When we say “dislocating the white gaze,” we are referring to a dislocation of the systems that have historically underserved some, such as disproportionately BIPOC student bodies, while upholding power structures that benefit others, namely white students.

Looking Back, Looking Forward: Resisting the White Gaze in Historical Narratives and Future Possibilities of Art Education

Hannah Kim Sions
James Madison University
Courtnie N. Wolfgang
Virginia Commonwealth University

Looking back at art education’s past, the authors find too little space for some of us to situate ourselves. The histories and narratives of art education, as well as the curricula, are the histories and narratives of the victor and, according to DeVille (2018), “it’s garbage.” While there is much work to be done generally in regard to justice and equity in art education, in this manuscript, we posit a looking back at histories from outside the margin of the white supremacist patriarchy (hooks, 2013), looking to scholarship, teaching, and artistic production resisting the white gaze (Morrison, 1998; Paris & Alim, 2014b), and looking forward to a more racially just future of art education. We begin with a framework of Critical Race Theory, then review past multicultural efforts in (art) education through a critical race lens to provide a theoretical analysis of the role that whiteness played in these movements. We provide examples of artists creating art in active resistance to the white gaze and then discuss pedagogical and epistemological possibilities of resisting the white gaze (Morrison, 1998; Paris & Alim, 2014b). Finally, we conclude by looking forward, with hopeful prophecies for the future of art education.

Keywords: whiteness, anti-racist pedagogy, multicultural art education, history, multicultural education

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hannah K. Sions at sionshk@jmu.edu, and to Courtnie N. Wolfgang at cnwolfgang@vcu.edu
The summer of 2020 was a pivotal moment in history in the United States of America. On social media, we saw an onslaught of anti-racist resources, statements of solidarity, and proclamations of allyship—particularly, declarations of white and non-Black persons of color (NBPOC) allyship toward the Black community. The authors are geographically situated in a state with a long and violent history of anti-Black racism: one of the authors is located in Richmond, Virginia, the former so-called Capital of the Confederacy and the seat of months-long public and highly profiled protests of anti-Black racism during spring and summer 2020. The moment felt like a national reckoning of systemic racism via social media. As meaningful as it might have been to see discussions about race and racism with such frankness, how is this moment different? How much change might this increased visibility and attention toward systemic racism in the USA create? Hafeli (2009) argued that the field of art education is an eternal return, repeating scholarship as a result of a disregard for past voices while emphasizing current discourse. Buffington, in her 2019 Marantz Distinguished Alumni Award (AAEP, 2020), stated the importance of looking back on our field to learn and build upon the work of those who have come before us.

However, looking back at art education’s past, the authors find too little space for some of us to situate ourselves. The histories and narratives of art education, as well as the curricula, are the histories and narratives of the victor and, according to DeVille (2018) “it’s garbage.” While there is much work to be done generally in regard to justice and equity in art education, in this manuscript, we posit a looking back at histories from outside the margin of the white supremacist patriarchy (hooks, 2013), looking to scholarship, teaching, and artistic production resisting the white gaze (Morrison, 1998; Paris & Alim, 2014b), and looking forward to a more racially just future of art education. We begin with a framework of Critical Race Theory, then review past multicultural efforts in (art) education through a critical race lens to provide a theoretical analysis of the role that whiteness played in these movements. We provide examples of artists creating art in active resistance to the white gaze and then discuss pedagogical and epistemological possibilities of resisting the white gaze (Morrison, 1998; Paris & Alim, 2014b). Finally, we conclude by looking forward, with hopeful prophecies for the future of art education.

Who we are

We acknowledge our subjectivities in the work of justice pedagogies. We are: Hannah Sions—cisgender, heterosexual, Asian, neurodivergent woman of color and Courtnie Wolfgang—cisgender, gay/queer, white woman. While neither of us experience the privileges of what hooks (2009) refers to as the heteropatriarchy, neither of us have experiences of blackness. While racism is not exclusive to bias against blackness, we submit that racial socio-cultural politics regarding blackness in the United States of America were centered during the uprisings of the summer of 2020 and largely inform the history and analysis forthcoming. We also submit that the extensive work of moving toward anti-racist pedagogies in art education is assigned to all of us, not just those directly affected by anti-Black racism (Wolfgang, 2019). Blackness and whiteness are both socially constructed—however whiteness relies on false claims of superiority and therefore has historically (Alexander, 2010) occupied the point around which all other experiences and rights
must pivot. What we present moving forward is an offering of the historical, educational, and artistic movements that have flourished in spite of historical erasure, violence, and suppression as a result of the construction of whiteness.

