

Fifty ways to leave your racism

Nimisha Patel & Harshad Keval

Introduction

“Racism does not stay still; it changes shape, size, contours, purpose, function...people’s attitudes don’t mean a damn to me, but it matters to me if I can’t send my child to the school I want...if I can’t get the job for which I am qualified...the acting out of prejudice is discrimination and when it becomes institutionalised in the power structure of this society, then we are dealing not with attitudes, but with power.”
(Sivanandan, 1990: 65)

The above is a quote from a speech given in 1983 by the late Ambalavener Sivanandan, then director of the Institute of Race Relations, UK. The speech was during a period of constant racialised turmoil, discrimination and violence, and starkly renders our multi-racial, multi-ethnic, culturally syncretic UK landscape in powerful racially rendered hues. Thirty-four years after this speech, we are seeing a newly revived racialised antagonism which has been fuelled by both political machinations of old, as well as by recent national, European and global economic contexts. Our contemporary landscape is marred by increased racial violence, intensified far right and White supremacy movements which openly embrace and express anti-Black, anti-foreigner, anti-migrant and anti-refugee sentiments. In 2016, both the UK EU referendum and the US presidential elections, with unexpected outcomes, were characterised by a variety of racialising validities. The build-up to the Brexit campaigns were punctuated by what could be seen as flashpoints where the possibility of intense racialised conflict loomed. These flashpoints related to principally *immigration*, and notionally the UK’s state as a sovereign independent country and its right to more tightly protect its borders and to prevent terrorism (by ‘home-grown British Muslims’). Much has been written about this recently (e.g. Bhambra, 2016; Jones et al., 2017; Raja-Ranking, 2017; Virdee and McGeever, 2017; Wood and Patel, 2017), and what we are witnessing again is inexhaustible othering, dehumanising and essentially, race-making – the reproduction (and contestation) of race and racial categories.

The current climate has produced a discursive façade in which race and racializing elements of these flashpoints can even be contested. Are we really in a ‘post-racial’ moment (see Lentin, 2014) and did racism ever go away? How then, has racism (therefore race) ceased to occupy a discursive and practical space, and been distorted, whitewashed and delegitimised in the language of diversity, whilst the very real, lived impacts of racism and racialisation become part of this logical negation? The convenience of moving back and forth from culture to religion and on to ethnicity and back within discussions about difference and diversity gives the illusion of speaking to racism (without naming it). Yet, it erases the very machinations of racism and the enduring and profound impact of racism, as well as the powerful racialising gaze that gives birth to it.

In this paper, we ask what happened to racism in our discourses? Where is racism? Where is Whiteness? Specifically, we consider how academia and the psy-professions have engaged in

race-making, by taking racism off the agenda and producing the mirage of addressing race and Whiteness, whilst proficiently performing and reinforcing racism.

We use the term Whiteness, as a social construct, to refer to the invisible privileges and power which, via various ideological and cultural practices, systematically maintain structural, racialised and intersectional hierarchies (Clark & Garner, 2009) and the oppression of people of colour. We use the term Black to refer to those subjected to racism on the basis of colour or assumed racial categories; whilst recognising the heterogeneity of racialised histories, inequalities, experiences and systematic oppression of people and the complexity of differing intersecting experiences of discrimination.

As authors, we have different disciplinary backgrounds and trainings, in psychology and sociology, but our interests and professional experiences coalesce around the race-making circuitry of both everyday life, as well as wider, over-arching institutional power structures that fundamentally rely on the unspoken privileges of Whiteness. In focusing on sociology and the psy-disciplines we reflect on whether White privilege can be dismantled and how we could address racism.

“Race – what are we talking about?”

Increasingly, racism has ceased to be given space for discussion in sociology and the psy-disciplines and their professional trainings, and all too often when race is brought up, or racism named, responses range from confusion, incredulity, discomfort, irritation and vacuous expressions. Race is indeed both a non-sensical notion and vitally important to the analysis of history and of contemporary questions around racism. It is non-sensical in that it encapsulates a history of epistemic discursive constructions, economics, social conditions, cultural movements, global contexts, and the development of nation-state boundaries. Yet, it speaks to the process of racialisation, racist discrimination and racist brutality, which at its extreme are acts of ethnic cleansing, genocide and torture.

Historically, relentless attempts have been made to render race redundant, not least through adopting inventive discursive devices (e.g. ‘celebrating diversity’) and by revisionist re-writings of colonial history, where the ‘now’ is often dislocated epistemically and practically from the ‘then’. Small wonder then that politicians can speak of the era of slavery affectionately (e.g. Roy Moore in the USA); that demands are made that (some) racialised populations ‘should move on from slavery’; or that ‘the past is in the past’ (see for example the ‘Alt-right’ movements in the UK and USA). New racisms (see Fernando, 2017) and Whiteness abound, where explanations for the data on racial inequality in health, education, criminal justice systems, employment etc. and on racial violence and race hate violence, are explained with a White privilege lens, where blame is located in genes, cultural ‘habits’, cultural and religious beliefs, ‘Black culture’, poor cultural values, poor parenting, poor mental health etc. – but not on structural and institutional racism.

