

Trust, Play, and Intersubjectivity

Mary Jo Hinsdale

Westminster College

A number of years ago, *National Geographic* featured an article on animals and play. Among the many wonderful photographs that accompanied the text, I remember one particularly striking series of images. In northern Canada, a sled dog that was restrained by a chain played with a polar bear. As the bear approached, the dog wagged his tail and bowed — the same “let’s play” bow dogs everywhere use to indicate their desire to other dogs or to humans. “The bear responded with enthusiastic body language and nonaggressive facial signals” and surprisingly, the animals entered a playful exchange in which the bear did not harm the dog.¹

Certainly, people are also playful creatures and our play takes many forms. The intellectually engaging and emotionally fulfilling back-and-forth of college classroom discussions can feel like a special form of play, one that we desire for ourselves, and our students. And yet, I have encountered “outsider” students who may consider my position in the university or my skin color, and conclude that I am an untrustworthy partner for play. Sara Ahmed reminds us that these students have been “made into strangers”: their experiences and perspectives are marginalized in the American university and their bodily presence is often considered unexpected in Eurocentric, white-normed academic spaces.² They may well be “too hurt to remain open,”³ and they are not necessarily eager to engage with me. Perhaps they perceive me as a polar bear: to enter a play relationship is potentially quite dangerous. Indeed, María Lugones once hauntingly asked of those in dominant social positions, “why and to what purpose do I trust myself to you ... [a game of] cat and mouse just for your entertainment?”⁴ Her question directs our attention to the “neocolonial gap” of which Frank Margonis writes. When educators work with students from marginalized and formerly colonized groups, historical wounds complicate the communicative “gap” between them, and teacher/student relations may already be closed.⁵

In “Tending Neocolonial Gaps,” Margonis presents a compelling vision of how we might enter “intersubjective play” with students to enhance the possibilities for “dynamic teaching and learning.”⁶ Arguably, his use of the word “play” refers to the “give and take that emerges in a relationship.”⁷ I am, however, struck by the use of the word. It connotes ease, a sense of lightness, and sometimes, even joy. But what is at stake for the Other, the outsider student, when she risks entering the game? Where are the possibilities for (playful) educational exchanges? To understand how I might invite students wounded by coloniality⁸ into intellectual play, I will complement Margonis’s ideas with María Lugones’s essay on “Playfulness, ‘World’-Travelling and Loving Perception.”⁹ She reverses the colonizing gaze,¹⁰ and articulates a worldview that resonates with many from marginalized and formerly colonized communities.

PLAYFULNESS AND “WORLD”-TRAVELLING

Lugones wishes to create openings for “cross-cultural and cross-racial loving”; she asks women from different backgrounds to fully appreciate one another, and

to embrace their rich plurality as “central to feminist ontology and epistemology” (*PW*, 3). To attain a pluralistic feminism, she encourages “travel” to other “worlds.” Lugones writes that “[t]hose ... who are ‘world’-travellers have the distinct experience of being different in different worlds and of having the capacity to remember other ‘worlds’ and ourselves in them ... The shift from being one person to being a different person is what [she calls] ‘travel’” (*PW*, 11). Echoing W.E.B. Du Bois’s concept of “double consciousness”¹¹ or the Native idea of “walking in two worlds,”¹² she acknowledges that world-travelling is often a practice borne of necessity. As outsiders to dominant societies, she and other women of color must do much of their travelling “unwillfully to hostile White/Anglo ‘worlds’” (*PW*, 3). However, Lugones also affirms it as a “skillful, creative, rich, enriching” practice that can be willfully exercised by animating “an attitude [she describes] as playful” (*PW*, 3).

