Theology in Practice

Conundrums in Practical Theology

CHAPTER 5

Writing in Compliance with the Racialized "Zoo" of Practical Theology

Courtney T. Goto

In the context of the academy, a conundrum is a persistent, perduring dilemma that is enmeshed in the process of producing knowledge '(in this case practical theology). It is deeper than a research question on a particular subject, when a scholar doggedly wrestles with a formidable problem and neither will let go. Many questions and their permutations have their seasons. However, the nature of the beast is such that the same conundrum can trip up the researcher repeatedly and quite aside from a particular topic of research. (Sometimes when a conundrum is so irksome, a practical theologian makes it a subject of research.) A conundrum entangles a person in a perennial quandary because it evokes something at stake for the researcher beyond filling gaps or addressing problems in the literature. For some of my colleagues in this volume, conundrums are limited to the work itself. When these theorists close their books and shut down their computer, the conundrum remains in the world of ideas. However, other conundrums such as the one I describe impinge in a more personal, existential way—not because of what I think but because of the status I am assigned as a person of color.

In this chapter, I present a conundrum in practical theology as well as the wider academy that reflects the racism of the larger culture in which it is embedded. The discussion shares intersections with Phillis Sheppard's chapter on racism as well as Jaco Dreyer's chapter on reflexivity.[1] Like other authors, I take a practical theological approach to the conundrum I describe, using multiple disciplines to analyze it, in my case drawing on postcolonial, Asian American, psychoanalytic, and theological perspectives. I then identify some areas of work in which the practical theology community can respond collectively to coercive mimeticism.

The Emergence of a Conundrum

I was invited to write the Asian American chapter for *Opening the Field of Practical Theology* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).[2] This introductory textbook was designed to help students explore the breadth of trajectories in practical theology. Each chapter (fifteen in all) features a different perspective, including, for example, feminist, hermeneutical, liberationist, and contextual approaches to the field. Three "racial chapters" were originally intended to be included in the book (African American, US Latino/a, and Asian American).

As much as I was delighted to be asked to write a chapter for *Opening the Field*, it raised some troubling issues about which I wrote and discussed with colleagues as we engaged the work.[3] I appreciated that the editors wanted to include diverse perspectives, reflecting differences in race, gender, theology, and method. Asian American approaches to practical theology are not well known by scholars and students in the field. At the same time, I wondered why only scholars of color were asked to write the racial chapters, while white colleagues were invited to address approaches that are central to (meaning "well studied in") the discipline. Their request was not the result of conscious racism on anyone's part but a result that is consistent with larger patterns of unconscious marginalization of scholars of color in the academy and in the wider culture. To their credit, many of my white colleagues in the project cited literature authored by scholars of color. Many are mindful of the need for diverse perspectives. However, this does not erase an unwitting division of labor that implies and reinforces an assumption that those with power and privilege in the field speak about what is privileged (often without realizing that the field itself and they are in fact privileged), while those who are historically marginalized address what is often treated as marginal. As Dale Andrews, another contributor to the volume, writes, "We have not escaped the marginalization of studying the marginalized."[4] I was also disturbed that unlike scholars of color, my white colleagues in the project and in general were not expected to account for dynamics of power, privilege, and whiteness in their research and teaching. When I shared my concerns at our first authors' meeting, Tom

---

1 See Jaco Dreyer's chapter 4 (pp. 91–109) and Phillis I. Sheppard's chapter 9 (pp. 219–249) in this volume.

2 Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S. Mikoski, eds., *Opening the Field of Practical Theology: An Introduction* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

3 Courtney T. Goto, "Asian American Practical Theologies," in *Opening the Field of Practical Theology: An Introduction*, ed. Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S. Mikoski (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 31–44.

4 Dale P. Andrews, "African American Practical Theology," in *Opening the Field of Practical Theology: An Introduction*, ed. Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S. Mikoski (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 27.