**Framing the conversation:**

**Critical race theory**

Critical race theory seeks to identify the role of racism in history and society and provide a counternarrative that challenges the status quo. It also recognizes the connection that racism has to other forms of white supremacy (e.g., classism, patriarchy, homophobia, etc.) and highlights societal, legal, and historical forces that perpetuate discrimination of individuals based on their race, gender-identity, sexuality, etc. (Carbado, 2011). Critical race theory also asserts that racism and racial hierarchy has been written into the American legal system to benefit white individuals and disadvantage Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) (Crenshaw et al., 1995). For the purpose of this paper, we borrow Kendi’s (2019) definition of race: “a power construct of collected or merged differences that lives socially” (p. 35). Racism is not limited to blatant acts of racial discrimination, but is just as harmful through subtle microaggressions that slowly wears down the receiver of these acts (Delgado & Stefanic, 2017). To put it simply, racism is ubiquitous, and action is needed to create change (Delgado & Stefanic, 2017; Valdes et al., 2002). Many critical race scholars originated from disciplines outside of law, as such, critical race theory is inherently interdisciplinary (Gaztambide-Fernández, et al., 2018). Because of these interdisciplinary roots, the adoption of critical race theory into education is not unexpected. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) were early champions of critical race theory in education. In this introductory article, the authors posit that social inequities, at large and in schools, are based on three tenets:

1. Race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity in the United States.
2. U.S. society is based on property rights.
3. The intersection of race and property creates an analytical tool through which we can understand social – and consequently school – inequities (p. 48).

Ladson-Billings and Tate acknowledged that racial inequities were not separate from class or gender-based inequities, and that these forms of identity intersected each other. They did argue, however, that race was untheorized while theoretical considerations for gender and class existed to a greater extent.

To counter dominant and existing narratives, critical race scholars emphasized counter-narrative and qualitative research methods to highlight the lived experiences of BIPOC, and as a continuation of disrupting the notion of objectivity in research (Dixon & Anderson, 2017).

Critical race theory is a very intentional fight against racial power, but pragmatically recognizes that the fight against racial inequities must be in alignment with white interest (Bell, 1995; Gaztambide-Fernández et al., 2018). Unfortunately, this knowledge makes it so that all efforts to dismantle racism have to be in ways that are tolerable to whiteness (Gaztambide-Fernández et al., 2018), which creates a push and pull dynamic that prevents large reform. This

---

1 For the purposes of this manuscript, we use BIPOC to be inclusive of Black, Indigenous, and Non-Black people of color when discussing racism toward non-white people. We use Black when historically or contextually relevant related specifically to racism toward Black people.
dynamic is visible in multicultural efforts in education, where the demands of BIPOC were met with superficial changes that integrated diversity without challenging the status quo. The following section examines multicultural (art) education and how whiteness has impacted its ability to respond to the needs of BIPOC students.

**Multicultural (art) education and whiteness**

Multicultural education scholars credit African American scholars including W.E.B. Du Bois, Horace Mann Bond, George Washington Williams, Charles H. Wesley, and Carter G. Woodson for changing the parameters of traditional scholarship in America (Banks, 1996) by challenging existing understandings of knowledge (Banks, 1995a). At this time, African American scholars were fighting to be visible and acknowledged by a white field. Still, despite whiteness dominating scholarship these scholars pushed to have their perspectives and scholarship recognized (Banks, 1995a).

One of the earlier attempts to incorporate multicultural curriculum into education was the intergroup-education movement in the 1940s and 50s. This movement was the result of the displacement of Southern Black and white individuals during WWII. As they settled into new cities, riots erupted from building racial tensions (Banks, 1988). The intergroup-education movement was the response to these riots, in an effort to reduce the racial tension and prejudice. Whiteness, unfortunately, can be identified as the demise of the intergroup-education movement, as white educators only saw its need in racially diverse schools. As such, it was never adopted in most schools in the United States (Banks, 1988).