Concerned with her lack of playfulness in certain worlds, Lugones sought guidance from Gadamer’s work on play. From the outset, however, Gadamer’s approach to play differs from hers. He writes: “play has its own essence, independent of the consciousness of those who play;” so, “play is not such that, for the game to be played, there must be a subject who is behaving playfully.”¹³ That is, unlike Lugones, a playful attitude does not indicate to him that “play” is taking place. There are other crucial differences. From Gadamer, Lugones gleaned that western concepts of play and playfulness are agonistic and “have, ultimately, to do with contest, with winning, losing, battling” (*PW*, 15). Further, she found Gadamer’s adherence to rules and emphasis on role-playing contrary to her understanding of play. Recognizing that his description of play would be “deadly” to her concept of world travel because “one cannot cross boundaries with it” (*PW*, 16), Lugones seeks to uncover her understanding of the word. Playfulness, in her view, has several characteristics. Contrary to Gadamer, she believes an attitude turns activity into play. Also, there is an element of uncertainty as well as an openness to surprise — as players, we are “open to self-construction.” With this idea, she points to the creative, intersubjective nature of play. To Lugones, ultimately, “there are no rules that are sacred to us,” and she notes an element of risk and vulnerability, for in playful relations we are open to being the fool (*PW*, 16–17).

Educators have much to learn from Lugones’s understanding of play, especially considering that to enter educational relationships can be risky for the outsider student. As she writes, “There are ‘worlds’ we enter at our own risk, ‘worlds’ that have agon, conquest, and arrogance as the main ingredients in their ethos. These are ‘worlds’ that we enter out of necessity and which would be foolish to enter playfully in either the agonistic sense or in my sense. In such ‘worlds’ we are not playful” (*PW*, 17). Educators from dominant backgrounds — or those of any background who have been steeped in competitive traditions through their training and academic socialization — may feel at home in a world of agonistic play. Debate competitions, quiz bowls, and erudite, oppositional discussions at conferences spring to mind as but three examples of “play” as conceived by an individualistic Eurocentric academy. But such interchanges may not feel like play to outsider students, especially those from more cooperative cultures. Rather, they may be perceived as travel to

a hostile and unhealthy world that has already constructed them as unplayful (see *PW*). Scholars such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith help us understand why the world of higher education is often distressing for outsider students: colonialism is alive and well in its structures and knowledge practices.¹⁴

COLONIALISM AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH

In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Smith provides valuable insight into the troubling legacy of imperialism and colonialism in the contemporary university. She writes:

From the vantage point of the colonized ... the term 'research' is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, 'research,' is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary.... The ways in which scientific research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world's colonized peoples. It is a history that still offends the deepest sense of our humanity. Just knowing that someone measured our 'faculties' by filling the skulls of our ancestors with millet seeds ... offends our sense of who and what we are.¹⁵

The example of measuring skulls may be historical, but Smith is careful to point out that "[i]mperialism still hurts, still destroys, and is reforming itself constantly."¹⁶ It is not a thing of the past. Rather, the notion of post-colonialism is a chimera, and the university is one site where imperialism may continue to hurt the formerly colonized or enslaved, as well as those othered by dimensions of difference such as class, sexuality, or ability: their histories in the academy are often similarly troubled. The West is not monolithic and "insurrection[s] of subjugated knowledges" do sometimes disrupt academic discursive power.¹⁷ However, when the normalized boundaries of "acceptable" knowledge are used to discipline students "through exclusion, marginalization, and denial," even well-intentioned professors may become implicated in the legacy of colonialism.¹⁸ I would add that Western research protocols are prominent disciplinary technologies¹⁹ that marginalize other viewpoints and "[reaffirm] the West's view of itself as the centre of legitimate knowledge, the arbiter of what counts as knowledge and the source of 'civilized' knowledge ... generally referred to as 'universal' knowledge."²⁰ Tellingly, Smith writes: "I frequently have to [orient] myself to a text world in which the centre of academic knowledge is either in Britain, the United States, or Western Europe; in which words such as 'we', 'us', 'our', and 'I' actually exclude me."²¹

Just as Sandra Harding points out that "value free inquiry" is in itself a value,²² Smith reveals the cultural orientation inherent to Western academic research. It includes "a different conceptualization of such things as time, space and subjectivity, different and competing theories of knowledge, highly specialized forms of language, and structures of power."²³ That is, what counts as knowledge must be recognizable (intelligible) within an implicit understanding of the "rules" governing how the world works — the rules of the game, so to speak. Each of our academic disciplines has its own research protocols, its rules regarding what constitutes knowledge, and "[s]cientific and academic debate in the West takes place within these rules."²⁴ As a result, students who wish to conduct research based on their outsider status often meet with resistance in the academy.²⁵ Sometimes, they are steered outright into work that is not of their choosing, but which fits within the rules. Their perspective

is not allowed on the figurative academic playing field. Or, as Lugones might put it: the academy is a “world” in which outsider students are constructed as unplayful.