Beaudoin and Katherine Turpin were inspired to write the "White Practical Theology" chapter.[5] Unfortunately, even this contribution could not solve a larger structural problem of the book.[6] The design of the volume assumes that the field is divisible into broad approaches that are seemingly untouched by race, while the work of addressing issues of race is assigned to isolated chapters coded as such.[7] The "racial chapters" reduce people to racial identity and "exoticize" those who are "other."

In writing my first draft of the chapter, I was reminded of cultural critic Rey Chow's discussion of John Berger's work, in which he characterizes tokenism and marginalization as zookeeping.[8] At the zoo, exotic animals are kept in captivity for the entertainment and education of visitors. Reflecting on the metaphor, Berger observes that zoo animals are subject to a gaze through which they are not seen truly. In fact, it is impossible to see wild animals as they *really* are because they are, of course, in captivity. What is seen is a distorted (imprisoned) version of animals in the wild. Worse yet, says Berger, zoo animals are completely dependent on their keepers or trainers.[9] I would add that sometimes dolphins and other animals are even trained to perform tricks that make them appear to be more like their captors. They are given food incentives and verbal praise to perform in ways that are pleasing.

Reflecting on Berger's metaphor, Chow likens the gaze of visitors at the zoo to the critical gaze of white readers in the academy. Especially when white Western readers interrogate literary texts or other cultural artifacts of developing countries, she argues, their gaze or reading becomes "a critical part of

---

5   Tom Beaudoin and Katherine Turpin, "White Practical Theology," in *Opening the Field of Practical Theology: An Introduction*, eds. Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S. Mikoski (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 251–269.

6   Bonnie Miller-McLemore, Authors' meeting for *Conundrums in Practical Theology*, San Diego, November 21, 2014.

7   Another example of this pattern is Serene Jones and Paul Lakeland, eds., *Constructive Theology: A Contemporary Approach to Classical Themes* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005). Elaine Robinson points out that in this book substantive reflection on race in relation to human being is left to Shawn Copeland's chapter, "such that the white theologians need not wrestle deeply with their own white privilege." This approach "projects an 'additive' method in which the white theological tradition might appear to be normative and supplemented by theologians of color. No doubt this was not the intention of the authors. But the printed text, in fact, may belie the goal of presenting diverse perspectives as authoritative alongside more traditional ones." Elaine A. Robinson, *Race and Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2012), 52.

8   Rey Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 95–96.

9   John Berger, *About Looking* (New York: Pantheon, 1980), 1–26, cited by Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic*, 96.

---

the image—and the imagining—of third world cultural productions."[10] Chow expresses the sense of captivity I experienced in writing my chapter, a feeling with which other scholars of color are likely familiar. I am seen and cannot help but come to see myself in terms of a destructive gaze, thinking and producing scholarship that responds to how I am seen by those in power. Chow writes about the imbalance of power between those who are seen as subjects of research (i.e., ethnics in so-called "developing countries") and those who have the power to define and construct with their looking (i.e., scholars from countries with a history of imperialism).[11] Through images, those without power are constructed in the imagination of those in authority, while the oppressed lack the agency to do the same.

I want to be clear that as an Asian American scholar, I have considerably more power than those who live in a developing country with less education and resources. As an author, I have some power to shape others' perceptions of me and to combat stereotypes about Asian Americans (as I am doing at this very moment). It might seem that if I wrote something true to my experience as an Asian American, readers could see me (and by implication other Asian Americans) as we "truly" are, but that is not possible. The assumption that people of color can represent or reveal what is "authentic" about their culture is a misperception that perpetuates the zoo.

No colleague of mine, and certainly none of my colleagues with whom I was collaborating on the *Opening* book project, would ever knowingly play the role of a zookeeper or want anything to do with a project that tokenizes or marginalizes anyone. The zoo image is as difficult to take in as it is for me to express. However, Chow's metaphor of the zoo helps to explain the bind that I and other scholars of color experience when we are asked to write an ethnic chapter representing "our people."

