This PDF includes a chapter from the following book:

Knowledge Justice

Disrupting Library and Information Studies through Critical Race Theory

© 2021 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

License Terms:

OA Funding Provided By:

The title-level DOI for this work is:

doi:10.7551/mitpress/11969.001.0001

INTRODUCTION: THIS IS ONLY THE BEGINNING

Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight

LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Before we begin, we honor and offer gratitude to the Indigenous peoples who cared for the lands where the majority of this introductory chapter was written and the majority of the collection was edited. We acknowledge that the lands we inhabit are the unceded ancestral territory of the Massachusetts and Wampanoag peoples and of the Tonkawa, Lipan Apache, and Comanche peoples. As Chinese American and Mexican Black American settlers and guests, we acknowledge the history of violence, biological warfare, and genocide that led to the colonization of these lands and our eventual occupation of it. We cannot forget the loss of lives, culture, and knowledge that is a part of the US nation-state's history, and we work toward individual and collective action to combat the continued erasure of Indigenous land, life, stories, and experiences from our histories and institutions. We encourage you, reader, to do the same.

REFRAMING RACIAL POWER IN LIS THROUGH CRITICAL RACE THEORY

"Can't we get past race?" My response is, we've never gotten to race.
—David Stovall

For decades, in the United States, libraries and archives as professions have grappled with race and racism in terms of representation of people and ideas within the field, but with little concrete or meaningful success. Critical Race legal scholar Kimberlé

Crenshaw has stated that frames help us decide what kind of problem we want to deal with and who is most impacted by that problem. She emphasizes that the way a problem has been framed can tell us a lot about how it will be solved (2020). Like most other fields, library and information studies[1] (LIS) has framed the race problem as one of diverse representation of racialized bodies, rather than one of racial power, domination, and privilege. David James Hudson writes, "Diversity's preoccupation with demographic inclusion and individual behavior competence has…left little room in the field for substantive engagement with race as a historically contingent phenomenon" (2017). LIS as a whole understands the problem to be the supposed unintentional absence of racial diversity in librarianship and archives, by which they mean the lack of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in a field (librarianship) that is 88 percent white and has had only a 1 percent increase "in the percentage of racial and ethnic minorities working as credentialed librarians in the nation's public, academic and school libraries" over the last decade (American Library Association 2010).[2] This understanding lacks a *critical understanding* of racial power and how it operates in the field, which is unsurprising considering how radical justice efforts centered on race have materialized in the US society.

Historically and socially, we have observed this crucial misunderstanding and framing before. The Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, part of a long tradition of BIPOC fighting for the right to be seen as human, opened doors that were previously closed to BIPOC, and it paved the way for us to continue the struggle for social justice. The liberal rhetoric of "color blindness"—as in, "I don't see race"—grew out of the mainstream Civil Rights movement, where noticing race became synonymous with racism and shifting away from its more deeply rooted critique of racial oppression.[3] So rather than using words like *racism* and *antiracism*, safer, diluted terms like *diversity* and *inclusion* became the normalized rhetoric, and demographic representation and cultural difference became the problem being framed rather than racial justice. Additionally, the incremental reforms of the Civil Rights movement are often used to indicate that the major issue of racism has been solved, that Black communities and other communities of color have been given the rights they demanded, so anything else we ask for is extra, too much, and how dare we ask for anything more. The movement is also sometimes used to demonstrate how slowly racial progress happens, that "these things take time" and everything cannot be changed at once. This is not to diminish the achievements of our ancestors in the Civil Rights movement, nor to belittle the sacrifices and pain they suffered. Instead, it is to show how racial justice movements have been co-opted by whiteness

and liberal multicultural discourse,[4] and as a result, lost their commitment to lasting radical change.

Framing this problem as one of diversity (and/or inclusion) problematically allows LIS as a field to devise superficial solutions that maintain the racial hierarchy where whiteness is dominant. It provides people a way to talk *around* the endemic problem of racism while at the same time, signaling that the profession values diversity, social responsibility, and the public good. By claiming to care about diversity through the construction of a series of ineffectual strategies to solve the "diversity problem" (Hathcock 2015; Hudson 2017), the profession puts on a performance of virtuousness and benevolence that provides a false sense of racial progress. For example, term-limited diversity residencies, isolated diversity initiatives, and diversity committees or task forces are seen as transformative solutions that are accomplishing something. Instead, what they often end up doing is bringing in more BIPOC to replace the ones who have left (or been pushed out of) the profession. These so-called solutions perpetuate ongoing systems of oppression and cause harm and trauma to those they purport to help. The diversity framework is purely concerned with optics and how it can make an institution look "good." It is a great example of what Derrick Bell, the forefather of Critical Race Theory (CRT), would call interest convergence, where whites will only move the needle toward racial justice if it also benefits them. In this case, diversity is only interested in preserving white racial domination and therefore obscures the very real issue of racial justice with performative, futile gestures that make dominant white culture think, "If we're just welcoming and inclusive enough, then the problem of racism will be solved" or "I've been so welcoming, the problem must be with those people." It becomes another way to check a box and pretend that these stopgaps—a way to check off diversity as done or completed—will somehow solve racism (Ahmed 2012).

Consider diversity residencies, such as those endorsed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Diversity Alliance Program. These residencies, which are one of the dominant ideas of racial transformation for academic librarianship, often operate by hiring one to three new librarians or archivists from "underrepresented minority groups," dropping them into predominantly white institutions (PWIs) with majority-white staff and eventually forcing them to acquiesce to whiteness. As Hathcock puts it, "Our diversity programs do not work because they are themselves coded to promote whiteness as the norm in the profession and unduly burden those individuals they are most intended to help" (2015). The expectation is

that having BIPOC working at libraries and archives, often in limited-term roles, will bring the diversity and inclusion the institutions so desperately want. This is not just true for diversity residencies but for BIPOC in the profession at large. However, in reality, BIPOC will be forced to assimilate and adhere to white cultural standards and behaviors, and as such, they are set up to fail (Brown and Leung 2018). Then, when they do fail, because those standards are framed as objective and neutral, the failures can be blamed on the individual BIPOC for not being able to "fit" in. Additional examples of this performative commitment to diversity are the requirements of academic search committees to ask applicants for diversity statements, the formation of offices for equity and inclusion that lack institutional power, and the hiring of diversity officers without the authority to make systemic change. Despite these administrative and organizational changes, there is still a distinct lack of critical, antiracist, anti-oppressive theorization and action. This is not a new critique of the profession's attempts to "fix" the demographic underrepresentation of BIPOC and/or to advance liberatory understandings of LIS as an institution. Over the past two decades, and arguably longer, this ground has been covered by many critical LIS scholars such as Tracie D. Hall, Todd Honma, Tonia Sutherland, Jarrett Drake, Anthony Dunbar, David James Hudson, and April Hathcock.

One of the other issues with the diversity framework is that it engages with racism at the individual level rather than at a systemic and institutional level. Cultural competency, as one of the approaches employed by the diversity framework, is a clear example of this. The ACRL "Diversity Standards: Cultural Competency for Academic Libraries" uses the National Association of Social Workers' definition of cultural competence: "a congruent set of behaviors, attitudes, and policies that enable a person or group to work effectively in cross-cultural situations" (Racial and Ethnic Diversity Committee of ACRL 2012). This framework appears to suggest that it is possible to reach a level of competency around other cultures that will result in fewer individual incidents of racism, that the problem we are facing is one of cultural difference, and that to fix it we must learn about other cultures. The diversity framework absorbs and builds on this idea by positing that racism can be fixed if we can just train white people to not be racist. Again, this ignores the intertwined structural and systemic issues of racism and White Supremacy that result in the oppression of BIPOC.[5]

More recently, cultural humility as a framework has entered the LIS lexicon, being advanced by BIPOC and non-BIPOC. Andrews, Kim, and Watanabe describe it as "an ongoing process that focuses on three things: self-evaluation of one's own background and expectations, committing to redress power imbalances, and

building relationships" (2018, 20). This social justice framework, in its current articulation, comes closest to addressing core issues of race and power but still seems overly focused on the behavior of individuals and the idea that culture difference is the problem, which will make it difficult to truly "redress power imbalances" at a structural level. We argue that cultural humility alone will be only a small stepping-stone and will not get us to the collective action needed to make real, radical, impactful change.

The profession tends to focus on demographics from a very particular liberal, multicultural lens that is individualized and ahistorical, locating the problem not in the profession's history and current formation but in the bodies of BIPOC. Even within critical librarianship or #critlib, a growing movement that examines the structural oppression that librarianship perpetuates with a lens of critical theory, the focus is often on the practices and praxis of librarianship, without looking holistically, and specifically, at how interlocking systems of oppression intertwine to keep (and move) BIPOC out of the profession and therefore continue to perpetuate whiteness throughout the work of librarianship (Brown et al. 2018). Similarly, in archival critical spaces, there have been calls to integrate social justice and critical theories more broadly into archival practice, theory, and scholarship, especially through the critical archives studies movement (Punzalan and Caswell 2015; Caswell, Punzalan, and Sangwand 2017), and to move beyond the same cultural competence and diversity frameworks that hinder movement toward critical approaches in libraries. Yet, in our minds, given our profession's and field's (as well as nation-state's) history and unwillingness to (critically) engage structural racism, we worry that critical perspectives and social justice frameworks that do not attend to the specificity of White Supremacy allow for its perpetuation. We are not expressing that other critical left approaches and social justice frameworks are unimportant and unnecessary. We certainly need some of them working in concert if we are going to destroy this structure of domination. However, many of those engagements do not apply a structural understanding of how we arrived, and are still arriving, at this juncture.

CONFRONTING WHITE SUPREMACY

We demand that LIS directly acknowledge and address the root of the issue: White Supremacy was built into our structures and systems from the very beginning and continues to be an active destructive force. We use CRT scholar Frances Lee Ansley's definition to clarify what we mean throughout this book:

By "white supremacy" I do not mean to allude only to the self-conscious racism of white supremacist hate groups. I refer instead to a political, economic and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement are widespread, and relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad array of institutions and social settings. (1989, 1024)

This definition employs a structural and systemic understanding of what White Supremacy is and how it operates. It considers the contextual elements that have led to white dominance over BIPOC and that continue to sustain and maintain that power structure. It also details exactly why it is so difficult to stop White Supremacy given its pervasiveness. Existing in a nation-state ruled by White Supremacy, we first have to determine what is taught to us that originates from White Supremacy and then consciously unlearn it. Without an understanding of the historical, social, economic, and political implications of structural racism and racialized power relations, LIS will never be able to move beyond superficial changes to the field and BIPOC will never be safe in LIS spaces. We need to go beyond diversifying the profession and being welcoming to all. Libraries and archives will need to reckon with how the field continues to harm BIPOC and other people with marginalized identities. The belief that the decisions we make, the policies we choose to enforce, and the people we choose to hire are based on objective and neutral standards is ~~complete bullshit~~ completely ignorant of the profession's history and the US nation-state's history. It is based on the fallacy that normalcy and objectiveness are synonymous with whiteness. As two People of Color, born racialized into this world, we have firsthand experience of the tense political climate that the Trump administration has fostered, which has intensified the need to go beyond mere discussion around race and diversity initiatives.