But some academics know how to encourage outsider students; they create openings for playful travel into the academic world. For insight on this matter, it is instructive to consider the one-on-one relationship between student researchers and their mentors.²⁶ Like Lugones, Billy, Abriella, and Anali are from groups that have been “othered” by dominant society and historically excluded from the academy, yet they worked with mentors across dimensions of social and historical difference. When asked how they found their mentors, they indicated that classroom experiences were the first factor they took into account. Abriella offered,

I would have been suspicious of my mentor if she had not shared some of her experiences in class. Her openness and frankness helped me feel comfortable. It was important for me to know what she was thinking and to be able to read her emotional signals. Her nontraditional anecdotes and teaching resonated with me.

Billy wrote,

I find people who can't be reflexive about themselves untrustworthy. My mentor exhibited a high degree of self-reflexiveness in and outside of the classroom. He consistently saw [socioeconomic] class as a kind of diversity where other professors tended to have a much more narrow definition. And I appreciated it because it demonstrated a degree of honesty on his part. It also allowed me to see myself as being closer to some bases of knowledge than he was, which made me feel more like I deserved to be in academia or could contribute.

Finally, Anali's thoughts are valuable to share in their entirety.

One moment stands out to me. My mentor ... made a comment ... in one of our seminars, and the following week she apologized and described how it was problematic. This was the first time I ever witnessed a White professor correct herself in public. It showed me that she was dedicated to her own self-growth and that she respected the class. This is a very distinct characteristic that sets her apart from a lot of other White faculty who claim to be critically conscious or allies, but who still exhibit an implicit sense of White supremacy in the classroom. It says a lot about her character and her ... commitment to growing as a critical scholar.

These mentors reveal traits that professors of any background might strive to express in the classroom: openness, honesty, self-reflection, respect for a student's unique ideas, and critical consciousness. Significantly, they were willing to speak out on what are sometimes thorny and divisive issues; doing so created an intersubjective space that allowed the outsider students in their classrooms to feel safe enough to enter the academic playing field. They enacted several interwoven concepts Margonis addresses: political intersubjectivity within the dynamic social field of the classroom, and the importance of offering students both responsive and critical modes of address.

POLITICAL INTERSUBJECTIVITY

To articulate the notion of political intersubjectivity, Margonis draws on Gert Biesta's Levinasian approach to subjectivity and Paulo Freire's understanding of the shattering educational legacy of colonization.²⁷ In so doing, he brings a post-modern relational ontology together with a critical, modernist understanding of the social and historical positions of both teacher and student. Following Biesta, Margonis holds that we are dependent on one another for our subjectivity. Only in responding to the imperative of the other's utter alterity do we become subjects: it is in the event of relating to others who are not like us that we come into presence as

unique beings.²⁸ In the classroom, an encounter constructed upon a desired outcome — even a humanistic ideal — forecloses possibilities for presentation by imposing norms “of what it means to be human, and in doing so excludes those who do not [or are unable to] live up to this norm.”²⁹ Indeed, Biesta calls upon Alphonso Lingis to describe the problematic workings of the normative “rational community” in educational contexts.³⁰ In the university, it is not hard to see how disciplinary rational communities serve as forms of surveillance that exclude students who will not, or cannot, meet their norms. Margonis is clear that “the teacher’s first responsibility is to look after the specific subjectivity of each individual student.”³¹ Educators are, therefore, to “set up the intersubjective contexts within which students might ‘come into presence’” (AS, 277). We invite students into the educational relation, and allow them to respond to us as they see fit, so that they may find out who they are in that event and in that context. Taking such a responsive stance can help educators move outside the bounds of the rational community.

