

We Are All on Native Land: Transforming Faculty Searches with Indigenous Methods

Becky Thompson

SINCE ITS INCEPTION IN THE LATE 1960s, women's studies has brought substantial change to curricular, pedagogical, and epistemological practices in the academy. The initial "add and stir" approach to including women in the curriculum has largely been replaced by a sophisticated analysis of gender, race, and class; a transnational focus; and a complex understanding of women's embodiment. Feminist attention to pedagogy has succeeded in illuminating multiple forms of learning as well as the multiple ways that power manifests itself in the classroom. Women's studies-inspired theoretical formulations—including standpoint theory, mestiza consciousness, and intersectional frameworks—also reverberate across the academy.¹

Although facilitating these changes has been, for many of us, the center of our life's work, acknowledging what remains to be done is a humbling experience. One area that we have yet to examine systematically is how institutions go about recruiting and hiring diverse new faculty. The percentage of full-time people of color faculty in women's studies (30.4 percent) substantially exceeds the percentage of people of color in other disciplines (19 percent), but we have yet to offer sustained discussion of the methods and ethics we use (and hope to use) to continue to diversify the faculty.² In addition, the actual embodied experience for many women of color in women's studies still makes relevant the pioneering title, *All the*

Feminist Studies 37, no. 3 (Fall 2011). © 2011 by Feminist Studies, Inc.

*Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies.*³ These realities are especially ironic given that the building and sustaining of women's studies and other disciplines in the twenty-first century absolutely depend upon a process of diversified regeneration.

I became particularly aware of the limited analysis in hiring and retention practices when, as a newly hired director of the recently combined Women's and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS), my first charge was to lead a search for a tenure-track scholar specializing in Native American studies. As I began to document the process we used for the search, I looked for articles about other search processes intent upon achieving a diverse pool of applicants. Along the way I uncovered various handbooks about the strategies administrators and faculty have created through the years for recruiting diverse faculty. The *University of Michigan Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring: Academic Year 2009-2010*—one of the most substantial and comprehensive online handbooks currently available—offered crucial points for conducting searches, including broadening pools, using active recruitment processes, and focusing on the scholarship and commitments of candidates of color (not solely their demographic characteristics).⁴

The most helpful quantitative research on affirmative action includes a study based on data from seven hundred searches conducted at three large elite public research universities. These data convincingly show that in order to hire people of color successfully, it is essential to change how regular searches and hiring processes are conducted. The authors conclude their study with a plea for detailed case studies that will “shed more light on the particular circumstances under which faculty of color hires are made.”⁵ The value of case studies, in part, is the potential for nuance, specificity, and attention to complex power dynamics. Such specificity can, among other contributions, help counter the common tendency to lump Africans, African Americans, South Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans into one category—people of color—a conflation that misses the numerous ways that strategies for recruitment need to be culturally and racially specific.⁶

Although handbooks and quantitative work offer valuable guidelines, I found myself continuing to search for “thick description,” for qualitative analysis of searches that successfully resulted in hiring faculty of color.

The dearth of case studies—on practicing affirmative action in general and in relation to Native American scholars in particular—is of special concern because few faculty members have been granted the training we need to conduct race-, gender-, and language-conscious searches. This reality led me to think deeply about some of the reasons for the silence on this topic.

One reason may be the many myths surrounding affirmative action including, perhaps most powerfully, the mistaken assumption that it is now illegal and therefore should not be practiced openly. Although the implementation of affirmative action in the United States has never been transparent, the multiple and contradictory interpretations of the 2003 Supreme Court decision involving the University of Michigan Law School have masked the fact that the decision did, in fact, uphold affirmative action in higher education.⁷ The Supreme Court has ruled on four significant cases since the 1978 decision in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, each of which has upheld the constitutionality of using race/ethnicity as one qualifying factor in higher education admissions. Media representation may lead people to think that affirmative action is dead and gone, but it is still a legal practice in forty-six states.⁸ The problem is that when people either think it is now illegal (and therefore don't practice it) or are not sure (but then think they need to practice it in covert ways), the possibility of finding methodical, specific, and nuanced analyses of how affirmative action is actually practiced is dramatically diminished.

An additional reason for the silence has to do with maintaining the status quo, including white supremacy, sexism, able-bodyism, and other hierarchies. Keeping questions about search processes private (except to report the race and gender of the candidates to human resources departments) serves to bury the ways that racism, as well as other oppressions, plays out in hires. Despite the fact that there has been some brave autobiographical writing by faculty about how their race, gender, sexuality, and other aspects of their personhood were held against them during searches, we are still missing first-person narratives from the point of view of those doing the hiring about methods for democratizing the academy.⁹ Those with the most to lose, with the least occupational protection, have been writing, but those of us chairing search committees have mostly remained

quiet. It is ironic that, although university professors have made inroads into analyzing the power dynamics that go on within the classroom, we have yet to examine the power dynamics and complexity of faculty searches.

A third, and potentially most influential, reason why there is limited writing on methods for conducting searches may have to do with our inability fully to recognize and confront the gatekeeping that is still practiced in the academy. In important research on academic hiring, Devon Abbott Mihesuah identifies multiple ways that non-Native academics have historically sabotaged the hiring of Native scholars. These gatekeeping practices have included hiring non-Native candidates even when Native candidates with more qualifications were in the search; not advertising widely enough to obtain a diverse pool; choosing not to confirm the professed tribal affiliation of candidates; and hiring a weak Native candidate and then saying “I told you so” when she or he is over her or his head.¹⁰ Mihesuah’s analysis underscores the need for hiring methods that counter this gatekeeping. Bernice Johnson Reagon has noted, when reflecting on the civil rights movement, that culture itself creates a methodology for social change.¹¹ In the same vein, this case study suggests that the tools needed to build Native American studies, including the steps for hiring its scholars, are embedded in Native culture.

It is within this context—of the many, interlocking factors responsible for the silences about hiring—that I offer this case study focusing on the internal dynamics involved in a recent search for a tenure-track faculty member at UCCS. The case study shows why, at each step of the process, we needed to move beyond normative conventions for conducting searches. By normative conventions I mean a reliance upon existing hierarchies (upheld by university, publication, and geographical rankings); a belief that knowledge is portable, not connected to the land or one’s community; the application of rigid aesthetics (in manner, dress, and presentation); an expectation that candidates seek out jobs rather than schools recruit candidates; and a valuing of youth and potential over age and wisdom.