Naming the Conundrum: Coercive Mimeticism

My experience of the book project illustrates a conundrum that is insidious, systemic, and chronic, not only in practical theology but also in the academy, a

---

10   Chow, *Protestant Ethnic*, 100.

11   The binary of developing and developed countries implies a hierarchy, but I use it here to highlight the mentality that Chow criticizes. Nicholas Mirzoeff also discusses how colonized peoples have often been deprived of the "right to look" (in the words of Derrida). Nicholas Mirzoeff, *The Right to Look: A Counterhistory of Visuality* (Durham, NC: Duke University, 2011), 1.

conundrum that expresses the racism and colonialism that characterize Western (and other) culture(s). It is not simply painful to feel tokenized. It is that I, and other scholars of color who aspire to be successful in the academy, are required to participate—one could properly say *trained* to participate—in making our own cages in conformity with white expectations. Chow would regard these practices as expressive of "coercive mimeticism," which is "a process (identitarian, existential, cultural or textual) in which those who are marginal to mainstream Western culture are expected, by way of what Albert Memmi calls 'the mark of the plural,' to resemble and replicate the very banal preconceptions that have been appended to them, a process in which they are expected to objectify themselves in accordance with the already seen and thus to authenticate the familiar and imagings of them as ethnics."[12] In other words, a person of color, whether as a research subject or as a research scholar, is expected to participate in being and becoming who his/her "captors" (i.e., members of one or more dominant cultures) deem this ethnic person to be.

Coercive mimeticism is a conundrum with a series of interlocking parts. First, I am handed the role of Asian American, and I feel obligated to play the part because there are consequences if I do not and incentives if I do. If I do not comply, I forgo the opportunity to be seen and heard at all. Not only does noncompliance hold me back professionally, it hurts others in my community who suffer the same chronic sense of invisibility and marginalization. However, accepting the invitation has its dangers as well, which leads to a second part of the bind. The term *Asian American* is problematic as I and many voices in Asian American studies and theology have discussed.[13] Writing a chapter on "my people" is liable to reinforce common assumptions that there is an essence to which the category "Asian American" refers, which of course there is not. Asian American identities are fluid and evolving, expressed and known only as they are performed at intersections of multiple histories, political commitments, and communal memories that do not necessarily meet easily or

12   Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, expanded ed., trans. Howard Greenfeld, introduction by Jean-Paul Sartre, afterword by Susan Gilson Miller (Boston: Beacon, 1991), 85. Cited in Chow, *Protestant Ethic*, 107.

13   See HyeRan Kim-Cragg, "Between and Beyond Asian-ness: A Voice of a Postcolonial Hybrid Korean-Canadian Diaspora," in *What Young Asian Theologians Are Thinking*, ed. Leow Theng Huat (Singapore: Trinity Theological College, 2015); Nami Kim, "The 'Indigestible' Asian: The Unifying Term 'Asian' in Theological Discourse," in *Off the Menu: Asian and Asian North American Women's Religion and Theology*, ed. Rita Nakashima Brock et al. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 24.

consistently.[14] This leads me to the third part of the quandary. Asian American experiences are so vastly varied in terms of language, culture, religion, history, and levels of assimilation that one must question whether one can say anything meaningful about what Asian Americans experience, even though it is politically necessary to do so. I am forced to choose among no-win options— to be someone less than or largely other than myself in order to be accepted in white circles of discourse, not to participate at all, or to risk being called out by members of my community for misrepresentation.

In writing an Asian American chapter, I am constantly aware of how it will be viewed by my Asian American counterparts, colleagues of color, as well as my white peers. This affects both what and how I write. I am accountable to Asian American colleagues and communities because I have an opportunity to be seen and heard by those with power and by a wider audience. Sometimes I write in a self-referential way to speak as one person rather than speaking on behalf of all Asian Americans. However, one cannot make a political argument about power dynamics on a cultural level by speaking from personal experience alone. I agree with theorists such as Lisa Lowe and Gayatri Spivak who resign themselves to "strategic essentialism."[15] While recognizing that words can collapse differences and thereby disempower, referring to a "pan-ethnic"[16] or a "coalitional"[17] identity is in service of forming a critical mass that challenges oppressive norms and practices.