Responsiveness is vital for encouraging every student in a classroom, but it is especially important for opening the academy to the distinctive perspectives of students from groups that have “endured forms of colonial attack.”³² Like Margonis, I am deeply committed to such a project, and I also find Freire’s groundbreaking work offers a needed balance to the postmodern understanding that our subjectivity arises in the event of relating to the Other. While recognizing that Freire’s modernist language leads to a deficit-laden understanding of the “oppressed” student, Margonis also acknowledges that Freire is

grappling with something profoundly real ... for there are many cases in which students will not voice their own perspectives, when [their] words ... reflect the power dynamics of their intersubjective context: we’ve all seen contexts in which students ... choose silence instead of speaking out. Freire is undeniably right to ask educators to consider the existential situation of oppressed students. (AS, 273)

Consider Joanna Kadi’s straightforward advice: “If you want to hear me, you will listen to my silences as well as my words.”³³ Her writing rings true for many students who have felt silenced in the classroom.

Listen. It’s my second semester of graduate school... The vast majority of the women in this room are white and upper-middle-class. The topic is Black Women’s Literature. We read about African-American history, ethics, experiences; we spend classroom time analyzing these in terms of classism, racism, sexism. Or at least they do. The white, upper-middle-class women speak easily. They’ve been taught that the space into which they speak is their birthright. It’s not mine. I am mostly silent, but there is much activity behind that silence: An inordinate desire to speak. Fear. Shaking hands. Sweat. An identification with the characters in the stories we read. Too much knowledge of how white, class-privileged women respond to working-class women of color speaking...

This is grad school/This is a white upper-middle-class space designed to keep people like me out. Or at least silent...

I remained silent about my legacy of poverty, racism, illiteracy, factories, and a love of trade unions so fierce I could only produce stutters when the subject arose.³⁴

This then, is the political aspect of Margonis’s “political intersubjectivity”: we take into account students’ social and historical positions, and consider how these interact not only with our own positions, but with the educational context in which we are

all brought together. Inevitably, there will be power dynamics at play: some of these are inherent to the structure of the game.³⁵ As Margonis writes, educators “wade into intersubjective contexts already in motion” and, significantly, as in Kadi’s classroom, these may well “rearticulate previously colonial relations of power between people of color and white people” (AS, 274). Close attention to the context of our encounters with students is crucial if we hope to sidestep imperial traps.

SOCIAL FIELDS

While Lugones delves into Gadamer to illuminate her understanding of play, Margonis turns to the same text when developing his concept of social fields. Margonis calls upon Gadamer’s idea that the “players are not the subjects of play; instead, play merely reaches presentation ... through the players;”³⁶ as a result, “all playing is a being-played.”³⁷ Or, as Margonis puts it: “the game plays the players.”³⁸ This idea, central to his characterization of educational “social fields,” also resonates with an important aspect of Lugones’s discussion of “worlds.” It is important to recall that whether or not Lugones is playful in a world is not a matter of will: certain worlds already construct her as unplayful. Essentially, the social field of that world plays her. In the classroom, Margonis writes, the “patterns and rhythms of educational interactions lead to, or close off, student experiences, and ... the character of classroom interactions shapes the types of expressions made possible.”³⁹ That is, educational exchanges always take place within dynamic contexts, peopled by students and teachers who bring their own social and cultural histories. Each classroom is a world that opens some possibilities for student expression and forecloses others. Our intersubjective relations always take place within the (hopefully playful) give-and-take of these multi-layered, dynamic social fields. Because outsider students may carry painful personal histories, Margonis asserts that to be responsive to them, we need to balance learning *from* them — creating openings for students to come into presence in their singularity — with learning *about* them.