In place of normative conventions, our search required us to draw upon certain Indigenous methods including recognizing the land upon which we do our work; valuing elders and women; emphasizing

face-to-face interactions and community networking (beyond the academy); valuing humility, humor, lived experience, reciprocity, and multiple truths; and recognizing that accountability to one's people and ancestry may trump one's commitment to an institution.¹² We find that such Indigenous methods cannot be "added and stirred" into normative practices; rather, they need to be held in their own regard in order to be transformative.

The case study method I draw upon in this article allows for the identification of where we succeeded and went wrong—the lessons we learned, sometimes painfully, along the way. Our happiness lay not only in the success of the individual search but also in the implications of the search: knowing that incorporating Indigenous methods in women's studies might be applicable to searches in other disciplines as well. Cases such as ours could also help us understand more about the promises and challenges of adopting Indigenous methods amid legal constraints and ingrained academic traditions.

BACKGROUND FOR THE SEARCH

Women's and Ethnic Studies (*WEST*) at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs is a newly formed interdisciplinary program that was made possible by a coalition of faculty and administrators who worked for several years to establish a joint major and program.¹³ Establishing *WEST* included hiring a director of the new program followed by conducting successive searches for two tenure-track faculty—the first, a scholar in Native American studies. Our decision resulted from recognizing Indigenous studies as the center of *WEST*; that is, the foundation upon which the program could be built. The direction of this first search was unanimously supported by the approximately thirty-five faculty in *WEST*. The search committee was comprised of a multiracial group of tenured and tenure-track faculty (Cuban American, South Asian, African American, Latino, and two Euro-American women) and one student (Southern Ute) and was chaired by me (a white woman).

GETTING THE WORD OUT

From the beginning, although we intended to consider every candidate who applied, our priority was to be sure that a critical mass of Native scholars would be in the pool. Although there are indeed numerous non-Native scholars who have done outstanding work in Native American studies, this reality has been more than matched by a long history of non-Natives speaking for and sometimes at the expense of Native scholars. Maintaining our commitment meant facing down a number of doubts and misconceptions. For example, more than once during the search we heard the hackneyed warning that “there just aren’t any Native scholars out there” (a logic used to render invisible Black and Latino/a scholars as well). We knew that the situation was quite the opposite: in fact, in the last two decades, there has been a veritable explosion of work by Native scholars. A number of signs—an unprecedented burst of new scholarly work; the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; the founding and remarkable growth of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association; the buzz in the air at Native panels and talks at many recent interdisciplinary academic conferences—underscore that we are currently witnessing an extraordinary moment in Native American studies.¹⁴ Our intention was to tap into that momentum.

Our task then, was to create our own “buzz”—to get people excited about what WEST at UCCS offers, including longstanding support for innovative teaching; a small but important community of Native American scholars (and non-Native allies); an expansive understanding of what constitutes scholarship (academic books as well as community organizing, creative projects, etc.); and a sane program where people truly enjoy working together.¹⁵ We also publicized the university’s location in Colorado Springs, built on a bluff overlooking the Garden of the Gods, a touchstone for multiple Native peoples (Southern Ute, Apache, Sioux, Navajo) for thousands of years. Although every university in the United States rests on land cared for by Native people, this is especially palpable in Colorado Springs. The city is also the home of several Native activist organizations, including White Bison (an organization that has spearheaded the Wellbriety Movement, with over two hundred Native sobriety programs

in the United States, and the historic Way Home Forgiveness Tour in 2009) and other key Native community projects.¹⁶

Needing to celebrate the university and its location was one key reason why, from the beginning, we knew that advertising the job would require us to go beyond the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and discipline-specific employment bulletins. In addition to those sources, we publicized the position in tribal publications; regional newsletters; activist newsletters; the Ford Foundation minority scholars' mailing list; museum, park, and theater publications; and so forth. We knew we needed to talk personally with as many people as we could about our program and search—tribal college leaders; Native activists; nonprofit leaders; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender activists; artistic directors; feminist activists; and foundation directors. We called a wide range of scholars in Native American studies to ask them for names of students completing their doctorates. We attended and spread the word at a range of conferences and community events including scholarship benefits for Native American students, powwows, documentary film showings, political demonstrations, and feminist events. We also visited interdisciplinary programs in the region to talk personally with faculty about our search.

At each step of this networking we avoided using the Internet as much as we could, opting instead for handwritten letters and face-to-face meetings. We shied away from e-mails because of their impersonality. We wanted to initiate free-flowing dialogue—to hear people's voices and see their faces. Clearly this method is time consuming, but our logic was that putting in time at the front end—in getting the word out about the search—would save much time on the other end since we would get the range and caliber of candidates that would ensure a successful search.

Faculty and students from the search committee also had lengthy individual phone conversations with candidates immediately after receiving their applications.¹⁷ We deliberately arranged individual phone conversations rather than group conference calls, which can be alienating and overwhelming for the interviewees, while keeping the power in the hands of those conducting the interview. During these informal conversations we spoke about the WEST program's commitment to innovation, activism, and creativity. The conversations enabled us to give a sense of the range

of scholars already at UCCs and to let the candidates know about Native organizing within the community. Talking also gave us a way to learn about the candidates' epistemologies and to ask how their community ties influenced their work.

Conversations about community ties mattered to us because we have often heard people justify a final pool of candidates that is all white by saying that, before meeting the candidates, they thought from their resumes that they may have been African American, Chicano, or Native American. To us, it is revealing that all the Native candidates who applied specified their tribal affiliations and how those affiliations directly informed their teaching and scholarship. This naming linked people to their relations (both living and ancestral) and to those who have supported them. The tribal naming underscored that the candidate did not come to the hiring process solely as an individual but also as a member of a group. Many asserted their membership as a source of their strength and accountability. Such allegiance challenges the individualism that so defines the academy and grounds the candidate in ways that make it possible to survive in potentially toxic academic settings.

