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[START PAGE 203]

The Whiteness of Practicality

David James Hudson¹

We must focus less on ideas and more on action — getting things done.
-James G. Neal, American Library Association president-elect (2017-18)²

From age eleven until I left for university, I lived three blocks down a quiet street from a small branch of the Ottawa Public Library. The first few years of my visits to the branch mostly resulted in piles of Asterix and Tintin comics, alongside hockey magazines, National Geographic, various editions of the Guinness Book of World Records, and the occasional copy of Rolling Stone (my mom often recounts that she and my dad were worried that I was not reading anything more substantial, even as the rest [START PAGE 204] of the family were voracious readers). As I started to develop political consciousness through my mid to late teens, I gravitated towards more serious texts, including books on black liberation movements — Henry

¹ Parts of this chapter are based on a keynote address given at the Critical Librarianship and Pedagogy Symposium on February 25th, 2016, at the University of Arizona. I’m grateful to the participants of the symposium for the valuable feedback they provided, as well as to Karen Nicholson and Lisa Baird for their help in working through early versions of these ideas. A special thanks is due to Gina Schlesselman-Tarango not only for her support throughout my development of these ideas and her careful editing work, but also for her patience with the delays that marked the process of this chapter’s writing.

Simpsons short quarterback, Johnny Unitas of the Baltimore Colts, hair of New York Jets quarterback Joe Namath, whose image is shown on the screen. When the opposing G simmering discourse library work intersect with the interests and violences of white supremacy? How could such a here that my now close-cropped hair was “much more civilized.” Even as the library was a space in which I could explore germinal racial consciousness and find validation in extracurricular reading to counter the sense of racial alienation I felt among my peers, the building was also a space in which a sense of status quo utilitarianism tended to assert itself aggressively in racially coded ways — like innocuous comments on hair, implied alignments of dreadlocks with barbarism, valorizations of the orderly, the practical, the clean cut — the kind of haircut you can set your watch to.3 [START PAGE 205]

Practicality more broadly operates as an imperative in our profession — a dearly-held value and an exhortation, an expectation inscribed into a thousand professional sites. This chapter raises critical questions about the racial politics of such an imperative: the focus of analysis is not on our commitment to prioritizing user needs, but rather on the operations of practicality as a dominant value. Turning as it does on relational exaltations of the practical and devaluations of the theoretical, the imperative to be practical is indeed truly hegemonic. It is not simply (or even chiefly) that institutional and organizational authorities are directly repressing attempts to do work understood to be theoretical. It is rather that our very expectations and assumptions about the practical character and value of our field subtly police the work we end up doing and supporting, the kind of questions we ask and conversations we have, our sense of what useful and appropriate conferences, publications, and research look like, and indeed our sense, more generally, of what useful and appropriate political interventions look like from the standpoint of our profession.

This chapter explores the implications of such hegemonic dynamics for anti-racist work in the library world. Where does the imperative that we be first and foremost practical in our library work intersect with the interests and violences of white supremacy? How could such a seemingly liberalatory discourse — that we remain practical, focused on getting information to

3 This latter image of clockwork haircuts is drawn from an episode of The Simpsons during which the character Grampa Simpson is shown in a flashback watching the 1969 Super Bowl. He comments disparagingly on the long hair of New York Jets quarterback Joe Namath, whose image is shown on the screen. When the opposing quarterback, Johnny Unitas of the Baltimore Colts, is shown, Simpson comments of the athlete’s closely cropped short-back-and-sides hairstyle, “now, Johnny Unitas — there’s a haircut you could set your watch to.” See The Simpsons, season 7, episode no. 8, first broadcast November 19, 1995 on Fox, directed by David Silverman and written by Richard Appel and Dan Greaney.
users with efficiency, committed to universalizing access — possibly be implicated in the dispossessive work of whiteness? Drawing on stories of theory and practice, of the world of libraries and beyond, of academia and beyond, of diversity and justice, of the normative and the unintelligible, of plain prose and deceptive violence, I suggest that there are answers to be found in the examination of whiteness’s operations as an aggressively unmarked locus of power. Its self-effacing claims to self-evidence — and our field’s perpetuation of its structures of material and epistemological violence — are left unchallenged as exaltations of practicality work to foreclose spaces in which we might confront white supremacy through interrogations of its complexities, practices of critique that do not always produce clear answers for the questions they pose. The foundational recourse to status quo languages and logics that, along with the disavowal of the unintelligible, underpins imperatives to practicality both reinforces the dominance of liberal racial politics in our field (under the sign of “diversity and inclusion”) and obscures the ways in which such politics have themselves worked to entrench structures of white supremacy. We might craft alternate spaces of anti-racist critical practice in our field through purposeful challenges to such imperatives, through the recognition of the value of questions without answers and the value of language that pushes beyond common-sense meanings. We might also complement such work by unsettling the entrenched dualisms of theory and practice that animate such imperatives in the first place, by actively interrogating the assumptions about the location of intellectual life and critical analysis that underpin such dualisms, and by working to materially enact an anti-racism in the library world that hinges on translation across contexts of critical practice rather than the implicit dismissal of all understood to be impractical.