The current moment in history provides clear evidence of the fallacy of whiteness as our moral code. To contextualize and situate when and where we are writing this, it is 2019 in (what is currently known as) the United States. It is the time of white nationalists attempting to take away women's rights, immigrant rights, and the rights of anyone not white, cisgendered, heterosexual, Christian, and male. Climate disasters are disproportionately impacting low-income communities of color. Technologies, including machine learning and artificial intelligence, are being employed to continue the hypersurveillance of BIPOC and to "predict" who will be more likely to commit a crime. However, it is also the time of critical movements like Black Lives Matter, the Dakota Access Pipeline protests, #metoo, #SayHerName, and

more—where people are taking collective action to fight White Supremacy, patriarchy, capitalism, sexism, and racism. The time for this type of critical engagement with the profession's adherence to White Supremacy is long past due. As Vincent Harding wrote about the Black student movement in 1970, "The only time we have is now" (1970, 100). A sea change is necessary and we contend that CRT will be a vital tool to get us there.

The purpose of this collection of chapters is to produce a volume that reenvisions what LIS could be with Critical Race Theory as a central philosophy, not only as a profession and academic field but also as a far-reaching institution with organizations, governing bodies, and professional standards and guidelines. We hope that this volume serves as a theoretical and methodological guide for placing CRT more firmly within LIS, and given the power and control of LIS, as an institution, in society, in—and over—our lives, that CRT becomes an important application toward making LIS structurally just. CRT, while not new to LIS, is not commonly employed in LIS except by a handful of scholars, and its presence in the field, which we unpack below, is marginal, at best. This book, as far as we, the editors, are aware, is the first to focus solely on applying CRT to LIS. The choice to use CRT as the main theoretical framework is a deliberate and significant one. While we recognize that there are many critical theories and social justice frameworks, CRT as a conceptual construct, and methodology, is about critically examining the structures and systems that maintain White Supremacy's chokehold on our society. It is about how we reconstruct our laws, our policies, and our systems so that change can happen at a broader, deeper level instead of at an individual level. Moreover, it provides opportunities to identify points of integration across dynamic and multifactoral forces that together work to re-create and sustain historical systems of racial power and oppression and provide new, actionable paths toward a liberatory future.

One of the problems CRT is seeking to remedy is the fact that BIPOC knowledge has never been considered valid knowledge, that it is effectively and purposefully missing from the knowledge that has shaped this country's governing structures and institutions, and that without it, we will not be able to break the oppressive cycle of White Supremacy. Part of why these systems of domination are so powerful is precisely because, beyond the control of BIPOC bodies, they rely on the erasure of BIPOC forms of knowledge and experience. Consider the significance that LIS as a field plays an enormous, active, and foundational role in determining what is and isn't regarded as knowledge and the unique positioning of archives and libraries as potential places of learning and support that can be accessed throughout one's life.

These institutions shape and (re)produce violence and harm but also have the capacity to build toward care, joy, and justice. In that direction, CRT can push LIS to ask critically important questions of race and power in distinctive, urgent ways that can create new social realities. This is a central focus and exploration of this collection, and it is absolutely necessary given how the institution primarily (mis)understands and frames race matters: through diversity, inclusion, and equity. Here, in this space, we are interested and focused on social justice projects that center race and its entanglements with other social positions, forces, and contexts.

We argue that as disseminators and centers of cultural knowledge that hold power in/over communities, libraries and archives have a deep ethical responsibility to create information institutions and systems that portray vantage points and life experiences that meaningfully attend to difference and social conditions. The application of CRT is needed to advance the development of holistic historical and cultural records, as well as to ensure the creation of spaces, programming, and practices, within instruction, reference, preservation, collections, and physical or virtual spaces in libraries and archives that are antiracist, humanizing, and equitable. This conceptual and methodological framework will help the profession name, understand, and act on the impact White Supremacy has—continues to have—on the various institutions and areas in LIS.

Before we get to this book's journey and what you can find in these pages, we must start with where and how CRT developed as a theory, its guiding tenets and methodologies, and its past and recent intersections within LIS.

BEGINNINGS AND FORMATIONS OF CRITICAL RACE THEORY

Critical Race Theory's genesis and development emerged from a particular place and time in legal scholarship when scholars, mostly People of Color (POC), recognized that mainstream legal studies firmly believed that color blindness was the opposite of racism.[6] As the introduction to *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement* puts it, "Racism was identified only with the outright formal exclusion of people of color" (Crenshaw et al. 1995, xvi). Historically, law was seen as neutral, objective, and apolitical. In the 1970s, a group of legal scholars formed a movement, critical legal studies (CLS), to question this interpretation of the law and why it was institutionalized as part of the legal curriculum. However, many law students and scholars of color found that CLS still lacked an engagement with race and the impact of White Supremacy on BIPOC in the United States.

The Civil Rights movement paved the way for the emergence of CRT, but as mentioned earlier, its discourse became co-opted by the larger societal idea that racism is specific, concrete, and definite. In this interpretation, it was thought that by taking racist language out of the law, the law could no longer be racist. In fact, Crenshaw and colleagues argue that mainstream civil rights equated race consciousness with racism and saw color blindness as the answer to racism (1995, xv). This deeply problematic construction of civil rights and the law, which continues today, erases the lived experiences of BIPOC and does not take into account racism as a systematic and structural issue. At its root, CRT is about understanding how White Supremacy has oppressed and continues to oppress BIPOC in the United States through the legal system (Crenshaw et al. 1995, xiii) and how we might transform the law.

As CRT scholars themselves tell it, CRT as a movement crystallized over several formative events. The first occurred when Derrick Bell left the Harvard Law School to become dean of the University of Oregon Law School.[7] Bell was one of two African American professors in the entirety of Harvard's faculty at the time, and he taught a class called "Race, and Racism, and American Law." In 1981, student activists demanded that Harvard hire a professor of color to replace him and teach his course. They boycotted the performative "diversity" course with which Harvard administrators tried to placate them. Instead, they organized "The Alternative Course," their own student-led version of Bell's course, which taught law through the lens of racial consciousness. "The Alternative Course" helped to establish CRT as a movement by building a support network of legal academics of color, demonstrating that the creation, organization, and use of knowledge is political, and proving that a group of radical BIPOC operating within the confines of an institutional space was necessary and urgent, and that CRT scholarship stems from resistance to liberal mainstream ideas about race (Crenshaw et al. 1995).

The Critical Legal Studies National Conference meetings in 1986 and 1987 were where the differences between CRT and CLS became very clear. These distinctions helped CRT scholars further develop their critique of CLS and sharpen their own ideas that led to Critical Race Theory's formation. The conference in 1986 was organized by a group of majority-white feminist legal scholars who asked scholars of color to serve as facilitators in discussions of race. These discussions were framed with the question "'What is it about the Whiteness of CLS that discourages participation by people of color?' [and] revealed that CLS's hip, cutting edge irreverence toward establishment practices could easily disintegrate into hand-wringing hysteria when brought back 'home'" (Crenshaw et al. 1995 xxiii). While white CLS scholars

were perfectly willing to critically deconstruct long-established legal practices, when the critical eye was focused on their own practices with race at the center, they dissolved into a state of defensiveness and denial.

CLS as a movement was unwilling to contend with race as a central part of the discourse around law. This divide spurred early CRT scholars to formulate their own theory and movement—"how law constructed race" (Crenshaw et al. 1995, xxv) through a series of informal and more formalized gatherings. Finally, in 1989, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, and Stephanie Phillips launched the first Critical Race Theory workshop. These organizers created the name "critical race theory" with "critical" marking the political and intellectual orientation, "race" being the focal point (it literally is centered in the project's name), and "theory" representing aspirations for explaining race and law meaningfully (Crenshaw 2001, 1361). The workshop helped form the foundation of this theory and the movement centering race in their interpretation and reformation of law.

As Critical Race Theory continues to evolve in legal scholarly activity, inclusion in the legal education curriculum, and an annual symposium hosted by UCLA School of Law's Critical Race Studies Program, the project has moved outside the legal field to the social sciences and humanities, notably ethnic studies, public health, sociology, and philosophy. These disciplines have found CRT to be a valuable project in investigating how (and why) race, power, and systems of domination operate in their particular areas of study, and, perhaps unintentionally, have illustrated the full ecology of racism in society (Delgado and Stefancic 2017; Ladson-Billings 1998). For example, in public health, a CRT framework has offered scholars important conceptual (e.g., race is socially constructed, racism as ordinary) and methodological tools to move the understanding of racism away from individual instances between people to conceive its structural nature and its relationship to health disparities and inequities, specifically in Black communities and HIV testing (Ford and Airhihenbuwa 2010, 2018).

Of particular relevance to the LIS profession, given that education, archives, and libraries are social institutions and their focus is on learning, is CRT's impact in the field of educational research, which has, arguably, transformed areas of the discipline, including policy, theory, and curriculum. Arriving in the educational literature just a few years after CRT's official emergence in law, CRT has become a visible, expansive, and sustained force in education with multiple book-length texts, an annual conference, a dedicated scholarly publication, as well as special issues of academic journals focusing on a CRT framework. Education scholars have centered race and racism in their analyses of educational inequities by drawing from CRT concepts, methods, and

analytical and theoretical constructs. They have utilized the voices of parents, students, and faculty of color in various educational sites to disrupt the dominant conversation that places pathologies and deficits on and within these communities and used their knowledge and experiences to reveal the structures of racism in education. In analyzing teacher-education programs, scholars have explored interest convergence and critiquing of dominant ideologies (namely, color blindness and liberalism) to interrogate practices, curriculum, and policy. Some have argued that teacher-preparation programs continue to be sites that construct White Supremacy by their refusal to engage in a deep analysis of race, racism, power, and racial justice interests, inevitably benefiting whites (Dixson and Anderson 2017, 34–38; Howard and Navarro 2016).

As CRT in education continues to grow, explore, and assess its impact beyond its intellectual contributions, Marvin Lynn, the lead editor of the *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education,* points to one of the major issues facing critical race research in education: "We appear to be perpetually stuck in a 'problem-posing' pattern and, by and large, fail to see the importance of using CRT as a tool to frame solutions to these longstanding problems" (Decuir-Gunby, Chapman, and Schutz 2019, x). This will be a vital lesson for LIS to heed, as it can be an easy trap to fall into. While the first step is necessarily naming and understanding the problem, we must also develop solutions or we will be caught in an endless cycle of naming and understanding, never making progress toward measurable, concrete actions.

Additionally, in CRT's relatively short history, the theory has not just traveled to other disciplines, but also continued to evolve within some of those locations to address the specific legacies, realities, and needs of those racialized, oppressed communities. For example, Asian Critical Race Theory (AsianCrit), developed in law and transported to education, continues to explore the Asian American experience by problematizing the black-white binary, model-minority mythologies, and anti-Asian discrimination. Similarly, in both law and education, Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) is a framework put forward to theorize racism and oppression and how its construction and deployment through immigration, human rights, language, and other social-identity markers impact Latinx[8] communities (Curammeng, Buenavista, and Cariaga 2017, 1–3; Iglesias 1996; Solórzano and Delgado Bernal 2001; Valdes 1997).