Racism in all its guises - scientific, personal, institutional - persists whilst an examination of Whiteness and of the ‘get out-card’ of non-culpability (arguably, the epitome of a ‘race-card’, only invisible) is evaded. Talking about race then, is a demand to name, denude, scrutinise and dismantle Whiteness and racism. Before exploring how this could be done, it is important to consider how and why race has been taken off the agenda.

Taking (and keeping) race off the agenda

The almost magical disappearance of race (Keval, 2015) from the view of public debate is coupled with a highly sophisticated anti-migrant/foreigner trope and a blatant recycling of racism, reminiscent of Enoch Powell's vitriolic and notorious so-called 'rivers of blood' speech in 1968. In the psy-professions, this disappearance of race is coupled with a vigorous and trenchant psychologising of experiences of Black people in mental health services, refugee and asylum-seeking people, Grenfell Tower survivors, Muslim youth deemed vulnerable to radicalisation etc. The search for faulty genes seamlessly transposed with the persistent search for deficiencies in the psyches of those from Black and minority ethnic backgrounds and deficiencies in their families, communities, cultures and faiths.

These appearances and disappearances of race gives the illusion that it *wasn't* there all along. That in fact sometimes it waxes and wanes, has vicissitudes of activity, that sometimes, it is benign, well-meaning and *acceptable*. Thus, rendering race and racism, including attitudes and race-making practices, little more than normal, acceptable and inevitable.

Yet, without acknowledging the contemporary presence of history, Whiteness and power, talking about race becomes pathologized, another figment of the Black person's over-paranoid imagination, fears and refusal to 'let go' of past historical wrongs. And what of those who raise racism? Silence them, pity them, placate them, problematise them, their logic, their capacity to think clearly and to articulate the problem, problematise their expression of moral outrage as unfounded, naïve, too extreme, attacking, as childhood wounds, 'chips on their shoulders, as unresolved 'personal issues' - individual pathology. Responses to the person raising racism within institutions can range from outright denial, indignance, discomfort, personalising and pathologizing the person raising the issues, guilt, paralysis, blame, anger, even rage, structural busy-ness with more institutional policies, guidelines, posters and websites with 'diverse' faces and a kaleidoscope of hands of colour etc. The effect, whatever the conscious or unconscious desires, is to take race off the agenda, as fast and efficiently as possible. As if we can annihilate racism, or at least cloak it, smother it, anything but name it and look inside the belly of the beast.

When Black professionals, academics and writers persist in raising the spectre of racism, there are many responses at an individual and institutional level (Gabriel and Tate, 2017) and identifying troubling issues marks the bodies and the occupiers of these spaces as troubling and troublesome – and creates confusion, defensiveness and reaction (Ahmed, 2012). George Yancy on the phenomenology of being a 'black-philosopher' – spells out the way in which white philosophers approach him as an *anomaly*, occupying a contradiction in terms ('Black? Philosopher?'). Similarly, Black academics and trainers of professional psychologists and psychotherapists are often treated with a degree of suspiciousness, guardedness and suspended respect tinged with incredulity ('how *did* you get here?'). Sometimes they are afforded the 'Black expert' status; asked for help in both understanding the problem of racism (the prerogative of Whiteness), and in finding solutions to racism and its impact. Sometimes their colour is made invisible, at least until racism is named. Treated as heretic, the naming of racism re-makes colour as hyper-visible and as spoiling, precluding honest dialogue and creating a pervasive atmosphere of fear and readiness for impending confrontation, a conflict between sides. As if naming racism requires one to pick a side.

One fundamental question is the issue of who gets to put race back on the agenda, and to define racism? There is an epistemological connection between who gets to enjoy the privilege of thinking, of philosophising, of generating and maintaining knowledge, and

setting the agenda for how that knowledge is not only used, but also the parameters of what subsequently gets defined as deviant to that normalising construction.

When a discipline or profession demands that a given set of knowledge structures are legitimate, normalised, rational and logical, we need to ask the same questions that Foucault posed: “What types of knowledge are you trying to disqualify when you say that you are a science? What speaking subject, what discursive subject, what subject of experience and knowledge are you trying to minorize when you begin to say: I speak this discourse... What theoretico-political vanguard are you trying to put on the throne in order to detach it from all the massive, circulating and discontinuous forms that knowledge can take?” (Foucault, 1977, p.10).

Commonly, in psychology, sociology and other disciplines, individualised, culture-based and so-called diversity issues may be open to discussion, happily consuming Foucauldian notions of the *effects* of power, or noting structural inequalities, yet, without embracing an analysis of the production of power. This, we refer to here as ‘apolitical racial reflection’. The more insidious, powerful and damaging racism in theorising, practice and in the institutions which maintain racialised subjugation and oppression are invariably off limits. Challenges to this apolitical racial reflection are then met with different gradations and manifestations of bemusement, denial, defensiveness and contempt, or simply ignored.

Putting race back in the spotlight

In putting race firmly back in the spotlight, we turn to the psy-disciplines and sociology to note some examples of ongoing race-making.