On Practicality Imperatives in Library Land

It is practicality in the popular sense of the word that is central to the library world. We organize and administer things. We develop systems and services, workflows and procedures, guides and frameworks. We identify technical problems and solutions. We emphasize efficiency, brevity, speed. We save the time of the user, to paraphrase Ranganathan’s fourth law of library science. No nonsense. Get on with it so you can get it done. Library service without friction, to repurpose Bill Gates’s capitalist imagery. I suspect even the most ardent critical theorist in library land rarely, if ever, responds to a simple directional question with an in-depth lecture on the nuances of Frantz Fanon’s The Wretched of the Earth and its implications for library-as-place.

But the imperative to be practical extends beyond the daily implementation of user services and organizational workflows. It shapes our intellectual work as well: we are to be pragmatic, solution-oriented professionals, not only when we are serving users, but also when we are undertaking scholarly inquiry. Library and information studies (LIS) education is dominated by “texts that solidify the use of technical and managerial language in LIS in the sense that they are basically how-to books, constantly referring to techniques, standards,

principles, methods and rules.”\(^6\) Ours is a tradition, to use Christine Pawley’s words, “that uses managerial language as a matter of course and that pays almost exclusive attention to technical and administrative issues . . . we restrict ourselves to an instrumental, means-end range of concerns and language.”\(^7\) Concomitantly, “major areas of practice conduct a great deal of research that is pragmatic,” write Gloria Leckie and John Buschman, “but highly uncritical.”\(^8\) The vast majority of the intellectual output in our field, whether through presentations or writing, indeed takes the form of positivist social science research, reflective case studies, standards, best practices, how-to guides and “cookbooks,” and the like — work, in other words, that might be described as drawing on tangible, on-the-ground realities as subject matter and moving beyond questions to providing tangible, actionable answers.

The hegemony of such forms of intellectual output is shaped, at least in part, by the enshrinement of practicality demands in submission [START PAGE 208] guidelines governing publication and presentation opportunities. A well-known journal of academic librarianship indicates in its submission guidelines that “above all, librarianship is a practiced discipline” and that the scholarship that they are seeking to publish

- must be needed — in demand in individual institutions or broadly required elsewhere by other libraries — having intrinsic value and utility;
- must be used locally, and likely elsewhere, as an illustration of the value to the field of librarianship; and
- in short, must not be trivial.\(^9\)

Another journal requires that all articles include a section called “Implications for Practice” in which authors articulate how the conclusions of their work “will impact practice.”\(^10\) Another journal still — one known to be open to critical theory — indicates an interest in “well written articles that have actionable solutions.”\(^11\) Similar examples abound from calls for conference presentations: presenters are encouraged, in the words of one call, to prepare “hands-on lessons and demonstrations (and/or practical takeaways)” so that participants can, in the words

---


of another, “take home practical ideas/solutions.” In advising new professionals on how to develop a conference presentation, a 2011 primer-style article published in a fairly well-known Canadian journal of librarianship [START PAGE 209] emphasizes that “conference committees are looking for sessions which contribute reliable or new knowledge in a particular area of librarianship and that deliver concrete benefits to participants.” “Remember,” the article continues, “organizations are investing a substantial amount of time and money in order to send delegates to a conference, and they will care about results. Your session should deliver education that leads to improved performance, improved services and improved results.”