CRT, as an intellectual movement in its third decade, continues to move forward, especially in education, where CRT has branched out and prompted the development of group-specific and methodological frameworks (Decuir-Gunby, Chapman, and Schutz 2019). These theorizations aim to critique racial domination through specific racialized and intersectional experiences and oppression. For example, "racecrits" in

education include Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit), which accounts for Indigenous peoples' distinctive experiences with colonization, the US government, and educational structures (Brayboy 2005). Likewise, Black Critical Theory (BlackCrit) specifically centers the Black experience and commits to "analyze how social and education policy are informed by anti-Blackness, and serve as forms of anti-Black violence" (Dumas and Ross 2016, 419). Other crit(s) formations, found in education and law, include Queer Critical Race Theory (QueerCrit), which pursues not only racial justice but also, simultaneously, social justice sexuality for racialized peoples and communities; QuantCrit, put forward by education researchers, grounds a quantitative methods approach in CRT in order to challenge dominant research method ideologies (objectivity, neutrality) while also pushing for quantitative methods to situate itself in relation to sociopolitical, historical forces, in hopes that these approaches can contribute to racial justice efforts; and dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit), theorizing race and ability intersections, co-constructions, and their relationship to inequities in educational and societal contexts (Garcia, López, and Vélez 2017; Misawa 2012; Annamma, Connor, and Ferri 2013). These critical race projects seek to further our understandings of the entanglements of race, power, and racial domination in complex ways, and unveil the totality of White Supremacy.

CRT, and its various formations, we argue, have traveled well to, and within, other disciplines, including LIS, albeit inadequately. As CRT has been a mobilizing force in some areas, the movement and development of CRT in LIS and the majority of the profession's subfields has languished and largely been unsuccessful in coordinating an antiracist project and generating a coalition of critical race scholars employing CRT. Nevertheless, there has been and continues to be a CRT presence, however small, in LIS, and our hope is for CRT to occupy more space, create greater noise, and reposition itself from the margins to the forefront of the profession's discourse and actions, especially if LIS seeks to truly become antiracist, anti-oppressive, and equitable.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY TENETS AND METHODOLOGIES

The CRT framework consists of numerous tenets, and though there are not universal principles that all CRT theorists and practitioners believe or endorse, there are common themes that many in the movement would accept as foundational elements (Crenshaw 1991; Delgado and Stefancic 2017; Matsuda et al. 1993). CRT is deeply committed to social justice, having an activist element that is rooted in the erasure

of racism and *all* types of oppression (Matsuda 1991). Ultimately, CRT strives for a number of goals that are underpinned by a specific tenet: *a commitment to social justice and to the elimination of racial oppression and all forms of oppression.*

Fundamental to these goals is an understanding that a gradual, liberal line of action toward justice is inadequate and that what is essential is a confrontation with a social hierarchy rooted in White Supremacy. This action-based construct of CRT is focused on empowerment and transformation for the oppressed, and should include, as Stovall (2013) suggests, "a dedication to the physical/material, social, and intellectual support of the efforts of historically marginalized groups to self-determine" (293). And though it is implied here, it is necessary to state directly that this dedication to relentlessly pursue justice happens in community and solidarity. CRT also uses a number of different methodologies and tools to operationalize its framework and progress toward social justice.

The tenets and methodologies, coming from seminal CRT scholars in both the law and education fields, are sketched out here to ground the reader in specific understandings, while opening space for further articulation in the chapters that await you.

TENETS

Race as a social construct   Race is a construction of our society, not one that exists biologically (Delgado and Stefancic 2017), and it carries significant, concrete meaning-shaping societal realities that have material, political, cultural, and psychological consequences. As the various iterations of the US census demonstrate, the category of "white" has been constructed and reconstructed to maintain White Supremacy. Definitions of who fits into what racial category are circumscribed by those in power (Ladson-Billings 1998), and white as the normative category is at the top of the racial hierarchy. However, it is important to note that we are not saying that racism exists only in people's behaviors and thoughts. The following tenet expands on this concept.

Racism is normal   Delgado and Stefancic (2017) state, "Racism is ordinary…the usual way *society* does business, the common, everyday experience of most people of color in this country" (8; emphasis added). One of the first and central tenets of CRT is the belief that racism is normal and deeply ingrained in American society through its systems and institutions. Racism is doing exactly what it is intended to do, which is to maintain a social structure rooted in White Supremacy.

Experiences and knowledge of BIPOC   Because the experiences and knowledge of BIPOC historically have been and continue to be ignored and erased, white people have little idea of what it's like to be Black, Indigenous, or a Person of Color, nor do they often understand the value of BIPOC experiences and knowledge. CRT contends that these experiences and knowledge are necessary and crucial to moving us to eradicating multiple oppressions (Matsuda et al. 1993; Yosso et al. 2009).

Intersectionality   Intersectionality is a lens through which we can locate overlapping oppressions in the intersecting social divisions of class, race, gender, sexuality, ability, ethnicity, and citizenship to better understand how power operates in a society and creates social inequality (Crenshaw 1991). It is a framework that provides a bridge between identity politics and coalition building through which change can be enacted (Collins and Bilge 2016).

Interdisciplinary   As legal scholars Matsuda and colleagues (1993) put forward in their original formation of CRT, and Yosso and colleagues (2009) include in the field of education, the framework pushes for the embracement of theories and methodologies from various academic disciplines and intellectual approaches. This flexibility allows for a more thorough examination of racial domination, both currently and historically, with the aim to more forcefully advance racial justice. It also implies that CRT is meant to be applied across disciplines, that the boundaries between disciplines are falsely constructed barriers.

Whiteness as property   Cheryl Harris (1993) put forward the concept of whiteness as property, which argues that in the construction of the US, the concepts and relationship of race and property took form together. The nascent nation was dependent on Black peoples being not peoples, but property (through chattel slavery), and the erasure of Indigenous peoples (through conquest and colonization) for their land (seen as property). In relation to these violent structures of domination (and while establishing a racial hierarchy), whiteness, legally as well as psychologically, became constructed as property, containing certain functions, including rights of disposition; rights to use and enjoyment; reputation and status property; and the absolute right to exclude (1731–1736).

Critique of dominant ideologies   Another central element of CRT is the challenging of dominant ideologies of color blindness, objectivity, neutrality, and meritocracy. These claims frequently are used as disguises for the dominant group (and their structures) to push forward their interests, thus (re)producing and extending their

power and harmful systems of domination (Delgado and Stefancic 2017; Matsuda et al. 1993; Solórzano and Yosso 2002).

Focus on historical contexts   CRT scholars argue that in order to understand what is happening in the current moment, we must look to history and examine the particular historical, social, and economic contexts that led to this point. Those contexts are what allow us to identify and comprehend the underlying structural and systemic issues. Without that understanding, we will not be able to develop the necessary interventions (Delgado and Stefancic 2017).

Counterstorytelling and voice   Solórzano and Yosso (2002) define counterstorytelling as part of critical race methodology for the social sciences, and more specifically, within education. It is a way to communicate the experiences of people who are considered marginal and unvalued by society. "The counter-story is also a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the [dominant white] stories of racial privilege" (Solórzano and Yosso 2002, 32). As Dixson and Anderson (2017) have noted, voice (counterstory, counternarrative) in CRT in education has been used in various forms, ranging from personal, direct experiences to fictionalized narratives rooted in the knowledge and realities of racialized peoples to counternarratives as units of analysis (35–38). Returning further back to CRT's legal roots to show the creative and imaginative form that voice can take, Derrick Bell's (1992) "The Space Traders," a story of speculative, allegorical fiction, provides incredible insight into racial oppression while incorporating other CRT elements.

Interest convergence   Derrick Bell presented this principle in his article "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interests-Convergence Dilemma," stating, "Interests of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites" (1980, 523). Thus, whites' self-interests motivate their participation (or not) in racial justice and will not eliminate racism, or their dominance. That is to say, marginalized peoples' racial justice interests are considered only when they converge with the interests of powerful whites. Going further, Bell suggests that if a racial remedy does actually materialize, it "will be abrogated at the point that policymakers fear the remedial policy is threatening the superior societal status of whites, particularly those in the middle and upper classes" (Bell 1980, 523; 2004, 106).

In the following narrative, we will chronologically examine the application of these core CRT elements in the LIS discourse as a way to gain a deeper understanding of the work CRT has done in this field.

LOCATING AND EXCAVATING CRITICAL RACE THEORY IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION STUDIES

In 1991, Jean Stefancic, at the time an assistant librarian for technical services at the University of San Francisco School of Law, published an article in *Legal Reference Services Quarterly* titled "Listen to the Voices: An Essay on Legal Scholarship, Women, and Minorities." In the essay, Stefancic describes two revolutions: outsider jurisprudence, a new critical position in legal thought/scholarship that originated in CLS and expanded to include the two new movements of feminist legal theory and CRT; and the electronic (computer) revolution, a significant change in the amount of information accessible. The intersection of these two revolutions, according to Stefancic, has the possibility to (re)shape laws and social structures, and the article asks, "How can librarians respond to this new scholarship?" Though Stefancic does provide suggestions on what efforts information workers might undertake with this "new scholarship," they do not explicitly connect CRT concepts to LIS.[9] Rather, the question, an important one, and one we should consider, is a challenge to the profession to intellectually engage critically with race and gender. This brief essay is possibly the first published article in the LIS literature that connects CRT to information institutions, and it is where this story begins.

Even though CRT in LIS did not surface again until fifteen years later, critical scholarship from BIPOC and white scholars, including Isabel Espinal, Todd Honma, Lorna Peterson, Clara M. Chu, Teresa Y. Neely and Khafre K. Abif, and Christine Pawley, did speak to race and racism in their analyses of the LIS field that, while interrogating CRT concepts, did not formally locate their work within the specific scholarly lineage of CRT. They did, however, deepen and develop our understanding of race and power, and, arguably, pushed the conversation toward a more CRT-aligned direction. This direction has been in relation to the "diversity" paradigm in LIS that has driven and continues to drive the profession's and discipline's conversations and actions about race matters.[10] A critical point of departure, however, is that CRT rejects liberal frameworks as they do not examine and center critiques of power, race, and racism. We argue that current and past diversity frameworks continue to ignore these critiques. Further, the soft approach of diversity frameworks seeks a type of reconciliation that is not just misaligned with a CRT approach, but *incompatible* because a CRT perspective demands a fundamental shift of the racial power structure of the world, consequently transforming the profession and discipline.

In 2006, Anthony W. Dunbar published the foundational article "Introducing Critical Race Theory to Archival Discourse: Getting the Conversation Started," which

as the title states, aimed to do just that for the archives community.[11] Dunbar, in bringing CRT to archives, explores how the framework conceptually and methodologically can help actors—practitioners, scholars, and institutions—create different, previously excluded epistemologies, while also uncovering racial biases in archival institutions. The CRT tenets that Dunbar argues can be used in the archival field—of record creation and of institutional and collective memory care—include counterstories, microaggressions, and social justice. Counterstories, as Dunbar conceives them, can be positioned in archives as a way to create different versions of narratives that are often hidden or silenced from the archive (given the social, political, and historical relationships between dominant and nondominant cultures), either by uncovering them in existing collections or by having, or creating, archives that are, in and of themselves, a counterstory to the deliberate absence of minoritized narratives, thus challenging official knowledge(s). Microaggressions, which can be part of counterstories, are understated acts of subjugation and can be present, specifically in the form of racial biases, in the assigning of value to records during the appraisal process if "frameworks that (re)enforce racial bias and the interests of dominant power structures" are used (Dunbar 2006, 116). Lastly, Dunbar suggests social justice principles that are rooted in an analysis of subjugation from the micro to macro level should be utilized when interrogating various elements of the archives as social institutions, professional practices, and scholarly discourse. At that time, concerned with the lack of theoretical, conceptual, and methodological constructs to examine racial oppression and the underdeveloped social consciousness in the profession, Dunbar positions CRT as a necessary intervention to confront race, both individually and structurally (Dunbar 2006).