The Civil Rights movement brought multicultural education to be implemented into schools across the nation. Black and other POC activists demanded changes, such as the hiring of more Black teachers, positive representations of Black history and Black life in curriculum, and rewriting of textbooks to reflect that. Activists pointed to the lower academic achievement of minority and low-income students as proof of the failings of existing curriculum (Banks, 1988). As a response, multicultural education was introduced into schools. From the beginning, however; whiteness derailed the efficiency of multicultural education--these multicultural efforts did not change the existing curriculum, only added multicultural content to existing school content (Banks, 1988). The curriculum was still grounded on knowledge that was written within a framework of whiteness first, and cultures were viewed through a similar lens. Since then, scholars have challenged the white supremacy that underpins the curriculum in United States public schools.

In the early stages of the multicultural art movement, scholars analyzed multicultural texts to identify practices and limitations (Gibson, 1976; Pratt, 1983; Sleeter & Grant, 1987). In an analysis of 127 multicultural articles and books, Sleeter and Grant (1987) identified five approaches to multicultural teaching: teaching the culturally different; human relations; single group studies; education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist; and multicultural education. Their analysis identified that each of these methods introduced diversity into curriculum and, in some instances, made room for students from different cultural backgrounds to share their cultures. Tomhave (1995) analyzed multicultural art education literature utilizing the framework created by Sleeter and Grant (1987) and Gibson (1976). His analysis found that multicultural art education literature from 1976 to 1989 focused...
on the following approaches: acculturation/assimilation, bi-cultural education/cross-cultural research, cultural separatism, multicultural education theory, social reconstruction, and cultural understanding. However, these methods centered whiteness: an emphasis was put on assimilation and/or the assumption that intergroup relations, without addressing inequities (such as power, bias, and social constructs) would resolve the issue of racism in curriculum (Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Failure to address the discrimination that BIPOC students experience, but endorsing the benefits of integration, demonstrates a "color-blind" ideology where the failure to acknowledge race "legitimizes and thereby maintains the social, economic, and political advantages that whites hold over other Americans..." (Gotanda, 1995, p. 257). Desai (2010) suggests that colorblind racism in art education avoids discussing race while covertly expressing racial views and overlooking systemic racism.

Grant and Sleeter (1998) recognized the shortcomings of the early stages of multicultural education, acknowledging that educational equity was not being achieved through these efforts. As a response to their early analysis, Grant and Sleeter (1998) introduced practical multicultural teaching methods, putting much emphasis on the gap between BIPOC students' experiences and the predominantly white teaching force. Banks (1995b) introduced the five dimensions of multicultural education, which identified that true change could only happen with an overhaul of the structure of education. Banks believed that education equity would only be achieved with five main changes to education: the integration of cultures throughout curricula; understanding the influence of cultures on knowledge construction; identification of students' racial biases; addressing and changing inequitable social structures in schools; and providing diverse teaching practices to accommodate all different types of learners. During this same period, Ladson-Billings (1995) introduced the concept of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy, a landmark perspective where BIPOC students were seen for their contributions and knowledge in school spaces. Ladson-Billings (1995) argued that preexisting multicultural literature only perceived BIPOC students from a deficit lens, measuring students based on their academic struggles without attention to the context of more broad educational inequity and failing to acknowledge the contributions that diverse student experiences bring. The deficit lens is complicated further by inherently biased curriculum and policies in schools that disproportionately underserve students of color (Kraehe & Acuff, 2013). Unlike earlier efforts toward multicultural pedagogies, these scholars challenged the inherent structure of education, (deficit) perceptions of BIPOC students, and the relationships and power dynamics between white educators and their BIPOC students. Yet, educational scholarship in art/education seems to be stuck in place on repeat— renaming and redefining ways to address inequities in schools. Ladson-Billings' Culturally Relevant Pedagogy inspired additionally scholarly and pedagogical approaches: culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2000), cultural competence (McAllister & Irvine, 2000), culturally connected pedagogy (Irizarry, 2007), and culturally sustaining pedagogy (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014a). In art education, we saw critiques of multicultural art practices that simplified cultures (Stout, 1997) or misinterpreted artwork through a Western lens (Desai, 2005). Critical multicultural art education became the term used to describe pedagogy where inequities were combated with critical
understanding, critical analysis, and critical thinking (Acuff, 2016; Holloway & Krensky, 2001). At the same time, social justice themes that moved beyond race were introduced into multicultural education and multicultural art education scholarship. Social justice pedagogy advocated for an equitable education for all students, recognizing marginalization beyond race and ethnicity and included gender, sexuality, gender-identity, disabilities, social/economic inequities, class, and religion (Au, 2014; Bailey & Desai, 2005; Brooks, 2012; Congdon et al., 2002; Derby, 2011; Desai & Chalmers, 2007; Fiarman, 2016; Nieto & Bode, 2018; Seider, 2011): an intersectional approach where the “dynamics of difference and the solidarities of sameness in the context of antidiscrimination and social movement politics.” (Cho et al., 2013, p. 787).