The psy-disciplines and race

The well-known historical examples of race-making in the psy-disciplines are not repeated here (for example, the legacy of eugenics (Galton, 1881); the view that ‘race’ genetically determines intelligence and poor outcomes (e.g. Rushton and Jensen, 2010; Rushton, 1985; 1990) - though race science and these ideas have never gone away (e.g. see Rawlinson and Adams, 2018). Similarly, racialised inequalities in mental health services persist (e.g. Fernando, 2017; Cabinet Office, 2017; Care Quality Commission, 2011; Mental Health Act Commission, 2009; Keating and Robertson, 2004; Audini and Lelliott, 2002; Fernando, Ndegwa and Wilson, 1998; Nazroo, 1997; Bebbington et al., 1994; Lloyd and Moodley, 1992; Moodley and Perkins, 1991).

Even in the recent decade, psychological literature and practice continues to ‘other’ and obscure this othering in various ways. Conventional cultural psychology often reifies and essentialises culture and is devoid of critiques of the normalising gaze. This can result in epistemic violence with the repression of local and subjugated representations of history and experience, and the imposition of dominant understandings and knowledge, as apparently universal, to examine and explain the ‘other’, for example in the Global South (thereby maintaining structures of domination). Other examples include the acknowledgement of intersectionality, based on class, gender, sexuality, without naming racism; or utilising ‘intersectionality’ in terms of identity descriptors and individual experiences, or ‘diversity’ as a supposedly neutral term, each without naming the operations and impresses of power. Pertinent questions include *how* are these terms used, *when* and by *whom*? What does the use

of such terms and concepts *do* in practice; what is de-centred and rendered invisible – and what are the processes by which Whiteness is centred so successfully?

The dominance of Whiteness and privileging of Eurocentric knowledge persists, with most psychological research published by those from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic ('WEIRD') societies (Henrich et al., 2010); whilst the universalist drive and the applicability of this research to the 'neglected 95%' of the rest of the world (Arnett, 2008) remains largely unquestioned. Whiteness in the setting of research questions and research methodologies is ignored, conclusions presented as apolitical or depoliticised and stripped of context, often seeking to elevate the status of the research as scientific and value-neutral. For example, Fischer et al. (2012) in a recent study on the relative absence of expressive cues and the effect of contextual cues on the perception of emotions and its effect on attitudes conclude that the niqab may have the effect of exaggerating the perceived amount of negative emotion expressed by a wearer, whilst diminishing the perceived amount of positive emotion. They posit that this finding supports concerns in political debates about whether niqabs should be permitted in social settings.

Even where research seeks to study 'othering', an analysis of structural and discursive power is often absent. For example, the expanding research on infrahumanisation and blatant dehumanisation often avoids, even erases, any examination of the perpetuation of racist constructions within studies. Studies by Kteily et al. (2015) ask British and American participants attitudinal questions and to rate different groups on how evolved and "human-like" they were, using the 'ascent of man' image. 'Muslims' (a broad *religion-based categorisation*) is constructed as apparently a distinct (and homogenous) group, alongside (and seemingly distinct from) Arabs (constructed as an *ethnic group*) and Americans, Canadians, Europeans, Austrians, Australians, Japanese and Chinese. One of the findings was that Arabs and Muslims were rated as significantly less evolved than all other groups; and that in the American sample, participants attributed significantly more humanity to Americans than Arabs across all dehumanization measures. Islamophobia, the complexity and multidimensionality of racism, racist constructions in the methodology and how power operates in identifying certain implications of such research (but not others, such as how such research can be misused) are not discussed. This increasing focus on Muslim people in psychological literature in efforts to explain psychologically "jihadi radicalisation" (see Silke, 2008) and to identify (Western, 'home-grown') Muslims deemed vulnerable to radicalisation (i.e. prior to a crime being committed) (e.g. McGilloway et al., 2015; Bhui et al., 2014), is also largely unquestioned in its blatant divorce from the wider highly politicised and racialised debates on counter-terrorism, violent extremism, Islamophobia and discussions of the erosion of human rights (see Open Society Foundations, 2016). Questions such as what we mean by radicalisation, is radicalisation now to be considered a psychological construct, process and phenomenon, why is the focus on Muslim youth, and why now – remain veiled in the name of science. Worse, such research is disguised as a humanitarian endeavour in the service of the public, research that will apparently help protect 'vulnerable Muslim youths' from themselves and from malevolent others - from their own marginalised communities, and the wider public from them.

In professional psychology, such as clinical psychology, there has been an increasing interest in addressing the lack of 'representation' of Black and minority ethnic trainees in professional training programmes (e.g. Williams et al., 2006) and attempts to increase the diversity (of colour) of the profession (e.g. Turpin and Coleman, 2010). Unsurprisingly, this lack of representation is typically framed as a lack of knowledge and awareness, within Black

and minority ethnic communities, of psychology as a potential vocation, or as the lack of ability by applicants from Black and minority ethnic communities to reflect psychologically or as being unsupported in their vocational aspirations by their families (who are also implied to be psychologically unsophisticated). The lack of representation is rarely explored as a possible result of experiences of discrimination in education, work and life experiences, or fears of the profession and the psy-disciplines as being White, oppressive and as ‘White psychology for White folk’ (e.g. Fatimilehin and Coleman, 1998; Howitt and Owusu-Bempah, 1994).