Just the following year, Furner (2007) introduced CRT to the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) knowledge organization system as a framework that can be applied to assess how race is employed ideologically in the DDC's most recent (at the time, the 22nd) edition.[12] That edition had updated table 5 by removing "Racial" from its title (leaving "Ethnic and National Groups") as well as basic racial classifications, while largely conflating ethnicity with race (Furner 2007). Furner points out that through a CRT analysis, this change, or deracialization of Dewey, furthers the larger colonial project of White Supremacy by supporting the current racial hierarchy and its relations of power, control, and domination (2007). Unlike Dunbar, Furner does not neatly identify specific CRT tenets they are employing; however, multiple concepts—especially race as a social construct, challenge to dominant ideologies, and racism as endemic, among others—inform their analysis. Like Dunbar, Furner

names and shows how racial biases operate within the profession's knowledge systems and institutional structures. Additionally, and similar to Dunbar, they connect CRT's social justice focus to LIS's (supposed) commitments and values, urging information workers to apply CRT and even proposing six concrete strategies to inform practice (provide antiracist service) and use it as a tool to examine, and ultimately transform, various LIS areas and institutions.

In looking at the racialized experiences of undergraduate students of color in an urban academic library and their sense of feeling welcome or unwelcome, Elteto, Jackson, and Lim, in 2008, extend the utility of CRT by analyzing their findings through the framework's concepts of race as a main component of US society and racism as ordinary (2008, 330). It is significant, and should not be understated, that they foreground the understanding of their academic library—its services and spaces—as already being impacted by structural racism, which will undoubtedly shape the experiences of students of color, as their findings indicated.

In 2009, CRT came to children's literature and school librarianship, with the important publication of "Promoting Equity in Children's Literacy Instruction: Using a Critical Race Theory Framework to Examine Transitional Books," by Hughes-Hassell, Barkley, and Koehler.[13] Like Furner and Elteto, Jackson, and Lim, the authors use CRT as an analytical tool to examine the absence of characters (and authors) of color in transitional books and how that exclusion impacts literacy and self-worth in children of color.[14] Hughes-Hassell, Barkely, and Koehler (2009) utilize numerous themes of CRT, especially racism as endemic, to address the pervasiveness of white racial subjugation in the children's literature industry. They argue that their findings illustrate whiteness as normalized and prized, and that children of color remain invisible in the literature, or when they do appear, they need to align with whiteness to be seen, understood, and valued. In pushing school librarians toward racial justice action, the authors attempt to operationalize CRT's social justice aspirations by offering nine direct actions, from collection building and programming to writing grants and conducting research, that resist inequitable literacy education for children and communities of color (Hughes-Hassell, Barkely, and Koehler 2009).

In the following years, 2010 to 2012, CRT further developed in the school librarianship discourse. Hughes-Hassell and Cox examined another area of children's literature, board books, to show (again) the lack of representation and misrepresentation of People of Color as well as the absence of authors and illustrators of color. They analyze their findings through a CRT lens and, similarly to Hughes-Hassell, Barkely, and Koehler's article, expose the white racial domination of the children's publishing

industry and its destructive psychological effects on children of color (Hughes-Hassell and Cox 2010). Extending CRT's applicability to urban youth and school libraries, Kafi Kumasi (2012) calls for school libraries and school librarians to reenvision their practices through a CRT framing. This creates the possibility for transformation of deficit thinking and centering students' voices and experiences, in turn allowing for greater understanding of racism at a structural level, and pushes for interrogating whiteness in collections, spatially as well as ideologically. Further, Kurz (2012), building on this scholarship, provides a state-level context that had been missing from the discourse, with their examination of the nominated books for the South Carolina Picture Book Award. Using CRT as an analytical framework to interpret their findings, Kurz argues that the nominations, dominated by "White-centered books written and illustrated by Whites with casts of largely White characters," fail to represent the diversity of South Carolina and the US, thus reinforcing White Supremacy (136). Additionally, the author positions some of the literature that focuses on the Black American experience as counterstories disrupting majoritarian narratives that often do not confront racial oppression (Kurz 2012). Cumulatively, these articles utilize a CRT framework to center and analyze race and racism in children's literature and school librarianship and help us to understand unjust structures of racial power that subjugate children and communities of color. These articles also illuminate strategies to achieve racial justice in LIS.

Moving the discourse to Black librarianship, Tracie D. Hall's 2012 chapter, "The Black Body at the Reference Desk: Critical Race Theory and Black Librarianship," pushes for a racial analysis through a CRT framework by investigating interpersonal acts of racism and connecting those to institutional and structural racial oppression, and by a (re)examination of the history of libraries to Black communities. Further, Hall argues that given LIS's continued refusal to critically engage the relationship between race, racism, and power, the unchanging demographics of the profession, and ongoing unjust library services to People of Color, CRT becomes vital as a lens that can provide an understanding and language to challenge inequality in LIS. Responding to Hall's suggestion, Karin L. Griffin's 2013 "Pursuing Tenure and Promotion in the Academy: A Librarian's Cautionary Tale," narrates their Black, female, middle-class ascending path through the inequitable tenure process by grounding their analysis in Critical Race Feminism's (CRF) intersectional lens and CRT's concepts of racism as endemic and the valuing—and centering—of People of Color's experiences as legitimate sources of knowledge that provide insight into understanding interlocking systems of oppression. Significantly, Griffin's article provides the

first in-depth, firsthand account deploying CRT and CRF to frame and analyze issues on their journey in the profession, such as the lack of racial diversity in the field, recruitment and retention, mentoring, and their relationship to the intersections of race, gender, and class.

Extending the CRT construct of POC's experiences as knowledge that challenges, and exposes, the dominance of white racial narratives over multicultural young adult literature, Hughes-Hassell (2013) argues counterstorytelling is articulated through the publication of (some) books by authors of color and (some) books that center youth of color by providing voice and visibility to marginalized youth. In this way, counterstorytelling disrupts the notion of only one type of narrative and showcases the intricacy of developing racial and ethnic identities. Lastly, Hughes-Hassell proposes that this CRT construct pushes readers belonging to the dominant culture to reckon with their own racial identities and privilege while gaining greater insight into social inequality (2013, 215). Though the author deeply examines counterstorytelling as a tool to expose and interrogate the permanent nature of racism (a core construct of CRT) and how it operates in society to oppress youth of color, they also advance counterstorytelling as acts of resistance. Kafi D. Kumasi (2013) uses voice, intersectionality, whiteness as property, and interest convergence to critically examine White Supremacy in school and public libraries, thus deepening our understanding of CRT's core ideas and applicability to youth of color and their relationship to libraries as a means to challenge LIS scholars and practitioners to imagine new possibilities and understandings of, and for, them. In particular, they reveal interest convergence operating when "a librarian holds a cultural deficit perspective toward Youth of Color and masks this belief system, but at the same time capitalizes on efforts to promote diversity with Youth of Color" and the property value of whiteness, demonstrated through the profession's positioning of youth of color literacy practices as abnormal and nonstandard in relation to whiteness (106–108).

Since 2015, as more critical approaches have materialized, CRT has seen an increase in its application in the LIS scholarly discourse. Building on the work of Karin L. Griffin (2013) and others, Shaundra Walker challenges the diversity paradigm and the absence of narratives from POC not participating in dominant diversity initiatives and programs. By providing a counterstory focusing on her recruitment, retention, and promotion as an African American, female librarian through a CRT lens, she importantly shares her experiences and connects them with specific CRT constructs— reexamining the US history of unequal educational access (revisionist history); critiquing LIS diversity efforts (critique of liberalism); and exposing LIS as racially structured

(racism as endemic)—to provide a new perspective in the diversity demographic discourse and to position CRT as a much-needed framework to interrogate racial inequality (Walker 2015). In problematizing whiteness in academic libraries (spaces, library workers, and reference work) through their analysis of national professional library documents and LIS scholarship, Brook, Ellenwood, and Lazzaro focus on the CRT concepts of race as socially constructed, ending racial oppression, racism as pervasive, and voice to challenge and transform white hegemony in LIS. The authors contend that a CRT-based analysis offers antiracist approaches and understandings, situates racism at the structural level, and engages in deconstructing it. In that direction, they also put forward direct recommendations. Creatively, and similarly (in aim, though not in application) to how other scholars have used them, counterstorytelling and narratives of Peoples of Color in published scholarship are utilized to understand the architecture of inequities in libraries and the profession (2015, 247–251).

Extending CRT to the graduate curriculum in LIS, Nicole A. Cooke posits as a form of counterstorytelling the teaching of diversity and social justice courses focusing on race, racism, and justice from the perspectives of the vulnerable, oppressed, and dispossessed. This approach provides a disruption to majoritarian, normalized, liberal discourses on those topics and concepts, and it has the potential to inform future information workers' understandings of systems of oppression (2016). Returning to the archival field, and building on Dunbar's work, Kellee E. Warren utilizes CRT concepts to explore Black women's representation in the materials of French Antilles archives and connects their absence, oppression, and erasure in the record to the profession's low number of Black women archivists (2016). Grounding her understanding of Black women's oppression through an intersectional lens, Warren argues that archives still have power to control Black women's identities and narratives and influence multiple areas of their lives. However, Black women working in archive positions have the possibility to construct counternarratives that offer voice and agency to the marginalized and underrepresented. Warren advocates for critical frameworks, especially CRT's concepts, to be included in archive and LIS education, not only to provide students with theories and methods that inform their practice but also as a challenge to what constitutes knowledge in the curriculum.

In 2017, CRT made significant advances in the LIS discourse with the publication of two book collections, *Teaching for Justice: Implementing Social Justice in the LIS Classroom,* edited by Nicole A. Cooke and Miriam E. Sweeney (2017), and *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science,* edited by Gina Schlesselman-Tarango (2017). Writing in *Teaching for Justice*, Kurz (2017) shares

their pedagogical and personal journey toward a social justice orientation utilizing CRT concepts—namely, its interdisciplinary flexibility that makes space for multiple perspectives that push racial justice forward; racism as ordinary and pervasive; and the entanglements of racism with other axes of oppression. Incorporating these core CRT elements allows for students of the author (an LIS educator) to critically examine race and racism in libraries and society, thus impacting future informational professionals' practices and understandings. Similarly, in the same collection, Hughes-Hassell and Vance provide a window into their youth services graduate LIS classroom, where they have constructed their course *around* CRT core concepts to ensure future librarians understand historical and contemporary structures of white racial domination and utilize a CRT approach regularly in their professional and personal lives to work toward abolishing racial oppression (2017, 114–119). Significantly, both chapters, especially Hughes-Hassell and Vance's, demonstrate the institutionalized possibilities of CRT.

Shaundra Walker's (2017) chapter in *Topographies of Whiteness*, a revisionist history—and counterstory—of Carnegie Library building grants to Black institutions of higher education, applies CRT concepts of whiteness as property and interest convergence to uncover and interrogate the operation of whiteness and its role in forming library spaces and access. In the South, Black colleges were shaped by White Supremacist law and the dispossession of Black folx;[15] the majority of those institutions were without buildings exclusively for academic libraries, and as Walker asserts, "at the turn of the century, the rights to grant access, use, enjoy and dispose of a freestanding academic library were enjoyed almost exclusively by Whites" (44), demonstrating that academic libraries were, in their origination, the property of whites. Also in *Topographies*, Joseph, Crowe, and Mackey (2017) apply the concept of whiteness as property (among other CRT themes), specifically its right to exclude in order to reveal how the beginnings of historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and predominantly white institutions (PWIs) are based on this exclusion, domination, and privilege, which has undoubtedly shaped the construction of archives in higher education and continues to (re)produce white hegemony in archives and their records, practice, and theory (55–60). Lastly, in the same collection, similarly to Walkers' promotion and tenure narrative, though focusing specifically on teaching and learning experiences at PWIs, Jorge R. López-McKnight (2017) utilizes counter-storytelling to challenge and provide insight into the workings of whiteness.