By contrast, only a few of the white candidates specifically identified their race in their cover letters, writing samples, or curricula vitae. This non-identification can be tricky for search committees. It is illegal to ask candidates their race (or ethnicity, religion, marital status, or disability), but discussion about how one's social location may shape one's research agenda and teaching is an epistemological concern that is integral to race-, class-, and gender-conscious research. While non-naming may partly have reflected a worry on the part of some non-Native candidates that they wouldn't be taken seriously for the position if they were not Native, the most compelling non-Native candidates were those who specifically articulated how they negotiated their relationship to Native studies.

We were especially interested in people whose community ties were extensive and long lasting—those whose understanding of Native epistemologies shaped their pedagogy and research. As we continued to network, we started to see that faculty, administrators, and activists from around the country were going out of their way to help us. They gave us ideas about other places and people to contact and information

about ways that other programs have sabotaged hiring Native candidates. After receiving handwritten letters asking senior faculty about graduate students they worked with, we often received personal phone calls back and open-hearted e-mails. Two senior Native scholars offered independently to confirm tribal affiliations if we weren't sure of a candidate's actual relationship to her or his tribe. They also cautioned us about candidates who are vague about their tribal affiliations.¹⁸ This warning reflected a history of non-Native candidates who have professed Native belonging. Their caution also reflected a pattern on the part of some non-Native faculty to favor Native candidates whose affiliations are distant or nonspecific over Native candidates who are upfront and clear about their tribal identities. Two Native activists (Muscogee and Mohawk) from the Colorado Springs community also gave vital feedback during the search process, met with the finalists one-on-one, and attended the community dinners with the candidates. Retrospectively, we believe this helpfulness stemmed from people coming to see that we were genuinely interested in contacting as wide a range of candidates as possible; we were not limiting ourselves to a few "stars" from certain schools with certain credentials.

SUCCESS IN THE SEARCH

For us, success from this networking came in the exceptional range and caliber of candidates who applied for the position. Of the seventy-five people who applied, seventeen were Native—Kiowa, Diné, Blackfeet, Concow, Ojibwe, Rosebud Sioux, Dakota, Cherokee, Native Hawaiian, Comanche, Miami, Akwesasne Mohawk, Choctow, Muscogee, White Earth Chippewa, Lakota, Lumbee, and others. These applicants included people who identified as two-spirited, as single mothers, and as grandmothers/fathers and who grew up on reservations as well as in urban contexts. The non-Native applicants were a truly multiracial group (Chicana, Puerto Rican, African American, Afro-Caribbean, Latina, bi- and multiracial, and white European), many of whom had established long-term, close working relationships with various tribes. Candidates included people just completing their doctorates and those who had been teaching and writing for many years. Their institutional affiliations included state universities, elite East Coast colleges (including Harvard and Brown), and Research I

universities. Applications came from Nova Scotia, Norway, Beirut, Ecuador, Canada, and all parts of the United States. Most of those who applied saw activism as key to their teaching and research.

We initiated campus interviews immediately following the closing date, wanting those we interviewed to know that we were excited about their candidacy. In the end, we succeeded by offering the position to one of our two finalists, Janice Gould, one of the most prominent Native poets and theorists in the United States. She accepted the offer within a matter of weeks despite being courted by a number of other universities.¹⁹

REEDUCATING OURSELVES

We were thrilled that a stellar combination of scholars applied for the position and that Dr. Gould accepted our offer. Retrospectively, however, we also learned many lessons about how easy it was for us to allow normative values to trump Indigenous methods—for us to allow academic socialization to trip us up. Perhaps our biggest realization was that we did not do enough work internally prior to the search in order fully to welcome and respect the candidates who came to the on-campus interviews. As a consequence, there were several instances when non-Native values were unthinkingly used to judge the candidates.

For example, when people asked Gould questions in small groups and after her job talk, her tendency was to say what she did not know before saying what she did know. When she was asked by a group of faculty about the relationship between literary theory and poetry, she initially said she wasn't sure, an answer that a few faculty members interpreted as her lack of knowledge about key debates among literary scholars on the subject. She then went on to cite the scholarly work by Keith Basso on Apache views on land and stories. She talked about "the importance of memory and how land gives us stories that help us remember how to be good human beings in the world. This, to me, is fundamental to Native writing as well as the oral traditions of the tribes."²⁰

The small group of faculty was not familiar with Basso's work nor could they see the subtle and sophisticated way that she was speaking about theory. They did not follow Gould's profound point about remembering "how to be good human beings in the world." As Gould puts it:

You see, that is what I am interested in. Some academics might laugh at this. But for me it remains a legitimate question. Does our literature tell us anything about how to be a human being? I guess rather than a theory I have a belief. I hold to the idea that words are powerful and that even the written word—carefully and precisely set down—can have an effect on the world.

In this instance, a key problem was that this group of interviewers was not well versed in Gould's theoretical work or her poetry. They also did not know that as a woman in her late fifties, she put a high value on humility, an elder quality. When she said initially that she wasn't sure of the relationship between literature and critical theory, it did not mean she did not have an opinion or scholarly considerations on the issue. Rather, she was expressing her view that the jury is still out about how much literary criticism can offer in comparison to the original source. The privileging of theory over primary sources is what the late Barbara Christian bravely addressed in "The Race for Theory"—how many English departments are more likely to hire literary theorists than poets and writers; jobs are often handed out to those who theorize about literature while failing to provide jobs for the writers themselves.²¹

Gould is well aware of the limits of theory, even as she is a literary theorist. Her initial response—"I am not sure"—reflected wisdom and knowledge of a history of contention on this issue. In post-interview correspondence with the author, she explains: "Certain kinds of theory I find attractive and useful. I have read atrocious applications of varieties of literary theory to Native American literature—ideas that leave me cold, ideas that make me shake my head with their absurdity, ideas that seem to have no relation whatsoever to the work, whether poetry or fiction—to its beauty, its intricacy, its depth, its meaning." She has also written extensively on the power of story—that meaning, belonging, and theory begin with narrative. The non-Native eyes saw ignorance rather than humility. They saw hesitation rather than measured consideration. They saw timidity rather than quiet confidence.

