanding of a disconcerting trend. It has been acknowledged that people have tacitly accepted that racism exists without the presence of racists (Bonilla-Silva 2006). By creating an absence of historical context and defining experiences of racism to the presence or absence of individual acts, white people are able to
reaffirm their dominant position and, while perhaps accepting that racism exists in problematic moments, are not confronted with their own complicities (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). In addition, in the context of schooling, white supremacy and the colonial state are supported by curriculum documents, policies, and how teachers take up these documents in classrooms. Conceptualizing white supremacy as existing and sustained in a vacuum, without the active participation and acceptance of white people, serves only to salve white people's conscience. I argue that we can still talk about the many interconnected systems in place that function to sustain white supremacy but that we must also address how these systems conscript and rely on a consistent and continuous acceptance by white bodies, in this case, white teachers. I do not claim this as a new idea. I know that people engaged in anti-racism activist work are well aware of the ways in which white bodies reproduce white supremacy in a multitude of ways regardless of the presence or absence of "equity" policies (Trask, 1991; Razack, 2000; Srivastava, 2005).

For people engaged in the kind of work that refutes white supremacy and colonization in schooling, it can be difficult to assert criticisms of white people's practices for at least two reasons. First, white people often respond with anger when confronted with these criticisms. These encounters can be both dangerous and emotionally and physically draining. Furthermore, for teachers, school administrators, and peers, there is always the risk of formal and professional repercussions when challenging white supremacy in the institutionalized setting. Secondly, it is difficult to tell a student or teacher that what they are saying or doing, especially as it pertains to their lived experiences, is not legitimate or is incorrectly framed. In essence, these actions and the arguments that legitimate them rely on the maintenance of a subordinated identity as not white. This paper is based on the understanding that it must be the responsibility of white people to work through their own complicities and to compel other white people to do the same and challenge white supremacy as it is claimed and perpetuated by white bodies.
With these points in mind, this project is based on three fundamental learning objectives. The objectives are developed as a starting point for conversations regarding the need for a different approach to anti-racism work for white people. They come in response to the prevalence of literature produced by white writers that function to recentre whiteness and the ways in which some white people approach anti-racism work that can derail the work at hand. The learning objectives are as follows:

1. To complicate the distinction often articulated in the literature between white supremacy as a system of oppression and white people as actors.
2. To understand how white supremacy is maintained and reinscribed through white bodies within Toronto District School Board schooling practices.
3. To consider possible alternative approaches to schooling that does not support or foster white supremacy and the continuation of the colonial state.

The learning objectives outlined above inform the research questions for this study. Given my employment of anti-racist theory, this project is intended to be transformative. Thus, I offer a few plausible alternatives that demand complicity be something to be mindful of rather than something to seek exemption from. The following questions are motivated by the certainty that there is a role that white people must play in anti-racist and anti-colonial work and that theorizing complicity can contribute to the development of beneficial and productive modes of engagement with this work. Thus, the questions are conceptualized as follows:

1. How does white supremacy function through white bodies, particularly in schooling?
2. What are the implications of this relationship on the role of white people and how we work with Anti-racism and Anti-colonial education?
3. What are the transformative possibilities of developing frameworks of engagement with this relationship of complicity in mind?

In order to pursue a project like this, it is important to first locate myself. My point of departure is that of a white person whose involvement with an anti-racist tutoring group brought to the forefront a number of uncomfortable truths about my role in the perpetuation of white supremacy. Over the course of the past four years, I was required to consider my motivations and privileges in pursuing degrees in International Relations and Latin American Studies as well as my intentions in coming to the tutoring program in the first place. My commitment to the program, a result of the sense of community I was starting to feel as well as an understanding that the questions I was being asked were of fundamental importance, has prompted a critical reexamination of my actions in various spaces. Dissatisfaction with myself as well as observations of other white people who claim to do anti-racism work is the driving force behind this work.

This project is crucial to me in a very personal way. This past year, the tutoring program previously mentioned ceased to exist after many months of limited support and funding as well as internal political divides. I have found its demise to be demoralizing and disillusioning and as a result, I have disengaged from the activist work I had previously been committed to. In the recent months, I have allowed my own anxieties over the complications with involving myself as a white person in anti-racism work to take precedent over the importance of the work and the contributions I could potentially make. In many ways this project is reflective of an internal conversation with myself to move beyond this counterproductive paralysis. In this way, by centring myself and my own anxieties, I reproduce the very approach to anti-racism work that I seek to critique. However, what is included in this project is my attempt to continue to write through this stasis hoping to find a way to trust myself in these engagements while fostering the humility necessary to continue learning.
**White supremacy and Implicit Racism**

I seek to theorize a useful starting point for white bodies engaging in Anti-racism and Anti-colonial work based on an understanding of complicity and the ways white bodies become, willingly or not, agents of white supremacy in the world. Acknowledging that white supremacy functions through white bodies runs counter to much of the literature that creates a distinction between white supremacy as a concept and the role of white people, both individually and collectively. This semantic divide is important since the framework under which we approach and understand anti-racism and anti-colonial work in schooling has material effects on the nature of engagement and our ability to imagine different possibilities. My goal is to motivate in white people a lifelong, sustained, and ever-critical engagement with anti-racism praxis based on the understanding that white bodies, considering the ways in which white supremacy is maintained and reinforced through them, are implicitly racist. This thesis considers the ways in which the colonial state and white supremacy function through white bodies and how white bodies are constantly conscripted to further these projects taking the schooling site as an example. I see the development of a sense of obligation as a result of this process and the knowledge that we will always be implicated as a useful starting point for engagement in this work. I propose this in opposition to frameworks often employed by white people that are motivated by quests for exemption or redemption. This work often relies on an understanding of racism in terms of individual acts and problematic beliefs (Goldstein, 2001; Aveling, 2004; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, and Campbell, 2005). If white people can acknowledge that they will always be implicated as a result of the ways colonization and white supremacy function through them, then the work is never done. This is not intended to imply that the work is fruitless or hopeless but rather to attempt to guard against the slippage into acceptance of white supremacy that is all too easy. As such, if white bodies are inherently racist, and white supremacy is constantly reaffirmed through white bodies, white people must be ever vigilant in critical self-reflection. We
must learn to acknowledge and work with our limitations rather than trying to work around or through them since this pursuit is often self-serving and frivolous.

**Multiculturalism and the Construction of the Colonial Nation-State**

Schools are an important site of social reproduction where students are expected to learn the skills deemed necessary to contribute to the state. As such, these sites provide an important case study to question how the state and its actors define and regulate 'good' citizenship as well as work to maintain the status quo through schooling practices.

The racial boundaries of 'Canadian-ness' are closely guarded, particularly through the performance of white supremacy in state institutions such as high schools. As Bannerji (2000) states, "Europeanness as 'whiteness'...translates into 'Canada' and provides it with its imagined community" (24). The ability to *be* Canadian becomes dependent on conforming to white, middle-class norms but more fundamentally, on being white. Whiteness then becomes a central identifier to Canadian-ness and all bodies read outside this parameter are excluded in some way from membership. In relation to this, Carl James (2009) recounts stories from African-Caribbean Canadians of instances in which their belonging was questioned through inquiries constructed as "innocent": "'Where are you from?' or 'Which island are you from?'... 'You must be from the islands. Aren't you?'" (103). This line of questioning serves to re-establish, primarily through white bodies, who can be unquestionably Canadian and who remains "characterized as 'outsiders' or 'foreigners'" (James, 2009, p. 103). The delineation of membership holds material rewards and penalties for white individuals, such as ease of access to services conferred as privileges of citizenship, and sustains the conceptualization of 'Canadian' as a white body.

Multiculturalism, which holds currency in the Canadian schooling system and has spawned many policies, has marketed a restrictive tolerance as “acceptance” thus reconstituting whiteness as
central within Canada. As Arat-Koc (2005) articulates, there are graduations of belonging. Citing Hage (1998), Arat-Koc summarizes the distinction between *passive belonging* and *governmental belonging* stating that the former "involves 'feeling at home' in the nation" while the latter "also entails 'the power to have a legitimate view as to who should feel at home' in the nation" (41).

Considering the types of inquiries white bodies are exempt from, we can observe that this distinction between types of belonging reflects racial lines and there are "two colours in this political atlas - one a beige-brown shading off into black and the other white" (Bannerji 2000 24). Bannerji (2000) points to the state's "mania for naming the 'others'" (25) as serving this function. Through the process of naming racialized peoples as other than Canadian, the state extends "its governing and administrative jurisdiction into civil society, while, at the same time, incorporating the everyday person into the national project" (Bannerji, 2000, p. 25). Similarly, Mahtani (2002) turns attention to white people’s preoccupation with identifying, and classifying, racialized peoples' ethnic background. The state's 'mania' with creating a linguistic difference between "capital C-Canadians" (Mahtani 2002) and hyphenated Canadians is mirrored and performed daily with and through white bodies. At key moments, the limitations of Canadian multiculturalism and the investment in keeping Canada white are betrayed through discourses around immigration (Li, 2001; 2003), citizenship practices, and meritocracies in schooling (Dei, 1997, 1999; James, 2012), the workplace (Galabuzi, 2006; Das Gupta, 1996), and access to social goods (Man, 2002; Villegas, 2013).

The development of official multiculturalism, the Canadian schooling system, and the entrenchment of the colonial state are closely linked and mutually constitutive. In fact, by focusing on aspects of the historical development of the Canadian manifestation of multiculturalism that are often overlooked and quickly dismissed by the state and many white people, we can see how these policies and rhetoric function to sustain the colonial state.
The origins of 'official' multiculturalism can be traced to the Canadian state's anxieties over a growing separatist movement in Québec (Arzad-Ayaz 2011). Adopted under Trudeau in 1971, the Multicultural Act asserts that "there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other" (Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada 1985, 15). Eva Mackey (1999), however, has traced the myth of national tolerance and multiculturalism to long before the advent of the 1971 Act. One of its early manifestations, the Royal Proclamation of 1763, betrays the hidden motives of the state in rolling out certain policies that then get taken up as indicative of Canada's predisposition towards tolerance and 'fairness' (Mackey, 23). The 1763 Proclamation, for example, claims to have mandated that the "Canadian governments would treat Aboriginal peoples 'as autonomous and self-governing peoples'" (23). As Mackey states, however, the policy in fact "granted certain land rights in the western areas of North America to Native peoples, with the aim of preventing Westward expansion of the American colonists" (27). The benefit lay in pushing British settlers coming from the soon-be-United States into the formerly French colony so as to dilute the cultural significance of the French settlers and the Catholic Church.

If we consider that the colonial state is challenged regularly through the resistance of Indigenous communities and peoples as well as in anti-racist and anti-colonial activism, present-day state policies that speak to a national identity can be assumed to serve a function other than their stated intent. This skepticism concerning multiculturalism as it relates to schooling is reinforced when considering the origins of the Canadian schooling system, established in part to solidify British cultural supremacy through the implementation of the residential school system. Beverly Jacobs (2008) speaks to the genocidal project of residential schooling, whereby young Indigenous peoples were removed from their families and communities, in which "the transference of traditional
knowledge and languages was directly impacted and replaced with a violent cycle of abuse" (223)\(^1\).

As evidenced by the recent elimination of many language revitalization programs that seek to counter some of the violence inflicted by these schools as well as resource exploitation and continued land theft, the state maintains a vested interest in the continuation of the colonial status quo and the elimination of Indigenous resistance (Jacobs, 2008; Mackey, 2013). As Ng (1999) states, the role of schooling in producing hierarchies of difference along racial, gendered, and class lines is evident in the practices of residential schooling as "it had a two-fold purpose: to make the "Indians" into dutiful and loyal subjects of the Crown and to prepare them to adopt a new mode of production" (54). This mode of production includes creating particular relations to the means of production that support the capitalist enterprise; Native men as physical laborers and Native women as domestic workers. The continuation of these gendered, racial, and class divisions in labor suggest that this project is ongoing.

With this backdrop in mind, how does the current schooling system play a role in maintaining racial hierarchies and the colonial state? Eva Mackey (1999), as previously mentioned, points to the importance for states to manage populations in order to eliminate the threat associated with resistance practices that name and challenge white supremacist and Anglo-colonial practices. Furthermore, Sara Ahmed (2006) points to the tendency of institutions to adopt the language of equity in order to quiet their critics in a way that robs critical approaches of their transformative elements. This phenomenon is particularly dangerous as policies that are symbolic in nature, or 'non-performative', are often intended to quell resistance to the white supremacist schooling project. As such, the adoption of a number of multicultural, or 'race relations', programs by the Toronto school boards, which came in response to parents and community members naming the failure of schools to

\(^1\) See also Chrisjohn and Young, 2006.
address the needs of racialized students, must be considered with scrutiny. As James (1995b) observes, within these programs:

race was acknowledged, but not in terms of how racial groups' educational outcomes are a consequence of structural inequalities... racism due to racial difference was seen to be the consequence of ignorance, and racial minority students' lack of success was a result of racial tension and lack of role models in the society generally, and in school and learning materials in particular (37)

In the process of institutionalization, the acknowledgement of the structural aspects of racism were written out of 'equity' policies and, "while the documents recognize the Eurocentric nature of current education programs, they do not suggest that this must be interrogated in order to bring about equity in the curricula" (James, 38). The explicit project of cultural genocide through assimilation and derogation of Indigenous knowledges in concert with the reticence of the Toronto school boards to adopt Anti-racism and anti-colonial educational policies points to the ways in which schooling continues to reproduce social oppressions. As Ng (1993) states, formal "education played a central role in the entrenchment of racist and sexist ideologies... [it] has always served as an assimilationist tool" (54). Furthermore, in concert with capitalist needs of the state, schooling plays the role of conditioning individuals, along the lines of race, gender, and class, for particular economic roles (Ng, 1999, Dei, 2010). This is most clearly observed in the practices of streaming high school students according to perceived ability and aptitude (Mizra 1998).

**Overview of Context**

In this section, I outline some information relevant to schooling in Ontario and the Toronto District School Board (TDSB). I situate this work within this location as I am most familiar with it after working with students in the process of navigating it. Furthermore, the TDSB is "the largest and
one of the most diverse school boards in Canada" (Toronto District School Board, 2014). On account of its size and 'diversity', it is often thought to provide a roadmap for smaller and perhaps more conservative school boards, particularly when it comes to 'race relations' and multiculturalism policies. The TDSB also falls under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Ministry of Education, which "administers the system of publicly funded elementary and secondary school education in Ontario" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014). These two bodies provide the policies and curriculum documents on which schooling procedures rest.