At the same time, I write with an acute awareness of how my writing will be seen by white colleagues. Their perceptions have an even greater impact on my professional advancement than those of my Asian American colleagues. According to Chow, scholars of color are never unaware of the power of the white gaze to define and shape them and their work, whereas white colleagues who

14   Tat-Siong Benny Liew, *What Is Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics? Reading the New Testament* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press; Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 2008), 16; Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 65.

15   Gayri Chakravorty Spivak, "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography," in *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 205; Lowe, *Immigrant Acts*, 82.

16   Yen Le Espiritu, "Asian American Panethnicity: Challenges and Possibilities," in *The State of Asian America: Trajectory of Civic and Political Engagement; A Public Policy Report*, ed. Paul M. Ong (Los Angeles: LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute, 2008), 119–36.

17   Kamala Visweswaran, "Predicaments of the Hyphen," in *Our Feet Walk the Sky: Women of the South Asian Diaspora*, ed. Women of South Asian Descent Collective (San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1993), 305. Cited in Liew, *Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics*, 14.

live in countries that privilege whiteness do not experience a racializing gaze.[18] What I experience is a version of W.E.B. Du Bois' "double-consciousness," "this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others."[19] In his context, he writes that one "measure[s] one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity."[20] However, in the company of white liberals in the academy, I gauge my scholarly worth according to the unspoken cultural rubrics of white peers who unconsciously expect conformity to white images—even images about "diversity."

After years of living in the zoo, I resist yet have internalized a white imaging of being Asian American. Granted, every representation of self is a performance of one degree or another regardless of race; however, it is especially problematic for scholars of color. In order to continue to be "kept" or "fed" in the academic zoo, I have internalized and even aspire to a "model minority" image and perform in ways that confirm the image in others' minds (as well as my own) because that is what is rewarded both in the academy and in the wider culture.

The term *model minority* was coined by sociologist William Petersen in a 1966 *New York Times Magazine* article, "Success Story: Japanese American Style."[21] Petersen portrayed Japanese Americans as an exemplary immigrant group worthy of emulation because they were successfully combatting discrimination through hard work, an ethic supported by family structure and cultural values. Similar "success stories" of other Asian American groups validated the impression that Asian Americans were (because of values, ethics, and even genetics) more capable of succeeding in the U.S. than other minorities.[22] As others have written, the model minority is a myth in that not all Asian Americans are high achievers, highly assimilated, or highly successful.[23] High poverty, low education, low rates of insurance, and/or lack of political representation characterize many Asian American communities.[24]

18   Chow, *Protestant Ethnic*, 107.

19   W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Rockville, MD: Arc Manor, 2008), 12.

20   Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, 12.

21   S. Cheryan and G.V. Bodenhausen, "Model Minority," in *Routledge Companion to Race & Ethnicity*, ed. S.M. Caliendo & C.D. McIlwain (New York: Routledge, 2011), 173–76.

22   Chervan and Bodenhausen, "Model Minority," 173–76.

23   For an influential essay on this issue, see Keith Osajima, "Asian Americans as the Model Minority: An Analysis of the Popular Press Image in the 1960s and 1980s," in *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies*, ed. Gary Okihiro et al. (Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1988), 164–74.