Socialization in the white academy means learning to give answers immediately, even before thinking them through. Any hesitation during a

candidate's "proving ground" presentation can be read as a sign of vulnerability or inadequacy, of not possessing the "quality of mind fitting for an academic appointment" (one of the phrases used by one of the faculty members who met with Gould during the interview process). In this instance the Native candidate's approach (listening, thinking—, then speaking) was directly counter to the non-Native communication style (speaking first—, thinking later). In many searches, including ours, the unnamed expectation was that candidates be willing to please the senior academics who are judging their performances. As one senior search committee member noted retrospectively, this expectation is an "initiation" ritual imposed on candidates, almost like fraternity hazing. Gould rose above this hazing, in keeping with her status as a poet, teacher, theorist, and elder.

Had we to do the search again, we would convene meetings with administrators, staff, faculty, and students prior to the interviews to disseminate information about the formidable challenges facing Native scholars in the academy.²² During these meetings we could have collectively discussed the finalists' scholarship. Although the candidates' complete files were available to the search committee, we should have distributed their work more widely and asked that all those meeting with the candidates (staff, administrators, and students) discuss their writing ahead of time. We could have also talked about possible differences in Native and non-Native communication styles and the value granted to humility.

The reason I specify that meetings should include a wide range of people is that, typically, only those formally meeting with candidates see their curricula vitae or read their writing samples. In fact, candidates often learn a tremendous amount about a department and the institution from those who are not voting members of hiring committees. Informal meetings with nonvoting members can be as helpful or damaging as meetings with those on the hiring committee in terms of creating impressions, revealing stereotypes, and so forth. In her analysis of the power dynamics she faced as a scholar from Sri Lanka, M. Neelika Jayawardane persuasively shows that some of the most debilitating encounters facing faculty of color occur around the edges, informally, in settings that are

not marked as official interviews or scheduled meetings. That means that entire communities, not only those on the hiring committee, need to be prepared to meet in intelligent ways with candidates.²³

Such a process is important in all searches, but it may be especially so for Native candidates whose work is often founded on writing that is unfamiliar to non-Natives because it extends beyond the European canon. Collectively discussing their scholarship would have helped us engage with each other about our own misconceptions and gaps in crucial knowledge while preparing people to interact with the candidates as intellectuals. Such engagement goes without saying for white candidates but does not necessarily hold for candidates of color whose mere presence, rather than their work, often becomes the focus of white attention.²⁴

Doing work internally before interviewing candidates might have also helped us identify possible differences between white faculty and scholars of color (Black, Latino, and Native American) in terms of their allegiance to the academy.²⁵ For example, there were faculty members on the search committee who were hesitant about another top candidate because it appeared (from her written application and phone conversations) that she was less interested in our particular campus and program than she was in being able to do her own research. Her questions seemed to center on whether there would be resources available for her to do her writing and the international travel necessary to continue her research. Her focus was interpreted as selfish and self-serving (i.e., that she might not be a team player). Had she been a man, this approach may well have been seen as appropriately ambitious and a sign of commitment to productivity. This difference raises a troubling question about whether internalized sexism (of those on the hiring committee) becomes less obvious when the candidates are of color—that is, might this expressed concern about the candidate's possible self-centeredness be a cover for racism?

Retrospectively, the problem with these expectations is that for many Native scholars, one's ultimate worth and value as a scholar is based on one's ability to serve one's community. Our candidate's inquiries about being able to do her research were not about advancing her own personal career. They were about being able to advance her own people's voice in

international arenas. This is the power and promise of naming one's tribal belonging.

A non-Native approach to hiring asks what a candidate can offer the university. A Native-conscious approach sees tribal communities as the first and last location of accountability.²⁶ The question then, for people on search committees, is to ask how the university can facilitate tribal priorities rather than how the candidate will contribute to an overwhelmingly white university. If a department truly takes Native scholarship seriously, the new faculty member may in fact choose to contribute to the institution (even as s/he on some level must do so in order to get tenure). But holding it against a candidate because her or his first priority is to tribal responsibilities is, in fact, asking the candidate to speak against herself or himself; it is what the legal theorist Patricia Williams has named "spirit murder."²⁷

CHALLENGING HIERARCHIES

Another normative assumption that emerged during the hiring was the presupposition that candidates would take our job only because it is a tough time economically. For example, some assumed that the first choice for one of the most outstanding candidates would be an elite East Coast school or Research I university. It is true that Colorado ranks among the very lowest of the fifty states in terms of its financial support of public education, which means that salaries and money for program development are abysmally low. But deciding ahead of time that candidates would rule out serious consideration of UCCS as a consequence is a way of speaking for the candidate—assuming that we know better than she what is best for her career. It also reveals internalized oppression on the part of faculty currently working in public universities (primarily attended by working-class students)—that UCCS does not have enough to offer to attract the finest scholars. Third, the assumption reflects the belief that the candidate has assimilated class- and race-biased ideas about quality education—that she herself would look down on a UCCS appointment. As it turns out, many of the top candidates spoke openly about seeking a school that serves working-class students and were astutely aware of both

the resources available at elite schools and the psychological costs often exacted in such a climate.

Prior to conducting the search, as a community we needed to tease out and ultimately reject the above and other assumptions. Before we began the process, I found myself saying to a Native colleague that we needed to do the search as early in the academic year as possible to get a jump on the wealthy Ivy League schools. I told her that UCCS would not be able to compete with the salaries of East Coast schools nor could we compete with their prestige and lower teaching loads. At the time, my colleague said to me, “While you might think there are multiple high-paying positions out there for Native scholars, I sure didn’t find that when I was on the job market.” With her forthright response I realized that, first, I was overestimating the space that is, in fact, available for Native scholars. Research shows that, systematically, scholars of color, even those who had earned prestigious fellowships, “were not highly sought after and that the bidding wars [that many people assume take place] are vastly overstated.”²⁸

Second, I was assuming that salary and prestige would be treated as more valuable than a whole range of other considerations that clearly, from the applications we received, are valued among Native candidates. Key to this value system is a belonging and attachment to land and specific regions. When I asked one of the candidates (Blackfeet), who recently earned her doctorate from an elite school in New England, why she would consider moving west again, she talked about how upset she was when her adolescent daughter recently informed her she wasn’t an Indian—that she was just from the East Coast. What the candidate said spoke volumes about why she planned to return west. Many top candidates spoke enthusiastically about wanting to be or stay in the West.