The tacit narrative in such imperatives to practicality is that work understood to be theoretical — work concerned chiefly with foundational critique, work that does not focus on delivering measurable improvement in performance — is of little relevance to the library world. What is at work, in other words, is the well-worn binary dynamic of definition through exclusion: inasmuch as they are regulated by the reproduction of a popular conception of practice accorded exalted status, the physical and epistemological spaces we shape for intellectual work in LIS are also governed by the reproduction of popular conceptions of theory accorded devalued status. Such devaluations are at times quite explicit. The widely cited Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) report The Value of Academic Libraries, for example, takes time to acknowledge critique that situates the assessment movement within a broader context of the ever-intensifying corporatization of higher education:

Those critical of the assessment movement say there is danger in adopting marketplace standards, rather than intellectual standards. Some point to the homogenizing effects of speedy and clear-cut measures of performance, believing it need not be inevitable that higher education adopt these corporate values and practices. . . . Some go so far as to advocate that academics not even engage in designing appropriate performance indicators, as that would be tacit endorsement, but instead use their analytical and rhetorical skills to create counter narratives to these calls for accountability or call for alternative approaches to demonstrating value.

While nominally “appreciated,” however, such critiques are promptly dismissed as “impractical, given the realities we face today in our institutions.” Another recent conference call for proposals invites participants to “get real” with practical ideas for information literacy:

14 Ibid., para. 22.
16 Ibid., 7.
“Librarians as scholars are bombarded with theory; however, it’s time to get real! This year’s conference is devoted to the mechanics of delivering effective and engaging information literacy instruction. Attendees will leave the conference with practical ideas to invigorate their programs.”

Tactically or explicitly, then, our hegemonic discourses of practicality are animated by a rough set of dualisms: practice is action, solutions, efficiency, the everyday, concreteness, reality; and theory is thinking, reflection, abstraction, problems, inapplicability, inefficiency. The theoretical is definitionally disconnected from reality.

Narratives of clarity often occupy a central place in our field’s exaltation of practicality, with clear language serving as a marker of a professional commitment to efficient, solutions-oriented intellectual work. Indeed, professional and scholarly communications venues regularly insist that all submissions be written in what’s understood to be straightforward, everyday language. “Write in a style that is clear and concise,” says one major journal. Another indicates that submissions should use a “straightforward writing style, and [avoid] over-long or complex sentence structures.” Another journal still explicitly “values clarity and utility over formality,” while yet another major journal advises that “clear, simple prose enhances the presentation of ideas and opinions.”

In this vein, imperatives to practicality more broadly might be said to rest on an appeal to shared frameworks — on shared languages, understandings, conceptual foundations that in turn enable collective action. The exaltation of practicality certainly connects at some level, then, to our explicitly articulated commitment to access, to a politics of inclusion that seeks to structure resources, services, and spaces so as to eliminate barriers for users. Imperatives to clarity thus pose a challenge to those normative rhetorics of intelligence that exalt institutionally-validated scholarly languages and that position linguistic complexity that conforms to such institutional norms as a sign of intellectual depth achieved by formal

---


18 Though there has certainly been an intensification of engagement with critical theory over the past few years, including conferences (for example, the Canadian Association of Professional Academic Librarians annual conference, the Gender and Sexuality in Information Studies Colloquium, the Critical Librarianship and Pedagogy Symposium, and the Social Justice and Libraries conference), journals (for example, Journal of Radical Librarianship, Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies, and In the Library with the Lead Pipe), regular #critlib and #radlibchat conversations on Twitter, and numerous individual publications. These have joined a handful of more established sites of critical engagement, such as Progressive Librarian and works published by Library Juice Press and Litwin Books.


disciplinary specialization. To the extent that formal educational institutions might be understood to be oriented towards extending the interests of ruling classes, such challenges to the outward complexity of institutionally-validated languages might themselves be understood to represent a challenge to domination.

There are questions to be asked, however, about the pitfalls of practicality as a hegemonic value in professional politics of inclusion. From another angle, the mobilization of shared conceptual frameworks that underpins our professional imperative to practicality can be read as a foundational reliance on existing ways of knowing, on received languages, on common sense — and common sense is a deceptive ally in challenges to domination. It is difficult to undertake the slow, messy practice of unpacking foundational assumptions — and their material implication in the dispossessive violence of existing social, political, and economic arrangements — where one’s environment is governed by expectations of efficiency, directness, brevity, speed. Don’t waste your time with questions for which there are no answers, with work that does not lead to improved productivity and measurable successes. Research is about results. Research without the drag of disrupted conceptual bases. Research without friction.

It is difficult to explore the violence of status quo discourse where one’s environment is governed by the exaltation of clarity, plain language, the everyday, the utilitarian transmission of content, the acceptance of normalcy as a basis for proceeding. Faced with such an imperative, what is one to do where the language that is plain and everyday is the language of domination — the language of daily epithets, to be sure, but also the language of occupations and settlements, of catastrophic pipeline projects, of a structure of profit inevitably dependent on labor exploitation?