24   Chervan and Bodenhausen, "Model Minority," 173–76.

I am encouraged to perform an assimilated Asian American who can move easily in white circles of discourse yet still be able to speak about her racial identity. Ironically, even as I wrote about Asian American practical theologies, particularly about what makes them unique and different, to some extent I was writing in ways that practiced conformity and reinforced a myth. What frightens me—speaking honestly even if it is potentially off-putting—is that I have been so thoroughly socialized by the academic zoo (and the larger zoo created by multiple dominant cultures), I am not always aware of the compromises I have made and even *continue* to make in participating in coercive mimeticism. While white colleagues may also be required to practice conformity and perhaps even inauthenticity in their scholarship toward tenure, this is not as pervasive and perennial as never knowing life outside of the zoo.

In the *Opening* project, my own experience of the zoo was heightened by being given a template of subheadings that determined the structure of the writing. These were good categories to use from the standpoint of the field—recognizable and foundational to many discussions. However, the issues and categories provided were not necessarily the categories and questions that Asian American practical theologians might have started with or carried forward. In essence, I was asked to *play* "Asian American" (adding exoticism to white perspectives), yet conform to a template that was taken for granted as neutral, ensuring that my contribution would be recognizable and matched with others (in other words, exotic but not too exotic). Other authors expressed concern about the limitations of standardizing the structure of chapters, but I could not aggressively challenge what had been decided, acutely aware that I was part of the project at the good grace of others. In scholarly discourse at the center of the field with white colleagues whose names are well known, I am constantly aware that my participation is precarious and contingent because it is by invitation and affirmation that I remain.

Even now there is also risk and danger to calling attention to the cage I willingly put myself in or to the whole zoo system that is the academy. It could signal to my senior colleagues: "Does not play well with others" and even less savory: "Angry Asian woman." I can/could hardly afford to embarrass or alienate any colleague, let alone those who are eminent in the field. This would be tantamount to committing professional suicide.

Coercive mimeticism is a set-up for everyone involved if I do not wish to be an exotic zoo animal, and if no person of good conscience and liberal training wants unwittingly to be a zookeeper. Some of the tragic irony of all this is that including racial chapters in the *Opening* book was intended to honor and embody diversity. Despite noble intentions, instances of coercive mimeticism crop up repeatedly because the problem of racism is structural. Consider a dif-

ferent but related situation. A panel at the American Academy of Religion was organized to introduce the book, focusing on issues of unequal power, scholarly writing, and the implications for practical theology.[25] There were good colleagues who proposed the panel because they felt that these issues needed to be explored and opened up. However, even in envisioning this session, at first I was the only person of color invited to serve on the panel. The zoo is replicated without thought and sometimes without question. Even in writing this chapter, I have used the tools of the academy to challenge oppressive, implicit norms, but in doing so I implicitly legitimize the academy that I critique.[26]

While coercive mimeticism is found in every academic field, it is of particular concern in practical theology because it is a field that emerged from concerns about honoring diverse ways of knowing. Rather than allowing theology to be dominated by those who work mainly on a conceptual level, scholars in the late twentieth century who put a name to practical theology advocated for taking seriously lived experience. In a perverse way, coercive mimeticism has obscured lived experiences of marginalization *within* practical theology by not examining *our own* contexts and lived experiences. It leads to the domestication of contributions by scholars of color to practical theology, which undermines the field's historic commitment to broadening theological epistemologies. As long as research and writing by scholars of color are subject to sterilization and homogenization, the field continues to be shaped predominantly by white sensibilities, priorities, questions, and assumptions. Ultimately, unchecked racism, power, and privilege not only distort the labors of those in the field but also do violence to those we serve in the academy, in churches, or in the public sphere.

Analyzing the Conundrum

In describing the conundrum, I have relied on postcolonial and Asian American perspectives, but I turn to sociology, psychoanalytic theory, theology, and social psychology to point to the formative and damaging role of images in coercive mimeticism. Underlying the conundrum is a general principle about

---

25   "*Opening the Field of Practical Theology* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2014): Exploring a New Textbook through Intersectionality," Panel session at the American Academy of Religion, San Diego, November 22, 2014.