Frequently, an unspoken assumption is that a search is successful (and the department valuable) if the pool includes applicants with degrees from Ivy League schools. With this assumption, the location of a university and its endowment base trumps a belonging to the land and region. With this logic, hiring a Penobscot, Harvard-trained scholar to teach in Colorado is considered more of a “catch” than hiring a University of New Mexico-trained Navajo whose undergraduate work was completed at a

Navajo tribal college. Certainly we needed to confront these biases during the search.

During the deliberations after the candidates came to campus, we also needed to think through the preference that some of the search committee granted to the applicants who were just completing their doctorates. They reasoned that newly minted scholars would have a longer tenure at the university; they would be there to run *WEST* after some of us had departed. Others argued that new academics would bring a youth and sassiness the students could more easily relate to. Although no one made this argument explicitly at *UCCS*, the vulnerabilities that newly minted PhD's face until tenure may also make them easier to control (and exploit) than is possible if people come in as associate and/or tenured faculty members.

In our search, the impulse toward a just-finished candidate made sense to some; yet, it was not in keeping with the deep respect granted to elders in Native communities. As was true for many other aspects of the search, we had to turn dominant beliefs (in this case, ageism) on their head during our deliberations. In our case, we were especially appreciative of the number of senior scholars who applied since, with their extensive publishing and teaching experience, there was a possibility for them to come in as advanced junior faculty and come up for tenure early. Such a tenure clock would enable them to be equals in terms of rank with the senior faculty sooner rather than later. In our situation that was especially important because there were no senior Native faculty members in the program. This hire would change that, and from our perspective, the sooner the better.

Typically in searches, there is also a privileging of candidates who have gone straight through in their training. Gaps in candidates' resumes—due to childcare or eldercare responsibilities, work in community organizations, or evidence of having left a position prior to tenure—are often interpreted as signs that the candidates are not truly committed to or cut out for the academy. Candidates who have left previous jobs can be presumed to have left because of some undisclosed inadequacy or because they lack a certain ineffable collegiality. A Native-conscious search is one that can interpret “gaps” as possible signs of a commitment to community and

family, a willingness to leave toxic environments, and a knowledge that we are, as people, more than our jobs. Such an interpretation acknowledges the damage caused in many academic settings—that people can literally lose their lives in certain environments.

Speaking on behalf of many Native scholars, Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Cavender Wilson write that

at least at the present, [we believe] that there is something worthwhile or salvageable within the academy, though we suspect that all of us have seriously questioned our participation on a regular basis. . . . Some of us feel as though we can only beat our heads against the wall so many times before the damage to our spirits outweighs whatever small gains we might be making within institutions that do not value our contributions.²⁹

The excitement often felt by a search committee during the hiring process, as well as the approach to interviewing in which we show the candidate the best of what the school has to offer, can easily lead people to forget or deny the tremendous anxiety and ambivalence that many candidates—particularly candidates of color—may be living through during the process.

Our search also required us to tease out essentialist notions about Native American identity. For example, faculty members may seek out scholars who grew up on reservations, assuming that this experience affords the candidate close and deep contact with traditional Indian knowledge. At the same time, privileging reservation-born scholars is problematic because many tribes don't have a history of living on reservations. Second, at the University of Colorado about 8 percent of the Native students are urban Indians who have never lived on reservations. During the search process, it was important for us to avoid the "she is more Native than he is" ranking that is based on romanticized and ahistorical notions about the most authentic Natives. Although there is a place for honest conversation about the limits of highly assimilated Native scholars, these conversations need to take into consideration the devastating consequences for students when they are told that they are somehow "not Indian enough."³⁰ Fixed notions of proper genealogies get in the way of recognizing multiple Indian identifications, and pit "reservation Indians" against Indians who live elsewhere.

Having a critical mass of Native scholars and students at a university is one crucial way to avoid narrow understandings of who is authentic and who is not. In our situation, when Gould laid out for the students her own lineage—as a Concow, a California tribe that was never on a reservation; as the daughter of a father who is transgender; as a lesbian with a partner of twenty-three years who is Latina—she left plenty of room for the Native students to bring their whole complicated identities to the table. Gould's story makes clear that there is no singular Native identity or genealogy.

Ultimately, the success of our search in the long run will depend upon our ability to respect core Native values after the search is over. After Gould accepted the position at UCCS, the university's work had just begun, a reality that other Native scholars at the university already knew. Once Gould accepted the position, we faced the difficult task of contacting all of the candidates to whom we were not able to offer a position. My exhilaration about calling Gould to offer her the position was matched by my sadness in sending out regret letters. It was at this point that we realized that the core values of community building and group rights could be guiding principles at this stage of the process too. As it turns out, a community of scholars had been created in the process of conducting the search. The overwhelming majority of those who had applied shared a devotion to Native American studies; the use of an intersectional analysis in their work (attention to race-class-gender-sexuality-nationality); the practice of innovative pedagogies; and a commitment to social justice. Those who applied did so as individuals although collectively they were a community—albeit one that existed in a file drawer only.

So, instead of sending a form letter of rejection to the candidates, we wrote handwritten letters and made phone calls. In most of the letters, we made reference to specific highlights in their application, with regard to their scholarship, teaching, activism, and vision. We also began a process of linking those who applied to each other. In the letters we wrote and phone calls we made, we let people know who did get the position (after asking ourselves why universities tend to be so tight-lipped about those to whom they offer positions). Might that secrecy, like the secrecy people learn to keep about salaries and contract offers, serve to mystify a process

that desperately needs to be transparent? Who, in fact, is served when both the process and the product of searches are kept under such tight wraps?

As it turns out, as people learned of Gould's hire, we got numerous e-mails, letters, and calls congratulating her and saying, "Yes, sign me up. I want to stay connected." We also received several calls and e-mails from candidates singing her praises as a poet, a teacher, and a human being. Creating ways for people to know each other can never make up for not being able to offer people jobs. But it does nurture networks between the stunning range of scholars in Native studies who are seeking jobs. Through networks, scholars gain watchful eyes that observe which searches are handled well and which ones are not. The network we created, and others like it, certainly counter the rumor that there are no people in the pipeline. We know they are out there.