The Ontario Ministry of Education heads approximately 4,891 schools across 72 school boards\(^2\) (Ministry of Education, 2014). Within this ministry, the TDSB is responsible for nearly 600 schools that serve approximately 259,000 students per year (TDSB, 2014). As such, the TDSB represents a significant portion of the Ministry of Education for Ontario's students. This is largely the result of the merging of a number of separate school boards in 1997 under Bill 104, "a cost-cutting measure that would allow for the drastic reduction in democratically elected trustees" (Dei and Karumanchery, 1999). The effects of these cuts are multiple and represent the entrenchment of neoliberalism in schooling in Ontario (Basu, 2004; Dei and Karumanchery, 1999).

Despite its size after these changes, the TDSB is still subject to the Ministry requirements. The requirements to obtain an Ontario Secondary School diploma (OSSD), for example, are outlined by the Ministry limiting the amount of control school boards and individual schools have over the types of courses they can offer students. Academic requirements for graduation include: four English courses, one French, three Math, two sciences, one Canadian geography, and one Canadian history course (Ministry, 2014). This list is not exhaustive and there are a number of electives from which students can choose (depending on what is offered at their school), but the subjects that are

\(^2\) Data for 2012-13 is preliminary.
mandatory suggest a hierarchy of importance according to the Ministry. In this thesis, I focus on two curriculum documents that inform a number of classes on related topics; first, Canadian and World Studies Grade 11-12 and second, Native Studies Grades 11-12. The first document applies to a mandatory course, Canadian history, and the second to Native Studies, an elective.

The relative positioning of these two classes (one mandatory to teach and the other an elective) speaks to the ways the schooling system continues to marginalize Indigenous histories and knowledges and recentre a white Eurocentric curriculum. Furthermore, as I will elaborate on in the analysis in chapter four, while each document holds different content, there is an underlying approach to schooling in both that actively legitimizes the colonial state, particularly through the language of 'good citizenship'.

Finally, I look at three policy documents that have been produced that seek to address issues of racism and oppression in the schooling site, one by the TDSB and two by the Ministry. While the Ministry's document, titled "Realizing the Promise of Diversity" was published recently in 2009, the TDSB's "Equity Foundation" was released in 1999. The final document, "Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework" (FNMI) was released in 2007. What is interesting about looking at these documents comparatively is that they share certain commonalities as well as divergences, which are informative. In addition, the decade that separates the "Equity Foundation" document from the other two does not seem to have resulted in a dramatic effect on their content. In fact, looking at the concepts used though not necessarily the approach taken, the TDSB's document from 1999 holds more progressive ideas than the Ministry's from 2009. I consider this further in chapter four.

Organization of Chapters
This thesis is comprised of six chapters. In chapter two, I outline some relevant literature related to this project. I focus on the works of racialized peoples. This is a conscious choice intended to work against the propensity of whiteness studies to invisibilize the foundational works of racialized peoples and claim ideas as their own. Furthermore, this literature review is based on the idea that white people do not necessarily need to read about white people specifically to learn about themselves and their role in white supremacy. In fact, limiting the conversation in this way can facilitate the recentring of whiteness in conversations that are intended to disrupt the centrality of whiteness. I begin with the work of George Dei (1999) on the salience of race to understand the material effects that make race more than simply an imagined category as well as to elucidate my reasoning for focusing on race and white supremacy in the first place. I also outline some of the current manifestations of race in public and schooling discourse, particularly the "post-racial" moment and coded language. In addition, I draw on work of Roxanna Ng (1993) in theorizing the concept of race, class, and gender as relational, or as existing in relation to a white male middle class and heterosexual norm in order to point to the fluidity of these concepts and the ways in which this can shore up white supremacy. Next, I turn to some of the defensive responses of white teachers, teacher-candidates, and students when confronted with their complicity in systems of oppression. In this section, my goal is to elucidate some of the intellectual barriers erected by white people in the schooling context which are both accepted and supported by the systems in place and to trace the effects of maintaining these barriers on racialized and Indigenous students. Next, I draw on the work of Indigenous and anti-colonial theorists to understand better the implications of schooling within a colonial context, particularly the legacy of residential schooling.

Chapter three introduces the discursive frameworks I employ to understand the questions I seek to address. First, I work with the principles of Anti-Racism Education and Critical Anti-racism Theory articulated by George Dei (1996, 2013) and focus on a few that are of particular relevance to
this project. Prompting questions as to the purpose of schooling, the rationale for white male power in society, the role of spirituality and the importance of community-building praxis, the principles chosen are highlighted for their importance to the development of this particular project and how I understand it as potentially useful within the schooling context. Next, I draw on Roxanna Ng's (1999) theorization of race, class, and gender as relational categories rather than biological fact. Finally, I look at the work of Indigenous authors that point to the relationship between colonization and white supremacy as well as the ways that the state works with ideas of difference to divide people and communities and make resistance more difficult.

Chapter four introduces the argument that the schooling site is set up to create the conditions to sustain and benefit from white supremacy and colonization. I focus on a few policy and curriculum documents to illustrate how these systems are written into schools and the ways they are communicated to students. The policy documents brought into focus are the Ontario Ministry of Education (2009) "Realizing the Promise of Diversity: Ontario's Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy" and the Toronto District School Board (1999) "Equity Foundation". These two were chosen as they represent the foundational documents for equity and inclusive schooling initiatives at the local and provincial levels. In addition to these two policy documents, I look at a number of curriculum documents provided by the Ontario Ministry of Education as guidelines and expectations for teachers, including Native Studies (2000), English (2007), and Canadian and World Studies (2005). This chapter examines how the framing of the issues highlighted by equity and inclusivity initiatives are framed in policy and, subsequently, disregarded in curriculum. I suggest that the interplay between policy, curriculum, and pedagogy recreate and legitimize white supremacy and colonization.
In chapter five, I turn attention to the ways the interplay outlined in chapter four relies on and is sustained by the investment of white people. I focus on the ways white bodies reconstruct the racial lines around membership as well as present, accept, and are rewarded for performing white supremacy in interactions with the perceived "Other" in schooling. This chapter considers prevalent discourses such as those of liberal multiculturalism, meritocratic 'fairness', and the deficiency of racialized peoples and communities that are employed and accepted by white people to reinforce white supremacy. Rather than assuming the validity of claims to white innocence, chapter five examines the concept of 'racial memory', a process through which white people write themselves back into the racial narrative that structures their lives and are able to connect to moments, past, present, and future, in which their whiteness, and perceived superiority, is communicated to them (Simpson 36).

Finally, in the conclusion, this paper turns attention to the transformative possibilities suggested by acknowledging that white people invest in and sustain white supremacy and colonization. I argue that acknowledging the ways in which white supremacy necessarily functions through white bodies does not negate the possibility of white people engaging in anti-racism activism. Letting go of the futile individualistic quest for exemption from white privilege and redemption for wrongdoings can free up emotional and physical energy to further engage in activism while maintaining self-reflection. Recognizing the complications and implications of attempting anti-racism work in a white body can lead to hopelessness unless we come to understand that "all white people are moral actors in relation to race matters" (Wilmot, 26). When white bodies come to understand themselves as agents of white supremacy, unwilling agents perhaps but agents nonetheless, we are better able to address how our bodies continue to function in this manner and see the ways we can contribute to anti-racism activism.
**Chapter Two: Literature Review**

Considering that I am a white woman writing about race and white supremacy, it is often assumed that my work should contribute to the field of whiteness studies. However, it is important to remember that the field of whiteness studies rose to prominence in the late 1980s and gained prestige in large part through the work of white writers (Howard, 2009). To be certain, many of these writers, including the often-quoted Peggy McIntosh (1990) who is referenced at numerous points in this literature review, provide thought-provoking and influential additions. However, in the process of developing a new genre defined as “whiteness studies,” the work of racialized authors in theorizing whiteness are too often erased, overlooked, or coopted. While this project works with some ideas commonly expressed in whiteness studies, I do not feel it necessary to align the work as such. Rather than limit the conversation to a field dominated by white voices that often centers white people’s experiences, I look to the writings and analyses of racialized peoples to guide my exploration of how white supremacy functions through and with the complicity of white people, particularly in high school and undergraduate classrooms.

The literature discussed here encourages a theorization of race, colonization, and white supremacy that does not recreate an artificial distance often found in the literature of 'whiteness studies' between the maintenance of white supremacy and white bodies. I see this conceptual divide as potentially harmful since it abstracts the concept of white supremacy from white people and can function to excuse complacency and inaction (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Ahmed (2004) relates this to "how whiteness gets reproduced through being declared" (11). The act of naming does not eliminate racism automatically. In addition, the act of distancing, at least discursively, from racism does nothing to protect against the possibility of reproducing white supremacy. As such, knowing that acknowledgements are not sufficient to challenge white supremacy, particularly when the intent is to create distance between an individual and oppressive systems, "the task for white subjects would be
to stay implicated in what they critique, but in turning towards their role and responsibility in these histories of racism, as histories of this present, to turn away from themselves, and towards others" (58/59). The literature discussed here was chosen with these conversations in mind.

I begin with a brief and incomplete overview of the writings of a number of prominent racialized theorists on race, whiteness, and white people. At times, the references to whiteness are explicit but often I employ writings and theorizing on race and racialization to imagine the implications for white people. I believe this is important if we seek to disrupt the dominant idea that racism is fundamentally a problem for racialized people and not an issue for white people. Furthermore, I begin with the premise that white people do not necessarily need to read about white people specifically to learn about themselves and their role in white supremacy. Put differently, it is not a result of a lack of literature dealing with the white perspective that explains white people's lack of engagement with anti-racist praxis but an intellectual resistance to seeing ourselves in conversations about race. I consider the linkages between schooling, white supremacy, and colonization including the ways curriculum and pedagogic practices support these systems and reconstitute the status quo. In the following section, I spend some time summarizing perspectives on the racist and colonial curriculum and pedagogy advanced in mainstream schooling institutions. This work is responding to the acknowledgement that schools act as assimilationist and state-building tools. Finally, I analyze literature that focuses on classroom experiences including writings on white teachers, teacher candidates, and students as well as curriculum and pedagogy. In this section, I am interested, on the one hand, in how enactments of white supremacy are framed by those who are invested in its maintenance and the defensive reactions to material that names whiteness and engages with conversations about complicity. On the other hand, I am conscious of the ways that these projects can often work to recentre whiteness, refocus/prioritize the comfort of white people, and be counterproductive to efforts to develop anti-racist and anti-colonial pedagogies. Ultimately, however,
I am concerned with how the interplay of policy, curriculum, and pedagogy function to teach white privilege and sustain white supremacy.

**Race, Whiteness, and Schooling**

Foundational to the decision regarding what literature to include in this review is the belief in the necessity of what George Dei (1996, 2007) calls "salience of race". Anti-racism does not seek to erase the importance of intersecting modes of oppression (along the lines of gender, class, sexuality, etc.) but rather speaks to the saliency of race and its continued importance as an organizing principle in the context of a white supremacist colonial state such as Canada or the US. Acknowledging the salience of race requires that we work with the concept of race while also acknowledging it as a social and historical construct (Omi and Winant 1993). Though these practices may strategically essentialize identities, the goal of anti-racism is not to reify such identities but rather to challenge their white supremacist underpinnings. As Dei (1999) states, "the fluidity of social identities is at times unwittingly evoked to counter the salience of race in public and academic discussions" (18). In this paper, my aim is not to erase the complexity of identities and I acknowledge that 'white' for example, is a fluid and ever-changing social construction. However, I see the complication of white identity and in-group differentiation as most often used in ways that defend white privilege, white supremacy, and excuse the complicities of white peoples' whose identity as white is intersected with other forms of oppression.

The motivation for this approach, often accused of reinscribing race as a concept in a supposedly 'post-racial' context, stems from the understanding put forward by Omi and Winant (1993), quoted in Dei (1999), that "race is a fundamental principle of social organization and social relations in Euro-American contexts" (19). Furthermore, that race is often made secondary to discussions of class, gender, and other forms of oppression in "local, national, and global politics for equity and justice"
necessitate insisting on the saliency of race and prioritizing these conversations. Elaborating on the importance of talking race, George Dei (2006) argues that "those who speak about race do not create a problem that is nonexistent in the first place" (26). Instead, refusing to acknowledge and work with the saliency of race, the presence and implications of racialization and white supremacy, to claim to not see color, "is an insult to human intelligence" (26). This practice serves to reify and legitimize white supremacy, discredit the lived experiences of racialized peoples, and does not address the consequences of racism.

The 'post-racial' society, or denying the relevance of race in the present context, represent one prominent argument often presented to discourage anti-racism organizing, particularly in government and institutionalized settings. This is not to say, however, that those who present this argument do not also talk about and communicate racism. However, it is often coded in language that keeps white people comfortable as they are provided with ways to communicate white supremacy without ever naming race. Examples of the racializing phenomenon of unrelated concepts include, "words and phrases such as 'welfare mothers', 'criminals', 'foreigners', and 'immigrants'" (Dei 2006: 18).

In the context of government bodies, encoded terms for race "can be borrowed from a benign source such that the terms in themselves are commonly used and accepted" both before and after they take on racial tones in certain contexts (Li, 2007: 46). While there are many examples, I outline three that are particularly prominent. First, taking an example from the Department of Employment and Immigration, Peter Li (2007) notes the use of the phrase 'non-traditional' as a stand in for 'non-white' in immigration discourse. Coding racial language makes expressing negative sentiments towards racialized peoples and a perceived threat to white cultural norms both justifiable and socially acceptable (Li, 44). Second, race is also coded as socioeconomic status, or class, often communicated through references to "education, style of life,...residential location, consumptive
capacity" (Goldberg 1992: 547). However, as Goldberg (1992) states, "conceiving of race in terms of class is tendentious, for we are thus encouraged to identify race misleadingly as class" (548).