26   This is a concern raised from the perspective of Asian women in Yoko Arisaka, "Asian Women: Invisibility, Locations, and Claims to Philosophy," in *Women of Color in Philosophy*, ed. Naomi Zack (New York: Blackwell), 219.

the formation and impact of images on the self, which sociologist Charles Horton Cooley theorized early in the twentieth century. He coined the notion of the "looking-glass self,"[27] which describes how a person comes to see herself through the eyes of others. She learns to relate to herself in ways that reflect how she imagines others have experienced and evaluated her, based on her experience of them.[28] Other people's images of her become her own, which is especially problematic if one is minoritized.

From a psychoanalytic perspective, the looking-glass self (and thereby the potential for coercive mimeticism) begins to form early in life and continues into adulthood. Pediatrician and psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott noticed that children who were raised in coercive environments where parents were overbearing or controlling could not be spontaneous or creative. He observed this of adults as well, where adults were *less alive* because they felt compelled to conform to what was expected of them.[29] An expectation is an image that is not only waiting to be fulfilled but can also convey the weight of obligation to conform.

Conforming to what is expected in order to be pleasing is normal to a degree, though chronic compliance has devastating psychological effects. It all but destroys the possibility of forming authentic self images while contributing to the formation of distorted self images. In this regard, racism that gives rise to mimeticism inevitably fosters a version of "illness" in minoritized communities. Of course, sometimes it feels necessary to conform to routines or to social norms that one believes will avoid the disapproval of others. Healthy individuals do this some of the time. However, less healthy people consistently and unconsciously perform a self that conforms to what they believe will be acceptable to others, with little room for creativity or spontaneity. Winnicott associates these ways of being with what he calls "false self."[30] A person is always negotiating between more and less false self according to what feels safe and appropriate at a given moment. If one feels the constant need for false self, it can lead to feeling dead, not real, or inauthentic, but false self cannot be

---

27   Charles Horton Cooley, *Human Nature and the Social Order* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902); see also George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

28   Leigh S. Shaffer, "From Mirror to Self-Recognition to the Looking-Glass Self: Exploring the Justification Hypothesis," *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 61 (2005): 54.

29   D.W. Winnicott, *Home Is Where We Start From*, ed. Clare Winnicott, Ray Sheperd and Madeleine Davis (New York: Norton, 1986), 39–54.

30   D.W. Winnicott, *The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment; Studies in the Theory of Emotional Development* (New York: International Universities Press, 1965), 142–43.

banished. For those who are marginalized, coercive mimeticism is performing false self but also with the obligation to objectify oneself in ways that confirm what is expected. Even more, coercive mimeticism involves not letting oneself (let alone others) know that one is performing false self. As a minoritized person, one's self image becomes more and more based on deception.

In addition to thinking psychoanalytically about the role of images in coercive mimeticism, I find the notion of *imago Dei* (image of God) helpful in reflecting theologically. The sheer idea that human beings are created in God's image is a radical one. In contrast to formative social images that are ubiquitous and in many cases damaging (e.g., stereotypes), the notion of *imago Dei* helps us to fathom the possibility of a divine image within us that may be hidden but is never destroyed. Coercive mimeticsm opposes and obscures *imago Dei* within the powerful as well as the minoritized, forming all of us with unholy images.

As a doctrine, *imago Dei* has a long history of usage and has many meanings, but I am drawn to Rubén Rosario Rodríguez's argument that understanding *imago Dei* should be based on the "other." He retrieves how the Cappadocian Fathers in early Christianity into the fourth century understood slaves to reflect the image of God, elevating their status in ways that challenged cultural norms. Forming a theological response to racism, Rodríguez uses this historical theology, as well as drawing on 16th century Calvinism and the example of Jesus, to reaffirm an understanding of *imago Dei* that is oriented toward the other.[31] From this perspective, the notion of *imago Dei* implies that one of the ways that a person is created in God's image is insofar as (s)he has "the freedom and capacity to transform the world through [his/her] work," drawing on critical, creative gifts.[32] In this view, the recognition and empowerment of the other are vital to the image of God being seen and known.