While anti-racism has seemingly become part of a popular lexicon in the summer of 2020, where celebrities and corporations are making space for actively anti-racist declarations via social media and advertising, the concept of anti-racist education is not new. Dei (1996) provided ten principles that are necessary to an anti-racist education:

1. Recognize the social effects of race.
2. Understand race through an intersectional lens.
3. Recognize and challenge white power and privilege.
4. Unpack marginalization: who experiences it and how it is perpetuated.
5. Education should be holistic, appreciating social, cultural, political, ecological, and spiritual aspects of students’ experiences.
6. Focus on students’ construct of identity and its relation to school.
7. Identify and confront challenges to diversity in schools and society.
8. Be transparent about the role education has played in the marginalization of students.
9. Connect and contextualize students’ lived experiences into curriculum, as their lives cannot be separated from their education.
10. Critically analyze how education dismisses students instead of diverting blame to family environments (pp. 27-35).

Lee (1985) wrote about anti-racism in education and its goals, stating that “Anti-racist education emerges from an understanding that racism exists in society, and therefore, the school, as an institution of society is influenced by racism” (p. 8). Anti-racist education aims to abolish racism in all its iterations. Anti-racist education responds to the notion that existing curriculum is oppressive and exclusionary for BIPOC students (Ighodaro & Wiggan, 2013); anti-racist curriculum is needed for education to meet the needs of all students, to help support BIPOC students and prepare all students for a diverse world (hooks, 2003). According to Brinson and Smith (2014) all parties involved in the field of education must become anti-racist to close the achievement gap, include broader perspectives in curriculum, and have a more diverse teaching force. This would require education to center anti-racism as a goal, emphasizing the need to confront institutional racism, racial inequality, and celebrate diversity without appropriation or exploitation (Cole, 2009). Without anti-racist considerations, diversity efforts in education will be superficial, “like a movie set made of cardboard: while it may appear authentic, it will take little to knock it down and reveal it as a sham” (Nieto, 1995, p. 195).
What’s keeping us from moving forward?

A fundamental roadblock to anti-racism work is that inequality cannot truly be addressed without honest conversations about (systemic) racism (Kendi, 2019). We posit that without deeper understanding of the implications of systemic racism, efforts toward multiculturalism, diversity, equality, equity, tolerance, acceptance, decolonization, abolition, and justice are relegated to buzzwords: they exist only as a mask, easily removed when the undergirding of dominant discourse prevails (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Ladson-Billings (2014) states there is a “static conception of what it means to be culturally relevant. Many practitioners...seem stuck in very limited and superficial notions of culture” (p. 77). Similarly, in interviews about her theory of intersectionality, and the misconceptions of what it means to be intersectional, Crenshaw (Coaston, 2019; Steinmetz, 2020) begins by outlining “what it’s not” because its definition has been stretched beyond her intentions as the idea became further removed from its original context. Crenshaw explains that,

[intersectionality is] not identity politics on steroids. It is not a mechanism to turn white men into the new pariahs...We tend to talk about race inequality as separate from inequality based on gender, class, sexuality, or immigrant status. What’s often missing is how some people are subject to all of these, and the experience is not just the sum of its parts (Steinmetz, 2020, para 2).

During the summer of 2020, a national uprising for racial justice in the USA resulted in prolific visibility of Black lives and movements toward anti-racist education; more specifically, tactics for educating white individuals on how to be anti-racist. For Hannah, it was in this moment that she started to question the extent that whiteness is almost always centered in “popular” anti-racism (Bejan, 2020; McWhorter, 2020) and, as a result, questioned the capabilities of anti-racist discourse. For Courtnie, she remarked on the language and action-policing from white person to white person-a theater of “wokeness” playing out via formerly actively-unpolitcized spaces of social media. In both cases, the centering of white experience in anti-racist dialogue was notable. We both felt anxious that the upswell in visibility and calls to action for racial justice would settle back to a status quo. Or that the newly highly politicized landscape would continue to be theater for white communities: a play to appear justice-oriented for social media audiences. And what does any of that have to do with art and education?