The abiding impact of colonialism and the pervasiveness and resiliency of racism, and the reluctance to name racism in its various guises, in recruitment, knowledge-production, methods, practices, training and services has been consistently critiqued (e.g. Wood and Patel, 2017; Patel, 2010; Fleming and Daiches, 2005); McInnis, 2002, 2017). Experiences of subtle, covert and institutional racism have also been pointed out by psychology students and clinical psychology trainees (e.g. Adetimole et al., 2005; Shah et al., 2012; Dixon et al. 2016; Paulraj, 2016). These challenges have not gone unanswered, with some efforts to name and address racism within psychology (e.g. McInnis, 2017; Wood and Patel, 2017; Constantine and Sue, 2006; Fleming and Daiches, 2005; Howitt and Owusu-Bempah, 2002; Patel et al., 2000).

Sociologising race

Without reducing and over-simplifying UK race sociology, much of this revolves around the country’s many varied and enduring relationships with its colonial ‘others’. That imperial and colonial histories have a tendency to be either re-written with nationalistic nostalgic sentiment or rendered invisible is a point that has been painfully evident in the selective historiography of racialised minorities in recent years. Sociology is no different. One of the principal tensions in race sociology has been its early and indeed recent tendency to see race and racism as *just* another aspect of social order and disorder, rather than playing a fundamental, central role in the ravelling and unravelling of social life.

Solomos (2014) illuminates the different ways in which race sociology has been attempting to keep in step with societal changes. Throughout the 1960s growing anxieties around class antagonisms (Virdee, 2014) that had been developing since early 19th century, provided insights into class unity-based dividing lines between elite ruling classes and those subjugated labouring classes regardless of ethnic origin, as well as racial divisions. As Virdee suggests, the idea of hard-wired white working class racism is as reductionist and essentialising any notion of biological or cultural racial essentialism. The conditions of race and racism were set through the machinery of capitalism and the requirements of capital to work in and through the notion of nation-state building, and the constructed purity of belonging. We can see, hear and feel such sentiments acted upon today, in the immigration politics cascaded upon us from the Conservative government as well as racist and xenophobic rhetoric around UKIP’s much maligned race-based anti-immigration campaigns (see Jones et al., 2017). As Clarke and Garner (2009) summarise, “there is something contradictory about British identity and it is based in thousands of years of hatred for the ‘other’” (p.9). The intersection of class position and material positions with structures of power connecting with many other dimensions of racialized identity, such as nation state and gender (Anthias and Yuval Davis, 2005) became a staple of sociological research into race, especially with the influence of intersectionality (Hill Collins and Bilge, 2016).

Despite academic developments in race sociology (mainly through the work of writers at the Birmingham centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies such as Stuart Hall and many others), and the centrality of Black expressive culture as sites of resistance and locations of new identities in emergent changes in the UK political landscape (e.g. Gilroy, 1987), problems persisted, and continue to do so, in an increasingly *legitimised* way. Certainly, current research agendas fully encompass the notion that research is inherently political, and therefore race research has an obligation to produce understandings that are directly located within what Buroway (2005) called a critically engaged ‘public sociology’, and what Battercharya and Murji (2013) and Lentin (2017) address as ‘race critical public scholarship’. Such movements fully allow for the possibility of scholarship as a public good, and the opening up of race scholarship as a way to dismantle perceived barriers between what is understood as ‘normal sociology’ and sociologies of race and racism.

Sociology as a discipline was birthed through its comparison with anthropology, which explicitly dealt with the practices of the (colonial) ‘other’, hence its focus on ‘modern’ societies (Bhambra, 2007; 2014). Modernity is the discipline’s core focus and is regarded theoretically and empirically as a thing in itself – unique and untangled, without connection to forces outside of its own complicity in racialized, gendered inequality and brutality, which means that sociology is primarily concerned with “Solving the puzzle ‘from the inside’” (Smith, 2017, p.491). However, as Connell (2007) amongst others such as Bhambra (2007; 2014) have pointed out, the social sciences have long had not only a problematic relationship with the idea and practice of race and racism, but that actually they have been borne of the racial moment in modernity: “Sociology was formed within the culture of imperialism and embodied an intellectual response to the colonised world.” (Connell, 2007, p.9).

Studying race requires an analysis of exploring racial phenomena as it moves across, in contrast to and in allegiance with old and new versions of itself, and between political institutions (Goldberg, 2015; Lentin, 2017). The alternative to this is to regard racial phenomena with a ‘snap-shot lens’ – as micro consequences of other micro-level processes that are somehow discreet. For our analyses here, it is useful for us to see race and racism as beyond discrete temporal categories (i.e. not being solely of a particular time and space), whilst acknowledging that systematic, brutal periods of oppression throughout history also have their specific catalysts and mechanisms. The point here is that racism, race-thinking and racialized being have a structural, material and discursive architecture which also manifests simultaneously at the individual racialized being level.

Sociological accounts then need to ask uncomfortable questions at all levels. The processes we are all involved in allow and facilitate its constant recreation, renewal and re-performance. Lentin summarises this neatly:

“...racial structures are bound by racial logics that have specific historical origins in European invasion, slavery and colonisation...structures are made racial by being imbued with discourses about ...the inherency of non-European inferiority or the possibility of progressive inclusion.” (2017: 866).

If sociological approaches to race and racism do not acknowledge and take ownership of the legacies of colonial racism, and the enduring implications in contemporary life and institutions, then racism simply becomes adorned with new legitimating political disguises, whilst retaining its power to oppress and harm.