References to race coded in these terms that call on class distinctions often rely on classist discourses about the capacity and integrity of working class and poor peoples. Supported by the logic of liberal democratic capitalism that claims to present equal opportunities to all, this becomes a 'common sense' or justifiable way to communicate white supremacy. Third, race is coded as ethnicity or cultural difference. This example is particularly relevant to the Canadian schooling context since multiculturalism as official state policy is so present in the school system. Sherene Razack (2005) points to racism that has emerged post-911 directed as Muslims in the US and Canada, particularly in the name of feminism. Razack states that Islam has been characterized as "everything the West is not... fatally pre-modern, tribal, non-democratic, and religious" which has made explicit and implicit expressions of racism socially acceptable due to the perceived misogyny of Muslim communities (2005, 12). As these arguments and their ideological foundations are all related, it is not surprising that they inform and support each other mutually. Furthermore, and supporting the idea that white people consciously and intentionally invest in white supremacy, these encoded terms work because "there is a common understanding of codes being shared by people encoding and decoding the messages" (Li, 2007: 44).

The propensity of talking race without naming it makes it easier for white people to claim innocence when confronted with their role in perpetuating racism. bell hooks discusses why she uses the term 'white supremacy' to refer to the current manifestations of racism in Talking Back (1989). She finds this terminology useful as it refuses to accept liberal white people's "fail[ure] to understand how they can and/or do embody white-supremacist values and beliefs even though they may not embrace racism as prejudice or domination" (113). bell hooks (1989) calls out white people who may be willing to deal with personal acts of discrimination, or speak coded racism, but refuse to address
systemic and institutionalized white supremacy. As observed by Philip Howard (2008), the unwillingness of liberal whites outlined by hooks is evidenced by much of the work produced in whiteness studies that seeks solutions through educational initiatives or 'sensitivity training' aimed at eliminating interpersonal and individualized racism.

As articulated by Fanon in (1967), another aspect of white supremacy is the understanding that "a given society is racist or it is not" (85). Such a formulation allows us to clearly define a racist society rather than employing gradations or meaningless comparisons to other spaces. For example, it is common to hear racism spoken of as a case of ignorance that is endemic to white working class communities or tied to elitist ideals, namely levels of formalized schooling. This view of racism that imagines it does not exist is middle class white communities again suggests the solution lies in educational initiatives solely, particularly directed at people without university education. However, as Deliovsky (2010), summarizing Dreema Moon (1999), points out, the practice of deferring charges of racism on to the working class is a "well-documented bourgeois strategy" (85). This tactic excuses the more insidious forms of racism that white people are often most reluctant to recognize and dismantle, namely institutional and systemic forms of white supremacy. While explicit acts of racism may be more easily identified and accepted as abhorrent, initiatives that seek to address them do not necessarily grapple with the broader systems that facilitate racist attitudes and maintain white supremacy. In relation to schooling, the inclusion of 'multicultural' and Native studies units and lessons is often talked about as though it represents the end of racism and the resolution of colonization though these classes rarely address systemic and institutional forms of racism nor do they compel students to acknowledge their positionality in these relation to colonized land. As Ahmed (2012) states, refusing to accept that these initiatives represent an end to racism or the negative effects of colonization often comes with negative consequences. Those who challenge systems of colonization and white supremacy, particularly if they are Indigenous or racialized, are
seen to be "a breach in the happy image of diversity", or as 'being the problem' (Ahmed 2012: 152). This is perhaps especially true in the schooling context where white students are considered innocent and in need of protection from difficult and messy conversations.

Talking about race is constructed as a dangerous endeavor as it disrupts the belief of Canada as a harmonious and diverse society. Furthermore, conversations that would acknowledge the "pigmented passport" of whiteness are often considered to be too controversial or potentially damaging to white students, a reasoning that ignores the effects on racialized students of the absence of these conversations (Johal, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2007). In these debates, as previously touched upon, it is common to hear the distinction made between whiteness and white supremacy as systems of oppression and white people as individuals. However, as Leonardo (2004) argues, in order for white supremacy to be imposed, white people must invest in it (143). While I do not mean to suggest that only white people are conscripted into white supremacist projects, as Howard (2009) points out, "ultimately, the domination of nonwhites, whether by whites or other nonwhites, always works in favor of the racially dominant and the maintenance of existing mainstream hierarchies of race, which position whites at the top "(42). This is the case for curriculum materials, pedagogy, as well as within personal interactions.

Perhaps the most obvious manifestation of white supremacy in schooling is the centering of white people and white knowledges in all aspects of curriculum. White students’ identities and values are reaffirmed in the pages of history books, course syllabi of English classes, sciences, geography, and math classes. Often claiming a 'colour-blind' approach, there is an implicit assumption as to whose knowledges, histories, and theories are valued. Furthermore, through the "Europeanization" of schooling and curriculum, as Mohanram (1999) states in relation to the construction of space, Europeans (white bodies) come to see themselves as the “Universal Subject,”
legitimate in all spaces and disciplines (in relation to their presence and participation) and able to move freely between them (Mohanram 15). Racialized peoples, on the other hand, are seen to be stuck in a mythic place of 'origin' or within particular disciplines and career paths. White bodies, by accepting and investing in their universality, gain and retain their sense of humanity through schooling. How curriculum and the purpose of schooling are framed effects how white students come to 'see' themselves in the material and understand the historical contexts that produced them.

Tied to this refusal by the institutions and those who are invested in maintaining the status quo, many teachers and white students invest in the idea of a meritocratic, 'fair' system of competition for grades, academic achievements, and the rewards they confer (Schick and St. Denis, 2003; Solomon, Portelli, at al., 2005). An example of the way that white supremacy functions through white bodies is the practice of streaming students in terms of perceived ability and imagined possible educational and career outcomes (James, 1995: 36). The dominant investment in the idea of meritocracy legitimizes higher rates of enrolment in university level classes and, by extension, universities while the absence of racialized people is naturalized and constructed as "common sense." Subscribing to this argument necessitates an acceptance of white supremacy in relation to schooling by white bodies. The meritocratic assumptions about the nature of schooling naturalize the racist results and hinder the possibility of critical engagement.

**Students, Teachers, and Teacher-candidates**

The concept of *racial memory* can be useful in disrupting some of the assumptions often made by white people about the racial neutrality of their lives and experiences. Defined by Simpson (2006), "racial memory, most simply, is how we remember race" (36). Through racial memory, white people write themselves back into the racial narrative that structures their lives and are able to connect to moments, past, present, and future, in which their whiteness, and perceived superiority,
is communicated to them. Through this process, we can better articulate the role of schooling in teaching white supremacy to students and teachers. However, there are numerous ways in which white people intellectually resist acknowledging racism. In this section, I outline literature that relates to the discourses of denying white supremacy within classrooms as well as a reluctance to acknowledging how race effects the lived experiences of students and teachers. The purpose of this section is to consider strategies used by white people to defend against challenges to white privilege and the consequences of these strategies. Barriers to anti-racist and anti-colonial education are significant and deeper understanding of the intellectual underpinning of them may facilitate work to dismantle them.

Pedro A. Noguera (2008) speaks to some contemporary discourses around the relationship between race and academic achievement in the U.S. He critiques authors that "attribute the lower performance of Black students generally, and the middle class in particular, to an ‘oppositional culture’, ‘anti-intellectualism,’ and ‘a culture of victimology’ "(132). The fact that these theories that "locate the cause of the problem within students" (Noguera 132) and communities have gained traction in educational discourse speaks to an acceptance of racist and essentialist interpretations of students and communities of colour and an unwillingness to engage with systemic and institutionalized white supremacy in schooling. These discourses are often employed in relation to Indigenous peoples and communities as well (Hookimaw-Witt, 1998). Fundamental to these denials is a belief that race and colonization are not influential in the lives of either students or teachers. This can manifest in a number of ways, a few of which are outlined by authors below.

In the Canadian context, Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, and Campbell (2005), speak to the barriers in implementation of anti-racist education in classrooms still largely taught by white women and the naiveté of assuming teacher training will be sufficient to fundamentally disrupt white supremacist schooling practices. The authors examine the responses of 200 teacher candidates to
reading Peggy McIntosh's famous article, "White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack". The authors identify three prominent strategies used by these students to avoid addressing whiteness: first, ideological incongruence; second, liberalist notions of individualism and meritocracy; and third, the negation of white capital. Of particular relevance to this project is the concept of ideological incongruence, which underpins many of the defensive strategies used by white people to deny white privilege, and facilitates the investment in the myth of meritocracy. To Solomon et al, (2005) ideological incongruence "refers to the dilemma experienced by individuals when their ideological or belief sets are incompatible" (153). In many ways, the concept mirrors Susan Dion's (2009) explanation of the scaffolding of ideas that structure her teacher-participants responses to the curriculum she presents. Solomon et al (2005) use the example of someone who theoretically agrees with employment equity but is unwilling to accept programs that would see it implemented. Those who can agree in theory to equity policies may be no closer to accepting the reality that there are consequences for white people when employment equity is established, namely the loss of privilege (Noguera, 2008). The ideological incongruence of acknowledging a lack of employment equity while maintaining a belief in the existence of meritocracy can lead to claims of 'reverse discrimination' and the assumption that those who hold positions as a result of equity policies are less qualified than their white counterparts. These strategies, amongst others, "can be used to ensure the maintenance of their initial belief set" (154). In relation to schooling, many white people's 'initial belief set' rests on white supremacist assumptions about the capabilities and motivation of racialized and Indigenous peoples, and the meritocratic values of education. Ideological incongruence must be grappled with if we are to commit to anti-racist and anti-colonial action rather than simply paying lip service.

There are many different mechanisms used by white people to reject the implications of white supremacy and the role that schools play in its reproduction. R. Patrick Solomon and Beverly-Jean M. Daniel (2007) speak to some of the specificities of discourses of denial in the Canadian context of
teacher education. The authors draw from responses of pre-service teachers in a "diverse" Canadian university. Participants were not exclusively white though data is not provided on the percentage identified as racialized or Indigenous. The authors identify two themes in the students' responses; "not here in Canada!", and "discourses of competing oppressions, which centres gender and class, while decentring race" (164). The first discourse relates to dominant beliefs of Canadian exceptionalism relating to equality and human rights. As such, the ways that Canada markets itself internationally as well as locally and the claims to multiculturalism prevent a discussion of white supremacy and colonization within these state borders. Such an argument posits that Canada exists within a post-racial moment and any claims to the contrary are unfounded and cynical. Furthermore, the discourse of exceptionalism forgets the historic and mutually sustaining relationship between the Canadian state, colonization, and white supremacy. In relation to the second point, as mentioned above, race is often made secondary to conversations of gender and class, which are more acceptable lines of social critique particularly considering that teachers in Canada continue to be "overwhelmingly White, female, and middle-class"(168). Within this context, white middle class women may be able to recognize the structural inequities in today’s society based on class differences and widespread sexism but unwilling to recognize both the presence of white supremacy as well as the ways that they are implicated in such systems. As previously stated, I do not suggest that capitalist exploitation along the lines of class, patriarchy and sexism, and other intersecting forms of oppression should be minimized or forgotten. Instead, the prevalence of discourses that ignore the saliency of race and refuse to acknowledge that the colonial state continues suggest that this phenomenon is more than incidental.

Sarita Srivastava (2005) outlines a number of ways in which the emotional responses of white women to challenges to their privilege and sense of self as 'not racist' can derail anti-racist organizing. While she does not deal specifically with individuals involved in schooling, Srivastava’s
findings are important and informative in theorizing the schooling condition, particularly given that white women make up a numerical majority amongst teachers and that many articulate their motivation within humanitarian frameworks of 'helping' others (Solomon et al, 2005; Dion, 2009). Srivastava focuses on the nature of responses within seemingly progressive spaces of feminist organizing, generally populated by white women. While Srivastava at times focuses on white people in looking at their resistance to acknowledging race in a meaningful and transformative way, her critiques of white women, often articulated by women of colour, are telling and important to building solidarity. For example, she illuminates some of the problematic aspects of emotional expression and empathy as expressed by white women towards women of colour. As Vijaya, an interviewee, observes, "white women cry all the fucking time, and women of colour never cry" (Srivastava, 42). Srivastava articulates the issue with emotional expressions such as those being referenced, either in response to hearing experiences of racism or in coming to terms with their complicity, not to mention the emotional labour expected in the aftermath; it does nothing to further the actual work of anti-racist organizing. Oftentimes, white women who seek to engage with anti-racist work "move toward deeper self-examination rather than toward organized change" (31). As Srivastava's work points out, there must be a self-consciousness in expressing the difficulty associated with acknowledging complicity since it can work to derail anti-racist organizing and is another way in which white people enact white privilege by taking up space. This is not to dissuade self-reflection, which is necessary for maintaining respectful and productive engagement, but rather to recognize the limitations of reflection and the need to do this emotional work on our own time and not at the expense of organizing work. The limitations of empathy and empathetic responses to teaching about colonization are taken up by Dion (2009) as well. She observes that her two teacher participants were most interested in taking up the stories her and her brother had compiled in order to develop a moral compass within their students. This approach falls in line with the understanding of their role as
teachers to "take care" of students and develop "good" citizens but it did not challenge racism or white supremacy, nor did it compel students to implicate themselves in the stories.

Related to Srivastava's (2005) work on the ways white women's self-reflection and claims to a moral identity rooted as not racist can derail anti-racist organizing, Sara Ahmed (2005) looks at a similar phenomena in institutional settings, namely universities. She outlines the ways in which the act of naming racism within an institution is considered to indicate the success of eradicating that same racism. As Ahmed says of the institutional examples of race equity policies, these "speech acts are taken up as if they are performatives (as if they have brought about the effects they name), such that the names come to stand in for the effects. As a result, naming can be a way of not bringing something into effect" (117). I see parallels to the ways in which whiteness is often taken up by white people; by claiming to know their racism and acknowledging whiteness, white people express the desire to distance themselves from their personal complicities and avoid the work involved in dismantling white supremacist systems. To this end, and by illustrating moments in which white supremacy is made anew and colonization is accepted by white people we can shift the focus away from constructing a potentially 'good' white identity and towards anti-racism work as a life-long obligation of white people since we continue to benefit daily from systems of white supremacy and colonization.

Understanding what underpins and supports strategies to deny the significance of race and colonization in schooling and the role white people play in these systems is important as there are material consequences to accepting them. Mirza (1998), quoting Gillborn & Gipps (1996), states that "young black people are four times more likely to be excluded from school" in the UK context (110). In Toronto, Dei (2003) draws attention to statistics that "Blacks and Portuguese students have between 42 percent and 40 percent dropout rates compared to 30 percent for the general population"
(244). Of course, the process of disengagement that can result in the removal of the student from the school site altogether has significant material consequences in relation to post-secondary and labour opportunities. However, there is more to the question of the effects on racialized and Indigenous students when confronted with the white supremacist and colonial schooling site than the availability of jobs or access to further qualifications.