The authors posit that the centering of whiteness and the (unearned) privileges therein in policies and curricula in art education are partially to blame for a lack of movement toward racial justice in the field. And that the theater of change—a change in name only—keeps the field stuck. According to Kendi (2019), “when our policy does not produce racial equity, we blame the people...not our flawed policy solution...what if we blamed our ideologies and methods, studied our ideologies and methods, refined our ideologies and methods again and again until they worked?” (p. 214). Critical race theory states that change cannot happen without white individuals intentionally giving up their power:

Whites may agree in the abstract that blacks are citizens and are entitled to constitutional protection against racial discrimination, but few are willing to recognize that racial segregation is much more than a series of quaint customs that can be remedied effectively without altering the status of
whites...whites simply cannot envision the personal responsibility and the potential sacrifice inherent in black’s conclusion that true equality for blacks will require the surrender of racism-granted privileges for whites (Bell, 1995, p. 22)

Educators who claim commitment to equity in schools must also be committed to the unlearning of historically biased pedagogies and curricula- and their direct or indirect complicity in those systems (Wolfgang, 2019). Educators must also commit to the practice of getting unstuck: to build new knowledge continuously toward justice in teaching and learning and to acknowledge the practice (how we teach) as well as the content (what we teach) is essential to undoing racism in art education. None of these ideas is revolutionary: as the literature included here suggests, we are not the first to claim them. What we offer next are considerations for the field that help one to remain unstuck in the work of justice pedagogies in art education moving forward.

Moving forward

Sions: Unfortunately, almost as quickly as it came, I saw fewer conversations about anti-racism and racial justice; the lack of media attention to ongoing protests perpetuated the false narrative that the movement was decelerating. Discouraged, I began reflecting on anti-racism and diversity efforts that accommodated whiteness and started to wonder what these things would look like if we were to remove whiteness as a consideration from these movements. What would our field and scholarship look like if we dislocated whiteness as the center around which all other scholarship orbits?

Wolfgang: As a white accomplice to anti-racist pedagogy, how will I continue to deeply investigate my past and current complicity in systems that uphold white supremacy in art education (Wolfgang, 2019)? What are the pedagogical and epistemological considerations that should inform my practice in the midst of a national uprising for racial justice and living and working in a city trying to heal from its legacy of racial violence?

We acknowledge the contributions of white allies who use their privilege in pursuit of equality (Bell, 1995). Still, it is our belief that contemplating futures that center voices historically relegated to the margins is an essential practice in art education moving forward if we are to imagine even the possibility of a post-racist future. The field of art education has already begun these conversations. Art Education, the journal of the National Art Education Association, recently published two issues dedicated to the future of art curriculum. In these issues, authors wrote about some considerations for the future of our field, such as teaching in the wake of Black Lives Matter (Kraehe & Herman 2020), shifting methods of assessment (Hogan et al., 2020), an empathetic curriculum that allows student reflection (Wilson, 2020), curriculum in a post-pandemic world (Kraehe, 2020), and civically engaged art education (Fendler et al., 2020). Further, Acuff (2020) has proposed reimagining art education through an Afrofuturistic lens, giving “Black students the agency to actively create their existence and futures” (p. 20), providing a counternarrative of possibilities in response to the mass erasure of Black experience. The Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education has also dedicated three issues to exploring the role of whiteness in our field, specifically to unpack the power and influence that whiteness has (Acuff, 2019). Author Toni Morrison spent her career making “sure that the white gaze was not the dominant one in any of [her] books” to push against the existing notion that whiteness must
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be prominent for writing to be “good” (PBS, 2020). Moving forward, what is actively anti-racist scholarship and practice in art education in resistance to the white gaze: the assumption that the reader or audience isn’t (primarily) white? (Morrison, 1998; Paris & Alim, 2014b)

**How and what we teach**

The authors posit that an investigation of pedagogical and epistemological underpinnings of how we teach is as necessary as what we teach to unlearn teaching for the white gaze. At the start of the fall semester 2020, Wolfgang witnessed administration at her university using language like “decolonize” and “abolition” for the first time publicly in regard to curriculum and pedagogy. A workshop titled “Decolonizing Your Syllabus” was offered for faculty. Meanwhile, amid panic of COVID related budget cuts, teaching faculty were subject to increased teaching and service loads, adjunct and staff positions were cut, departmental leadership was dissolved and consolidated without faculty governance. The institution seemed set on the theater of decolonization and abolition by declaring it the responsibility of teaching faculty without acknowledging the systems of oppression the institution continued to uphold. Tuck and Yang (2012) remind us that “decolonization” is not a metaphor, rather rooted in the abolition of settler colonialism and the restitution of indigenous rights and lands. “Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation” (p.7). Love (2019) cites abolitionist teaching as inclusive of boycotting and protesting; calling out racism, homophobia and islamophobia; centering Black joy and love in pedagogy. It felt unlikely that the institution was positioning itself for decolonization nor abolition by these definitions. The authors thereby question the institutional or pedagogical use of “decolonizing” related to practice that is not explicitly related to restitution of indigenous rights or the use of “abolition” if the structures of oppression and power are not ceded.