EMBODIED INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE

The transformative potential of "indigenizing the academy" comes from embracing values that can make us whole. How lonely is the academy when we think of ourselves as isolated individuals rather than as part of a larger people and vision? How painful is it to work in a place built on Native land where so few Native students and scholars now tread? Non-Native people know we are on stolen land. It is what makes us a nervous and defensive people. There is a reason the term "affirmative" goes with "action." Staying true to Paula Gunn Allen's identification of the "red roots of white feminism" means that women's studies can be the action, the powerhouse, for indigenizing the academy.³¹ The centuries of Native valuing of women and reverence for the land, as well as Native American studies' sustained concern about male hierarchy and violence, help us understand why Native American studies needs to be at the very center of women's studies (and many other disciplines, I would say). This commitment can, in fact, bring a ground to the discipline that many of us have found missing for a long time.³²

Finding such a ground necessarily begins with recognizing the embodied nature of Indigenous knowledge. This knowledge is not a tub on its own bottom; it is created and passed on by living breathing Native scholars. Respecting this knowledge means, first, acknowledging the tremendous

support that Native students, faculty, and elders in the community gave me as a non-Native, white woman heading up the search. It means acknowledging that my responsibility was to find scholars whose life work is about the sustenance and longevity of Native people and cultures. It also meant recognizing how, as the chair of the committee, my white privilege facilitated the search in key ways: for instance, we were able to ignore the accusation that we were giving undue advantage to Native candidates by widely publicizing the position. Above all, it meant being mindful of my need for guidance in order to not reproduce normative search methods.

Another key ethical issue related to the composition of our committee, which was overwhelmingly non-Native. Although several of us had long-standing, serious connections to Native scholarship and activism, there were inherent limitations with a committee that, although multiracial, only included one Native member. Furthermore, that Native member, while having voting rights on the committee, was also an undergraduate. One challenge for white people (or for men, non-Natives, or US citizens) is to try to walk in the world in a way that neither casually appropriates some culture that suits their fancy (practicing what Wendy Rose has named “white shamanism”³³) nor entirely avoids the culture for fear of misappropriating it. During the search, it was essential that none of the non-Native committee members try to speak *as* missing Native faculty members on the committee and that all committee members remain constantly accountable to the Native faculty, activists, and elders in the community who gave their feedback and guidance.

Our search was grounded in a certain geography, among a certain combination of Indigenous elders/activists, in a particular program that was already multiracial. On some level, the methods we used, however imperfectly, were acts of basic hospitality—ways of being that, one would hope, belong to any culture. They simply make sense in terms of treating people humanely. At the same time, to not name these values as Indigenous, as if they are methods that anyone can easily apply, in any context, runs the risk of cutting them off from the land, from a people, from long-practiced traditions. Such a cutting will render these methods “techniques” that will, inevitably, lose their power. The ethic at the foundation of multiracial feminism—to recognize power (its strength and misuses)

and honor the depths of Native American, African American, Latina, Asian, and white culture—remains a guiding principle. At each step of our search we needed to ask what it meant to draw upon Indigenous methods and, perhaps more importantly, ask what it would mean not to do so. These are questions we tried to wrestle with during the search in close dialogue with Native faculty, administrators, and community leaders.

Ultimately, these complicated questions underscored the necessity of affirmative action—as a promise and as a way of living. At the end of *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor*, critical legal theorist Patricia Williams writes,

I strongly believe not just in programs like affirmative action, but in affirmative action as a socially and professionally pervasive concept...to acknowledge that level of complexity is to require, to seek, and to value a multiplicity of knowledge systems, in pursuit of a more complete sense of the world in which we live. Affirmative action in this sense is as mystical and beyond-the-self as an initiation ceremony. It is an act of verification and vision, an act of social as well as professional responsibility.³⁴

Affirmative action in this sense promises discovery and offers change.

Affirmative action becomes the “initiation ceremony” that Williams writes of when departments tailor their searches to account for a university’s location and land base, the needs of the Native students, and the relationship of the university to Native communities in the region. Although this tailoring requires being mindful of legal issues (regarding questions that can be asked, ways that jobs need to be advertised), Indigenous methods typically support not only the letter but also the spirit of affirmative action policy.³⁵ Such acts of “verification and vision” involve treating consciousness raising as a consistent practice that is necessary in order to welcome candidates fully.

Our experience also suggests that respecting core Native values—land rights and group belonging, face-to-face interaction, humility, a valuing of elders, giving back to one’s community, reciprocity, placing group rights above individualism—has the potential to benefit the academy across the board—not only in women’s studies. For example, recognizing the centrality of landed peoples in Native cultures opens up the possibility of embrac-

ing other land-based cultures—other Indigenous people—Chicanos, for example, and their deep connections with and among Native people.³⁶

African Americans have also felt a deep belonging to the land, first in their ancestral lands in Africa and then in the South of the United States. The insistence on the part of the survivors of Hurricane Katrina to get back to their land, their roots, is one of the most graphic recent examples of this yearning. In her recent work, bell hooks also convincingly argues that, for Black people, a sense of belonging to the land is a key aspect of embodiment. Furthermore, hooks asks us to see a relationship between belonging to the land and human health.³⁷ Incorporating Indigenous awareness about the land becomes a way of developing our consciousness about wellness in the academy, about making room for the body in the academy, a commitment that moves us way beyond individual faculty searches and into the realm of reclaiming ourselves as teachers, learners, and healers.

Rethinking searches to include attention to the land that universities are built on is just one way that Indigenous methods could transform the academy. Honoring the Native value placed on elders could move us forward in how we conduct searches as well as how we work with non-traditional-age students and “retired” faculty. Considered attention to reciprocity could help us rethink how we treat each other in the halls, in faculty meetings, in “blind” reviews, and in rituals of promotion. Returning to the activist roots of women’s studies, an activism that has been an issue of sheer survival for Native people, can replenish women’s studies, save us from a privileging of abstract discursiveness that has left little room for “theory in the flesh.”³⁸

A Native commitment to fight in order to heal rather than fight in order to kill could move us well beyond the “politics of tact” where faculty stop short of openly disagreeing with each other while stabbing each other in the back behind closed doors. Cherokee scholar Daniel Heath Justice’s recommendation to “be generous of spirit, in war as well as peace” has the potential to shift the academic fights that have left so many of us bloodied. Justice writes, “To be generous of spirit is to be willing to enter a necessary fight with a goal of healing at its end, not destruction.