First, it is important to keep in mind that "dropping out", or being pushed out of school, "is a slow process of disengagement with academic activities that takes several years" (Schugurensky, 2009: 4; see also Dei et al. 1997). Students are subjected to a huge amount of violence in those years that can effect not only their participation in schooling but all aspects of their lived experiences. Second, student disengagement represents a failure of the institution rather than a failure of the individual, particularly when considering the high rates amongst racialized youth compared to their white peers. When students enter schools they are expected to fit within a liberal democratic frame of the 'Universal' subject based on white, middle class, and male ideas about personhood. When students are unable or unwilling to make this model fit for them, they are often demonized and labeled troublemakers. As Dei (2003) states, "dropping out' from school is conventionally attributed to individual failings and weaknesses" (245). This results in schools and policymakers shifting blame on to parents, communities, and the individual student. This "decontextualizes social problems in as much as it carries strong political messages that excuse institutions, systems and structures from social culpability" (Dei, 2003: 245). Third, the schooling site visits and revisits violence through a number of means and actors. Carranza (2009) looks at the technique of humiliation as racial violence prevalent in schools. She states,

At the structural level humiliation takes place within the lived experience of surveillance and the mark of criminality that characterizes the experience of racialized student's in
schools. Humiliation lies in the language of security that demands that racialized bodies be searched, stopped, ordered, and consistently checked. It hides in the language of responsibility and discipline and is authorized to restrict the freedom to move, to go to the washroom, to eat, and to speak (30).

These aspects of schooling that devalue, exclude, and dehumanize racialized and Indigenous students are maintained as a result of the unwillingness of teachers, administrators, students, and policymakers at all levels to engage with difficult conversations that implicate them and other white people.

**Anti-racist and Anti-colonial Pedagogies**

In this section, I consider a few approaches to curriculum and schooling that build on the theorizing of those mentioned above. Anti-racism and anti-colonial theories have distinct historical roots and differ in many regards but share an impetus for the centering of lived experiences and histories of community resistance to colonizing and white supremacist forces. In this section, I discuss literature concerning the performance, maintenance, and investments in white supremacist curriculum and pedagogies as well as resistance efforts. I emphasize methods that go beyond multicultural approaches to teaching difference that ignore racism and reinforce white supremacy. The following authors contribute to our ability to recognize where white supremacy is present in schooling and consider methods to challenge and transform the schooling systems. First, I highlight some aspects of the colonial schooling project, including the role of residential schools in shaping the Canadian schooling system, discourses of deficiency and supplementation, and Eurocentrism. I next summarize my reading of two authors in particular, Susan Dion and Cynthia Dillard. Both authors are concerned with how curriculum is presented and taken up in classroom settings. Dion (2009) focuses specifically on the complications of teaching Aboriginal subject material within a white
supremacist context. Dillard (1994, 1996) puts forward a critical pedagogy that addresses issues of race in a way that decentres whiteness and disrupts white supremacist practices within her classrooms.

The influence of residential schools on the present-day schooling system and other colonial state institutions cannot be overstated. Residential schooling, as Cannon (2011) states, "is an example of the kinds of policy aimed at cultural assimilation. These were policies aimed at cultivating Euro-Christian behaviours, appearances, and values. They were intended to re-socialize Aboriginal peoples into productive members of an emerging capitalist economy" (90). As previously stated, residential schools had a two-fold purpose; (1) to eradicate Indigenous resistance to the colonial state; and, (2) to make Indigenous peoples into exploitable units of labour (Ng, 1999). Policies of cultural assimilation sought to accomplish these projects through the theft of Indigenous youth. This was often accomplished by state and church actors by exploiting the desperate circumstances created by colonization and threats to withhold food and supplies from parents and communities should they refuse to send their children away (Fournier and Crey, 2011). The schools served another, less official, role in forcing back Indigenous resistance, namely genocide of Indigenous youth. Reported by the Montreal Star and Saturday Night as early as 1907, there was at the time a 24 per cent death rate among Aboriginal children in the schools and this number increased to 42 per cent when children who died at home, where many were sent when they got sick or injured, are taken in to account (Fournier and Crey, 2011: 174). That stories of rampant physical and sexual abuses in these schools can be found as early as 1907 indicates that, since knowledge and means were not sufficient for the government to change their policies, the genocidal outcomes of the residential school system was neither accidental nor a case of ignorance.
Genocide and forced assimilation efforts are ongoing. As Doxtator (2011) states, "ever since the two races first met, non-Indians have been trying to teach, convert, 'improve' or otherwise change Indian peoples. The idea has persisted that, somehow, Indians are really just undeveloped human beings in desperate need of training in the proper way to live and make a living." (32) This approach, that assumes the deficiency of Indigenous communities and students persists and is supported by the Eurocentrism inherent in schooling in Canada. According to Battiste and Henderson (2011), one of the foundational concepts of Eurocentrism is that of diffusionism. They state that "diffusionism is based on two assumptions: (1) most human communities are uninventive, and (2) a few human communities (or places, or cultures) are inventive and thus the permanent centers of cultural change or 'progress'" (11). In this formulation, Europe and European culture holds the answers to questions of progress, growth of social institutions, the organizing principles of society, and legality. By default, the superiority of Europe implies the inferiority, or 'emptiness', of non-European societies, knowledges, and peoples. This, in turn, "supports a series of claims about an Indigenous emptiness of intellectual creativity and spiritual values, sometimes described by Europeans (as, for instance, by sociologist Max Weber) as an absence of 'rationality'" (Battiste and Henderson, 2011: 12). The discourses that assume deficiency as well a perceived irrationality are reproduced across many contexts including schooling. Hookimaw-Witt (1998), for example, speaks to one supposed explanation of low schooling attainment of Native youth, that they "simply could not compete with the other youths in school because of their 'cultural deprivation,' meaning that our culture is so inferior to mainstream culture that we simply cannot succeed in a necessary education as long as we hold onto our culture" (162). This explanation shifts blame away from the Eurocentric and white supremacist institutions of schooling and on to the communities and students who are most negatively affected by these institutions. Furthermore, when the issue is framed as one of a culture that is incompatible with 'success', the choice to foster and encourage that culture is thought to be
irrational by the dominant for who may misunderstand and devalue Indigenous cultures and knowledges in the first instance. Furthermore, implicit in statements such as the one summarized by Hookimaw-Witt above is the understanding of Indigeneity as homogenous and singular.

Referring back to high school curriculum, Jean-Paul Restoule (2000) works to disrupt the notion of homogeneity implicit in talking about 'Aboriginal identity' stating that it "assumes a sameness and continuity that belies the fluidity and change that Aboriginal people experience and demonstrate. When this assumed permanence of character is run through institutions like the education and court systems 'Aboriginal identity' can be constractive and colonizing" (103). In addition, Restoule points to the dissonance between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal understanding of Aboriginal cultural values and knowledges. He states that whereas non-Aboriginal people often expect the material signifiers of culture such as "dress, wild traditional food, housing, and technologies... it is the values that sustain the culture and ensure its survival in any environment (Johnston, 1995)" (Restoule 2008, 15). The tendency of white people and settler institutions to 'fix' Indigenous identities around particular practices, diets, or appearances, particularly in the school curriculums, essentializes and depoliticizes identity and reconstitutes whiteness as central and universal.

Within Braiding Histories, Susan Dion (2009) discusses a project proposing a different curriculum for Aboriginal Studies in high school classrooms. Dion's focus on the teachers "scaffolding of ideas" and the effects on how students are taught to see themselves in texts speaks to the limitations of changing curriculum without transforming how we think about and engage in schooling. The author alongside her brother, Michael, sought ways of telling stories, particularly to non-Indigenous students, that "establish a scene of recognition that would invite readers to attend to, to recognize that 'this story has something to do with me'" (16). Curriculum developed with the intent of having non-Indigenous students, referred to by the author as 'Canadians', recognize their
connection to histories and ongoing practices of colonization departs radically from the curriculum advanced currently in state-produced stories of Indigenous and Aboriginal histories. Questions such as "how do the structure of the history class and the teachers' understanding of their responsibilities as teachers legitimate certain responses to the stories but suppress others?" (78), turn a critical eye to the ways white supremacy is produced, regulated, and legitimized in classrooms. This work acknowledges that currently, curriculum is set up to maintain "Aboriginal people as romantic, mythical Others" (78).

In addition to exposing white supremacy as an integral part of dominant curriculum, Dion (2009) asks that teachers reassess their roles as educators and incorporate a commitment to social justice and transformative pedagogy into their classrooms. She speaks to the frustration of seeing her project taken up as just another unit for teachers to get through. As Dion recognizes, while teachers "were genuinely interested in the content, their plan was to teach this unit and move on to the next one" (85). In this way, part of this project seeks to encourage an approach to teaching that prioritizes a commitment to equity in all subjects and units without exception. By pointing to the ways in which students are taught white supremacy in classrooms and constructing contending teaching units, we can see a necessary step to building a better schooling system. As George Dei (2006) says of education, "it may not be a panacea, for all problems, but it is definitely something to be taken seriously. Either education does something for you or to you." (30). As such, education can either reaffirm white identity through white supremacy in the deployment of current curriculum and pedagogical practices or it can critique, resist, and work with students to challenge this formulation.

Cynthia Dillard's (1994) work on critical pedagogy and teachers of colour provides a racialized perspective to teacher education that maintains focus on the experiences of racialized students and outlines certain ways she seeks to combat white supremacist practices within her
classrooms. Dillard focuses her attention on a program she worked with titled 'Opening Doors: The World of Graduate Study for Minority Students in Education'. As opposed to much of the writing that seeks to address racism within classrooms, Dillard does not focus solely on changing the minds of white teachers or diversifying curriculum. Instead, she seeks to examine what conditions must be in place in order to bolster recruitment of teachers of colour, including disrupting white supremacy in classrooms. Dillard begins with the assertion that "the recruitment of teachers of color for the nation's increasingly ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse populations depends on those involved in schools and schooling valuing the background, culture, ethnic understandings which people of color bring to teaching and learning" (9). This approach recognizes that people of colour are often expected to assimilate by taking on certain tropes of whiteness (or risk not getting hired) and, furthermore, reproduce white supremacy in classrooms through government-mandated curriculum. With such a high price to pay, it is no surprise that racialized students would be pushed out of teaching. In her workshops, Dillard asks questions of participants such as "On behalf of whom do you want to become a teacher? Whom do you place at the center of your education?" (11). She works with students to develop tools for critical thinking despite the fact that amongst teachers of color, "forgetfulness is encouraged" (10). As illustrated by bell hooks (1989), teachers of color are often penalized for remembering histories, both personal and collective, of white supremacist violence and exclusion. As such, Dillard's approach that values experience as knowledge and encourages the articulation of that experience can be transformative. Importantly, Dillard does not center whiteness by claiming that the articulation of pain is valuable because it aids white people in developing a consciousness of race, a mindset Dion (2009) found in her teacher participants. Instead, memory is valued as a way to sustain "a spirit of resistance" (hooks 1992).

In a related project, Dillard (1996) has written on critical pedagogy that rejects the idea of teaching as a politically neutral project. She calls on Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970) to
develop a system of journal writing and sharing with her classes. Through reciprocal sharing, the classroom becomes a space for community-building, weakening hierarchies between teachers and students, and encouraging critical consciousness through self-reflection. Furthermore, echoing her approach in the Opening Doors program and closely aligned with the principles of Anti-racism education (Dei, 1996), Dillard's pedagogy rejects the division between mind, body, and spirit and focuses on the importance of faith and hope (1994).
Chapter Three: Decentering Whiteness: A Discursive Framework and the Value of the "Anti"

Schools are an important location of social reproduction where, as Dion (2009) observes, students are expected to learn the skills deemed necessary to contribute to the state. As such, these sites provide an interesting case study to question how white supremacy is passed on and accepted by teachers and students as well as how the status quo is maintained through schooling practices. In this chapter, I outline various key concepts that contribute to my understanding of the role of schooling in reproducing white supremacy and the colonial state. This formulation differs slightly from proposing a theoretical framework. As Philip Howard (2009) says, while a theoretical framework is usually proposed "with the intent of applying the theory in a new situation", a discursive framework "is open and flexible enough to allow the research project to propose new relationships among its salient concepts" (49). I choose to outline a discursive rather than theoretical framework as I am working with concepts such as Anti-racism and Anti-colonial theory that are at times in conflict with each other. I am not interested in wrestling these theories into congruence, but rather hope to work with certain concepts associated to better understand the connection between the schooling process, white bodies, and the continuation of white supremacy and colonization.

I consider the inclusion of both theories important to creating a fuller understanding of how white people invest in and recreate the white supremacist social order that sustains the colonial state, as well as conversely how the continuation of the colonial status quo works to legitimize white supremacy. We cannot ignore that "the problem of white racial privilege transcends the nation state" (Leonardo, 2002: 29) nor "the commonality shared by the nationalisms of the dominant with those of the dominated" (Sharma and Wright, 2008: 128) though we can acknowledge that the latter comes as a response of resistance to centuries of colonial relations. As such, since the elimination of racism, in a nebulous and utopic sense, would not necessarily lead to decolonization (Dua and Lawrence, 2005)
and decolonization, in turn, would not necessarily result in the elimination of racism (Sharma and Wright, 2008), these two goals must be considered in tandem in order to guard against progress made on the backs of others. Furthermore, they share certain foundational aspects that make incorporating these theories compatible with work that seeks to subvert and challenge the colonial status quo. As Dei (2011) states, "the anti-racist and anti-colonial gaze seeks to highlight the material and experiential realities of racialized groups in their dealings with the state and its social institutions" (17).

I begin by summarizing the principles of Anti-Racism education and highlighting a few that are of particular importance to this project. Next, I elaborate on the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of race as I employ it and how it relates to other forms of oppression. Finally, I turn to a conversation about how I understand the colonial context as ongoing and multi-faceted rather than situated in the past and confined to acts of outright genocide.