Likewise, we are not suggesting these methods are decolonizing art education, lest we fall into the same well-intentioned albeit misguided and harmful stasis Tuck and Yang refer to. Instead, we suggest that these methods might help one dislocate the white gaze, opening space to reimagine pedagogies and epistemologies of a possible future: more relevant, more inclusive, more sustaining, more just.

**Dislocating the authority of the white gaze**

When we say “dislocating the white gaze,” we are referring to a dislocation of the systems that have historically underserved some, such as disproportionately BIPOC student bodies, while upholding power structures that benefit others, namely white students. We further suggest that the white gaze, or assuming a white audience, when developing pedagogies and epistemologies of art education is undergirded by white supremacy and is damaging to all students or learners but have specific and lasting negative impact on BIPOC students. Wolfgang acknowledges that her education and preparation to become a teacher did not include perspectives that decentered white experience—nor did her personal experiences as a white person. Therefore, the imperative for white teachers in particular to take audit of their materials and teaching practices- and enact meaningful changes- is paramount.
What we teach - curriculum audit

Buffington & Bryant (2019) encourage arts educators to reconsider the content of arts curricula, generally finding “multicultural” art education efforts lacking. They researched popular shared lessons via social media and found overwhelmingly a whitewashed approach to teaching about diverse cultures. Further, scholars have argued for the necessity of culturally sustainable representation in arts, academic, and educational spaces as a catalyst for deep personal engagement (Sions & Coleman, 2019).

This representation is often found in popular culture. Solange Knowles unapologetically makes space for blackness, with songs like F.U.B.U. (for us, by us) (2016) stating “[I] made this song to make it all y’alls turn / for us, this shit is from us / get so much from us / then forget us.” Her most recent album, “When I Get Home,” continues her message of Black solidarity through her lyrics: “Black skin, black braids / black waves, black days / Black baes, black things / these are Black-owned things / Black faith still can’t be washed away” (2019). Lizzo (2019) celebrates all aspects of her identity in her music: her blackness, fatness, and womxnhood: “I was born like this, don’t even gotta try / I’m like chardonnay, get better over time / heard you say I’m not the baddest, bitch, you lied.” Beyoncé praises Black beauty in Brown Skin Girl (Beyoncé et al., 2019): “Brown skin girl / your skin just like pearls / the best thing in the world / never trade you for anybody else.” The lyrics sing about Black beauty, but not Black beauty living in a world of whiteness or Black beauty assimilating to white standards, but the beauty of brown skin. The nation of Wakanda in Black Panther (Coogler, 2018) highlights African cultures to imagine a world without settler colonization. Molly of Denali (2019) is a show on PBS Kids about an Indigenous child, that includes Indigenous language, and is, voice-acted and written (KUAC, 2019) by Indigenous people. Hamilton was recognized for its racially diverse casting of white historical figures (Kail & Miranda, 2020). Nalgona Positivity Pride (2021) is rooted in Xicana Indigenous feminism and DIY punk culture.

Wolfgang (2019) argued that students do not need only to be taught about BIPOC artists, they need white teachers to teach that they value BIPOC artists and their narratives as much as they value whiteness in the arts. Two essential pedagogical shifts must happen: white teachers must acknowledge the construction of whiteness in their own education and actively unlearn harmful norms that privilege whiteness and sustain perceptions of white supremacy in art education. Second, introduce artists who push back on norms of whiteness, Euro-centrism, heterocentrism, ableism, and other systems of oppression and to make the concepts of that work part of arts education as well as the inclusion of the artists themselves in the curriculum. Inclusion (alone) is a language of appeasement (Stewart, 2017), not a practice of justice or equity. We put forward the following contemporary visual artists as examples of radical BIPOC love for dislocating the white gaze in arts education:

Visual artist Simone Leigh was recently spotlighted as the first Black woman to represent the U.S. at Venice Biennale (Sheets, 2020). Her work is created with Black women as her primary audience, much of her work focuses on celebrating Black beauty and Black women (Pogrebin & Sheets, 2018).

