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This special issue took root in my imagination far before it became a reality. As a graduate student in Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, I was introduced to Critical Race Theory (hereafter referred to as CRT) in an education course designed to explore issues of access and opportunity in colleges and universities. Early on in my personal and academic discovery of CRT, I was struck by the assertion that “Scholarship—the formal production, identification, and organization of what will be called ‘knowledge’—is inevitably political.” From this point forward, I had a stronger grasp of the importance of knowledge production and the inextricable relationship between knowledge, power and discourse that was often a point of discussion in my intercultural communication courses. Through CRT, I also develop a deeper understanding of the systemic nature of racism and the rich significance of racialized narratives. Thus although I had lived within my racialized brown body for quite some time and had stories to tell about my experiences, before being introduced to CRT, I didn’t recognize the academy as a place where critical conversations about race and racism were happening. My initial encounter with CRT, followed closely by Critical Race Feminism (hereafter referred to as CRF), represents the first time that I was captivated by scholarly works that I felt spoke to and with my lived experiences as a woman of color. CRT scholarship, as a race-based epistemological, methodological and pedagogical framework; a body of scholarship; and an intellectual movement that was birthed as an act of political resistance, sparked a hopeful sense of possibility around who I could become and what I could do as an academic. In essence, CRT ignited a personal, political and intellectual shift in my consciousness; a feeling of “homeplace” that sharply contradicted the sense of homelessness I had often felt on my journey to become a formally educated biracial (black and white) woman. Bolstered by the sense of hopeful possibility that accompanied my personal and academic discovery of CRT, the premise of this special issue is to serve as a focused point of entry for CRT into...
the field of communication studies. Although CRT, originally birthed in legal studies, has been utilized in education, feminist, media and sport research to critique racial oppression, the use of CRT remains quite sparse in the field of communication with the exception of a few critical works. Critical Race Theory emerged from Critical Legal Studies (hereafter referred to as CLS), which exposed and challenged how American legal policy functioned to sustain hierarchical relations of domination and subordination in the midst of the post-Civil Rights era. Although CLS scholars and race crit scholars within CLS agreed upon the necessity to interrogate power relations within the realm of law, race crits eventually emerged as a separate entity to move the discussion of race from the margins to the center by contesting historical understandings of the law as racially objective, neutral and apolitical. For example, CRT scholars refuted understandings of the law espoused by opinions such as Justice Harlan’s in the Supreme Court case *Plessy vs. Ferguson* in 1896:

> in the view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste system here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights all citizens are equal before the law.

Despite the dismissal of the relevance of race (and subsequently racism) via the law, exemplified by Harlan in particular but embraced by the vast majority of legal scholars and courts, race crits bravely built CRT upon the scholarship of Derrick Bell. At the foundation of CRT’s inception was the belief that Eurocentric epistemologies and practices in the creation and application of the law failed to adequately consider the lived realities of people of color. Therefore CRT was initially designed to critique the laws and policies that uphold white supremacy in the United States. Matsuda concisely describes the early purpose of CRT as:

> the work of progressive legal scholars of color who are attempting to develop a jurisprudence that accounts for the role of racism in American law and that works toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination.

In this vein, CRT scholarship deconstructs race and racism by positioning the interests of people of color at the center of inquiry to advance racial equality in general and equal treatment under the law in particular.

Two overarching premises unite CRT scholarship: (1) to reveal the roots and perpetuation of white supremacy and (2) to engage in social justice. Along with the basic premises of CRT, seven tenets that most CRT scholars adhere to include: (a) interest convergence, (b) racism as everyday, (c) colorblindness as insufficient, (d) race as a social construction, (e) whiteness as property, (f) racialized narratives as significant and telling and (g) racialized realities as contextual. Working from these tenets, CRT as theory provides a rich framework for understanding the lived experiences of people of color. By
comparison as method, CRT via storytelling allows people of color to narrate for themselves how race and racism work in their everyday lives. With a fierce emphasis on liberation, those who utilize CRT and its offspring including CRF, LatCrit, AsianCrit, TribalCrit, WhiteCrit, and QueerCrit within their work address the deeply embedded roots of oppression. Taken together, this genre of scholarship offers rich theoretical and methodological means to interrogate the purposeful orchestration of social inequality both nationally and internationally. As such, critically oriented scholarship rooted in CRT reveals the oppressive underbelly of dominant discourse that professes false commitment to racial equality, neutrality, objectivity, meritocracy and justice.