On Whiteness, Normativity, and Language

Critical writing on race teaches us to be suspicious of claims to common sense; the denaturalization of racial difference and power — its semiotics, its materiality — indeed remains a central feature of critical race analysis. Analysts of whiteness, accordingly, have long recognized that whiteness’s dominoic power resides, in crucial part, in its occupation of a space of unmarked normativity, its production as a “mythical norm,” to use Audre Lorde’s phrase: white supremacy persists through an ability to assert its historical peculiarity and precarity as timeless, universal, and neutral. Whiteness is, in this sense, standard(ized), unqualified, that which goes without saying, that which maintains structures of white supremacist domination through their presentation as self-evident, as simple, as plain. Such racializing work is relational, of course: the perpetuation of the standardized dominoic

---

24 The narrative of postsecondary institutions as elite spaces of exclusion that maintain themselves as such through dense jargon has indeed been a recurring, if contested, feature of online critical librarianship discussions under the #critlib hashtag.


26 For a more detailed, critical overview of this central tenet of critical whiteness studies, see Steve Garner, Whiteness: An Introduction (New York: Routledge, 2007), 34–47.
space of white supremacy is impossible without the regulation of its internal orders and external borders through the violent (if contextually differential) delegitimization, exploitation, or elimination of non-white Others. The paving of racially unmarked roads (where it is undertaken, at least) is paid for by revenues generated by the fees and fines of a justice system that has itself historically been animated by narratives of black and brown criminality. Perhaps more palatably, the racially unmarked “revitalized” downtown core — available to everyone, ostensibly — is made economically viable in part by the downward pressure on the real wages of a service sector supported disproportionately by the labor of black and brown working people, even as the “beautification” of such areas is also achieved through the eviction of inconvenient disorderly residents by police forces and, quite literally, by landlords. The official belonging of the racially unmarked (if tenuously multicultural) citizenry in a physically and economically secure Western nation-state is consolidated through [START PAGE 214] the perpetuation of non-white external threats — border jumpers, terrorists (homegrown or otherwise), an amalgam of brown enmity threatening to subvert our way of life (even as their mythologization does wonders for the security industrial complex and its contributions to gross domestic product). The production of massive resource extraction projects as drivers of racially unmarked economic growth turns on the ongoing colonization of indigenous land, on the elimination of indigenous sovereignty, of indigenous community, of indigenous life.

Whiteness, in other words, hinges on the physical and conceptual policing of the bounds of shared spaces of normalcy as they are inscribed territoriality and corporeally both as a means of establishing its own ordered universality and as a means of (implicitly or explicitly) defining and delegitimizing the constitutive outside of disorderly particularity, of subjectivities marked non-white and unintelligible in white supremacist social orders. In this respect, whiteness operates, in Homi Bhabha’s words, as an “unsettled, disturbed form of authority” that must overcome “incommensurable differences” — namely, “the histories of trauma and terror that it must perpetrate and from which it must protect itself; the amnesia it imposes on itself; the violence it inflicts in the process of becoming a transparent and transcendent force of authority.”

Whiteness is thus the production of shared norms underwritten by physical and epistemological violence, a violence invisibilized as a [START PAGE 215] condition of governance (even as it may well be hypervisible to those whose dignity it assaults). “Here we


touch on a well-rehearsed theme,” Steve Garner observes: “The capacity of power to make itself appear natural and unquestionable.” Critics of plain language advocacy emphasize that such self-concealing strategies of regimes of domination depend on the ongoing (re)production of linguistic self-evidence, on the curation of conceptual common sense. The exaltation of clarity is rooted in an assumption, then, that shared conceptual frameworks are politically neutral, an assumption that the languages and concepts that we’ve come to understand as ordinary and unremarkable are not part of the machinery of domination themselves. Judith Butler reminds us that “neither grammar nor style are politically neutral. Learning the rules that govern intelligible speech is an inculcation into normalized language . . . there is nothing radical about common sense.” Likewise, Trinh Minh-ha observes that “clarity is a means of subjection, a quality both of official, taught language and of correct writing, two old mates of power: together they flow, together they flower, vertically, to impose an order.” Domination would seem to wish to convince us that the expressed languages of its complex systems are actually not complex at all and are not about domination at all, that they are simple and commonsensical and ordinary. [START PAGE 216] The elimination, expulsion, and exploitation of languages cast as unintelligible and disorderly have long featured centrally as varied strategies in the maintenance of white supremacist orders. The elimination of indigenous languages and other forms of expression has consistently represented a key strategy in the genocide undertaken as a part of settler colonialism’s violent erasure of disorderly elements in claims to the rightful ownership and ordering of terrae nullius. The overt profiling — and ejection — of travelers from flights in Anglo-Western territories for speaking or writing (what is presumed to be) Arabic is now a regular occurrence, steeped as it is in the same fear of unintelligible dark threats that makes investment in defense industry stocks a financially sound practice. Music executives craft