**Anti-Racism Education**

George Dei (1996) outlines ten basic principles of Anti-Racism education and all have been foundational in the development of this thesis. There are, however, a few that stand out as particularly relevant to the topic at hand. First among them is that Anti-Racism education "questions White (male) power and privilege and the rationality for dominance in society" (27, parenthesis in original). This principle encourages a critical look at, using Gramscian terminology, the 'materiality of ideology' and 'common sense' understandings of who and what is of value in society. In relation to this thesis, the first principle subverts the assumption that white people *incidentally or coincidentally* hold most positions of power and privilege in society. Instead, it compels us to seek out understandings of the current social order that rejects outright these white supremacist arguments that devalue and dehumanize racialized peoples. The second principle mandates that "every form of
education must provide for a holistic understanding and appreciation of the human experience, comprising social, cultural, political, ecological, and spiritual aspect" (30). In this approach to education, "the individual must develop a deep understanding of the conscious self and how this self relates to others" (31). With that in mind, this thesis considers how students are taught to think of themselves in relation to others, particularly white students learning about Indigenous and racialized peoples’ histories. Third, Anti-Racism education advocates for 'inclusive schooling' in which "the powerful notions of 'community' and 'social responsibility' are brought from the margins into the centre" (33). The preceding two principles both relate to how we understand the project of schooling young people and what we expect from it as a society. Anti-Racism education suggests that schooling should, and indeed is, a political project that can either work to entrench the status quo or contribute to the dismantling of systems of oppression. Related, the final principle I focus on "acknowledges the traditional role of the education system in producing and reproducing not only racial, but also gender, sexual and class-based inequalities in society" (34). This approach to schooling has a long history, one that continues within the TDSB today. Taken together, these four principles provide a guideline and lens for my engagement with issues of cultural reproduction in schooling.

In addition to the ten basic principles, some of which are outlined above, there are certain foundational aspects that unite anti-racism initiatives across social spheres and the pursuit of diverse goals. First, anti-racism is "an action-oriented educational strategy for institutional, systemic change to address racism and interlocking systems of oppression" (Dei, 2000: 27). Acknowledging the 'interlocking systems of oppression', or integrative anti-racism, is defined as "the study of how the dynamics of social difference (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, physical ability, language and religion) are mediated in people's daily experiences" (Dei, 1996: 55). This requires that we acknowledge "our multiple, shifting, and often contradictory identities and subject positions..."
Integrative anti-racism, in effect, calls for multiplicative, rather than additive, analyses of social oppression" (Dei, 1996: 55). Second, anti-racism "draws on broad definitions of race and racism, extending beyond skin colour as the only signifier of difference" (Dei, 2000: 27). While the prevalence of skin colour racism persists, the ways racism manifests are many-fold, complex, and can include language, immigration status, religion, and cultural difference. Third, anti-racism "asserts that racial minorities cannot simply be presented as victims, powerless and subordinated in the study of race relations and conflict" (Dei, 2000: 27). By acknowledging the histories of resistance, anti-racism rejects the assumption that the white supremacist and colonial projects proceeded with the tacit acceptance of racialized and colonized peoples. Furthermore, this approach refuses to devalue the contributions of racialized and Indigenous peoples, communities, and activists and recognizes the contributions of the lessons learned and the fights both won and lost. Finally, anti-racism "moves beyond multiculturalism's celebratory approach to diversity and towards a discourse and praxis of fundamental power-sharing in communities" (Dei, 2000: 27). In relation to this thesis, this last point encourages a critical look at who defines the roles and responsibilities of the schooling system as well as who has the power to dictate curriculum. This approach goes beyond simply accepting the inclusion of multicultural content such as "song and dance", as stereotypes (or 'museum culture'), or as 'others'" (James, 1995: 36).

**Race Class and Gender**

It is important to note that, although I focus on the racializing and colonizing effects of cultural reproduction in schooling, racism does not exist separate from other systems of oppression. White supremacy, colonization, patriarchy, and capitalist exploitation are mutually sustaining and impossible to separate from one another. Furthermore, following Roxanna Ng's (1993) theorization, this paper seeks to "move away from treating race, gender, and class as categories designating difference... to discovering how they are relations that organize our productive and reproductive
activities, located in time and space" (50, italics in original). In this regard, Ng's work is consistent with the theorizations of Marx and Engels on class. In the same way that concepts of race and gender are relations to the dominant (white, male, heterosexual), class represents a particular relationship to the means of production. Put to the context of schooling, this formulation is most useful since it reflects the ways in which 'difference' is taken up as departing from the centrality of white, male, heterosexual, and middle class norms. Furthermore, considering the relational nature of race, gender, and class provides space to subvert the essentializing tendencies of labeling and identity formation within schooling.

**Anti-colonial and Indigenous Theories**

When I started working on the outline of this paper, my focus was on anti-racism. I felt that it was important to speak to the saliency of race in recognition of the tendency to dismiss issues of racism and white supremacy as too radical or 'fringe' issues. In the process of writing, however, I began to feel as though my inattention to ongoing colonization in the sites in which I live and work was resulting in a picture so incomplete as to negate the potential to imagine transformative possibilities. What is the purpose of anti-racism initiatives that do not challenge a colonial state that is built on white supremacy and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples globally? The same question can be applied to the schooling system, which is steeped in colonial histories and actively works to the benefit of the state. The following authors and their ideas have guided my attempts to understand these questions as well as to reframe what I thought I knew about my relationship to the practices of colonization.

Andrea Smith (2010) articulates the connections between the logics of white supremacy, which are "separate and distinct, but still interrelated". She argues that there are three primary pillars; "(1) slavability/anti-black racism, which anchors capitalism; (2) genocide, which anchors colonialism;
and (3) orientalism, which anchors war" (Smith, 2010). These pillars work in concert to limit our ability to imagine for a fundamentally different social context. Smith (2010) states,

> what keeps us trapped within our particular pillars of white supremacy is that we are seduced by the prospect of being able to participate in the other pillars. For example, all non-Native peoples are promised the ability to join in the colonial project of settling indigenous lands. All non-black peoples are promised that if they conform, they will not be at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. And black and Native peoples are promised that they will advance economically and politically if they join the US wars to spread 'democracy'.

I imagine similar statements could apply to the logics of patriarchy and sexism, particularly since white feminist organizing has a history of making gains for white and middle class women at the expense of racialized and working class women (Davis, 1983). With these interrelated pillars in mind, Smith (2010) advocates for an approach to analyzing white supremacy that does not assume a single logic, but multiple logics that may shift through time and space. Furthermore, she warns against the dangers in engaging in activism that is aimed at gaining recognition within the white supremacist state since these actions can serve to incidentally reinforce the same systems they sought to challenge.

Similarly, Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel (2005) describe the state's push to institutionalize Indigenous identities under the term 'aboriginal' as "a legal, political, and cultural discourse designed to serve an agenda of silent surrender to an inherently unjust relation at the root of the colonial state" (598). Put differently, the logic of multiculturalism in the Canadian context attempts to place Indigeneity under the same rubric that constitutes 'ethnic groups', or special interests, as peripheral, though at times tolerated or accommodated, to a white, male, middle class
norm (Lawrence and Dua 2005). According to Smith (2010), this serves a particular purpose since when seeking recognition from the state, "one will define indigenous struggles as exclusively as possible so that claims to the state can be based on unique and special status. When one wants actually to dismantle settler colonialism, one will define indigenous struggle broadly in order to build a movement of sufficient power to challenge the system". As such, it is the state that benefits most through fostering a divisive and 'zero-sum' approach to collective action that pits various groups against each other while entrenching further the white supremacist, colonial core. Drawing on Fanon (1963), Alfred and Corntassel (2005) express that "the most important strength of Indigenous resistance, unity, is also constantly under attack as colonial powers erase community histories and sense of place to replace them with doctrines of individualism and predatory capitalism" (603).

Having said that, and while conscious of the need to guard against the tendency to recentre the state and white supremacist institutions, Smith (2010) states that "while conditions of settler colonialism persist, short-term legal and political strategies are needed to address them". While these short-term goals, or reformist measures, are not necessarily inconsistent with approaches that reject the colonial state, it is important to remember that, as Tuck and Yank (2012) argue, "decolonization is not a metaphor". Pointing in particular to the schooling context, Tuck and Yang (2012) seek to remind their readers "what is unsettling and what should be unsettling" about decolonization and push back against the cooptation of the term decolonization to quickly reference a prior knowledge of settler colonialism and claims to being an 'ally'.

When metaphor invades decolonization, it kills the possibility of decolonization; it recentres whiteness, it resettled theory, it extends innocence to the settler, it entertains a settler future. Decolonize (a verb) and decolonization (a noun) cannot easily be grafted
onto pre-existing discourses/frameworks, even if they are critical, even if they are anti-racist, even if they are justice frameworks.

Taiaiake Alfred (2009) similarly argues against the idea of reconciliation, a term often used by the state in conjuncture with apology and 'forgiveness' discourses. He states, "If we do not shift away from the pacifying discourse of reconciliation and begin to reframe people's perceptions of the problem so that it is not a question of how to reconcile with colonialism that faces us but instead how to use restitution as the first step towards creating justice and a moral society, we will be advancing colonialism, not decolonization" (Alfred 2009, 182). Restitution, both collective and individual includes, according to Alfred, "land, transfers of federal and provincial funds, and other forms of compensation for past harms and continuing injustices committed against the land and Indigenous peoples" (181). In addition, restitution is not synonymous with decolonization since "Indigenous-settler relations cannot be obviously reconciled without deconstructing the institutions that were built on racism and colonial exploitation" (183). Instead, restitution, as defined by Alfred, and the deconstruction of colonial institutions creates the conditions under which decolonization could begin. Connected to schooling, while reform may be accepted in the short-term, especially considering what is at stake and the urgency to address some of the most damaging aspects of schooling, the current school system in Canada and other colonial states must be dismantled and reimagined as part of the decolonization process.
Chapter Four: Schooling for Colonization and White Supremacy

White supremacy functions through white bodies in the creation and mobilization of the Canadian national identity. As previously stated, "Europeanness as 'whiteness'...translates into 'Canada' and provides it with its imagined community" (Bannerji, 2001: 24). There are numerous ways in which the boundaries around “Canadian” are reinforced daily by white people. For example, claims to “innocence” are often utilized to distance Canadians from a colonial and white supremacist past. This project is supported in countless ways by the colonial state and its institutions including schooling systems. Contrary to many popular excuses, scenarios in which white supremacy is reinforced cannot be understood as ignorance or a lack of sensitivity on the part of white people (Leonardo, 2009). The concept of racial memory is useful in elaborating and challenging this point. Defined by Simpson (2006), "racial memory, most simply, is how we remember race" (36). Remembering the ways race has structured their lives and the times they were called on to accept and use their privilege disrupts white peoples' understanding of themselves as racially neutral, or not racist. For example, Ruth Frankenberg (1993) points to the forgotten interactions and relationships that white women had in their youth with people of color. The act of remembering can function to draw attention to the racial power dynamics that they have been encouraged to forget. Through racial memory, white people write themselves back into the racial narrative that structures their lives and are able to connect to moments - past, present, and future - in which their whiteness, and perceived superiority, is communicated to them. Through this process, white people may be better equipped to acknowledge their complicity, a necessary step for white teachers and students to address white supremacy in classrooms.

Acknowledging that, while coming to racial memory may be a process, ignorance has never been an excuse for enacting white supremacy, we must be critical the usefulness of educational initiatives that focus on 'cultural sensitivity' rather than acknowledgements of complicity for white
people. Contrary to the ways anti-racism is often coopted and institutionalized into workshops and policy, "[e]ncounters between dominant and subordinate groups cannot be 'managed' simply as pedagogical moments requiring cultural, racial, or gender sensitivity" (Razack, 1998: 8). Commonly, these diluted, liberalized forms of "anti-racism" within institutionalized settings "suggest that with a little practice and the right information, we can all be innocent subjects, standing outside hierarchical social relations, who are not accountable for the past or implicated in the present" (Razack, 1998: 10). As further illustrated below in relation to schooling, individualistic discourses that refuse to acknowledge these hierarchies are taken up by white people to facilitate the maintenance of white supremacy and avoid addressing Eurocentric and colonial pushes in schooling. The schooling process and the ways in which curriculum and pedagogy are conceptualized in turn support whiteness as central and white supremacy as the norm.

This section focuses on a few key questions:

1. How is 'difference', or diversity, framed and taught within schooling institutions? What is the function of multiculturalism in this framing?
2. In what ways does framing influence the development and deployment of Indigenous studies and Anti-racism programming within the TDSB?
3. What is the role of policy, curriculum, and pedagogy in these processes?

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the ties between frameworks employed, particularly as articulated through policy and curriculum documents, the maintenance of white supremacy, and how the colonial state is reified in these relationships.

*The Importance of Framing*
Speaking to the importance of framing in relation to how issues of Indigenous exploitation, exclusion, and colonization are theorized, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) states that "one of the reasons why so many of the social problems which beset indigenous communities are never solved is that the issues have been framed in a particular way" (153). This framing often calls on racist stereotypes assumed to be "common sense" related to the communities in question including notions of deficiency, corruption, laziness, and the need for paternalistic charity among them. Rarely are these issues situated within a historical context that acknowledges centuries of colonization, genocide, exploitation, and white supremacy. A high profile example of the kinds of framing used to dehumanize and infantilize Indigenous peoples and communities can be seen in the mainstream media coverage of the Attiwapiskat communities' declaration of a state of emergency in 2011 and the subsequent decision by the government to place the communities finances under third-party control (Crisis, 2011). Recalling Andrea Smith's (2010) three logics of white supremacy, these frameworks are also applied to racialized peoples and communities though often in different ways (Brown, 2011; Brown, 2014). Tuhiwai Smith (1999) writes that framing is about "making decisions about [an issues'] parameters, about what is in the foreground, what is in the background, and what shadings or complexities exist within the frame" (153). Fundamentally it is about who has the power to define the conceptual boundaries of an issue and the effect this has on what is seen as a positive solution. In what follows, I employ a critical discourse analysis to look at how 'diversity' and 'difference' are framed within a multicultural and liberal approach within government policy documents, first at the provincial level and then within Toronto District School Board (TDSB) documents.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

Employing a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) allows for a systemic procedure to examine not only what is stated in these three policies and two curriculum documents, but also present assumptions and their connection to a larger societal context. The method focuses on power relations
as well as "a rejection of naturalism (that social practices, labels, and programs represent reality), rationality (the assumption that truth is a result of science and logic), neutrality (the assumption that truth does not reflect any particular interests), and individualism" (Rogers, 2004: 3). Citing Fairclough and Wodak (1997), Rogers (2004) outlines certain "foundational principles of CDA" which guide the analysis in this these. They include the following points, "CDA addresses social problems; Power relations are discursive; Discourse constitutes society and culture; Discourse does ideological work; Discourse is historical, and; A sociocognitive approach is needed to understand how relations between texts and society are mediated" (Rogers, 2). Of particular importance to this thesis is the discursivity of power relations, discourse as ideological work and discourse as historical. Looking at the Ministry and School Board policies through an understanding of power relations as discursive allows for a conversation about how students are taught about identity and 'difference' in these spaces. Discourse as both ideological work and as historical puts these documents within the context of projects of ongoing colonization and white supremacy. Situating policy and curriculum documents within a broader ideological and historical moment recognizes how context and histories influence 'common-sense' conceptions of what is important in schooling.