Also in 2017, a special issue of the *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* signaled an important formation in the archival field: critical archives studies.[16] Writing in the introduction, Caswell, Punzalan, and Sangwand assert that by utilizing

critical theories—in their many manifestations, one of them being CRT—critical archives studies "broadens the field's scope beyond an inward, practice-centered orientation and builds a critical stance regarding the role of archives in the production of knowledge and different types of narratives, as well as identity construction" (2017, 1–2). The authors further push the archive field to mobilize together under this term and its emancipatory approaches to examine, disrupt, and ultimately transform structures and systems of domination, whether they be archives as institutions or the field of the humanities. Though a few articles in the issue grapple with CRT concepts, Kim's (2017) article explicitly uses a CRT lens to interrogate whiteness as the norm and its function in constructing archival collections to exclude BIPOC records, which is made possible by a racial hierarchy that privileges and preserves White Supremacy. Though not writing, identifiably, under critical archives studies, but using a range of critical theories to inform their work on the digital life of records showing Black death, Tonia Sutherland's article, "Making a Killing: On Race, Ritual, and (Re)Membering in Digital Culture," employs CRT to account for the destructive force of race, racism, and power in US society that allows for the "conditional possibilities for people of color to be killed at the hands of police officers and armed citizens without also creating the space for restorative justice" (2017, 33). With a similar focus on archives and records, Bowers, Crowe, and Keeran (2017) engage a CRT framework to critique the intentional absence and silencing of Native voices and perspectives in the archival holdings of a private PWI, and the institution's intimate connection to the Sand Creek Massacre. Building on Dunbar's application of CRT to archives, and the work of other critical archives scholars, the authors put forward counternarratives to inform their path forward in developing collections that attend to difference, center Native peoples and communities, and ultimately reconstruct the historical record to contest archives hegemonic whiteness.

Since 2017, there has been an increasing push to elevate the LIS discourse around race, racism, and power through the utilization of critical frameworks such as intersectionality, decolonization, whiteness, and the interrogation of concepts like racial microaggressions, white racism, and unconscious racial bias to unveil and problematize the (continued) white racial domination and colonization of the field.[17] In this current critical discourse, CRT continues to move in similar and new directions. Building on the work of previous LIS scholars arguing for the LIS curriculum to center race, power, and social justice so that all students and faculty are part of the commitment to understanding and challenging structural racism and hegemonic whiteness, Gibson, Hughes-Hassell, and Threats (2018) examined the required readings in the

core courses of the top twenty LIS programs for their inclusion of CRT. Applying a wide-ranging definition of CRT and its core ideas in their analysis, the authors still found that the "vast majority of the examined required foundational courses provided students with little to no exposure to CRT or critical theory" (64). In moving toward CRT's—and what should be LIS's—social justice aspirations, Gibson, Hughes-Hassell, and Threats advocate for LIS education to incorporate CRT's major concepts (intersectionality, race and racism) as a way to move the field toward a deeper engagement with racism as a structural phenomenon. Contributing to the emerging information behavior (IB) discourse that focuses on the ways in which youth are actively involved in making and distributing information, Kafi D. Kumasi (2018) utilizes CRT's counterstorytelling methodology to inform their InFLO-mation model. This new model, grounded in the foundations of hip hop, seeks to hold vital space for youth of color voice and expression that positions counterstorytelling as a method that not only challenges essentialized, dangerous, racialized dominant narratives but also illuminates their actual, active, rich, complex knowledges and information behaviors. In *Algorithms of Oppression*, Safiya Umoja Noble (2018) employs CRT to analyze algorithms, particularly Google's, to illustrate how racism is coded into those systems and how they continue to extend racism's hold on society to the detriment of BIPOC.

In 2019, Hines analyzed the curriculum, goals, evaluation, and costs of library leadership programs through a CRT lens, focusing on the conceptual elements of racism as normal, interests convergence, and structural determinism (6–8). In understanding the systemic issues of library leadership development, the author asserts that the leadership programs they examined set whiteness as the (desired) norm, reinforcing and furthering white racial power and control. Hines locates racism as normal in the programs' curricula or outcomes, which (unsurprisingly) do not include interrogating librarianship's race or gender inequities, and shows the role of interest convergence in the exclusiveness and individualized assessment of the programs' work toward benefiting the dominant white culture and maintaining its power. The way these elements interact in this particular issue in LIS shows the dynamic architecture of CRT's structural determinism, which the author describes as "the way academia is structured to educate library workers, the way libraries operate, and the way library leadership training works fundamentally reinforce [racial] societal biases" (2019, 7). Similar to Hines in both their application of CRT to a previously unexamined area of LIS—in this case, the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*—and their use of CRT's racism as ordinary element, Rapchak (2019) more forcefully, and appropriately, names White Supremacy as the structure of domination that shapes and produces relations of racialized power. Through a detailed

analysis of the language of three critical adjacent frames—"Authority Is Constructed and Contextual," "Information Has Value," and "Scholarship as a Conversation,"—the author argues that the active avoidance of naming, and deeply examining, race and racism (contextually, historically, contemporarily) perpetuates White Supremacy in teaching and learning. The inability of the *Framework* to push learners' and educators toward an in-depth understanding of systems of oppression is not a coincidence; it is necessary to mask, and maintain, the operations of White Supremacy. In exposing and disrupting this operation, Rapchak asserts that centering the counterstories of students of color can provide an important and empowering insight into the workings and construction of structural racism (186–187). Similarly, Nicole A. Cooke (2019) offers counterstorytelling as an important strategy of resistance and truth-telling for BIPOC LIS faculty as they navigate the toxic, hostile, and violent spaces of academia. Counterstorytelling as strategy, Cooke argues, not only challenges the master narrative of race and power but also can be a significant psychological, emotional release, help show new LIS workers of color the professional spaces they will encounter, and contribute critical knowledge to the scholarly record (228). Lastly, we would be careless if we did not at least highlight the recent valuable effort by Ebony Elizabeth Thomas, *The Dark Fantastic: Race and the Imagination from Harry Potter to the Hunger Games* (2019). Grounding their analytic method in CRT, Thomas utilizes counterstories to address the imagination gap that whiteness in children's lit and media creates.

As we hope to have shown above, the migration of Critical Race Theory in library and information studies has crossed multiple facets of the discipline and profession. Scholars in the discipline employing CRT have sought to center race and racism in their analyses, challenge the multidimensions of White Supremacy, and reveal the inequities that are pervasive in our field. By no means is this an exhaustive, detailed examination and review of all CRT and LIS scholarship. The focus of this section is to sketch the lineage of CRT in LIS, making visible some of the critical intersections of our discipline and profession and the theoretical framework. We invite you to engage with the CRT in LIS literature that exists. It is on and with this scholarship, as well as previous generations' discourses around race and racism, that the voices in this collection humbly build, and we can look back to imagine forward.

COLLECTIVELY JOURNEYING

As editors, we decided to approach this work as an edited collection of pieces by a cross-section of BIPOC in US libraries and archives. This was a deliberate choice on our part to embody counterstorytelling, a CRT strategy, in order to collectively

create a people's vision by the LIS community. This method allows for a wide range of BIPOC scholars, archivists, librarians, activists, students, and professionals in the field to examine race and racism and its relationship to inequities in the many areas of the LIS landscape. Our multidimensional approach crosses various professional boundaries—archives, public libraries, academic libraries, professional organizations, and more—and seeks to identify and closely examine the racial inequities that exist in those particular spaces. Concentrated on information institutions in the United States, the collective authors of this volume strive to provide steps and recommendations toward a new vision of the profession and field.

This book is intentionally a space created by BIPOC for a number of reasons. First, as previously stated, the field of library and information studies professionals is distinctly white. Seldom are voices of color heard or represented in the field's literature, and we want to provide a place for these voices to be lifted up. Second, the history/herstory of CRT has come out of the lives and experiences of BIPOC, and we want to reflect that in this academic scholarly space. Third, BIPOC are often asked to solve the problems of racism by themselves (although typically they are not listened to and or given any credit), which ignores how patriarchy, colonialism, and White Supremacy have historically led to these issues. This book will continue a legacy of BIPOC leading the struggle, as the people most impacted by White Supremacy. The justice movement cannot progress without the experience and knowledge that BIPOC have. Finally, BIPOC in this profession and field are constantly resisting and struggling with the implicit and explicit story of white superiority and BIPOC inferiority. White folx are always trying to contain us, not recognizing that we were never meant for white spaces. This book testifies to the fact that we do not need, seek, or desire white validation. We are the scholars of our own liberation.

At the beginning of this book's journey we were three editors, but our homie, Irlanda Jacinto, one of the brightest stars in the archival profession, decided to leave archives and this book project before we submitted our proposal. The loss of her presence, brilliance, and ferocity is deeply felt by us, the book's contributors, and the profession as a whole. One of the very reasons for this book was to address the profession's dangerous and toxic allegiance to White Supremacy and the impact of structural racism on the LIS workforce. It is not lost on us that Irlanda found it necessary to depart. She was not the first to go, nor will she be the last.

The genesis of this book grew out of conversations the editors had with one another and discovering that we shared a passion for Critical Race Theory and its application to libraries and archives. It was rare to find people in our field with these

intersecting interests and a relentless curiosity to know more. In July of 2016, Jorge and Irlanda met during a job interview in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and stayed in touch because of this shared interest. A week later, Sofia and Jorge met in Minneapolis at the Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians (MIECL) from traditionally underrepresented groups. During a bicycle ride, Sofia and Jorge talked CRT and the possibilities of a collaboration, which led to a subsequent email between all three of us about this very book.

Each of the editors came to CRT on a different individual journey, but more importantly, we collectively arrived here with this book. As bell hooks (1991) says, we searched for theory because we were hurting and trying to understand in new ways what this world was trying to do to us and our communities. CRT gives us the language, framework, and tools to enact the type of transformational change we want to see in our field. We are also heavily influenced by adrienne maree brown's work on emergent strategy, where one of the principles states: "There is a conversation in the room that only these people at this moment can have. Find it" (brown 2017, 41). This is a concept that we experienced at MIECL with the rest of the participants; it is difficult to imagine how that particular time would have been with different people in the room. Our time at MIECL coincided with the state-sanctioned murder of Philando Castile (less than five miles from MIECL), the domestic terrorist attack at Pulse nightclub, and the run-up to the 2016 election. These overlapping events turned the institute into a crucible, where under intense stress, scrutiny, and pressure, *we*, not the institute, created a beautiful and transformative experience for ourselves. We took our time there into our own hands. In a space filled with archivists and librarians of color, we could see what the profession *could* be. The relationships we made have continued to this day, and many of those folx—Jennifer Brown, Nicholae Cline (Coharie), Fobazi M. Ettarh, and Rachel E. Winston—are in this book. We found many of our contributors through similar personal networks that were built by being the only BIPOC in a white space, particularly through We Here, a supportive online (and sometimes physical) gathering space for BIPOC working in archives and libraries.