30 Garner, Whiteness, 35.
31 Judith Butler, Gender Trouble, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1999), xviii.
mainstream hip-hop for consumption [START PAGE 217] by audiences largely made up of suburban white men, culture made saleable by its deployment of stock narratives of unruly blackness, including language presented dangerous in its disorderliness. At the same time, plain language so often operates to sustain white supremacy through rhetorical sanitization. In a defense of Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed against critics who have dismissed the text as inaccessible, Donaldo Macedo points to the violence masked and extended through the integration into everyday parlance of seemingly unremarkable (and certainly racially unmarked) phrases like “collateral damage,” “educational mortality,” and “disadvantaged.”34 Similarly, the centuries-long, constantly shapeshifting violence of capitalism enacted disproportionately through the dispossession of non-white communities is absented through seemingly common-sense phrases like “tough economic climate” and “the real world.” In the same newscasts and polite water-cooler conversations, protest of endemic state violence against black and brown communities is “civil unrest” and genocide is “racial conflict.” Macedo notes that the sanitizing violence of such ostensibly commonplace phrases brings to mind Gayatri Spivak’s comment that “plain prose cheats.”35 He follows this observation with an insightful amendment to Spivak’s phrase: “I would go a step further and say, ‘The call for plain prose not only cheats, it also bleaches.’”36 Macedo’s appended imagery here is notable in its duality: a chemical erasure through corrosion, as well as an enactment of whiteness.

**On Diverse Librarians: The Deceptive Practicality of Common-Sense Phrasing**

“Diversity” is the plain language of racial difference and power in the library world, the shared conceptual framework to which we turn [START PAGE 218] in attempts to make sense of the whiteness of the field. The figure of the diverse librarian appears frequently within such discourse. One text documents strategies for recruiting and retaining *ethnically/culturally*


34 Macedo, introduction, 22.
36 Macedo, introduction, 23.
Another notes that we often make the mistake of looking to diverse librarians to meet the needs of diverse users, while another still reports that there are more diverse librarians these days, but also more positions. An institute for research in librarianship expresses empathetic interest in applications from ethnically diverse librarians. An American Library Association program seeks to recruit ethnically diverse students from high schools and colleges to careers in librarianship, while a pre-doctoral program at a library school seeks to remedy the shortage of culturally diverse information professionals with advanced post-MLIS training. A ProQuest executive sees tremendous value in contributing to the support of the group of culturally diverse librarians in the Spectrum Scholarship Program. The diverse librarian (in all its variations) is a plain language figure, then, its denotative value — “diverse” for “non-white” — generally accepted.

At some level, such corporate euphemism is about as laughable as the “ethnic food” aisle in the supermarket, providing a near perfect example of whiteness’s operation as the racially unmarked norm. There’s food — you know, regular food — and there’s ethnic food — you know, the kind that comes from some specific place and culture, the kind for special occasions. There are librarians — you know, regular librarians — and there are diverse librarians — you know, the librarians who have diversity or, if we are to dispense with the euphemism, the librarians who have race. “There is no more powerful position than that of being ‘just’ human,” writes Richard Dyer: “The claim to power is the claim to speak for the commonality of humanity. Raced people can’t do that — they can only speak for their race. But non-raced people can, for they do not represent the interests of a race.” There is more at issue here than euphemism, then: the figure of the diverse librarian exemplifies a more fundamental displacement of the problem of racial power and difference onto non-white subjects in the library world. White subjects — library staff, user communities, and so on — are just human; but we culturally diverse subjects can only speak to the color line, to our special interests, as it were. Perhaps this is why we are always playing the race card, as the tired rhetoric of derailment would have it. Such conversations are worth having sometimes, to be sure — but it’s not the sort of thing one wishes to talk about all the time, is it? Such dynamics of

displacement, then, clearly serve white supremacy’s interest in circumscribing the extent of racism, in casting racist violence as a series of localized, isolated incidents rather than a structure that governs virtually all aspects of our lives.