Decolonising as a way forward

A re-emerging (see Fanon 1965/1961) movement to address the colonial legacy and history of racism in psychology, sociology and other disciplines has been termed ‘decolonising’. The word decolonising attempts to highlight processes within institutions, institutional practices and institutions as sites for the expression and reproduction of domination – specifically, Whiteness, and the racialised representations and treatments of individuals and groups who may not symbolise the majority White male middle-class hegemony. Decolonising, from the theoretical, practical, experiential perspective, is a process of de-racialising, acknowledging the historical legacies of slavery, colonialism and racisms in everyday life, institutions (e.g. academia, psychological services) and practices– in other words, neo-colonialism and current racialised, colonial and epistemic violence. Decolonising is a process of exposing Whiteness and its historical trajectory. It seeks to dismantle those intersections of structural power bases that lead to multiple and connected discrimination (see Hill Collins and Bilge, 2016).

The question then, is how could we contribute to decolonising our disciplines and practices, de-centring Whiteness, acknowledging its impact and make space to embrace different knowledges and practices?

Strategies and tools for decolonising and addressing Whiteness

Decolonising is not about apolitical reflections on race or culture or tinkering at the edges of a curriculum and adding the odd lecture or workshop, or a staff training day, on race, diversity and intersectionality. It is not about introducing diversity policies, appointing diversity officers and champions or about simply promoting social inclusion or about apparently widening access (to exclusionary institutions and professions). It is not about only ensuring better representation of Black people in management, academia, judiciary etc. The danger of the juggernaut of the diversity agenda, which includes seeing representation of marginalised people as its end goal (whilst ‘embracing and celebrating diversity’), is that it gives the impression of addressing racism, amongst other isms. What diversity agendas often fail to do with respect to racism is to examine historical and current racism – overt, covert, intentional, unintentional, individual and institutional. They fail to examine the discursive and structural operations of power within institutions and institutional policies and practices. They fail to acknowledge and address the adverse and often pervasive impacts of ongoing racism internally in the organisation juxtaposed against a public-facing, ‘we welcome all’ diversity drive, on those so-called represented (but still marginalised) Black and minority ethnic people within those institutions, thereby simply window-dressing and inventing another form of race-making and colonial, structural violence.

What then, can we distil from historical attempts to address racism and from the re-energised movement for decolonising? We consider the asking of critical questions as one of the basic and essential tools as *a first step* in decolonising: asking questions which demand that each of us as individuals, as teams and institutions engage in specific tasks.

Fifty questions are posed as key tasks. None of these tasks, we contend, are one-offs, none yield easy answers or solutions, and none are short-term. To engage in these tasks, at least three ingredients are necessary:

- (a) **Stamina and determination** to embark on a long-haul journey with no clear end point;
- (b) **Courage** to stay in the process where uncertainty looms, and where there is not necessarily a clear vision or a list of steps in a linear direction; courage to take risks and to make mistakes; courage to challenge and be challenged; courage to see that which we are taught to not see (or avoid seeing); courage to be honest; courage to take responsibility in doing our own work;
- (c) **Humility** to know when we do not always know, when we do not always understand, when we cannot always see. Humility to acknowledge our part in oppression whilst recognising how and when we become defensive, avoidant, blaming and look to the 'other' to name the problem of racism, to explain racism, to find the solutions and to ease the shame and guilt; how we can then become resentful, blaming and disengage when the guilt or helplessness does not ease.

Tasks for individuals

Ask:

1. What is Whiteness? Examine Whiteness (Kendall 2006; Dyer 1997) – unpacking White privilege and its everyday manifestations.
2. What are the White privileges that I have and utilise in my personal and professional life?
3. What am I prepared to lose in order for Whiteness to be dismantled?
4. What power structures and institutional practices am I involved in, recruited into, or collude with, which perpetuate racism?
5. What can I do to help dismantle White privilege and dominance in my work?
6. How do I utilise my experience of oppression on one axis (e.g. gender, class) to defend against challenges of Whiteness or to deny Whiteness and my part in race-making and racism?
7. How does Whiteness impact on Black people?
8. Who and how does racism hurt and harm?

Tasks for academics and trainers (individually and collectively)

Ask:

9. What knowledges have we assumed and perpetuate as 'the' knowledges and preferred theories?
10. Whom and which groups does this benefit, and at whose expense?
11. Who or what is de-centred and rendered invisible in the perpetuation of these dominant knowledges?
12. How do we continue to reproduce Whiteness in the research process and knowledge production?
13. How do we advocate and perpetuate the application of dominant Eurocentric knowledges to the 'other', the 'neglected 95%' (Arnett, 2008)?
14. What knowledges, experiences and practices do we ignore or disqualify (e.g. as being too localised, 'indigenous' or culture-specific, as lacking evidence or theoretical

coherence etc.), in the attempt to gain purchase in our discipline and to perpetuate certain knowledges?