TOWARD INTERSUBJECTIVE PLAY ACROSS DIFFERENCE

To help marginalized students, as well as those from more dominant backgrounds, come into presence within the social field of the classroom, Margonis draws from Elizabeth Ellsworth’s work on addressing students. He notes especially the modes of address — the signals educators use to communicate with students on multiple levels. Indeed, Abriella used the word “signals” when referring to the classroom behaviors that allowed her to see her future mentor as approachable. Teachers and schools signal the possibilities and limitations of the educative space to students

through the content of their words, through the curricular materials to which they expose students, and through their bodily expressions and tone of voice. Students respond to these layered messages, acting in ways that are partly determined by the parameters of the particular educational setting. As groups of students respond to the school’s and teacher’s signals, and interact with one another, schools and classrooms come to have ... an intersubjective sense of what is possible and what is impossible. (AS, 275)

Returning to the metaphor of the game, students learn what the rules are: they come to understand the workings of the social field that holds the web of relationships between professor and student, as well as among the students themselves.

To create educational spaces in which outsider students might come into presence, Margonis calls on educators to use both responsive and critical forms of address in the classroom. Responsive forms of address include the sorts of open questions Biesta offers: “Where do you stand?” or “How will you respond?”⁴⁰ These questions invite *all* students to offer their unique perspective and to enter the pedagogical relation as complete human beings. For Margonis, however, these important forms of address must be coupled with critical approaches that speak to power relations, lest educators might not create social fields that would allow outsider students to come into presence. It is imperative we reveal to students that we understand how to balance learning about their lives and worlds with learning from the students themselves. We do so by educating ourselves about histories of oppression and colonization, about privilege in its many guises, and about students’ backgrounds and social histories, taking care not to make assumptions about them or to essentialize based on broad descriptive categories. Then, we must voice this knowledge in the classroom, all the while cognizant that to rely “upon summative understandings of the other’s being ... [reduces] mysterious and complex individuals to our object of knowledge.”⁴¹ Anali’s mentor signaled her openness and sensitivity when she apologized and offered a critique of a statement she had made. When Billy’s mentor addressed socioeconomic class difference, he created a space that allowed Billy to come to presence as a young scholar, someone who believed he could contribute unique ideas to the academy. Having broached the neocolonial communicative gap by critically addressing the classroom, these mentors could later address their protégés responsively — “What do *you* think?” — and, in stark contrast to Kadi, they trusted their professors enough to respond.

When Lugones defined a world, she was careful to note it “may be a construction of a tiny portion of a particular society. It may be inhabited by just a few people” (*PW*, 10). In the social field — the world — of the classroom, professors who signal students through both critical and responsive forms of address open possibilities for the small two-person world of mentor and protégé to emerge. Within the larger, frequently hostile world of the academy, professors can create social fields in which outsider students might enter playful intersubjective relations. Humor and irony are perhaps two ways through which, together with our students, we might cultivate a creative to-and-fro quality that destabilizes obscured colonial power relations, creating inclusive spaces for students to come to presence, while opening ourselves to self-construction and surprising ideas. Academic rules no longer apply in this playful world: the rational community does not impose intellectual or emotional limits on the relationship.

I am deeply concerned about learning to engage in fruitful ways with marginalized students who have been wounded by the academy’s imperialism. I want to signal not only that I hope for them to come into presence, but that I, too, become a subject when I respond to them. Margonis maintains that if we keep a “steady commitment to the coming to presence of each individual” (*AS*, 277), and create social fields in which we use multiple modes of address to encourage all students, we open the possibility for “human-to-human connection [that is] more basic than political

agreement and disagreement” (AS, 278). I would add that human connection across difference is also more basic than sharing the same social background: the mentors introduced earlier were able to use critical modes of address to speak to students across the neocolonial gap. They engaged their students in playful relationships that ultimately hold the possibility of revitalizing our shared intellectual world. A bit of American folk wisdom advises: “Go out on a limb. That’s where the fruit is.” To support outsider students’ unique resources, gifts, and perspectives, are we willing to go out on a limb? To enter playful, political intersubjective relations with students, are we willing to sometimes be a fool — to set aside “being self-important, not [take] norms as sacred and [find our students’] ambiguity and double edges a source of wisdom and delight” (PW, 17)?