In accordance with CRT, numerous communication scholars have called for the field of communication to more astutely address race and racism. For instance, Allen asserts that “Mainstream communication theory is culturally biased because it neglects to delve into race in critical, substantive ways.” Positioning CRT as a potential means to address the void noted by Allen, Madison says “Critical race theory analyzes the complex machinations of racialization in the very ways it is created, sanctioned, and employed.” Similarly, Hasian and Delgado argue with regard to Rhetoric “that combining the theoretical insights of rhetoricians and critical race theorists can help us move beyond simple and reductive ways of essentializing race and race relations.” Also of importance to note is the burgeoning advocacy for the critical perspective in intercultural communication which, in alliance with the impulses of CRT, necessitates paying close attention to power; context; culture as a site of struggle; historical, social and political macro contexts; hegemony; and ideology. Bolstering these arguments and calls for the field to be more inclusive of race and racism from an intersectional standpoint is the reality that racialized discourse, whether it be academic, legal, mediated, public, etc., is entrenched with the power of language and representation which profoundly (and undoubtedly) influences interracial communication, relationships and coalitions. More directly highlighting the significance of race in our field, Allen offers “Race merits theoretical and practical attention because it is an enduring, contested phenomenon with important implications for communication studies, and for transforming society.”

Although not without flaws, CRT scholarship easily joins the conversations of communication scholars engaged in critical race work and simultaneously stands to productively build upon the horizons of communication scholarship. More pointedly, CRT can aid and abet communication scholars who labor to name, decenter and map whiteness as a consequential identity, a structure and a space. Thus studies of whiteness in our field can benefit from the historical specificity that CRT offers in relation to the ways that whiteness is leveraged and protected as a form of property. Likewise, CRT serves to heighten the disruption of whiteness as the normative status quo by rendering social institutions such as
law and education vulnerable to incessant racial critique. Take for example the initial call put forth in 1995 for CRT in the field of education by Ladson-Billings and Tate which has since flourished into a body of education research that describes the experiences of people of color as students, instructors and administrators; problematizes the omnipresent nature of racism in education; and recommends practical strategies for positive social transformation. Critical Race Theory also mirrors the work of progressive communication scholars who position marginalized perspectives at the center of concern via commitments to counter-hegemonic discourse, counter-stories, counterspeech, voice, personal narrative, resistant narratives and/or subjugated knowledges. Hence, communication and CRT scholars whose work speaks to and with the voices of people of color bravely redefine racism by “looking to the bottom” toward those who bear the brunt of the U.S. American racial hierarchy.

Richly building upon the aforementioned offerings of CRT to communication scholarship, CRT also refutes dominant notions of colorblindness which are often relied on by those in power to mask both racism and white privilege. Illuminating the impossibility of colorblindness, CRT scholar Neil Gotanda offers “to be racially color-blind…is to ignore what one has already noticed.” By denouncing commitments to colorblindness, or what in the Obama era has been newly termed “post-racial,” CRT marks both overt and covert acts of racism as steadfast, enduring and omnipresent in accordance with communication research that highlights the continued relevance of race and racism in the everyday lives of people of color and whites alike. More specifically with regard to white privilege, CRT and critical race communication scholars unapologetically critique the ways that whites benefit greatly from the embrace of “colorblind” and “post-racial” discourse to expose the vested interest that racially unconscious whites have in maintaining the status quo to protect the worth of their whiteness as valuable property. Addressing the complexities of borderlands, nationality and globalization, CRT and CRF also align in harmony with communication scholarship that interrogates the oppressive entrenchment of Western and U.S. American racial hierarchies throughout the world. Last but certainly not least, CRT can work alongside the theories of race and communication that are rooted in our field including but not limited to Cultural Contracts Theory, Complicity Theory and Co-Cultural Theory. Not only can CRT compliment theorizing race and racism from a communication standpoint but it can also work in tandem with the interdisciplinary scholarship that communication scholars draw from including particular frameworks such as Queer Theory, Black Feminist Thought and Chicana Feminism as well as fields of study such as anthropology, sociology, psychology and philosophy.