15. What happens when White privilege and dominance is named and challenged?
16. What are reactions and which defences are mobilised when Whiteness and racial oppression is named? For example, distancing from one's own Whiteness, cultured, raced and gendered histories: "*but I'm not racist*", "*I'm not like that, I'm only responsible for my own behavior*"; or ignoring historical colonialism and racism and the collective responsibilities of those from White dominant groups.
17. Who and where are there allies in this contestation?
18. When the challenging and decolonising is done by a *Black* person, what happens to the challenger(s), how do colleagues respond to them?
19. When the challenging and decolonising is done by a *White* person, what happens to the challenger(s), how do colleagues respond to them?
20. What do we need to work together in staying in this journey of decolonising?
21. What may happen if we do not engage in decolonising? Where is the harm and who is likely to be disadvantaged, adversely affected and harmed?

Tasks for teams

Ask:

22. How can we observe, notice and catch examples of ahistorical and apolitical accounts of everyday and institutional racism (e.g. in the language of diversity, social inclusion, multiculturalism, celebrating cultures etc.)?
23. What happens when team or institutional initiatives for 'increasing representation', or diversity are challenged by a *Black* colleague as simplistic, apolitical race-making? How do colleagues in the team react to what is said? How do they respond to the person who is challenging? What does this do to race?
24. When the challenging and decolonising is done by a *White* colleague, what happens to the them? How do colleagues in the team react to what is said? How do they respond to the person who is challenging? What does this do to race?
25. Can we notice the reactions or reluctance in discussing Whiteness and racism in team meetings and other forums ("*not sure this is really necessary*", "*we have more urgent matters we have to address*", "*this is a huge topic, we don't have space for this (unwanted luxury) right now*", "*do we have to keep discussing this, there are so many other matters to discuss?*" etc.)?
26. How can we join and mobilise colleagues to critique together 'apolitical racial reflections'?
27. How can we examine the process of racialisation and the anatomy of racist oppression: looking in the belly of the beast and at our individual and collective role in this race-making?
28. How can we decolonise our minds? Addressing internalised oppression (David & Okazaki, 2006; Fanon, 1952/1967 - internalising the idea of racial and cultural inferiority), or 'mental colonisation', requires decolonisation, which (Ngugi Wa' Thiongo, 1986) argued is as much an internal emotional, spiritual, cognitive process as it is a materially loaded, brick-by-brick de-structuring of the very architectures of oppression that so many countries around the world, especially in Africa, have had to wrestle with.

29. When and why are conversations about Whiteness and racism confined to corridors, private offices or informal settings; and in hushed or speculative tones and with euphemisms, numerous qualifiers and declarations of *"this is very sensitive"*, *"we have to be careful"* etc.? What does this do to race?
30. How and when is responsibility for naming *and* addressing Whiteness; and to soothe the discomfort, guilt and helplessness that arises from naming and confronting Whiteness shifted to those most marginalised and suffering the harms of racism – colleagues, students, clients, communities etc.?
31. How and when is the responsibility to find solutions to racism shifted to those who suffer from the dominance of Whiteness and the violence of racism?
32. How can we notice, catch and problematise both hypervisibility and the pathologizing of those who raise Whiteness and racism; and the invisibility of those voices?
33. How can we identify networks of power and where they coalesce in the team and wider institution - asking what role does colour, race, language, gender, class, disability play in this?

Tasks for institutions

Ask:

34. How do we respond to instances where Whiteness and everyday operations of racial oppression and violence are exposed (e.g. by saying *"we've done race"* and *"...we have diversity initiatives now"* etc.)?
35. What does this *do*? Who is silenced and invisible?
36. What does the silence speak, what is not being said, why?
37. How does the institution engage in the busy-ness of window-dressing (rapid updates of policies, websites, leaflets, posters etc.), quick and superficial fixes and knee-jerk reactions or appointing of an individual to be responsible to advise on diversity, in response to the naming of racism?
38. How and when is this flurry of activity, or creation of specific posts, tokenistic and an attempt to limit or silence accusations of racism, inertia and complicity, or a genuine step to creating the structures and processes conducive to change?
39. When and who are the external consultants recruited to help promote a diversity agenda, and their position on Whiteness and racism?
40. When and why is there reluctance about *"bringing in outsiders (external consultants)"* and fear expressed of *"opening the floodgates"*, *"being exposed"*, becoming vulnerable to (unwanted) scrutiny and criticism etc.?
41. When certain practices of power are scrutinized (e.g. gender, disability) how are they then used to counter the highlighting of race (e.g. *"it's not just race"*, *"we have to think about lots of other things"*)?
42. When and how does the organisation and the senior managers shut down, minimise or deny Whiteness and racial oppression within the institution (e.g. *"it's just a one-off"*, *it's a handful of disgruntled staff"*, *"there's no evidence"*, *"if people don't come forward..."*, *"it's a personality issue"*, *"we can't win...like we don't have other bigger things to worry about"*, *"we don't need to air our dirty linen in public"*, *"we have to manage this (to minimise reputational damage) and not let it get out of hand"* etc.)?
43. How well do leaders and managers understand racism; its processes of operation; its impacts on staff, students and the public?

44. How and when do leaders and managers engage in apolitical racial reflection or in the active denial and shutting down of 'race talk' ("to protect" the institution)?
45. Are the leaders and managers 'doing their own work' (see tasks for individuals and teams)?
46. How is anti-racism watered down, drowned or made invisible in the diversity agenda (or its variants)?
47. How can anti-racism be institutionalised in every level and aspect of the institution's structures and practices and decolonising become a valued and essential skill?
48. How is the institutional competence in not committing racial harm and abuse honestly evidenced (not inflated, glorified, obscured or ignored)?
49. How and where does the organisation debate institutional incompetence in addressing racism?
50. How does the organisation communicate to those outside its organisation its achievements, failures and lessons learnt in addressing (or not) racism?