In its inscription of these familiar racial dynamics, the recurrence of the figure of the diverse librarian might well be said to represent a microaggression, a matter of interpersonal impropriety. But there is more at stake than personal anti-racist etiquette, than commitment and the conscious push to purge a phrase from professional discourse in place of a more direct naming of racial power and difference as matters that concern us all. Part of the challenge of developing spaces [START PAGE 220] for the confrontation of white supremacy from within the field lies in interrogating the more fundamental methodological assumptions and practices that underpin our discourse of racial power and difference. From this perspective, our field’s reinscription of narratives of white normativity through the uncritical circulation of the seemingly innocuous trope of the diverse librarian is emblematic of our perpetuation of white supremacy through the uncritical circulation of the concept of diversity more broadly — its logics more than its lexicon — as our received anti-racist wisdom and timeless truth. As I have argued elsewhere, the ongoing hegemony of the diversity paradigm has been marked by a failure to interrogate the concept’s fundamental premises as a racial politics — the premise that to be included is to have agency (as if racial inclusion, incorporation, cooptation have not long figured centrally into white supremacist formations); the premise that heterogeneity is justice (as if multiracial spaces have not long been a feature of empire); the premise that racial difference is a discrete, ahistorical phenomenon that can easily be captured through demographic surveys and studies of racialized information behavior (as if our racialization is not an ongoing, always-already context-specific practice inevitably intertwined with white supremacy and its contestation); the premise that the reform of individual professionals and organizations towards cultural competence (or, if one prefers, anti-racist civility) and our organizations and profession towards demographic alignment with the nation is the only conceivable — or indeed ought to be our chief — goal in challenging white supremacy from within the field. Where left unsettled, such premises corrode the possibility of deeper interrogation of the structural character and complex, geo-historically varied operations of white supremacy, as well as the ways in which we in the library world work to perpetuate it: racism is reduced to a standardized set of transgressive “race relations,” [START PAGE 221] to the maintenance of homogeneity by the exclusion of discrete ( interchangeable) racial subjects from library spaces through the misguided attitudes and behaviors of individuals and/or organizations.46

Diversity bleaches, in other words — as plain prose and received logic. Like the figure of the diverse librarian, diversity discourse more broadly extends contemporary white supremacist dynamics (if inadvertently) while obscuring the complex operations of such dynamics behind


generally accepted and innocuous (or even progressive) conceptual frameworks. Diversity is the common-sense language of racial liberalism, the ready-to-wear, one-size-fits-all analytic available for the presumably simple, utilitarian task of transmitting anti-racism in the library world. *Stop talking, start doing.*\(^{47}\)

The aim here, to paraphrase a point made by Ian Barnard,\(^{48}\) is not to celebrate rhetorical density and abstraction as politically preferable, nor is it to demonize work understood to be clear and practical as automatically simplistic or regressive. It is rather to ask after the work that practicality does as an imperative. It is to invite consideration of the ways in which the hegemonic insistence on practicality, including calls to clarity, that animates our field serves to extend white supremacy by implicitly valorizing shared professional languages, assumptions, and methodologies as neutral vehicles for intellectual work that transcend white supremacy; and by tacitly reducing racism to an uncomplicated and timeless phenomenon that can be addressed pragmatically with no departure from such frameworks. It is to suggest that we explore the tangled mess of aggressively self-effacing whiteness obscured by naturalized liberal languages of diversity and inclusion in our field. As a discourse, practicality renders theoretical engagement with such white supremacist [START PAGE 222] complexities — and the critical departure from existing languages and foundational assumptions this requires — conceptually impermissible. As white supremacy’s constantly shifting rhetorical figures and structures of material subordination extend beyond the bounds of the field, our anti-racist critique necessarily involves questions without immediate answers and therefore brings with it some level of unintelligibility. From the standpoint of hegemonic practicality imperatives, such nonsense is inaccessible, politically exclusivist in its assumed digression from the immediate aim of efficient access for a wide audience. From an anti-racist perspective, the rhetorical acrobatics are familiar: the minoritized work of challenging white domination is charged with divisiveness in its attempts to disrupt the aggressively enforced common-sense structures of racial power.

Challenging White Supremacy from within Library Land: Theory, Practice, Translation

The whiteness of practicality, then, is not a face-value formulation of neatly bounded, \textit{a priori} elements — a color, a group, a demographic and a value, a predictable tendency, a cultural essence. It is not an assertion that “whites” are “more practical,” nor a claim that all work popularly understood to be practical is solely and automatically complicit in upholding structures of white supremacist violence. Likewise, the whiteness of practicality is not an anti-racist acquittal of what is popularly understood to be theory: work that interrogates fundamental assumptions in abstract ways, that departs from received wisdom, that rejects plain prose may nevertheless perpetuate white domination, even if the questions posed by such work target structures of racial power and difference presumed to be hegemonic. “Simply arguing that theory displaces and breaks with structure and the establishment is to risk

\(^{47}\) This phrase is used as the title of Gregory L. Reese and Ernestine L. Hawkins’s *Stop Talking, Start Doing! Attracting People of Color to the Library Profession* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1999), a guide to the practice of recruitment and retention in the library world.