One of the driving forces behind the formation of this book was the desire to create a community of CRT scholars in LIS to help move CRT into the center of the LIS field. We purposefully wanted to disrupt the dominant narrative of a scholar in isolation and the celebration of the sole genius whose work was his and his alone. We wanted to mirror the CRT principle of building knowledge through community and to recognize that this work happens collectively, intersectionally, and in tandem with many others. Our approach was to build intentional, generative spaces

for shared efforts in a supportive environment where the individual chapter authors would have multiple opportunities to connect with us and each other. We organized large-group Google Hangouts, met one-on-one with the contributors of all the chapters, hosted drop-in virtual office hours, and created a Slack group and a shared Zotero library, all in hopes of creating coresistance possibilities and forming coalitions. We connected authors to others with whom we felt there was a relevant link—who had unknowingly signaled to each other, whether it was via the CRT tenets or methods they used or the LIS topic they were writing about—because we wanted people coming together to create. We asked each author to provide peer feedback on either a chapter, the introduction, or the conclusion, and tried to match up their expertise and skills with the needs of the chapter. Our hope is that these relationships strengthen the coherence and message of the book.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY PROJECTS IN THIS BOOK

We have arranged the collection in three parts and the chapters are organized by shared, though not necessarily matching, themes and principles. This arrangement of the collection is important and purposeful. Much care and thought went into the grouping and placement of each chapter as well as the concise, suggestive title for each part. The title of each part represents what we imagine the chapters in that location are trying to achieve. In other words, and this applies to all the chapters in each section, the chapters aim toward the goal stated with each section heading and taken all together mount a strong force in that purpose. But they also do so independently in different, nuanced ways, and each should be understood as its own world-building contribution, analyzed on its own terms, yet in conversation, engaging and exchanging across contradictions and tensions, with chapters that are close and others that are not. Lastly, one of the exciting elements of this collection is the invited contributions of the much-respected scholars Todd Honma, Anthony Dunbar, and Tonia Sutherland, who are all invested in a similar commitment to social and racial justice, particularly through LIS; they have written section introductions that provide context, framing, and analysis of the chapters and root the sections in a continuation of the work these scholars and many others have been engaged in.

PART I: DESTROY WHITE SUPREMACY
The first part, "Destroy White Supremacy," demonstrates important conceptual understandings and methodological approaches that work toward growing and understanding

CRT in LIS in ways that challenge and ultimately ruin White Supremacy. This part forms a strong foundation that illustrates a multidimensional approach and analysis that crosses institutional boundaries and professional duties and responsibilities, pushing information workers toward understanding and confronting the intersections of race, power, and domination. The authors here interrogate core values of libraries and librarianship; name and unveil a destructive organizing principle of society; problematize racialized and gendered labor expectations and realities of the white-dominated LIS landscape; and fight against colonial information authority and sharing. This section is introduced by Todd Honma, who wrote one of the foundational racial critiques of LIS, "Trippin' over the Color Line: The Invisibility of Race in Library and Information Science." In his insightful, attentive, and journeying section introduction, Honma urges us to consider the extraordinariness of racism and uses the title of the section as a liberatory destination to map the chapters' important contributions, guiding and teaching us along the way.

The collection opens with Anastasia Chiu, Fobazi M. Ettarh, and Jennifer A. Ferretti's "Not the Shark, but the Water: How Neutrality and Vocational Awe Intertwine to Uphold White Supremacy." The authors focus on CRT themes—racism as ordinary, critique of liberalism, and whiteness as property—to examine the deeply embedded, highly problematic values of neutrality and vocational awe and their toxic, necessary relationship to libraries and librarianship that White Supremacy undergirds. Weaving together professional documents, liberal delusions of libraries' histories and purposes, current realities of BIPOC library workers and users, and many of the primary services and spaces of libraries and librarianship, Chiu, Ettarh, and Ferretti show just how entangled and pervasive the values and concepts have been and still are. Going further, they challenge us to abandon these intimately connected (and held) destructive values so that we can then move away from this awful mess toward justice.

The next chapter is Myrna E. Morales and Stacie Williams's "Moving toward Transformative Librarianship: Naming and Identifying Epistemic Supremacy." They introduce the concept of epistemic supremacy and how it constructs, organizes, and facilitates racial and class domination in society and social institutions. Using CRT's storytelling method to center and critique two harmful, powerful figures who have profoundly influenced information structures, Morales and Williams provide insight into the workings of epistemic supremacy and libraries', and librarians', conformity to it, with careful attention to knowledge organization and scholarly communications that subjugate BIPOC. True to CRT's social justice roots, they offer a beautiful shape of praxis to fight this unjust system, which they call "transformative librarianship."

Jennifer Brown, Nicholae Cline (Coharie), and Marisa Méndez-Brady's chapter, "Leaning on our Labor: Whiteness and Hierarchies of Power in LIS Work," interrogates whiteness and diversity work by analyzing institutional documents that define diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. Understanding that White Supremacy intricately shapes institutions, the authors highlight the immense weight (and devaluing) placed on BIPOC for this specific type of work and demonstrate that professional and institutional diversity efforts are a very specific thing—a commodity. By utilizing CRT themes of interest convergence (to show the relationship between race and power) and racism as normal (in its intentional omission from most diversity documents), and using their critically important counterstories, the authors direct us not only to understand and confront racialized labor inequities and the very institutions that (continue to) position us in asymmetrical work relations of power, but also to interrupt and dream new futures for collective efforts and ways of being.

Closing out part I is "Tribal Critical Race Theory in Zuni Pueblo: Information Access in a Cautious Community," by Miranda H. Belarde-Lewis (Zuni/Tlingit) and Sarah R. Kostelecky (Zuni Pueblo). Writing for, and toward, their home, they share three projects from their pueblo's cultural institutions that center Zuni voices and knowledge and rightfully shift the power of their information to their peoples. The authors put forward—for the very first time that we are aware of in LIS literature—Tribal Critical Race Theory (Tribal Crit), a formation of CRT in education that attends to the specificity of Indigenous peoples and which necessarily positions colonialism as the central structure of domination. In a very intimate, loving, and generous voice, Belarde-Lewis and Kostelecky share with us some of their stories to end their chapter and this section. It is a gift, and as settlers, guests, or visitors, we need to listen carefully and closely.

PART II: ILLUMINATE ERASURE

In the second section, "Illuminate Erasure," the authors challenge the profession and discipline, demanding a shift of realities and the elimination of racial domination, through voice and counterstorytelling. From a variety of perspectives, they collectively approach LIS issues of information access, scholarly communication, and exclusionary collection development, while also highlighting social justice in collection building as acts of change and resistance. By exposing oppressive institutional hierarchies and collections and centering the voices and bodies of communities of color that are experiencing injustice(s), the authors fearlessly disallow our erasure and instead raise us up

and celebrate one another, while holding people, communities, and LIS accountable. Anthony W. Dunbar, a foremost CRT and LIS scholar who first introduced CRT to archives, opens this section with his own counterstory, "The Courage of Character and Commitment versus the Cowardliness of Comfortable Contentment." Before turning to his close description of the chapters, Dunbar, in an analytic, richly illustrative voice, reflects on his own critical race theorist becoming, examines the racialized social hierarchy of the US, and pushes for utilizing critical race theories in the LIS discipline to fight White Supremacy and contemporary segregation.

First, in "Counterstoried Spaces and Unknowns: A Queer South Asian Librarian Dreaming," Vani Natarajan uses several counterstories from their own life as entry points into exploring their praxis as a librarian, and by extension, the practices of libraries in general. They employ three CRT frameworks—community cultural wealth, intersectionality, and Queer of Color Critique—to analyze those stories and provide strategies for resistance. Community cultural wealth is a concept by Tara Yosso from the CRT in education realm, while Queer of Color Critique is a subcategory of CRT that centers the experiences of queer and trans People of Color (QTPOC). Natarajan substitutes the word *abundance* for *capital* to confront capitalism's desire for a false sense of scarcity to bolster competition rather than community. They end by weaving together the three frameworks to suggest ways to further develop their thinking and, by extension, the reader's.

Next, Shaundra Walker uses the counterstory of Ann Allen Shockley, a Black activist-librarian, to illustrate the importance of special collections in libraries at HBCUs in her chapter, "Ann Allen Shockley: An Activist-Librarian for Black Special Collections." Seen through the lens of CRT, Shockley's work toward racial justice for Black communities illustrates the ways in which the profession could further develop what she and other Black activist-librarians have already accomplished. Walker demonstrates through Shockley's accomplishments that the absence of special collections in HBCUs is a form of erasure that assists in the false stories of white superiority and as a tool of racial domination. Likewise, Sujei Lugo Vázquez highlights the work of several BIPOC librarians in her chapter, "The Development of US Children's Librarianship and Challenging White Dominant Narratives," to reimagine what children's librarianship can be when it centers the stories and experiences of BIPOC. She employs counterstorytelling and revisionist history to explore the permanence of racism in children's librarianship through Patricia Hill Collins's domains of power framework. Lugo Vázquez shares the counterstories of Augusta Braxston Baker, Pura T. Belpré, Charlemae Hill Rollins, Effie Lee Morris, and Lotsee Patterson to illustrate

the social justice work BIPOC librarians have been doing throughout the history of libraries. Both Walker and Lugo Vázquez illuminate the historical context within which collections have perpetuated and continue to perpetuate the erasure of BIPOC stories and knowledge; they retell a necessary remembering of the ancestral library work of Black, Indigenous, and Afro–Puerto Rican women.

We end the section with Harrison W. Inefuku's "Relegated to the Margins: Faculty of Color, the Scholarly Record, and the Necessity of Antiracist Library Disruptions," where he interrogates the academic publishing apparatus and the professions—librarianship, publishing, academy—that shape it, to provide insight into the processes that (re)create racial domination. Grounded in CRT's racism as ordinary, Inefuku illuminates the ways in which knowledge in the academy has been constructed and naturalized by racial power and advances a number of racially just librarian interventions that can challenge the structural racism inherent in the scholarly communication system.

PART III: RADICAL COLLECTIVE IMAGINATIONS TOWARD LIBERATION

The third and final part, "Radical Collective Imaginations toward Liberation," offers radical solutions and charts new imaginative directions for structural transformations in LIS that interrupt the large colonial project of White Supremacy. The chapters in this part focus on interventions in the profession's demographic problem, challenging dominant Western archive practices, proposing new pedagogical and mentoring approaches, critically examining the labor practices in academic librarianship and digital humanities, and illustrating a variety of CRT tenets through a fictional counterstory, in the vein of Derrick Bell's "The Space Traders." These chapters put forward the care and love of self and community and the creation of sites of healing. They move us toward a radical collective imagination of future possibilities and transformations for the profession and, more importantly, ourselves and our communities. Beginning this final part of the book with their contribution "Freedom Stories" is Tonia Sutherland, a leading scholar in the intersections of race and digital and archival studies. In generous, graceful, and alive language, Sutherland foregrounds the full humanity of the chapters, then traces, with deep understanding, the nuanced ways the authors engage CRT's voice tenet in the particular areas of LIS under examination. With liberation on the horizon, Sutherland sets in motion the chapters to take flight.

We start this section with Isabel Espinal, April M. Hathcock, and Maria Rios's chapter, "Dewhitening Librarianship: A Policy Proposal for Libraries," in which they

first put forth a new term, *dewhiten*, to replace the term *diversify*, as in "diversifying the profession," to make clear that whiteness is being decentered. They then delineate the economic history and policies of the United States to elucidate the structural inequities surrounding the fact that less than 12 percent of the LIS profession is made up of BIPOC. To address this issue, the authors present a plan to reallocate parts of library budgets toward increasing the number of BIPOC in the profession.