Conclusions

The herculean tasks, outlined above, are presented not as optional reflections, but as our collective responsibility and moral imperative to ask questions, to strip Whiteness and take apart the apparatus of racism, again and again and again. This responsibility however lies not with any one group or person, for the weight of racialisation is too heavy to bear by single groups or individuals. It requires societal effort, and collective, transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary and disciplinary efforts and individual effort. Racism mars and hurts us all. As Fanon (1958) remarked, the liberation aimed for is the liberation of all people, a transformation so that humans could, by escaping racism, become more.

References

- Adetimole, F., Afuape, T., & Vara, R. (2005). The impact of racism on the experience of training on a clinical psychology course. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 48, 11-15.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Anthias, F., & Yuval-Davis, N. (2005). *Racialized boundaries: Race, nation, gender, colour and class and the anti-racist struggle*. London: Routledge.
- Arnett, J. (2008). The neglected 95%. Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63 (7), 602-614.
- Audini, B. & Lelliott, P. (2002). Age, gender and ethnicity of those detained under Part II of the Mental Health Act 1983. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 180, 222-226.
- Bhattacharyya, G., & Murji, K. (2013). Introduction: race critical public scholarship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(9), 1359-1373.

Bebbington, P.E., Feeney, S.T., Flannigan, C.B., Glover, G.R., Lewis, S.W. & Wing, J.K. (1994). Inner London collaborative audit of admissions in two health districts: Ethnicity and the use of the mental health Act. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 65, 743-749.

Bhabra, G. (2007). *Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociological imagination*. New York: Springer.

Bhabra, G. K. (2014). Postcolonial and decolonial dialogues. *Postcolonial Studies*, 17(2), 115-121.

Bhabra, G. K. (2016). Viewpoint: *Brexit, Class and British 'National' Identity*. Discover Society, 5.

Bhui, K., Everitt, B. & Jones, E. (2015) Might Depression, Psychosocial Adversity, and Limited Social Assets Explain Vulnerability to and Resistance against Violent Radicalisation? *PLOS ONE*, 9(9), e105918, 1-10.

Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. *American sociological review*, 70(1), 4-28.

Cabinet Office (2017) Race Disparities Audit.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/686071/Revised_RDA_report_March_2018.pdf. Accessed: 20 April 2018.

Care Quality Commission (2011). *Count me in 2010: Results of the 2010 national census of inpatients and patients on supervised community treatment in mental health and learning disability services in England and Wales*. London: Author.

Clarke, S., & Garner, S. (2009). *White identities: A critical sociological approach*. Pluto Press.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

Constantine, M., & Sue, D. (2006). *Addressing racism*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.

David, E. & Okazaki, S. (2006). Colonial mentality: A review and recommendation for Filipino American psychology. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12, 1-16.

Dixson, A., Clayton, D., Peoples, L., & Reynolds, R. (2016). The Impact of Racism on Education and the Educational Experiences of Students of Color. In A. Alvarez, C. Liang & H. Neville, *The Cost of Racism for People of Color* (pp. 189-202). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Dyer, R. (1997) *White*. London: Routledge.

Fanon, F. (1965). *The wretched of the earth* (translated by C. Farrington). New York: Grove Press (original work published 1961).

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks* (translated by C. Markmann). New York: Pluto Press (original work published 1952).

Fatimilehin, I. & Coleman, P.G. (1998). Appropriate services for African-Caribbean families: views from one community. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 111, 6-11.

Fernando, S., Ndegwa, D. & Wilson, W. (1998). *Forensic Psychiatry, Race and Culture*. London: Routledge.

Fernando, S. (2017). *Institutional racism in psychiatry and clinical psychology*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fischer, A., Gillebaart, M., Rotteveel, M., Becker, D., & Vliek, M. (2012). Veiled Emotions: The Effect of Covered Faces on Emotion Perception and Attitudes. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(3), 266-273.

Foucault, M., & Ewald, F. (2003). "Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976 (Vol. 1). London: Macmillan.

Fleming, I. and Daiches, A. (2005). Psychologists against racism. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 48, 7-10.

Gabriel, D. and Tate, SA (eds.) (2017). *Inside the ivory tower. Narratives of women of colour surviving and thriving in British academia*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Galton, F. (1881) *Natural Inheritance*. London: Macmillan.

Gilroy, P. (1991). *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. 1987. London: Hutchinson.

Goldberg, D. T. (2015). *Are we all postracial yet?* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Henrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010) The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61-83.

Hill Collins, P. & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity.

Howitt, D. and Owusu-Bempah, J. (1994). *The Racism of Psychology*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Jones, H., Gunaratnam, Y., Bhattacharyya, G., Davies, W., Dhaliwal, S., Forkert, K., & Saltus, R. (2017). *Go home? The politics of immigration controversies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Keating, F., & Robertson, D. (2004). Fear, black people and mental illness: A vicious circle? *Health & social care in the community*, 12(5), 439-447.