Artist Kerry James Marshall responds to the exclusion of Black subjects in artwork by focusing on Black experiences in his work.
In doing so, he creates a space for himself rather than waiting for room to be made.

Osborne Macharia’s photographs depict the “future aspirations of people of colour using narrative, fantasy and fiction to highlight African identity” (Leiman, 2018, para 10).

Photographer Zanele Muholi’s work celebrates Black queer communities in South Africa since the early 2000s. Their photographs are an act of resistance, during a time where hate crimes and negative stigmas against the queer community in Africa were at a high (Guggenheim, n.d.).

Multimedia artist Wendy Red Star utilizes multiple forms of expression, including sculpture, fiber arts, video, photography, and performance (Mass MOCA, n.d.). A member of the Apsáalooke (Crow) tribe, her work seeks to challenge and change inaccurate narratives about Native people and their culture by revisiting existing historic artifacts and imagery. Wendy Red Star also creates interactive exhibitions that allow the preservation of her culture.

Aboriginal Australian multimedia artist and activist, Richard Bell is a member of the Kamilaroi, Kooma, Jiman, and Gurang Gurang communities. His artwork challenges stereotypes associated with aboriginal art (French, n.d.). Bell explains, “I recognize some people find [my work] contentious, and that my paintings attract controversy. This response has nothing to do with me; the response has to do with the viewer” (Farley & Portalewska, 2011, para 1). Having experienced first-hand the mistreatment of aboriginal people by the Australian government, Bell’s artwork does not cater to white fragility, but rather tackles race politics head on (Farley & Portalewska, 2011).

These artists, we posit, dislocate the white gaze enabling educators to bring culturally responsive content into teaching and learning spaces. We acknowledge, however, that there is much work left to be done. Beyoncé is criticized as avoiding a disruption of whiteness and, instead, representing her privileged upbringing (Dubler, 2014). Klein (2020) and Morin (2020) point of that the Broadway hit Hamilton has been scrutinized for its glorification of Alexander Hamilton without directly addressing his history as an enslaver. We stress that inclusion alone, on the principles of design, technique, or process, of any of these artists and their work is insufficient without also including the context of the work explicitly. Without that context, art educators are in danger of exploiting BIPOC artists by silencing the message behind their work.

**How we teach it**

The foundations of education in the USA are historically traced back to white interests (Banks, 1995b), which includes practices of teacher authority as opposed to shared governance in a learning environment. Instead, we ask ourselves about the possibilities of:

**Sharing the ownership of your curriculum with your students:** How involved are your students in shaping the assignments and grading for your class (Elbow, 2008)? Wolfgang employs a pedagogy of Collaborative Syllabus writing and Contract Grading as a method of dislocating staid practices of curriculum building that are teacher-centered. In doing this Wolfgang seeks to disrupt what can be assumed, according to Banks (1995b), methods that privilege white values.

---

1. [https://openpedagogy.org/course-level/collaborative-syllabus-design-students-at-the-center/](https://openpedagogy.org/course-level/collaborative-syllabus-design-students-at-the-center/)
2. [https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/i-have-seen-glories-grading-contract](https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/i-have-seen-glories-grading-contract)
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Considering collaborative guiding principles or code of conduct as opposed to top-down rules: Do your students have a say in the conduct of your class space? How open are you to feedback from students? How much of your behavior management was learned by you as a student? How effective is it? Wolfgang refers students to the Digital Library Federation Code of Conduct as a model of participatory conduct codes that honor intersectional experiences. Sions gives students multiple points of contact throughout the semester to provide the instructor with feedback. For example, during the COVID pandemic, students were asked to participate in an anonymous online survey indicating their feelings of safety in attending face to face courses and practicum placements. As a result, Sions made modality adjustments within reason to accommodate students, putting their safety and learning above the imperative to be face to face only.