-
1. Stuart L. Brown, “Animals at Play,” *National Geographic* 186, no. 6 (1994), 7.
 2. Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012).
 3. Lisa Weems, “Difference, Power, and the Limits of Openness,” in *Philosophy of Education 2013*, ed. Cris Mayo (Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society, 2014), <http://ojs.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/pes/article/view/3979/1291>.
 4. María Lugones, “Hablando Cara a Cara/Speaking Face to Face: An Exploration of Ethnocentric Racism,” in *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*, ed. Gloria Anzaldúa (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation Books, 1990), 46–54.
 5. See Frank Margonis, “Tending Neocolonial Gaps” in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 2010*, ed. Gert Biesta (Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society, 2011): 70–78; and “Seeking Openings of Already Closed Student-Teacher Relationships” in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 2006*, ed. Daniel Vokey (Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society, 2007): 176–84.
 6. Margonis, “Tending Neocolonial Gaps,” 70.
 7. Frank Margonis, “In Pursuit of Respectful Teaching and Intellectually-Dynamic Social Fields,” *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 30, (2011): 433–39, 435.
 8. *Ibid.* Margonis draws the term from Nelson Maldonado-Torres’s “On the Coloniality of Being,” *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 2/3 (2007): 240–70.
 9. María Lugones, “Playfulness, ‘World’-Travelling, and Loving Perception,” *Hypatia* 2, no. 2 (1987): 3–19. This work will be cited in the text as PW for all subsequent references.
 10. See Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008).
 11. W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), ed. David W. Blight and Robert Gooding-Williams (Boston: Bedford Books, 1997).
 12. William G. Tierney, “An Anthropological Analysis of Student Participation in College,” *The Journal of Higher Education* 63, no. 6 (1992): 603–18.
 13. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York, NY: Continuum, 2004), 103, 104.
 14. Smith notes that colonialism as a practice is “but one expression of” the more encompassing concept of imperialism. See Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 2012), 22.
 15. *Ibid.*, 1.
 16. *Ibid.*, 20.
 17. Michel Foucault, “Two Lectures,” in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, trans., Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper (New York, NY: Pantheon, 1977), 81.
 18. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 71.

19. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1995).
20. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 66.
21. *Ibid.*, 37.
22. Sandra Harding, *Science and Social Inequality: Feminist and Postcolonial Issues* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2006).
23. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 44.
24. *Ibid.*, 45.
25. For examples, see Dolores Delgado Bernal and Octavio Villalpando, "An Apartheid of Knowledge in the Academy: The Struggle Over 'Legitimate' Knowledge for Faculty of Color," *Equity and Excellence in Education* 35, no. 2 (2002): 169–80; and Daniel G. Solórzano, "Critical Race Theory, Race and Gender Microaggressions, and the Experience of Chicana and Chicano Scholars," *Qualitative Studies in Education* 11, no. 1 (1998): 121–36.
26. The students and their words are real; their names are changed for privacy. Surveys were administered by the author on May 20, 2013 (Abriella), July 12, 2013 (Billy), and August 1, 2013 (Anali).
27. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974).
28. Gert Biesta, *Beyond Learning: Democratic Education for a Human Future* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2006), 49.
29. *Ibid.*, 6.
30. Alphonso Lingis, *The Community of Those Who Have Nothing in Common* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994).
31. Frank Margonis, "Addressing Students Responsively and Critically," in *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 2011*, ed. Robert Kunzman (Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society, 2012): 271–79, 271. This work will be cited in the text as *AS* for all subsequent references.
32. Margonis, "In Pursuit of Respectful Teaching and Intellectually-Dynamic Social Fields," 433.
33. Joanna Kadi, "Speaking (About) Silence," in *Sing, Whisper, Shout, Pray! Feminist Visions for a Just World*, ed., M. Jacqui Alexander (Ft. Bragg, CA: EdgeWork Books, 2003), 539–45.
34. *Ibid.*, 539–40.
35. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*.
36. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 103.
37. *Ibid.*, 106.
38. Margonis, "In Pursuit of Respectful Teaching and Intellectually-Dynamic Social Fields," 437.
39. *Ibid.*
40. Biesta, *Beyond Learning*, 28.
41. Margonis, "Tending Neocolonial Gaps," 71.