Kendall, F. E. (2006). *Understanding white privilege*. London: Routledge.

Keval, H. (2015). Schizophrenia and psychosis: the magical and troubling disappearance of race from the debate. *Diversity and Equality in Health and Care* 12(1): 6-8.

Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The Ascent of Man: Theoretical and Empirical Evidence for Blatant Dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. DOI: [10.1037/pspp0000048](https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000048)

Lentin, A. (2014). Post-race, post politics: the paradoxical rise of culture after multiculturalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(8), 1268-1285.

Lentin, A. (2017). 'Race' in Outhwaite, W., & Turner, S. (Eds.). (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Political Sociology*, 2v. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Lloyd, P. & Moodley, P. (1992). Psychotropic medication and ethnicity: An inpatient survey. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 27 (2), 95-101.

McGilloway, A., Ghosh, P. & Bhui, K. (2015). A systematic review of pathways to and processes associated with radicalization and extremism amongst Muslims in Western societies, *International Review of Psychiatry*, 27(1), 39-50.

McInnis, E. (2002). Institutional racism in the NHS and clinical psychology? Taking note of McPherson. *The Journal of Critical Psychology, Counselling and Psychotherapy*, Autumn, 164-170.

McInnis, E. (2017). Black psychology: A paradigm for a less oppressive clinical psychology? Special issue: Diversity. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 299, 3-8.

Mental Health Act Commission (2009). *Coercion and consent: monitoring the Mental Health Act 2007–2009. The Mental Health Act Commission Thirteenth Biennial Report 2007–2009*. London: Author.

Moodley, P. & Perkins, R. (1991). Routes to psychiatric inpatient care in an inner London Borough. *Social Psychiatry Epidemiology*, 26, 47-51.

Nazroo, J. (1997). *Ethnicity and mental health*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.

Open Society Foundations (2016) *Eroding Trust: The UK's Prevent counter-extremism strategy in Health and Education*. New York: Open Society Foundations.

Owusu-Bempah, J. & Howitt, D. (2002). Addressing cultural diversity, addressing racism. *The Psychologist*, 5(6), 293-295.

Patel, N. (2010). Plus ça change plus c'est la même chose? Invited commentary on Turpin and Coleman (2010) Clinical psychology and diversity: progress and continuing challenges.

In C. Murray and J. Simpson (eds.) Special Issue: Training in Clinical Psychology, *Journal of Psychology Learning and Teaching*, 9(2), 30-31.

Patel, N., Bennett, E., Dennis, M., Dosanjh, N., Miller, A., Mahtani, A. & Nadirshaw, Z. (eds.) (2000). *Clinical Psychology, 'Race & Culture: A Training Manual*. Blackwell: Chichester.

Paulraj, P.S. (2016). How do black trainees make sense of their 'identities' in the context of clinical psychology training? D.Clin.Psy. thesis, University of East London.
<http://roar.uel.ac.uk/5401/>

Rajan-Rankin, S. (2017). Brexit Logics: Myth and Fact-A Black Feminist Analysis. *feminists@ law*, 7(2).

Rawlinson, K. and Adams, R. (2018). UCL to investigate eugenics conference secretly held on campus, *Guardian*, 11 January. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/jan/10/ucl-to-investigate-secret-eugenics-conference-held-on-campus>. Accessed 20 January 2018.

Rushton, P. (1985). Differential K theory and race differences in E and N. *Personality and individual differences*, 6(6), 769-770.

Rushton, P. (1990). Race, brain size and intelligence: A rejoinder to Cain and Vanderwolf. *Personality and individual differences*, 11(8), 785-794.

Rushton, P. and Jensen, A. (2010). Race and IQ: A Theory-Based Review of the Research in Richard Nisbett's *Intelligence and How to Get It*. *The Open Society Journal*, 3, 9-35.

Shah, S., Wood, N., Nolte, L., & Goodbody, L. (2012). The experience of being a trainee clinical psychologist from a black and minority ethnic group. A qualitative study. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 232, 32-35.

Silke, A. (2008) Holy warriors. Exploring the psychological processes of jihadi radicalisation. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(1), 99-123.

Sivanandan, A. (1990). *Communities of resistance: writings on black struggles for socialism*. London: Verso.

Solomos, J. (2014). Sociology of Race, Racism and Ethnicity: Trends, Debates and Research Agendas. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Sociology in Britain* (pp. 396-412). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, A. (2017) Racism, empire and sociology. *Sociology*, 51(2), 491-499.

Turpin, G. & Coleman, G. (2010). Clinical Psychology and Diversity: progress and continuing challenges. In C. Murray and J. Simpson (eds.) Special Issue: Training in Clinical Psychology, *Journal of Psychology Learning and Teaching*, 9(2), 17-27.

Virdee, S. (2014). *Racism, class and the racialized outsider*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patel and Keval (2018) Fifty ways to leave your racism. *Journal of Critical Psychology, Counselling and Psychotherapy*, vol.18, no. 2, 61-79.

Virdee, S., & McGeever, B. (2017). Racism, Crisis, Brexit. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1-18.
DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2017.1361544

Williams, P.E., Turpin, G. & Hardy, G. (2006) Clinical Psychology service provision and ethnic diversity within the UK: A review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 13, 324-338.