**Making yourself human, fallible, but do not ignore the existing power dynamic:** The teacher/student power dynamic is always in place, no matter what one does to diminish it. Acknowledge it and make efforts to mitigate the effects of it without pretending it is not a factor. Wolfgang acknowledges the complexity of this, and encourages teachers to practice transparency and humility with their students at every stage of their learning. Dislocate the notion that as a teacher you should “know everything” or that everybody holds the same knowledge upon entering your classroom- expectations that are often rooted in white-centered experience (Banks, 1995b). Tell your students, directly, what they can expect from you as their teacher. Teachers sometimes ask students to sign contracts of expectation that are scripted by the instructor but less often make themselves vulnerable to contracts scripted by the students. There are methods to mitigate the power dynamic, however it cannot be eliminated completely. The best one can do is to lean into that knowledge and move forward with as much transparency and fairness as possible (acknowledging that the teacher, as the power-holder, must do the work to mitigate that relationship).

**Being open to change of direction:** Modify assignments, be flexible with due dates, respond to student feedback (direct or indirect). Let your classroom be a living creature that ebbs and flows with the tide. For example, rethink penalties for late work. Why have them? How might it further de-incentivize student engagement? What possibilities are held by working with students on a flexible timeline to produce their best work? Foucault (1975) tells us that power disguises itself in institutional language. Wolfgang’s practice includes dislocating the reified, common, yet NOT required (per her university guidelines or job description) imperatives for penalizing students for work submitted late, for example. By not only asking herself “what is the most important thing I want my students to LEARN?” but also “What are they learning from me through this practice?” it became clear that student growth was not at the center of penalties for late work, missed classes,

---

4 [https://www.diglib.org/about/code-of-conduct/](https://www.diglib.org/about/code-of-conduct/)

5 The authors would like to acknowledge the complexity or difficulty of learning online for some students while also acknowledging the expanded access and equity for other students with the proliferation of online learning environments during COVID.
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inflexible curricula; power and control, as well as Wolfgang’s learned practices as a student herself informed those decisions. For Sions, deadlines for assignments are encouraged to be met for class discussions and course pacing, however, students may contact the instructor at any point for an extension without penalty.

Reconsidering what constitutes a “good student”:

How much of your assessment of how a good student performs/behaves is rooted in white school culture and values systems? How open are you to reimagining successful performance in your classroom? For instance, for university and college teachers, do you assign points for “attendance”? If so, why? How is attendance or being “on time” a quantifiable measure of a student’s academic ability? Are there multiple modes of engagement encouraged? There is a lot to be said about this, more than the boundaries of this section will allow in this article. We strongly recommend the writing of authors like Love (2019) as well as her work with the Abolitionist Teaching Network; Morris (2015); Smith et al.,(2018); Moore et al. (2018), and others to critically reflect on the subjectivity of student performance and the history of pedagogies and assessment that produce violence on Black and Brown students (Ighodaro & Wiggan, 2013). Smith et al. (2018); Moore et al. (2018) and others, to critically reflect on the subjectivity of student performance and the history of pedagogies and assessment that produce violence on Black and Brown students (Ighodaro & Wiggan, 2013).

Dislocating the white gaze in pedagogy, epistemology, and curriculum is not the end goal. It is a step toward a goal of more just, equitable, and meaningful arts education for all students. In this article, we have looked back on multicultural (art) education, utilizing a critical race lens to understand the role of whiteness in these movements. We posit that moving forward would require educators to re-examine what and how they teach by reconsidering which pedagogical practices are built on white cultural expectations. We introduced artists who actively resist the white gaze, providing suggestions for how one might dislocate the white gaze when examining and creating art. Finally, we conclude this article by providing considerations for pedagogical practices that redefine the roles of the educator and student.

Anti-racism requires hope, a belief that racism is not indestructible and that change can happen (Kendi, 2019). We offer these pedagogical, epistemological, and curricular considerations of dislocating the white gaze in art education as an offer of hope. The uprisings of the summer of 2020 bled into the fall election cycle of the same year; President Trump issued the Executive Order on Combatting Race and Sex Stereotyping in September of 2020 (The White House, 2020), and increased fear of institutional, social, and political retaliation rippled through many communities of educators committed to justice education and to the protection and well-being of their students. While the newly elected President of the United States, Joseph Biden, swiftly issued a new executive order that mitigated some of the fears brought on by

---

6 The extent of flexibility for any teacher is subjective per their job requirements. However, we posit that the root of this pedagogy is intended to dislocate unexamined practices that many teachers take for granted.

7 https://abolitionistteachingnetwork.org/
Trump’s order, the takeaway that many of us felt was that protections for underserved, marginalized communities and the folks actively in pursuit of justice must be vigilantly defended. We are hopeful, however, that the horizon burns bright with justice. And that art educators will take up the mantle of radical justice moving forward.
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