In "The Praxis of Relation, Validation, and Motivation: Articulating LIS Collegiality through a CRT Lens," Torie Quiñonez, Lalitha Nataraj, and Antonia Olivas gift us a new model of pedagogy, relationship growing, and critical race/gender praxis incorporating LatCrit, a relational-cultural mentoring framework, Yosso's community cultural wealth, and validation theory, that contest white-dominant ways of being and knowing. They use personal counterstories as examples of how epistemologies of whiteness work to isolate and otherize BIPOC. These highly racialized, gendered, and classed experiences informed and shaped their approach to their teaching, research, and each other.

Anne Cong-Huyen and Kush Patel begin their chapter, "Precarious Labor and Radical Care in Libraries and Digital Humanities," with an imaginative, deeply hopeful quote from Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha that shares important new ideas for building and sustaining relationships, which their chapter takes up. The authors push us to consider the practices, mechanisms, and conditions of an academic industrial complex rooted in White Supremacy, through their analysis of academic librarianship and digital humanities labor that is dependent on division, invisibility, uncertainty, and harm. In their opposition to this harmful, oppressive labor, Cong-Huyen and Patel highlight multiple critical movements within digital humanities and librarianship and put forward justice-focused approaches with radical care at the forefront.

Next, Rachel E. Winston's moving and engaging chapter, "Praxis for the People: Critical Race Theory and Archival Practice," directs us to consider—again, for the first time, to our knowledge, in archival and LIS scholarship—critical race praxis (CRP), a branch of CRT, in archival work. Responding to and extending both critical archives studies and CRT, Winston advances a CRP framework, consisting of five related yet independent elements—Disruptive, Responsive, Actionable, Informed, and Caring— that pushes toward relational and structural shifts in archives, which are critically necessary to change the relationship between race and power.

"'Getting InFLOmation': A Critical Race Theory Tale from the School Library," by Kafi Kumasi, closes this part and is the final chapter before the collection ends with a contribution from us. Kumasi displays CRT's imaginative underpinnings by offering a fictional story that centers the always already rich, deep, and nuanced information

worlds of a Black family, community, and a Black male youth in an unnamed, contemporary US city and high school library. Kumasi presents a wide range of connected information formats—Black Twitter, text messages, college acceptance letters, conversations with family and friends—in the reality of her main character, Jamar. Through Jamar's understanding of CRT's whiteness as property and interest convergence concepts, college admissions, K–12 schooling enrollments, and Black-white relations are critiqued.

We hope that in reading this collection of some of the leading LIS scholars and practitioners utilizing CRT to reconstruct the field and profession, you too feel inspired, activated, and emboldened to engage with CRT in a transformative way.

We challenge you.

NOTES

1. Throughout the introduction and conclusion chapters, we intentionally use library and information studies, rather than library and information science, to move away from the idea that this discipline is scientific in any way. *Science* as a term is often used to imply that the thing we are talking about is neutral and objective when in reality it reflects the same racial hierarchy and structures of oppression that exist in the US nation-state. Contributors to this collection may still use library and information science as that is what the field is most commonly known as.

2. Throughout the introduction and conclusion chapters, we also intentionally use the term Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) not to rank oppressions but to call out the specific realities that exist for this group in the country now known as the United States.

3. "Color blindness" is intentionally enclosed in quotation marks to highlight the ableist nature of the term. Though the term is commonly used and has a long, significant tradition in Critical Race Theory scholarship, we believe it is necessary to move with DisCrit scholars who direct us toward the term *color evasiveness*, "which both refuses to position people who are blind as embodying deficit and recognizes the active evasion involved in people's refusing to discuss race in the face of racial inequities" (Annamma, Connor, and Ferri 2016, 6).

4. April Hathcock defines whiteness beyond its connection to individuals and racial identity and directs us to understand whiteness as not only "the socio-cultural differential of power and privilege that results from categories of race and ethnicity … [but] also … a marker for the privilege and power that acts to reinforce itself through hegemonic cultural practice that excludes all who are different" (2015, para. 3).

5. We capitalize White Supremacy throughout the book in order to call attention to its dominance and power, as it is often purposely hidden from view.

6. Here, we do not distinguish between BIPOC and POC because the leading scholars describing their own history do not do so and because it provides an example of how language around race continues to shift.

7. The late Bell is also recognized as one of CRT's leading intellectual figures. In a serendipitous closing of the loop, half of this introduction was written and revised one block from the Harvard Law School campus.

8. A challenged and still-evolving term, Latinx is used in the introduction and conclusion intentionally and politically to contest hetero/homonormativity and patriarchy, gesture our committed solidarity to queer, trans, lesbian, and gay justice movements, and imagine gender, sexuality, and subjectivity beyond binaries, boundaries, and borders.

9. Throughout this piece, and especially in this section, we default to the singular "they" in an effort to not misgender individuals.

10. As mentioned earlier in this introduction, the wonderfully thought-provoking 2017 article "On 'Diversity' as Anti-Racism in Library Information Studies: A Critique," by David James Hudson, incisively analyzes this phenomenon.

11. Building on the incredible work of the movement Cite Black Women, from here and throughout the rest of this section, when analyzing and describing singly authored and coauthored scholarship, we deliberately write out the full names of Black scholars as a way to honor, value, and elevate the intellectual contributions of Black thought.

12. It should be noted that the scholarship of critical, radical librarian Sanford Berman engaged CRT concepts, especially racial bias in the Library of Congress Subject Headings, long before the official emergence of the CRT movement.

13. This would turn out to be an important moment in the evolution of CRT in LIS scholarship, because it marked the beginning of CRT's presence in that particular area of librarianship, which, to date, has been the most prolific.

14. Transitional books are categorized as literature that moves children from an early reader stage to an independent one, which often takes place around the second or third grade.

15. Throughout the introduction, we use the term *folx*, rather than *folks*, as a gender-neutral term.

16. Though the term was introduced earlier, the intentional effort to organize scholars writing under this description took form in this issue.

17. Some of these efforts by mostly BIPOC that require mention include the edited collections *Pushing the Margins: Women of Color and Intersectionality in LIS* (2018); *In Our Own Voices, Redux: The Faces of Librarianship Today* (2018); *Asian American Librarians and Library Services: Activism, Collaborations, and Strategies* (2017); a *Collection Management* special issue, "Sharing Knowledge and Smashing Stereotypes: Representing Native American, First Nation, and Indigenous Realities in Library Collections" (2017); the *Library Trends* special issue "Race and Ethnicity in Library and Information Science: An Update" (2018); the *Journal of Radical Librarianship* special issue "Race and Power in Library and Information Studies" (2019); a special issue of *Archival Science*, "'To Go Beyond': Towards a Decolonial Archival Praxis" (2019); and the *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* special issue "A Critical Dialogue: Faculty of Color in Library and Information Science" (2019).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.

American Library Association. 2010. "Diversity Counts 2009–2010 Update." American Library Association. http://www.ala.org/aboutala/offices/diversity/diversitycounts/2009-2010update.

Andrews, Nicola, Sunny Kim, and Josie Watanabe. 2018. "Cultural Humility as a Transformative Framework for Librarians, Tutors, and Youth Volunteers." *Young Adult Library Services* 16 (2): 19–22.

Annamma, Subini Ancy, David Connor, and Beth Ferri. 2013. "Dis/ability Critical Race Studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the Intersections of Race and Dis/ability." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 16 (1): 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.730511.

Annamma, Subini Ancy, David Connor, and Beth Ferri. 2016. "Introduction: A Truncated Genealogy of DisCrit." In *DisCrit: Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education*, edited by Subini Ancy Annamma, David Connor, and Beth Ferri, 1–8. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ansley, Frances Lee. 1989. "Stirring the Ashes: Race Class and the Future of Civil Rights Scholarship." *Cornell Law Review* 74 (6): 994–1077.

Bell, D. A. 1980. "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review* 93 (3): 518–533.

Bell, Derrick. 1992. *Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism*. New York: Basic Books.

Bell, Derrick A. 2004. *Silent Covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the Unfulfilled Hopes for Racial Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowers, Jennifer, Katherine Crowe, and Peggy Keeran. 2017. "'If You Want the History of a White Man, You Go to the Library': Critiquing Our Legacy, Addressing Our Library Collections Gaps." *Collection Management* 42 (3–4): 159–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2017.1329104.

Brayboy, Bryan McKinley Jones. 2005. "Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education." *Urban Review* 37 (5): 425–446. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y.

Brook, Freeda, Dave Ellenwood, and Althea E. Lazzaro. 2015. "In Pursuit of Antiracist Social Justice: Denaturalizing Whiteness in the Academic Library." *Library Trends* 64 (2): 246–284. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2015.0048.

brown, adrienne maree. 2017. *Emergent Strategy—Shaping Change, Changing Worlds*. Chico, CA: AK Press.

Brown, Jennifer, Jennifer A. Ferretti, Sofia Leung, and Marisa Méndez-Brady. 2018. "We Here: Speaking Our Truth." *Library Trends* 67 (1): 163–181. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0031.

Brown, Jennifer, and Sofia Leung. 2018. "Authenticity vs. Professionalism: Being True to Ourselves at Work." In *Pushing the Margins: Women of Color and Intersectionality in LIS*, edited by Annie Pho and Rose L. Chou, 329–347. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2018.

Caswell, Michelle, Ricardo Punzalan, and T-Kay Sangwand. 2017. "Critical Archival Studies: An Introduction." In "Critical Archival Studies," edited by Michelle Caswell, Ricardo Punzalan, and T-Kay Sangwand. Special issue, *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1 (2): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v1i2.50.

Chou, Rose L., and Annie Pho, eds. 2018. *Pushing the Margins: Women of Color and Intersectionality in LIS*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Clarke, Janet Hyunju, Raymond Pun, and Monnee Tong, eds. 2017. *Asian American Librarians and Library Services: Activism, Collaborations, and Strategies*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Collins, Patricia Hill, and Sirma Bilge. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Cooke, Nicole A. 2016. "Counter-storytelling in the LIS Curriculum." In *Perspectives on Libraries as Institutions of Human Rights and Social Justice,* edited by Ursula Gorham, Natalie G. Taylor, and Paul T. Jaeger, 331–348. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.

Cooke, Nicole A., ed. 2018. "Race and Ethnicity in Library and Information Science: An Update." Special issue, *Library Trends* 67 (1): 1–181. http://muse.jhu.edu/issue/39275.

Cooke, Nicole A. 2019. "Impolite Hostilities and Vague Sympathies: Academia as a Site of Cyclical Abuse." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 60 (3): 223–230. http://hdl.handle.net/2142/104218.

Cooke, Nicole A., and Joe O. Sánchez, eds. 2019. "A Critical Dialogue: Faculty of Color in Library and Information Science." Special issue, *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* 60 (3): 169–238. https://www.utpjournals.press/toc/jelis/60/3.

Cooke, Nicole A., and Miriam E. Sweeney, eds. 2017. *Teaching for Justice: Implementing Social Justice in the LIS Classroom*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 2020. CRT & Intersectionality Summer School. African American Policy Forum.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 2001. "The First Decade: Critical Reflections, or a Foot in the Closing Door." *UCLA Law Review* 49 (5): 1343–1372.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas, eds. 1995. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. New York: The New Press.

Curammeng, Edward R., Tracy Lachica Buenavista, and Stephanie Cariaga. 2017. "Asian American Critical Race Theory: Origins, Directions, and Praxis." Center for Critical Race Studies at UCLA Research Briefs. June 1, 2017. https://issuu.com/almaiflores/docs/ec_tlb_sc_asianam_crt.