As stated by Pimentel and Velázquez (2009), "the goal of CDA is to analyze the assumptions hidden in text or oral speech in order to refute various forms of power" (8). Put differently, CDA allows us to 'unpack' the power dynamics that are often invisibilized through the bureaucratic language of policy and curriculum documents. CDA is perhaps most informative when language is coded in terms that may appear to be compassionate or well meaning as is often the case in policy and curriculum documents. As stated by Menjívar and Kil (2002) in relation to immigrant-related issues, "discourse analysis exposes benevolent language as a strategy used by public officials to make their verbal claims more compassionate or apolitical, while protecting access to resources"
This approach is useful to the following analysis as CDA can work to bridge issues of framing and power with the material consequences of the language used.

**Policy, Curriculum, and Pedagogy**

While working with a CDA of curriculum documents, it is important to acknowledge that what is considered to be curriculum is contested. There are a number of different ways in which to define curriculum and these definitions can have profound effects on how a curriculum document is thought about and employed. As summarized by Lunenburg (2011),

Some authors refer to the curriculum as a formal course of study, emphasizing content or subject matter. Others define the curriculum as the totality of experiences of each learner, stressing how subject matter is learned or the process of instruction. Still others point out that the importance of statements of expected learning outcomes or behavioral objectives... Some describe the curriculum as a plan for instruction specific to a particular school or student population (italics in original, 1)

The documents taken up in the following section from the Ontario Ministry of Education and the TDSB are not uniform in their approach to curriculum. For example, the 2009 Ministry of Education's "Ontario's Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy" could be seen to represent curriculum in line with the second definition provided by Lunenburg (2011) that speaks to the "totality of experiences of each learner" (1). However, the curriculum documents for particular subjects such as English or Native Studies follow more closely the first and third definitions as they combine lesson planning with learning objectives. How these documents are used in classrooms, including the strategies individual teachers' and students’ employ to make curriculum more relevant and inclusive, is beyond the purview of this thesis but is nonetheless an important factor in defining
how curriculum is experienced. In the following sections, I focus on the content of curriculum and policy documents while also acknowledging that this represents an incomplete picture.

In a document titled "Ontario's Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy: Realizing the promise of diversity", the Ontario Ministry of Education (2009) defines diversity as "the presence of a wide range of human qualities and attributes within a group, organization, or society." (4) The nature of inclusive education is defined as "education that is based on the principles of acceptance and inclusion of all students" (4). Noticeably absent from these definitions is an acknowledgement of the structural aspects of racism, sexism, and classism in schooling. In fact, diversity, inclusivity, and even equity are depoliticized and appear to be disconnected from the institutions as a whole.

Furthermore, the tension within a liberal capitalist society, articulated by Brown (1993), between the "I's" and "we" is evident in the ways in which difference is taken up in Ministry of Education and TDSB documents. For example, while maintaining the focus on the benefits of equity for "all students" (the abstracted "we"), the Ministry of Education document (2009) frames schooling as an individualized pursuit as "every student is a unique individual and learns in different ways" (14). As Brown (1993) states, the conflict between the individualistic nature of liberal capitalism and the abstracted 'we' necessitated by the liberal democratic notions of fairness and equality "remains unpoliticized, as long as differential powers in civil society remain naturalized" (391). As such, it is fundamental to the continuation of the state that discourses of difference are not considered to relate to unequal power relations but rather represent unfortunate anomalies in an otherwise equal and democratic society. Furthermore, inequity is often individualized and considered to exist primarily within the domain of unstable or 'backward' individuals. While the 'Promise of Diversity' document (2009) makes reference to systemic barriers to success within schooling, this is undermined and obscured by conflating these barriers to individual bias and "ongoing incidents of discrimination" (7). The suggestion that what is necessary is that people simply develop a basic respect for, or
tolerance of, the 'diversity' of individuals and come to “know” other cultures is problematic. This formulation, however, fits the multiculturalist values that are so prevalent in the Canadian cultural imaginary they are taken as "common sense" These themes continue throughout the document and mirror the multitude of similar policies at various levels of government that reinforce the notion that discrimination exists in the actions of a few misguided individuals, sometimes called bullies (Ontario 2009, 13).

The TDSB's Equity Foundation document (1999) similarly recognizes the inequitable treatment of certain groups "because of individual and systemic biases" (1, emphasis added). However, there appears to be a disconnect between the two policy documents at the municipal and provincial levels and the limitations of curriculum documents that do not appear to take up equity issues. For example, in a document outlining the curriculum for Native Studies at the grades 11 and 12 level (2000), the 'place' of Native Studies is defined always in relation to the Canadian state and other subjects that are positioned as more legitimate fields of inquiry. Stating that, "by its very nature, Native studies is integrative," the curriculum is said to relate to history "when students examine the terms of a treaty negotiated by an Aboriginal nation with the Crown" and to English "when they use the works of Aboriginal writers to study the theme of renewal" (Ontario, 3). This formulation recentres European definitions of subject materials (history and literature) and suggests that the relevance of Native studies comes from the materials' ability to contribute to a broader understanding of what may be covered in other classes.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), employing Stuart Hall's work, argues that the concept of the West functions in ways which (1) allow 'us' to characterize and classify societies into categories, (2) condense complex images of other societies through a system of
representation, (3) provide a standard *model of comparison*, and (4) provide *criteria of evaluation* against which other societies can be ranked. (43, emphasis original)

The function of multiculturalism, as demonstrated in the previous section, is to maintain whiteness as the central norm and maintain 'diversity' as existing benignly on the periphery and always in relation to this norm. Tuhiwai Smith's (1999) observation that through the above-mentioned processes "indigenous peoples and their societies were coded into the Western system of knowledges" (43) is of particular relevance to how 'diversity', in which Indigeneity is included, is framed within the schooling context. Furthermore, this conceptualization is also characteristic of the ways racialized peoples are constructed in schooling today.

One example that betrays the underlying commitment to maintaining whiteness and Eurocentricity can be found in the discourses that emerged during and after the development of the TDSB Africentric Alternative School. Community members and educators who brought this school into being sought to disrupt the centrality of whiteness and challenge the 'diversity' model in schooling. The Africentric Alternative School was established in January 2008 with the Toronto District School Board's passage of a four-part motion (Dei and Kempf 2013, 69). The process to accomplish this was long and hard fought and the criticisms directed at the school and its advocates demonstrate the limitations of most people’s investment in the concept of multiculturalism. These criticisms range from misinformed claims of "reverse racism" and returns to segregation, to outright racist assertions about the perceived capability of Black and African educators (Dei and Kempf 2013). The violent responses to the development of an Africentric *school*, as opposed to more tempered objections to African-centred programs or units within an already established curriculum, are indicative of the investment in the centrality of Eurocentricity in schooling, something that multicultural educational policies does not disrupt.
In contrast, the "Ontario First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Education Policy Framework" (2007) differs from the above-mentioned documents in a number of positive ways. First, it acknowledges the legacy of residential schooling and the effects on Indigenous peoples engagement with the schooling system. As the FNMI framework (2007) states, "it is important for educators to understand the First Nations perspective on the school system, which has been strongly affected by residential school experiences and has resulted in intergenerational mistrust of the education system" (6). This acknowledgement is entirely absent in the other policy documents and represented as having no bearing on our world today by the curriculum documents. This omission is both dangerous and disingenuous, as white people are not forced to grapple with the impact of state actions on the lives and experiences of Indigenous peoples and communities as well as how these actions benefit them. This logic facilitates the acceptance of discourses of cultural and cognitive deficiency as Indigenous parents’, communities’, and students’ skepticism and suspicion of schooling in the face of residential schools and cultural genocide is represented as a lack of interest or ability.

Second, the FNMI framework includes an implicit acknowledgement of Eurocentricity in schooling curriculum and pedagogy that is absent from all other policy and curriculum documents discussed in this thesis. For example, the FNMI framework calls for schools to "develop awareness among teachers of the learning styles of First Nation, Métis, and Inuit students" (12). Implicit in the recognition that schooling currently lacks engagement with multiple and diverse knowledges and pedagogies is the acknowledgement that the system is Eurocentric and not racially neutral. The idea of a distinct Aboriginal learning style is contested (Castellano, Davis, and Lahache, 2000). However, there could be benefits for all students when we think about "pedagogy from a perspective that recognizes teaching as an act of love" rather than "teaching as science" (Castellano, et al., 2000: 100). As was the case with the Africentric Alternative School, naming Eurocentricity in schooling is often met with violent and reactionary responses. As such, this is particularly powerful especially when
considering the prevalence of 'common-sense' understandings of how schooling should be delivered and the absence of these acknowledgements in other policy and curriculum documents.

Third, this document places the onus to enact change on the Ministry of Education, School Boards, and teachers rather than blaming Indigenous students and families for resisting the violence of schooling. There are multiple references to the need to reassess teacher education programs and provide training on how to best for teachers to engage (FNMI, 2007). This is contrasted with the "Promise of Diversity" (Ministry, 2009) that provide provisions for changes to curriculum while assuming that pedagogy is neutral or a case of personal preference. Furthermore, the FNMI framework encourages the Ministry and School Board to work to increase the presence of Indigenous peoples in schooling as students, as teachers, and as administrators, which recognizes the importance of bodies and representation. Though this cannot guarantee a better schooling experience for Indigenous youth, it points to a consciousness in the document of the politicization and importance of identity.

Looking at just a few examples provides a far from complete picture and it is important to note the ways students, administrators, and teachers resist through the dismantling and reframing of these curriculum documents. However, it indicates that, even when curriculum is developed to specifically address Indigenous knowledges and histories, it continues to be framed in a way that reinforce whiteness as the standard and Indigeneity as abnormal or supplemental. As such, students receive similar messaging in their schools as they do in broader society in this regard and are encouraged to consider whiteness and colonial histories as objective and most important.

Learning Objectives and Curriculum Expectations

The ways in which the TDSB's responsibility in teaching ‘difference’ is framed reflects a broader failure of schools to prioritize racialized and Indigenous students and respond to colonial
projects and white supremacy within the classroom. These policies that take up equity as a mandate of the schooling institution do not necessarily compel action that would result in transformative change. For example, the TDSB Equity Foundations (1999) document suggests changes to the curriculum so that it "reflects and uses the variety of knowledge of all peoples as the basis for instruction" and "helps students to acquire the skills and knowledge that enable them to challenge unjust practices, and to build positive human relationships among their fellow students, and among all members of the society" (1). Without diminishing the importance of working with curriculum that is not Eurocentric and building healthy relationships between students, this approach falls short of advocating for the kinds of changes that would move schooling away from the model that places a teacher in the position of expert and students as devoid of their own knowledges. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine schools, in their current forms, working to dismantle the colonial state and white supremacy considering how closely aligned and historically tied they are to these systems. As such, it is perhaps unsurprising that the changes have been largely superficial, particularly changes to the curriculum in relation to the 'core' subjects of History, Social Sciences, English, Math, and Sciences.

While the preceding section spoke to the content of policy and curriculum documents that guide what, materially, is included in classrooms, this section focuses on the way education itself is framed and what is generally considered to be the role and purpose of public schooling. Here, I look at a few of the learning objectives as well as some general statements concerning the curriculum expectations articulated in the TDSB's curriculum documents.

The curriculum guidelines for the Native Studies units for grades 11 and 12 provide insight into the nature of these curriculum expectations and the purpose they serve. For example, we can look at the specific expectations of each course that "describe the knowledge and skills students are expected to develop and demonstrate in their class work, on tests, and in various other activities on which their achievement is assessed and evaluated" (Ministry 2000: 6). These expectations are numerous and
include the following: "describe the ways in which Aboriginal languages contribute to Aboriginal peoples' sense of identity... identify ways in which Aboriginal elders, healers, leaders, artists, and writers promote cultural perspectives and identities...[and] evaluate the ways in which the identities of contemporary Aboriginal people are influences by media, literature, and popular culture" (20). In this document, titled Native Studies, there is not a single reference to Canada as a colonial state and the only reference to decolonization comes in parentheses under the course titled 'Issues of Indigenous Peoples in a Global Context' (74). As such, it is unclear whether the idea of decolonization could apply to Canada. In addition, under these expectations that do not acknowledge colonization as a present-day reality, students are also not asked to identify themselves in relation to the colonial state. While students are encouraged to acknowledge 'challenges' that Indigenous peoples face today, these expectations do not speak to the ways colonization is reinforced through and legitimized and the ways they may be complicit or implicated in this process. Furthermore, and in line with the logic of multiculturalism, one expectation states that students should learn to "compare practices, behaviors, beliefs, and symbols found among Aboriginal cultures and other cultural groups in Canada" (48). The conflation of Indigenous peoples and 'other cultural groups' fails to address the specific experiences of people with diverse backgrounds and different relationships to the colonial state and draws all into the realm of multiculturalism, a policy that has a colonial history in the first place (Mackey, 1999; Lawrence and Dua, 2005).

Similarly, the curriculum document provided for grades 11 and 12 English by the TDSB commits to providing "learning resources that reflect the broad range of students' interests, backgrounds, cultures, and experiences" (20). This is in line with the Equity Foundations document and is representative of at least a portion of the mandatory class curriculum documents. Pedagogically speaking, taking into account the interests of your students is useful but there are a number of issues with how this is framed and phrased by the TDSB. First, implicit in this statement
is the conflation of difference along the lines of 'interests' (a student interested in chemistry as opposed to a student interested in geology, for example) with differential backgrounds, experiences, or cultures. By supposing that white supremacist curricula that devalues non-white cultures and knowledges and ignores the contributions of Indigenous and racialized peoples is equivalent to the absence of a topic that appeals to a particular student ignores the consequences on students who learn not only what is legitimate knowledge but also who is legitimately able to contribute to that knowledge. Once again, equity in schooling is depoliticized so that it encompasses all versions of difference rather than focusing on how power differentials affect the classroom climate for racialized and Indigenous students, as well as poor, queer, and women-identified students. Second, how people come to identify their interests or strengths is not unrelated to systems of oppression (James, 2012). Put differently, since schooling continues to work to prepare students to contribute to the capitalist state (Ng, 1999; Cannon, 2011), the school system and teachers, administrators, and other students contribute to defining what each of us are interested in, often dependent on how bodies are read and interpreted. Third, there appears to be an assumption that racism, sexism, class-based discrimination, and xenophobia are issues of exposure and knowledge.