\(^{48}\) Barnard, “Ruse,” 435.
romanticizing an already territorialized space,” writes Christa Albrecht-Crane: “An uncritical celebration and fetishization of theory’s capacity to only disrupt risks placing us in an idealized, complacent, and complicit relationship with [START PAGE 223] the state we so adamantly critique.”

Rather, the whiteness of practicality suggests that the exalted status of the practical in our field reproduces conditions through which whiteness sustains its dominative power by foreclosing spaces of critique in which the complex, ever-shifting dynamics of white supremacy might be confronted. If we are to deepen challenges to the whiteness of the field, then, it is crucial that we actively push back against imperatives to be practical, that we foster spaces that recognize the value of what is so often dismissed as “theory” — the value of questions without answers, of critique without actionable solutions, as well as the value of wrestling with difficult language and the value of exploring the historical and political contexts, limits, and compilicities of languages understood to be plain. And the recognition of such value must be more than notional: in this form, anti-racist work is a practice of shaping calls for submissions, tables of contents, and conference programs, of pushing back against the encroachment of dominant professional expectations in editorial practice and committee meetings, of advocacy to ensure that the work of critiquing normative structures of power without providing concrete, pragmatic service or policy recommendations is explicitly welcomed.

But challenges to the whiteness of practicality also require active recognition that conventional forms of scholarly communication do not represent the extent of anti-racist critique as such. As this suggests, we would do well to unsettle our assumptions about what theory and practice look like, about whose lives and labor are involved in each. At stake, indeed, are more deeply embedded assumptions about the intellectual lives of subordinated communities: the construction of theory as an elite, academic activity removed from the concrete realities of the everyday — _Enough with the theory! Let’s get real!_ — assumes that [START PAGE 224] subordinated communities do not engage in critical analyses that raise questions without immediate solutions, that subordinated communities do not reframe the world in unfamiliar language that disrupts received wisdom. Such mappings of theory/practice dualisms onto structures of power — the theoretical critique of the elite versus the lived experience and practice of ordinary people — are themselves implicated in insidious colonial narratives that cast the colonizer as mind and intellect, as white rationality, and the colonized as body and intuition, as the dark masses who, whether romanticized or demonized, appear as having only their experience and intuition — and certainly no critical faculties — through which to make sense of the world.

We would do well, indeed, to unsettle our assumption that theory and practice represent discrete phenomena with separate lives whose only meeting point might be in no-less binarizing formulations of praxis that hinge on combinations of elements — action plus reflection, theory plus practice — presumed to be distinct. Absented by such an assumption is

---

49 Albrecht-Crane, “*Whoa,*” 868.
50 Lather, “Troubling,” 528.
the reality that those activities traditionally thought of as theory — thinking, speaking, writing abstract critiques of the fundamental assumptions that shape our worlds — are materially situated practices. Somewhere a scholar is preparing a manuscript on the poetry of Lucille Clifton while his child happily plays under the watch of a childcare provider, the cost of whose labor is paid without worry but the cost of whose living is a source of ongoing anxiety. Somewhere a Frantz Fanon scholar is spending grant money on addressing the built-in obsolescence of their laptop, the rare earth in the guts of which has been plundered from the ground in the new scramble for Africa;\(^{51}\) the toxic skeletal remains of which will be shipped away out of sight, out of mind, to be dismantled by dispossessed, non-white hands in sacrifice zones for digital capitalism.\(^{52}\) Somewhere a theorist of settler colonial economic formations is falling asleep on the train en route to a precarious adjunct gig an hour and a half from home, the text of the conference proposal in their lap blurring like the landscape outside, their eyelids heavy from last night’s shift at the café at which the hourly pay is more or less equivalent to that which they receive for teaching. Somewhere a mid-career scholar is arriving on campus for office hours more relaxed than they have been in years, buoyed by a mixture of validation and excitement after having read an article on white supremacy in classrooms lead by non-white faculty, text on page relaxing muscles, jaw, and gut, thinning the dense cloud of alienation in a department in which indelicate phrases like “playing the race card” and “all lives matter” are replaced with more professional ones — like “you may be overreacting” and “try to adopt a student-centered approach.” Scholarship, no matter how abstract its subject matter, is always already a material practice, a lived experience with complex, far-reaching physical entanglements.