It is never easy, but the elders I most admire all share this quality, and it gives me much hope for the future.”³⁹

Such a generosity of spirit might well be coupled with a deeper sense of perspective about what is worth fighting for, and what is not. Tsalagi (Cherokee) scholar Jeff Corntassel recommends that people don’t get caught up in the “politics of distraction.” Quoting a friend of his, Corntassel said, “Always ask yourself, is this the hill you want to die on?”⁴⁰ This, I think, is a question worth keeping close to us in the work we are doing to humanize the academy.

NOTES

The author wants to thank Susan Kosoff, Crystal Rizzo, Kee Warner, Linda Watts, Eulala Pegram, Sebrina Forrest, Janice Gould and, especially, Diane Harriford for their astute thoughts and suggestions on this article. The author also wishes to thank the members of the *Feminist Studies* editorial collective and former editorial director Claire G. Moses.

1. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987); Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990); Barbara Smith, ed., *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology* (New York: Kitchen Table Women of Color Press, 1983); Kimberlé Crenshaw et al., eds., *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement* (New York: New Press, 1997).
2. See “A National Census of Women’s and Gender Studies Programs in US Institutions of Higher Education,” www.nwsa.org/PAD/database/downloads/NWSA_Data_Report_08.pdf (accessed May 17, 2010).
3. See Gloria Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds., *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women’s Studies* (Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press, 1982). One of the many extra challenges women of color face in women’s studies includes being one of the only, if not *the* only, woman of color in their departments. For example, the “NWSA/Ms. Magazine Guide to Women’s and Gender Studies” (see “A National Census for Women’s and Gender Studies”) revealed that over 80 percent of women of color have no colleagues of color in their departments.
4. Martha McCaughey, ed., *Women’s Studies Program Administrators’ Handbook: New Edition* (2006), www.nwsa.org/research/downloads/paddocs/admin/WShandbook2006.pdf (accessed May 18, 2010); Caroline Sotella Viernes Turner, *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees*, www.aacu.org/publications/divfacintro.cfm (accessed May 18, 2010). See the University of Michigan’s “Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring: Academic Year 2009–2010,” www.advance.rackham.umich.edu/handbook.pdf (accessed May 17, 2010). It recommends that if a search includes no people of color, it be re-opened and intensified. It also emphasizes

- the value of including more than one candidate of color and/or woman among the finalists, reporting that interviewers evaluate them more fairly when there is more than one in the pool. It is ironic that, given the scrutiny that the University of Michigan faced leading up to the Supreme Court decision, the handbook the university produced is the most serious and nuanced of those I studied.
5. In Daryl G. Smith et al., "Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty," *Journal of Higher Education* 75 (March–April, 2004): 133–60, the authors found that hiring faculty of color depended upon at least one of three strategies: using job descriptions that emphasize diversity, conducting "special hires," and utilizing ethnically diverse committees in searches (154).
 6. Will Potter, "American Indians Seek a Voice in Affirmative Action Debate," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 49 (June 6, 2003): A–22; Josephine Beoku-Betts and Wairimū Ngarūiya Njambi, "African Feminist Scholars in Women's Studies: Negotiating Spaces of Dislocation and Transformation in the Study of Women," in *Still Brave: The Evolution of Black Women's Studies*, ed. Stanlie M. James, Frances Smith Foster, and Beverly Guy-Sheftall (New York: Feminist Press, 2009), 300–315; M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "Genealogies, Legacies, Movements," in *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, ed. M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty (New York: Routledge, 1997), xiii–xlii.
 7. *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 US 306 (2003); On June 23, 2003, the Supreme Court upheld the right of universities to consider race in admissions procedures in order to achieve a diverse student body. See Joanne Barkan, "Alive and Not Well: Affirmative Action on Campus," *Dissent* 55 (Spring 2008): 49–57.
 8. Michelle S. Moses, Patricia Marin, and John T. Yun, "Affirmative Action's Fate: Are Twenty More Years Enough?" (paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, March 27, 2008).
 9. Jeff J. Corntassel, "An Activist Posing as an Academic?" and Jeane Breinig, "Everything and Nothing: A First-Year Experience," both in *American Indian Quarterly* 27 (Winter–Spring 2003): 160–71 and 103–112, respectively; Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner, "Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginality," *Journal of Higher Education* 73 (January/February 2002): 74–93.
 10. Devon Abbott Mihesuah, "Academic Gatekeepers," in *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, ed. Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Cavender Wilson (Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 2004), 33–34.
 11. Bernice Johnson Reagon, "African Diaspora Women: The Making of Cultural Workers," *Feminist Studies* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 77.
 12. The reason I clarify "certain" Indigenous methods is that those I am addressing are neither inclusive of all Indigenous values nor universal among Indigenous people. Dramatic linguistic, regional, familial, historical, and cultural differences among Native people make the notion of a set or monolithic Indigenous methodology absurd. For discussion of diverse understandings of Indigenous ethics/methods, see, for example, V.F. Cordova, *How It Is: The Native American Philosophy of V.F. Cordova*, ed. Kathleen Dean Moore et al. (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007); Linda

- Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 2004); White Bison, *The Red Road to Wellbriety: In the Native American Way* (Colorado Springs: White Bison, 2002) (in particular the appendix A1–A12); and Mihesuah and Wilson, *Indigenizing the Academy*.
13. The logic behind this institution building was that in many universities, women's studies and ethnic studies often have to compete against each other for faculty, resources, and students. In the process, it has fallen on the backs of women of color to build bridges between the two programs, dealing with the racism in overwhelmingly white women's studies programs and with the sexism in male-controlled ethnic studies programs. Building a single program (one of only a handful in the United States) was a structural attempt to move beyond the prophetic title "This Bridge Called My Back," while combining faculty and resources to build a global, interdisciplinary, activist-based program. See Cherrie Moraga, and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds., *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (New York: Kitchen Table Women of Color Press, 1983).
 14. Robert Nelson's guide to Native American studies programs in the United States and Canada underscores the vibrancy of Native studies in the northern hemisphere, with over one hundred undergraduate programs and over thirty MA and PhD programs in the United States alone, <http://oncampus.richmond.edu/faculty/ASAIL/guide.html> (retrieved May 18, 2010). This guide puts to rest the notion that there are few Native scholars in the pipeline. Research by Smith et al. ("Interruption of the Usual") also documents multiple ways in which the rationale that there are no people in the pipeline can be deceptive. In her crucial book, *Soul Talk: The New Spirituality of African American Women* (Vermont: Inner Traditions, 2001), Gloria Akasha Hull identifies the early 1980s as a high point in African American women's studies, Black women's consciousness, political activism, and creativity. There are a number of signs that point to such a high point in American Indian studies now. See Vine Deloria Jr., "Marginal and Submarginal," in *Indigenizing the Academy*, 16–30; Clara Sue Kidwell, "American Indian Studies: Intellectual Navel Gazing or Academic Discipline," *American Indian Quarterly* 33 (Winter 2009): 1–17.
 15. While preparing for the search, we compiled a "Resources for Native American Studies" guide that specified the goals of Native American studies at uccs, the areas of faculty expertise, and the Native organizations in the area. With this document we hoped to send the message that a Native scholar would not have to build a program from the ground up—that there was already institutional support and history at uccs for Native studies. This guide was emailed, mailed, and hand-delivered to prospective candidates, faculty, and community activists.
 16. White Bison, *The Red Road to Wellbriety*.
 17. Our logic here was that sending out applications and then waiting for extended periods of time before hearing from a committee can breed loneliness and insecurity. Typically, the first contact after an applicant submits material is a form letter. We wanted our first contact to convey our respect for each individual's scholarly, teaching, and activist commitments.

18. May Annette Pember, "Ethnic Fraud: Tribal Scholars Say Some Faculty Are Falsely Claiming Indian Heritage to Boost Their Job Prospects," *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* 23 (January 27, 2007): 4.
19. Janice Gould, *Earthquake Weather: Poems* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996); *Beneath My Heart* (New York: Firebrand Books, 1990), "I Give You Back: Memory, Language, and Transformation in the Poetry of Joy Harjo" (PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2000); and, Janice Gould and Dean Rader, eds., *Speak to Me Words: Essays in American Indian Poetry* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003).
20. Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in High Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997). This quote was from my post-interview conversation with Janice Gould, 2009. Gould read this article in draft form and provided key insights both through her direct quotes and through dialogue with me.
21. Barbara Christian, "The Race for Theory," in *Making Face, Making Soul: Haciendo Caras, Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*, ed. Gloria Anzaldúa (San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1990), 335–45.
22. Collectively reading the *American Indian Quarterly's* special issue, "Native Experiences in the Ivory Tower," could have provided crucial knowledge about the challenges that Native graduate students and junior and senior faculty have to negotiate in academic settings. See *American Indian Quarterly* 27 (Winter-Spring, 2003).
23. M. Neelika Jayawardane, "Taking Things Personally, and Publicising the Private: Encountering Erasure on the Frontlines of Academia," *Social Dynamics* 33, no. 1 (2007): 31–51.
24. Expanding ourselves as intellectuals prior to and during a search is part of the process of what critical race legal theorist Mari Matsuda identifies as becoming an "affirmative action scholar"—of seeing affirmative action not as a momentary practice but as a way of life. This commitment includes consistently engaging with a multi-racial group of scholars and scholarship, taking affirmative steps to organize multi-racial panels and conferences, learning new listening skills, and resisting apartheid in curriculum. See Matsuda's "Affirmative Action and Legal Knowledge: Planting Seeds in Plowed-Up Ground," *Harvard Women's Law Journal*, 1st ser. 11 (1988): 1–17. See "Handbook for Faculty Searches," 15.
25. William T. Cross, "Pathway to the Professoriate: The American Indian Faculty Pipeline," in *Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education*, ed. Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner et al. (Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster, 1996), 327–36.
26. Angela Cavender Wilson, "Reclaiming our Humanity," in *Indigenizing the Academy*, 74.
27. Patricia Williams, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 73.
28. Smith et al., "Interrupting the Usual," 136.
29. Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Cavender Wilson, introduction to *Indigenizing the Academy*, 6–7.
30. Julie Pelletier and Becca Gercken, "The 'Old Ways' as New Methods: Decolonizing and Native Values in Academia," *Studies in the Humanities* 33 (December 2006): 245–63.

31. Paula Gunn Allen, *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Tradition* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986).
32. This yearning for steady and affirming ground is precisely why the new, multiracial leadership of the National Women's Studies Association identified Indigenous feminisms as one of the key themes for the 2010 meetings.
33. Wendy Rose, "The Great Pretenders: Further Reflections on Whiteshamanism," in *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*, ed. M. Annette Jaimes (Boston: South End Press, 1992), 403–23.
34. Williams, *Alchemy of Race and Rights*, 121.
35. While following the letter of the law in affirmative action policy typically upholds a color-blindness ideology, the spirit of affirmative action more closely resembles a color-and-gender-conscious approach to hiring and retention. This consciousness is key to nurturing a multiracial academy.
36. Devon G. Peña, *Chicano Culture, Ecology, Politics* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1998); Earl Shorris, *Latinos: A Biography of the People* (New York: Norton, 1992).
37. Diane Harriford and Becky Thompson, *When the Center Is on Fire: Passionate Social Theory for Our Times* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008). In addition, bell hooks writes about her return to her roots in Kentucky after having lived elsewhere for decades, feeling an intimacy (with herself and others) and a sense of belonging that she believes she could have only found through the land. See bell hooks, *Belonging: A Culture of Place* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 37, 38.
38. Moraga and Anzaldúa, *This Bridge Called My Back*.
39. Daniel Heath Justice, "Seeing (and Reading) Red: Indian Outlaws in the Ivory Tower," in *Indigenizing the Academy*, 103.
40. Corntassel, "Activist Posing," 167.