As stated within the curriculum document provided for English grades 11 and 12 (TDSB 2007), "the primary purpose of assessment and evaluation is to improve student learning" measured through "assignments, demonstrations, projects, performances, and tests" (20). This betrays a superficial commitment to inclusive schooling since the method of evaluation remains individualized and coded in Eurocentric terms. Testing facilitates the singling out of students who are perceived as not meeting the minimum requirements for coursework and learning within classrooms and reinforces ideas of deficiency as inherent to students (Dei et al., 1997). This approach decontextualizes students' classroom performance, ignores the Eurocentric methods of evaluation, and ultimately reproduces the conditions that define some students as deficient in relation to
dominant norms. This is evident in the concern over the relatively low academic attainment of Indigenous and racialized students in comparison with their white counterparts. Framing the violence and exclusion experienced by racialized and Indigenous students in terms of an innate inability to 'keep up' with their peers leads the TDSB to put forward solutions that function to segregate low-performing students and reproduce racial hierarchies, particularly through the practices of streaming wherein only those who stay in the higher level streams are eligible to apply to universities upon graduation. Furthermore, individualized approaches within schooling ignore the relationship that exists between schooling outcomes and "larger environmental and societal challenges related to inequality, poverty, and powerlessness" (Noguera, 2008: 188). A shift in this approach would necessarily compel schools, teachers, and administrators to consider their role as part of a larger whole, responsibly to their communities rather than the institutions and bureaucracies. In addition, since both successes and failures are individualized, and often pathologized for marginalized students, under the current model of schooling, "co-operative learning" approaches that seek to establish "communities of learners" (Dei, 1996: 86) can counter the institutionalized devaluing of community and collectivity in favour of competition and the myth of meritocracy. The approach contained in the TDSB and Ministry of Education documents, particularly how evaluation is thought of, are often assumed to be the best, and the only, mode of testing knowledge.

Despite the issues outlined above, the curriculum document for grade 11 and 12 English goes on to mention the importance of 'critical literacy’, which involves "asking questions and challenging the status quo, and leads students to look at issues of power and justice in society" (34). However, the learning objectives, and the ways in which 'success' is measured, do not necessarily support this outcome. As hooks (1990) observes, the political standpoint of any educator will determine "whether issues of difference and otherness will be discussed in new ways or in ways that reinforce domination" (131). While there are countless teachers and students who work to create the context
for this kind of learning within classrooms, the onus falls entirely on the individuals and these efforts are often punished rather than rewarded within the institutions. Furthermore, since teaching remains a profession of predominantly white women (Solomon, Portelli, et al. 2005), it is unsurprising to hear of teachers' resistance to taking up the task of Anti-racism, Anti-colonial, and community-based education. In this context, and as Susan Dion (2009) argues, we must consider not only what resources are being used but also how the lessons are being framed by teachers. How these topics are taken up has a marked effect on what is 'heard' by students within the classroom. She suggests that the 'failure to listen', both on the part of teachers and students, is accomplished through a number of mechanisms including "challenging the narrative's relevance to one's life in the present; locking the events in a history that has no present; dehumanizing Aboriginal people; claiming 'there is nothing I can do, therefore I don't have to listen'; asserting the stories are too hard to listen to" (Dion, 2009; 56). This failure on the part of students and teachers, particularly white teachers, to take up 'critical literacy' in a way that would challenge the status quo, as is stated as the intended purpose, intersects with the reproduction of Canadian-ness as a culture of multicultural tolerance and innocence of racism at its foundation.

The creation of barriers to listening put up by white teachers and students allow them to "resist confronting the country's racist past and the extent to which that past lives inside its present" (Dion, 57). Frankfurt's (1986) formulation of 'bullshit' is relevant here. Bullshit, building off Max Black's definition of *humbug* refers to a "deceptive misrepresentation, short of lying, especially by pretentious word or deed of somebody's own thoughts, feelings, or attitudes" (Frankfurt, 2). The relation to curriculum comes in the ways bullshit is differentiated from a lie. Confronted with equity policies and subsequent revision to curriculum, teachers and school boards continue to (mis)represent relations of race, gender, and class to avoid engaging with challenging conversations in classrooms, particularly as these conversation will inevitably implicate white teachers, students,
and the institutions in the histories and processes of white supremacy and colonization. Frankfurt (1986) uses the following example relevant to the American context to elucidate how bullshit works in practice:

   Consider a Fourth of July orator, who goes on bombastically about ‘our great and blessed country, whose Founding-Fathers under divine guidance created a new beginning for mankind.’ This is surely humbug. As Black's account suggests, the orator is not lying. He would be lying only if it were his intention to bring about in his audience beliefs which he himself regards as false... He is not trying to deceive anyone concerning American history. What he cares about is what people think of him. He wants them to think of him as a patriot"

Similarly, the way difference is presented in classrooms represents bullshit as these lessons are; 1) misrepresentations or misinformation that are taken as truth by those who espouse them, and 2) not necessarily intended to change anyone's mind. After all, multiculturalism and tolerance are taken as self-evident in Canada. Instead, the intended function is to reinforce the teachers' conceptions of themselves, their classrooms, and their society as fair, objective, and definitely not racist. This represents a particular form of bullshit, aptly named 'white noise' and explained by McCoy (1997), as the "din of common sense" which assumes a superficiality or divisiveness about difference (336). Framing the issues of racism in schooling as existing solely in the actions of misguided individuals or as a need for more information regarding the "Other" supports the assumption that Canada is tolerant, devoid of racism, and historically neutral. The curriculum documents discussed here betray a superficial commitment to the policies that advance equity and inclusivity in schooling and allows for the continuation of the reproduction of the power relations of colonization, white supremacy, capitalism, and patriarchy. Put differently, the approaches advanced by the Ministry of Education
and the TDSB suggest that within schools, "with a little practice and the right information, we can all be innocent subjects, standing outside hierarchical social relations, who are not accountable for the past or implicated in the present" (Razack 1998, 10). There is a benefit conferred to white students and teachers who are given an easy escape from white guilt and the acknowledgement of privilege. As Solomon, Portelli, et al. (2005) observe, even when equity courses are mandatory and soon-to-be teachers are assigned materials that challenge privilege and white supremacy in schooling, many choose, and are supported in, not continuing this approach once they are assigned their own classes.

Even when conversations about race and colonization do occur in a schooling context, too often "forgetfulness is encouraged" (Dillard 1994, 10). hooks (1992), states the following about the how white people's comfort gets prioritized in these conversations:

When people of color remember ourselves, remember the myriad ways our cultures and communities have been ravaged by white domination, we are often told by white peers that we are too bitter, that we are full of hate. However, this memory sustains a spirit of resistance (191)

In addition, when conversations about equity are taken up in ways that encourage memory and resistance, white peoples' discomfort in these moments is often prioritized over advancing Anti-racism initiatives. Questioning the status quo by pointing to the existence of racism and colonization violates the logic of multiculturalism and, as a result, is often met with claims of 'reverse racism', playing the 'race card', or wanting a hand out. (Dei et al, 2004; James 1995a). Since multiculturalism facilitates the discourses used to avoid honest and useful conversations about racism and white supremacy, it is white people who benefit the most from its continuation. Most importantly, these benefits are understood and accepted by white people and these systems require the investment of white people in order to continue.
Chapter Five: For white People, by white People: Who benefits?

White students are taught to enact white supremacy through a multitude of different means in relation to schooling. White supremacy can be seen in every aspect of the schooling process despite the daily resistance of many students, families, and some teachers. Furthermore, it is common to hear the distinction made between whiteness and white supremacy as systems of oppression and white people as individuals. While I do not suggest that only white people are conscripted into white supremacist projects, as Howard (2009) points out, "ultimately, the domination of nonwhites, whether by whites or other nonwhites, always works in favor of the racially dominant and the maintenance of existing mainstream hierarchies of race, which position whites at the top "(42). In addition, facilitated by the liberal multicultural Canadian imaginary, white people are accustomed and encouraged to consider themselves as moral and tolerant by virtue of their membership within Canada (Thobani, 2007). However, this must be troubled, particularly when considering the ways these discourses are taken up in schools.

As McIntosh (1992) observes in her often-quoted work, "whites are taught not to recognize white privilege... I was taught to see myself as an individual whose moral state depended on her individual moral will" (71-77). This statement, while intended as an initial step to recognizing white privilege, can be problematized. First, McIntosh does not address the issue that, while being taught to naturalize white privilege, white students are simultaneously being taught to enact and expect white privilege. Secondly, as noted by Leonardo (2004), in such a statement, "white racist thoughts are disembodied, omnipresent but belonging to no one" (143). This is problematic as it creates an artificial distance between white supremacy, white privilege, and white bodies. In order for white supremacy to be imposed, white people must invest in it (Leonardo, 143). To expand on the ways white supremacy functions in these spaces, I focus on how white bodies present, accept, and are
rewarded for performing white supremacy in classrooms, especially as it relates to the deployment of
deficiency theories and assimilationist efforts aimed at Indigenous and racialized students.

**White Bodies and Discourses of Deficiency**

White bodies are not passive in the processes through which white supremacy is presented
and made presentable in schooling. Discourses of deficiency are readily available for white people
and are often accepted as the basis for charitable endeavors or simply 'realistic' appraisals of the
situation at hand. On the one hand, white students benefit from employing these arguments as they
are able to create a sense of self-worth through their success while also being insulated against the
demoralizing effects of failure. On the other hand, white teachers are provided with an easy and
accepted excuse for their inability to connect with or understand their non-white students. For
example, when white bodies are 'successful', as conceptualized by Eurocentric schooling systems
(test scores, GPAs, meeting behavioral expectations etc.), it is considered to be matter a of personal
merit and hard work and when white people fail, it is explained by a myriad of diverse reasons that
rarely include genetic or cultural inadequacy (Valenzuela and Dornbusch 1994; Carter, 2005;
Ladson-Billings, 2007; Noguera, 2008). These can include issues of mental health, teacher bias,
personal distractions, or simply 'youth'. What these explanations share is that they are individualized
and considered anomalous. In contrast, both successes and failures of racialized students are
pathologized and considered outside of individual merit.

One of the common discourses employed to imply the pathological nature of failure for
racialized students is that of being "at risk." Levin, quoted by James (2010), "defines an “at risk”
student as 'one whose past and present characteristics or conditions are associated with a higher risk
of probability of failing to obtain desired life outcomes”" (465). The "at risk" designation in relation
to schooling is conflated with race, gender, socioeconomic status, as well as other forms of
oppression in order to sustain assumptions of a deficiency of 'culture' for racialized students, especially Black boys (Noguera, 2008; James 2012). Quoting Balibar, James points to a new racism "defined as 'a racism whose dominant theme is not biological heredity but the insurmountability of cultural difference..." (quoted in James 2012 470). Alternately, when racialized people succeed, it is often dismissed as the result of 'affirmative action' or a teacher’s 'charitable', though misguided, political correctness.

When students fail to conform to the dominant cultural rule, there are differential sanctions if the student is white (Carter, 2005, 6). While Darder (1991) conceptualizes the role of "cultural gatekeepers" in terms of teachers and principals, I would argue that peers play a significant role in the monitoring of compliance as well. White students, whose sense of 'humanity' stems from Eurocentric pedagogy and epistemology, may feel threatened and respond with their own sanctions should a student transgress white supremacist schooling practices, by calling out racism for example. This is especially true when considered in the context of an imagined 'post racial' society, or Canadian multiculturalism, which is advanced so aggressively in schools. In addition, explicit sanctions from teachers and peers are only one mode through which white supremacy is communicated to white and racialized students alike. As Carter (2005) observes of the 'hidden curriculum,'

Schools are not just places where learning comprises how to read, compute, analyze, and synthesize information; they are also key sites of socialization and cultural reproduction. On top of teaching the "three R's" - reading, writing, 'rithmatic - teachers signal to pupils how they should interact and speak, what cultural tastes and sensibilities to cultivate, and what cultural knowledge is needed to be classified as a smart person in our society... Furthermore, if students were to challenge the school's
hierarchy of cultural meanings, regardless of whether or not they believed in the aims of education, they would risk reprimands, low evaluations, and other sanctions that come with embracing cultural practices contrary to the school's expectations. (9)

By accepting the characterization of their racialized peers as less capable than themselves, white supremacy functions through, and with, white bodies to teach this hidden curriculum. White students may reaffirm their perceived superiority through the ways in which they choose partners for group projects, show surprise when racialized students succeed, or disappointment when racialized students achieve higher grades than them. Furthermore, white students may not accept certain racialized students as equals even when the discourses of deficiency are not applied to academic ability, in relation to 'model minority' students, for example. White bodies, set on maintaining a sense of distance and superiority, may conceptualize 'model minority' students as deficient in terms of English language proficiency, or simply too different from themselves to foster a friendly working relationship. As just one example, Maclean's Magazine published an article recently in which the central argument, based on a quote from a white private school student, was that the University of Toronto was "too Asian." According to this white student, "too Asian" meant that competition over grades and academic expectations were too high (Macleans, 2010). Implicit in the article and the student's statements, however, was the assumption that attending U of T would infringe on her ability to have fun at university, not just because the expectations were high but also because the school is "too Asian", and by extension, too different. This is just one example of the ways in which racialized peoples are presented as deficient in some regard - most often, academically, but also socially, culturally, and morally. Despite the prevalence of articulated examples of Smith's (2010) logics of white supremacy, white people often claim an ignorance of not only racism but also race.

_White Bodies and the Myth of Meritocracy_
Tied to the refusal by white people to recognize racism and institutionalized white supremacy, is an investment in the idea of a meritocratic, 'fair' system of competition amongst students for grades, academic achievements, and the rewards they confer. An example of the way that white supremacy functions through white bodies is the practice of streaming students in terms of their perceived ability and imagined possible educational and career outcomes.