Further absented is the anti-racist theoretical work that lives outside the academy and indeed outside research and writing. In *Teaching to Transgress*, bell hooks offers a story about the critical thinking, reflection, and analysis that helped her to negotiate her childhood struggles with the patriarchal structures of her home: “When I was a child, I certainly did not describe the processes of thought and critique I engaged in as ‘theorizing.’ Yet . . . the possession of a term does not bring a process or practice into being; concurrently one may practice theorizing without ever knowing/possessing the term, just as we can live and act in feminist resistance without ever using the word ‘feminism.’”\(^{53}\) Challenging the whiteness of practicality — making space for messy critiques of white supremacy that eschew pragmatic solutions — requires recognition of the theoretical work enacted through storytelling circles, through artistic performances, through protests, through forms of expression that elude easy classification. At some Black Lives Matter protests in Canada in the fall of 2014, for example, organizers encouraged non-black allies to attend, but asked that they situate themselves at the edge of the protests and refrain from speaking to the media; black voices were purposefully centered in occupation of space and airtime. While this was not particularly controversial amongst those in attendance and was only one among many organizational details of the protests whose purpose was to draw attention to the deep structures of state
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violence against black communities in Canada, the physical centering of blackness became a focus of corporate media coverage, prompting backlash marked by the customary liberal narratives of reverse racism and racial unity. By staging a public action in this way, then, the organizers theorized space, voice, and anti-racist solidarity in terms that departed sharply from mainstream liberal racial politics, the anti-racist plain languages of inclusion and heterogeneity. We would do well to recognize, in other words, that theory is material, theory is action, theory is practice.

Ultimately, the imperative to be practical in our field hinges on a deep (if somewhat paradoxical) individualism. In spite of overtones of inclusivity, it treats critical work as self-contained, suggesting that truly ethical work in the library world requires each of us to come up with complete sets of questions and complete sets of answers, to individually balance what is understood to be theory with what is understood to be practice, to ensure that our language is always going to be intelligible to everyone. We in the library world ought to understand that this is neither possible nor desirable, as so much of what we do points to the fact that all work is both necessarily incomplete and necessarily interdependent — the citation, the bibliography and its community of complicated absences, the shelf with more than one item, the marginalia and corporeal micro-residues (visible and invisible) left on magazines pulled through circulation, the reference interaction in which knowledge reveals itself to be created between subjects rather than springing forth ex nihilo as the stuff of individual genius. But the individualist myth of exhaustiveness is pervasive, even if it is persistently exhausting. Such [START PAGE 227] tiresome individualism is, of course, profoundly entangled with whiteness, serving as an animating force in well-worn colonial narratives of race: the unhinged white loner as mass shooter, as contrasted with the terrorist motivated by collective cultural allegiance; the intrepid white explorer “discovering” the land through economic enterprise; the dark masses of migrants threatening to flood the white nation’s border, containable only through mass detention, expulsion, or assimilation; the dispossession of a black single mother read as black cultural pathology. More specifically, it aligns epistemologically with the individualism of liberal racial politics: racism as an attribute of individuals, anti-racism as self-work, the problem and solution collocated and self-contained.

Perhaps the unsettling of the whiteness of practicality, then, in part brings with it a move to accept the messy collectivity of challenges to structures of white supremacy from within our field. What if our racial politics included meaningful treatment of racial identity not as an individual attribute that remains static from cradle to grave, but as constantly and relationally reproduced and redefined through dispossession and resistance within structures of white supremacy in which we are all implicated (albeit differentially so)? What if we accepted that the complexities of contemporary white supremacist formations are such that no one of us could possibly account for all its violent acrobatics and shapeshifts — including those enacted by the library world — nor possibly achieve complete, transcendent solutions? And what if we reminded ourselves that being in critical community as such requires trusting that we do not have to do everything ourselves (even if we do have to do something)? What if we

recognized that our anti-racism thus requires work across different contexts, both within our field and beyond it, with the understanding that we might learn from critical analysis wherever it takes place and without the assumption of scholarly origins. Such interdependence and transcontextual movement are perhaps a reminder that critical work is always a practice of translation, always already a practice of adjusting how we speak, depending on the environment we are in and our negotiation of the limits of its plain prose — and what could be more practical than that? [START PAGE 228]
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