Decuir-Gunby, Jessica T., Thandeka K Chapman, and Paul Schutz. 2019. *Understanding Critical Race Research Methods and Methodologies: Lessons from the Field*. New York: Routledge.

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. 2017. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. New York: New York University Press.

DiAngelo, Robin. 2011. "White Fragility." *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 3 (3): 54–70.

Dixson, Adrienne D., and Celia K. Rousseau Anderson. 2017. "And We Are Still Not Saved: 20 Years of CRT and Education." In *Critical Race Theory in Education: All God's Children Got a Song*, edited by Adrienne D. Dixson, Celia K. Rousseau Anderson, and Jamel K. Donnor, 34–38. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Dumas, Michael J., and Kihana Miraya Ross. 2016. "'Be Real Black for Me' Imagining BlackCrit in Education." *Urban Education* 51 (4): 415–442. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0042085916628611.

Dunbar, A. W. 2006. "Introducing Critical Race Theory to Archival Discourse: Getting the Conversation Started." *Archival Science* 6 (1): 109–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-006-9022-6.

Elteto, Sharon, Rose M. Jackson, and Adriene Lim. 2008. "Is the Library a 'Welcoming Space'?: An Urban Academic Library and Diverse Student Experiences." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 8 (3): 325–337. https://doi:10.1353/pla.0.0008.

Ford, Chandra L., and Collins O. Airhihenbuwa. 2010. "Critical Race Theory, Race Equity, and Public Health: Toward Antiracism Praxis." *American Journal of Public Health* 100 (S1): S30–S35.

Ford, Chandra L., and Collins O. Airhihenbuwa. 2018. "Commentary: Just What Is Critical Race Theory and What's It Doing in a Progressive Field Like Public Health?" *Ethnicity and Disease* 28 (suppl. 1): 223–230. https://doi.org/10.18865/ed.28.S1.223.

Furner, J. 2007. "Dewey Deracialized: A Critical Race-Theoretic Perspective." *Knowledge Organization* 34 (3): 144–168.

Garcia, Nichole M., Nancy López, and Verónica N. Vélez. 2017. "QuantCrit: Rectifying Quantitative Methods through Critical Race Theory." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 21 (2): 149–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1377675.

Gibson, Amanda, Sandra Hughes-Hassell, and Megan Threats. 2018. "Critical Race Theory in the LIS Curriculum." In *Re-Envisioning the MLS: Perspectives on the Future of Library and Information Science Education,* edited by Johnna Percell, Lindsay C. Sarin, Paul T. Jaeger, and John Carlo Bertot, 49–70. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.

Griffin, K. L. 2013. "Pursuing Tenure and Promotion in the Academy: A Librarian's Cautionary Tale." *Negro Educational Review* 64 (1–4): 77–96.

Hall, Tracie D. 2012. "The Black Body at the Reference Desk: Critical Race Theory and Black Librarianship." In *The 21st-Century Black Librarian in America: Issues and Challenges*, edited by Andrew P. Jackson, Julius C. Jefferson Jr. and Akilah K. Nosakhere, 197–202. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Harding, Vincent. 1970. "Black Students and the Impossible Revolution." *Journal of Black Studies* 1 (1): 75–100.

Harris, Cheryl I. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106 (8): 1707–1791. https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787.

Hathcock, April. 2015. "White Librarianship in Blackface: Diversity Initiatives in LIS." *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, October 7, 2015. http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/.

Hines, Samantha. 2019. "Leadership Development for Academic Librarians: Maintaining the Status Quo?" *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4 (February): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v4.29311.

Honma, Todd. 2005. "Trippin' over the Color Line: The Invisibility of Race in Library and Information Science." *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies* 1 (2): 1–24. http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/4nj0w1mp.

hooks, bell. 1991. "Theory as Liberatory Practice." *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 4 (2): 1–12. https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yjlf/vol4/iss1/2.

Howard, Tyrone C., and Oscar Navarro. 2016. "Critical Race Theory 20 Years Later: Where Do We Go from Here?" *Urban Education* 51 (3): 253–273.

Hudson, David James. 2017. "On 'Diversity' as Anti-Racism in Library and Information Studies: A Critique." *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1 (1). https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis .v1i1.6.

Hudson, David James, and Gina Schlesselman-Tarango, eds. 2019. "Race and Power in Library and Information Studies." Special issue, *Journal of Radical Librarianship* 5.

Hughes-Hassell, Sandra. 2013. "Multicultural Young Adult Literature as a Form of Counter-Storytelling." *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 83 (3): 212–228. https://doi.org/10 .1086/670696.

Hughes-Hassell, Sandra, Heather A. Barkley, and Elizabeth Koehler. 2009. "Promoting Equity in Children's Literacy Instruction: Using a Critical Race Theory Framework to Examine Transitional Books." *School Library Media Research* 12:1–20. http://www.ala.org/aasl/slmr/volume12/hughes -hassell-barkley-koehler.

Hughes-Hassell, Sandra, and Ernie J. Cox. 2010. "Inside Board Books: Representations of People of Color." *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 80 (3): 211–230. http://www.jstor.org /stable/10.1086/652873.

Hughes-Hassell, Sandra, and Katy J. Vance. 2017. "Examining Race, Power, and Privilege in the Youth Services LIS Classroom." In *Teaching for Justice: Implementing Social Justice in the LIS Classroom*, edited by Nicole A. Cooke and Miriam E. Sweeney, 103–138. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Hurley, David A., Sarah R. Kostelecky, and Paulita Aguilar, eds. 2017. "Whose Knowledge? Representing Indigenous Realities in Library and Archival Collections." *Collection Management* 42:3–4, 124–129.

Iglesias, Elizabeth M. 1996. "International Law, Human Rights, and LatCrit Theory." *University of Miami Inter-American Law Review* 28 (2): 177–213. https://repository.law.miami.edu/umialr/vol28 /iss2/2/.

Joseph, Nicole M., Katherine M. Crowe, and Janiece Mackey. 2017. "Interrogating Whiteness in College and University Archival Spaces." In *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*, edited by Gina Schlesselman-Tarango, 55–78. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Kim, Eunsong. 2017. "Appraising Newness: Whiteness, Neoliberalism, and the Building of the Archive for New Poetry." In "Critical Archival Studies," edited by Michelle Caswell, Ricardo Punzalan, and T-Kay Sangwand. Special issue, *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1 (2): 1–40. https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v1i2.38.

Kumasi, Kafi. 2012. "Roses in the Concrete: A Critical Race Perspective on Urban Youth and School Librarians." *Knowledge Quest* 40 (5): 32–37. http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/slisfrp/71.

Kumasi, Kafi. 2013. "'The Library Is Like Her House': Reimagining Youth of Color in LIS Discourses." In *Transforming Young Adult Services: A Reader for Our Age*, edited by Anthony Bernier, 103–113. Chicago: ALA Neal-Schuman.

Kumasi, Kafi. 2018. "INFLO-mation: A Model for Exploring Information Behavior through Hip Hop." *Journal of Research on Libraries and Young Adults* 9 (1): 1–18. http://www.yalsa.ala.org/jrlya /wp-content/uploads/2018/11/INFLO-mation_Kumasi.pdf.

Kurz, Robin F. 2012. "Missing Faces, Beautiful Places: The Lack of Diversity in South Carolina Picture Book Award Nominees." *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship* 18 (2): 128–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/13614541.2012.716695.

Kurz, Robin F. 2017. "Transgressing LIS Education: A Continuing Journey toward Social Justice." In *Teaching for Justice: Implementing Social Justice in the LIS Classroom*, edited by Nicole A. Cooke and Miriam E. Sweeney, 77–99. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1998. "Just What Is Critical Race Theory and What's It Doing in a Nice Field Like Education?" *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11 (1): 7–24. https:// doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863.

Matsuda, Mari. 1991. "Voices of America: Accent, Antidiscrimination Law, and a Jurisprudence for the Last Reconstruction." *Yale Law Journal* 100 (5): 1329–1407. https://doi.org/10.2307/796694.

Matsuda, Mari, Charles R. Lawrence III, Richard Delgado, and Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, eds. 1993. *Words That Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech and the First Amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Misawa, Mitsunori. 2012. "Social Justice Narrative Inquiry: A Queer Crit Perspective." Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, Saratoga Springs, NY, June 1–3, 2012. http:// newprairiepress.org/aerc/2012/papers/34.

Neely, Teresa Y., and Jorge R. López-McKnight, eds. 2018. *In Our Own Voices, Redux: The Faces of Librarianship Today*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Noble, Safiyah. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression*. New York: New York University Press.

Punzalan, Ricardo L., and Michelle Caswell. 2015. "Critical Directions for Archival Approaches to Social Justice." *Library Quarterly* 86 (1): 25–42. https://doi.org/10.1086/684145.

Racial and Ethnic Diversity Committee of ACRL. 2012. "Diversity Standards: Cultural Competency for Academic Libraries (2012)." Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). May 4, 2012. http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/diversity.

Rapchak, Marica. 2019. "That Which Cannot Be Named: The Absence of Race in the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*." *Journal of Radical Librarianship* 5 (October): 173–196. https://journal.radicallibrarianship.org/index.php/journal/article/view/33/51.

Schlesselman-Tarango, Gina, ed. 2017. *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Solórzano, Daniel G., and Dolores Delgado Bernal. 2001. "Examining Transformational Resistance through a Critical Race and LatCrit Theory Framework: Chicana and Chicano Students in an Urban Context." *Urban Education* 36 (3): 308–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901363002.

Solórzano, Daniel G., and Tara Yosso. 2002. "Critical Race Methodology: Counter-storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 8 (1): 23–44. https://doi.org /10.1177/107780040200800103.

Stefancic, Jean. 1991. "Listen to the Voices: An Essay on Legal Scholarship, Women, and Minorities." *Legal Reference Services Quarterly* 11 (3–4): 141–149.

Stovall, David O. 2013. "'Fightin' the Devil 24/7': Context, Community, and Critical Race Praxis in Education." In *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*, edited by Marvin Lynn and Adrienne D. Dixson, 289–301. New York: Routledge.

Sutherland, Tonia. 2017. "Making a Killing: On Race, Ritual, and (Re)membering in Digital Culture." *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture* 46 (1): 32–40.

Thomas, Ebony Elizabeth. 2019. *The Dark Fantastic: Race and the Imagination from Harry Potter to the Hunger Games*. New York: New York University Press.

Valdes, Francisco. 1997. "Under Construction—LatCrit Consciousness, Community, and Theory." *California Law Review* 85 (5): 1087–1142. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38VX4J.

Walker, Shaundra. 2015. "Critical Race Theory and the Recruitment, Retention and Promotion of a Librarian of Color: A Counterstory." In *Where Are All the Librarians of Color? The Experiences of People of Color in Academia*, edited by Rebecca Hankins and Miguel Juárez, 135–160. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Walker, Shaundra. 2017. "A Revisionist History of Andrew Carnegie's Library Grants to Black Colleges." In *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*, edited by Gina Schlesselman-Tarango, 33–53. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Warren, Kellee E. 2016. "We Need These Bodies, but Not Their Knowledge: Black Women in the Archival Science Professions and Their Connection to the Archives of Enslaved Black Women in the French Antilles." *Library Trends* 64 (4): 776–794. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0012.

Yosso, Tara, William Smith, Miguel Ceja, and Daniel Solórzano. 2009. "Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate for Latina/o Undergraduates." *Harvard Educational Review* 79 (4): 659–691. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.4.m6867014157m707l.