White students invest in the idea of meritocracy to legitimize higher rates of enrolment in university level classes and, by extension, universities. White people's presence, and the absence of racialized people, in these classrooms is naturalized and constructed as "common sense" since grades, and enrolment in “high level” classes or universities, are considered to be objective evaluations of knowledge and ability. Subscribing to this argument necessitates an acceptance of white supremacy in relation to school by white bodies. White people, who overwhelmingly take up positions of power, remain committed to the myth of a meritocratic system (Solomon, Portelli, et al. 2005). This remains the case even when confronted by statistics that point to systemic racism and exclusions. As outlined by Dei (1996), numerous studies in Ontario conducted in the 1990s have shown that racialized students, and especially Black students, are over-represented in classes that do not allow for applications to university and leaving schools without graduating at higher rates than the average (82). The discourse that emerges is often related to what is wrong with Black students rather than how does white supremacy operate within schools to reward white students at the expense of Black students. In this way, the meritocratic assumptions about the school naturalize the racist results and hinder the possibility of critical engagement.

**The Inexcusability of white Ignorance**

The ideals of multiculturalism has long been romanticized and encouraged in the Canadian national imaginary. Like other dominant ideologies that become detached from their historical roots,
in this case, from colonial nation-building projects and the management of dissent, multiculturalism has been embraced by many individuals, organizations, and state institutions at all levels. Schooling sites are no exception. Looking at how difference is taught in schools and how white supremacy and colonialism are reconstructed in these spaces, we can see how white supremacy functions through white bodies in relation to their acceptance of the colonial status quo in schooling. Often claiming a 'colour-blind' approach, there is an implicit assumption as to whose knowledges, histories, and theories are valued. While this is normalized and often overlooked by white people, it is not an innocent project. As Leonardo (2004) states,

It is not only the case that whites are taught to normalize their dominant position in society; they are susceptible to the forms of teachings because they benefit from them. It is not a process that is somehow done to them, as if they were duped, are victims of manipulation, or lacked certain learning opportunities. Rather, the colour-blind discourse is one that they fully endorse (144)

Leonardo points to the ways in which white supremacy functions through white bodies in their refusal to acknowledge the centering of whiteness and white supremacy in curriculums. While racialized students experience the same schooling within government schools, and no group is taught anti-racism praxis, schooling curriculum for white bodies "maintains their sense of humanity" (144). The discourse of multiculturalism serves to invisibilize, for white people, the presence of race privilege through the depoliticization of difference. As Mirza (1998) says of color-blindness, multiculturalism is a catch-22. Colour-blindness seeks to distance those who espouse its virtues from biological racism based on physical difference but they do not challenge racism that is already deeply embedded. As such, "it maintains the status quo, it validates inequalities, which in turn fuels the arguments of biological racism" (111). The logic of white supremacy facilitates an acceptance of
the absence of racism and colonization in the present. Academic 'success' for white students is individualized and attributed to the hard work and persistence. But for racialized students, a lack of academic 'success', as defined by the schools themselves, is seen as a cultural deficiency rather than a manifestation of structural and institutionalized racism. Filtered through the lens of multiculturalism and the post-racial moment, new life is breathed into this iteration of white supremacy.

Furthermore, since white supremacy provides white people access to discourses of deficiency as they relate to Indigenous and racialized peoples, the schooling process reinforces their perceived supremacy as white people as well as their individual exceptionality. Solomon, Portelli, et al. (2005) identify that teacher candidates often "strongly believe that the rewards that have been afforded them have been due to their individual efforts" and respond in violent and defensive ways when this is called into question (158). The liberal, individualistic approach to schooling and 'success' is in direct contradiction to the principles of Anti-racism education that "acknowledges the traditional role of the education system in producing and reproducing not only racial, but also gender, sexual and class-based inequalities in society" (Dei 1996, 34). While these ideas provide the scaffolding of teachers and students experiences, it is difficult to imagine for an alternative to the current schooling system. Difficult, however, is not impossible and both Anti-racism and Anti-colonial praxis demand that our work grapple with these complications.
Chapter Six: White bodies and Transformative Practices

Considering the preceding arguments, it is clear that there are many ways white supremacy and colonization are reconstituted in the everyday functioning of schooling. These include enactments through curriculum and policy documents, pedagogy, and the actions of white people in schools. While it is easy to claim that differential outcomes are accidental or not intentional, looking at the schooling site over time and the role it has played in solidifying white supremacy and colonization in Canada encourages skepticism. Furthermore, as there is no lack of literature that speaks to the role of schooling in reproducing social relations, and resistance to racism and colonization has a long and continuous history, ignorance is not a valid excuse (Leonardo, 2009). In spite of this, willful refusals sustain systems of white supremacy and colonization. For example, we can observe Prime Minister Stephen Harper, claiming to the G20 representatives in 2009 that "we [Canada] have no history of colonialism... so we have all of the things that many people admire about the great powers but none of the things that threaten or bother them" (Fournier and Crey, 2011: 263). This sentiment is both sustained by and reproduced within state-run institutions and those who invest in their legitimacy. Disturbingly, in this statement by Harper, there is an erasure not only of the genocidal actions of the state, both past and present, but also of the active resistance of Indigenous peoples and communities that do in fact threaten and 'bother' the state. Furthermore, in this statement there is a glorification of the outcomes of colonization, particularly when stating, "all the things that many people admire about the great powers." This suggests that while colonization may have been morally wrong, the outcomes, including land and resource theft, the imposition of exploitative systems of government, the consolidation of money and power in the hands of a few, and systems that devalue racialized and Indigenous peoples, are both desirable and justifiable. Schooling, as an ideological apparatus, reintegrates these violent ideas by sanitizing them for the national imagination that removes or minimizes understandings of effect and responsibility. To
address this, the schooling site can and should take up the task of reframing the Canadian state as a colonial entity and counter the erasures perpetrated by state officials and people invested in the maintenance of these systems.

There are countless ways to work towards this. In this chapter, I suggest a few approaches that are motivated by both an understanding of the complicity of white people and the ways the schooling system is set up to sustain colonization and white supremacy. It is important to note that no matter what changes occur within the schooling context, the institutions that sustain it remain colonizing forces. However, considering the current conditions of education for racialized and Indigenous peoples, I am also conscious of the "politics of urgency" in scholarship and activism (Hurtado, 2003: 222). As Andrea Smith (2010) states, "while conditions of settler colonialism persist, short-term legal and political strategies are needed to address them" though they can be pursued in ways that do not lose sight of the broader goal of decolonization.

First, and on a systemic and institutional level, the role of schooling must change to involve the questioning of what is accepted and reproduced as 'common sense' and prioritize the voices of those whose subjectivities are marginalized (Dei, 1996). In the Canadian context, this will necessitate greater attention paid to colonization and the role of white settlers in creating and sustaining the ongoing project of Canadian nation-building on the backs of Indigenous communities (Dion, 2009). This is intrinsically tied to how we conceptualize community, as exclusionary and divisive, and the ways this is employed to exclude racialized peoples from the Canadian imaginary and Canadian histories. Secondly, as Susan Dion (2009) argues, we need to look to the effects of the ways we are approaching lessons rather than what we see as 'good' content. If white students are failing to position themselves in relation to the material being taught, if racialized students are made to feel that they cannot or should not speak in ways that challenge white supremacy in classrooms, and if
Indigenous knowledges are being taken up as supplemental and colonization as occurring in the past, then we cannot pretend that equity policies are adequate to guard against the reproduction of racism in schooling. Developing in schools a "common mission, vision, values, and goals... that articulates what students should learn, how they will learn it, how we will know whether they have learned it, and what will happen if learning does not occur" that prioritizes equity, anti-racism, and critical thinking is integral to accomplish this (Noguera, 2008: 162). Without this kind of institutional support, the onus remains on teachers, administrators, parents, community members, and the students themselves to compel this kind of learning and counter the hidden curriculum taught in classrooms.

Second, while acknowledging the importance of the development of documents such as the FNMI framework (Ministry, 2007), there is little indication that transformative change is desired or will be prioritized in the near future. As such, we can also think of ways to resist individually that may contribute to compelling change. For example, in classrooms that seek to subvert hierarchies of race, class, and gender, students must be encouraged to situate themselves in relation to curriculum that challenges the centrality of the white, male, heterosexual, and middle class norm. The implementation of Anti-racism education absolutely necessitates power being taken from white people in classrooms, even (or perhaps especially) white teachers. We must believe that white students can be pushed to acknowledge their personal and collective complicities without damaging their self-esteem, particularly considering the violent and damaging effects on the self-esteem of Indigenous and racialized peoples of not having these conversations. Theorizing how the concept of complicity can function, Probyn (2004) encourages us to frame it "not as injury but as starting point and the condition of ethics itself. Complicity as a reflection of the mutual implication of domination and resistance, as a critical interest in the effects of one’s praxis and as a mode of mutual recognition itself" (36). Similarly, Ahmed (2002) suggests that we think of difference as "determined at the level of encounter" (562). As such, schooling as a site of encounter must grapple with how to encourage
individuals to come to these spaces with histories and complicities in mind. Recalling Ng's (1999) formulation of race, class, and gender as relational, classrooms can become sites where white students are taught the importance of collective histories and how this knowledge can influence the terms of engagement with those who are situated differently in these relations from ourselves.

As previously stated, acknowledging the ways in which white supremacy necessarily functions through white bodies does not negate the possibility of white people working against its performance in classrooms. On the contrary, accepting this premise can lead to engagement in more productive ways though it is always complicated. As Howard (2008) states, "it is this struggle between racialized consciousness and egalitarian intent - knowing oneself through the colour line while trying to unmake it - that leads to the sometimes contradictory character of the white body's antiracist efforts" (30). Acknowledging the complications and implications of attempting anti-racism work in a white body, especially in positions of power, can lead to hopelessness unless we come to understand that "all white people are moral actors in relation to race matters" (Wilmot, 26). When white bodies come to understand themselves as agents of white supremacy, unwilling agents perhaps but agents nonetheless, we are better able to address how our bodies continue to function in this manner and see the ways we can contribute to anti-racism and anti-colonial agendas. One possible strategy to subvert power dynamics within the classroom could be to draw attention to who speaks in group settings. This means challenging white bodies to be conscious when they take up disproportionate amounts of much space. Overall, it may mean working actively working to develop spaces that are safer for Indigenous and racialized peoples, particularly women.

Extending beyond the classroom or pedagogic initiatives, white people must be conscious of whose voice they choose to hear. One example of the manifestation of white privilege is the tendency of white people to pay particular attention to work produced by white people. In discussing
the gaps in whiteness studies, for example, Howard states that "this whiteness work has been done largely by white scholars" who rarely acknowledge the critical analysis of whiteness "pioneered much earlier by Black scholars" (Howard 2009, 17-8). The failure of white people to acknowledge theorizing from racialized and Indigenous scholars provides yet another example of the ways in which white supremacy functions through white bodies. Whiteness studies became a legitimized field of study, considered to be new and exciting, when white people took it up.

Furthermore, knowing that the work of white people, both academic and professional, can be taken as 'ground-breaking' or 'foundational' when we are simply building off of centuries of active resistance that facilitated our ability to theorize about white bodies, white privilege, and white supremacy, must motivate a response. We must respect these histories rather than erase them or risk coopting the work of others and as well as limiting our work in significant ways. Lorde (1984) states that "in order for us to survive, those of us for whom oppression is as american as apple pie have always had to be watchers, to become familiar with the language and manners of the oppressor" (115). Conversations about anti-racism cannot happen solely amongst white people, even if the subject matter is white identity or privilege. White bodies must foster humility and remain open to the idea that their interpretations of their lived experiences are in need of revision and that their analysis may be lacking due to their subject location.

Related to the performance of white privilege in classrooms, white people must be conscious of the ways they enact privilege in all group settings including workshops, activist organizations, and meetings. How often do we come to spaces that are set up by and for racialized people only to see conversations dominated by white voices? How many times do we engage in anti-racism discussions only to see white people redirect topics in ways that they can relate to? In order to build solidarity, white people must critically examine where their sense of entitlement to space (physical and
metaphorical) comes from. This is not to say that white people cannot, or should not, speak in spaces set up to counter white supremacy and colonization. Rather, we can aspire to move away from recentring whiteness in these spaces and away from the idea that being a 'good' white person with a critical analysis creates what Razack (1998) refers to as "innocent subjects, standing outside hierarchical social relations" (10). The recognition that we all remain embedded in these hierarchies requires recognizing that who takes up 'space' is not accidental.

Furthermore, considering the ways in which white bodies are constructed as the 'Universal Subject' able to travel and move anywhere they please while racialized people are considered static and 'rooted' in place (Mohanram 1999: 15), white people must trouble our sense of entitlement to feeling welcome in anti-racist spaces. Years ago, one white male friend came with me to the anti-racist tutoring program that motivated this thesis and told me afterwards that he thought the program was great, but that he simply wasn't comfortable going back. I, unsuccessfully, encouraged him to consider why it was that he was surprised to feel uncomfortable in this space and the ways in which that discomfort could be telling and profoundly useful. This story is reproduced, white people choosing disengagement over discomfort, in classrooms, organizations, and social settings all the time when racism and colonization are talked about and challenged. I do not mention this to discourage white people from entering critical spaces, but to encourage a respect for the politics of suspicion and the necessity of humility in these moments. White people must be active in anti-racism work, but anti-racism workers cannot preoccupy themselves with making white people 'comfortable' or risk losing focus on the issues at hand.

As I have show in this thesis, institutional interventions to construct a better environment for schooling have only gone so far. A big reason for their limitation is the ways these documents are hinged upon and do not question white supremacy and the colonial state. Furthermore, the active
erasure of white bodies from responsibility and complicity in the invisibilization of Indigenous and racialized peoples from the curriculum as well as school spaces furthers deficiency theories. In order to address this, white people must recognize that while disguised as discursive, white supremacy also operates through their bodies. For this reason, we must respect spaces constructed for Indigenous and racialized peoples as well as monitor our actions in collective places. Finally, we must stop being party to the intellectual theft of Indigenous and racialized peoples' knowledges. Too often white people claim discomfort when confronted with the thoughts and ideas of said bodies and prefer to receive 'white washed' versions from white people. We must learn to work with discomfort and recognize that too often in daily life, our comforts come at the discomfort, pain, and exclusion of racialized and Indigenous peoples.
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