Described as “a gasp of emancipatory hope” by Cornel West, CRT offers numerous possibilities to the field of communication studies as a theoretical and methodological force that necessitates positioning
the perspectives, embodied knowledges and experiences of people of color at the center of inquiry. Given the absence of CRT in our field, the authors that appear in this special issue bridge CRT and communication scholarship to offer rich critiques of race and racism. Speaking to and with intercultural, rhetorical, media and pedagogy scholarship, each manuscript poignantly highlights how CRT can be implemented in communication research to deconstruct ideologies of whiteness, recover marginalized perspectives and fuel progressive research. In the first essay, Jonathan P. Rossing presents a strong argument for critical rhetoric and CRT to unite in the critique of racial comedy. Utilizing Stephen Colbert’s commentary on Justice Sonia Sotomayor’s perceived racial bias; he situates racial comedy as a space for transformational critiques of the socially constructed meanings of race. Following his critique, Rossing offers brilliant direction for the continued examination of how communication scholars can utilize humor to illuminate the manifestation of race and racism in our everyday lives albeit via television or otherwise. The second essay, authored by Kelly M. Young, delves into a subject that is not addressed often enough in the field; namely, Native Americans and Native American sovereignty. Utilizing both CRT and Tribal Critical Theory, Young deconstructs the court’s rhetorical use of Moby-Dick in the 2002 Anderson v. Evans decision to reveal the imposition of whiteness on the court’s ruling against the Makah’s right to whale. In the final essay of this special issue, Tina Harris and Kirsten Weber offer a compelling analysis of the film White Man’s Burden to demonstrate how CRT can be utilized as a means to deconstruct popular culture. Jointly, these authors argue that the film’s representation of the reversal of racial privilege can be used to render the everyday nature of racism visible, interrogate imperialism and heighten social consciousness. Taken collectively, all three articles draw numerous links among CRT and communication scholarship revealing a rich space for an alliance that undoubtedly expands our understandings of race and racism.

Like Allen, I am quite hopeful “about the possibility of our discipline to promote positive change related to racial issues within the United States and around the world.”41 Yet, I know that hope in and of itself will not be enough. Rather, we need far more communication scholars, administrators and students to take concerted and decisive action to critique the everyday implications of racial hierarchies within and beyond the ivory tower. Imagining our journey, Crenshaw offers wise insight on the future direction of CRT infused and inspired scholarly discourse. She says:

We need to determine how to translate our work better, to intervene in ways that help model interventions at the local level, to show people what a difference critical race thinking makes in their own workplaces and communities. And we need to learn how to demand a popular space and make good use of it when we get it.42
In closing, our aspirations to continue the deep interrogation of race and racism will need to be quite diligent, as Crenshaw forecasts, and accompanied by resilience, energy and commitment. In this moment, I am tangibly reminded by the authors whose work appears in this special issue of the optimism that I began with in this introduction. I am quite hopeful that as you engage with the arguments and insights raised by each article that you will ponder how CRT might productively guide your own academic ventures to deconstruct, recover and evolve.

1 I am very grateful to Dr. Frank Tuitt, the professor who taught this class, for his pedagogical patience and compassionate care. As a student, I was so moved by CRT during this course that I imagine my interest became akin to a runaway train that was likely both energizing and quite overwhelming. Of importance to recognize is that without professors and mentors like Dr. Tuitt, those who took risks in the classroom and placed their own bodies on the line to propel student learning, I doubt that I would have sought after a career in academia.
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