Imago Dei cannot be experienced and known in itself, unmediated, but only as it is mediated socially. My overall self-image, and thereby my indirect sense of *imago Dei*, have been misshaped by being forced constantly to decode images of what I am not—not a perpetual foreigner, not a model minority, and not an as-good-as-white academic. *My experience of God's image within me is distorted by a lifetime of experiences of being seen by others who see me as "other" and who have the power to construct, and more particularly, the power to construct me, by their gaze.* Being "othered" makes it difficult for me to embody God's image in transforming the world. As various dominant cultures enact

---

31   Rubén Rosario Rodríguez, *Racism and God-Talk: A Latino/a Perspective* (New York: New York University Press, 2008), 148–49.

32   Rodríguez, *Racism and God-Talk*, 173.

images that ostensibly reflect who I am, I am mirrored as "different from," "less than," or "needing to conform to," the "right" (dominant) images. No matter how much accurate mirroring one receives, it is difficult to undo internalized stereotypes.

Coercive mimeticism gives white colleagues false images of themselves that obscure historic, ongoing, unexamined habits of racism. Many colleagues have the impression that they are "celebrating the diversity" by adding people of color to their midst but without examining deeper and more threatening issues of unequal power in the academy and elsewhere. As it is commonly used, the language of "embracing diversity" assumes that God's image, captured in the richness and variety of humanity, can be witnessed and experienced firsthand and without contradiction. The assumption that we just need to "be ourselves" suggests no awareness of how truly futile it is for those who are racially labeled as "other." Liberal colleagues often take the mere presence of Asian Americans (and other scholars of color) among them as evidence of embracing diversity and seeing them "truly." Coercive mimeticism deforms and harms white colleagues through a lack of critical self-awareness of their role in the zoo.

Coercive mimeticism is incubated by a larger system of white supremacy that allows practical theologians (and Christians more broadly) to base assumptions about the collective "we" on white experiences, captured and represented in images that are taken for granted yet have profound power. This is a problem that practical theologians share with the wider theological academy. As a source of theological normativity, church history has long been read, studied, and taught as if North-Atlantic-Europe and North American were the center of Christianity.[33] There has been a historic assumption that "we" are "intellectual, spiritual, and even genetic heirs" to the unproblematic melding of a movement inspired by a radical Jew from Galilee, with Greco-Roman culture in Hellenistic times, followed by the conversion of Germanic peoples.[34] By separating mission studies from church history, this skewed view of church history teaches white people to imagine that the people of God have been those who are like "us," and everyone else is understood to have assimilated into a dominant history and identity.[35] Likewise, theologians (including practical theologians) have been trained in historical critical methods that inter-

---

33   Justo L. Gonzáles, *The Changing Shape of Church History* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice, 2002), 9.

34   Gonzáles, *The Changing Shape of Church History*, 16.

35   For an African American view of the racist nature of Christian imagination, see Willie James Jennings, *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010).

pret the biblical text from Eurocentric perspectives.[36] Such methods have long been assumed to be neutral, perhaps even lending a social scientific (read: scientific, "objective") air to hermeneutics. Although biblical hermeneutics are dominated by white perspectives, they are not marked as "white biblical hermeneutics."[37] To do their work, practical theologians habitually turn to theological disciplines without considering their racial bias, which reinforces the felt rightness and normalcy of the zoo.

Widening the analysis, one can argue that coercive mimeticism in practical theology is fueled by larger social patterns, drawing from an unconscious well of biased images. The Implicit Project at Harvard University has produced numerous studies, some of which address the implicit nature of racial bias and racial understanding. An important finding of the Project is that our behavior is less predicated on explicit beliefs about race than on implicit associations with social groups, which I understand to be images.[38] For example, one study finds, "In whom we trust is not only a reflection of who is worthy; it is also a reflection of who we are."[39] An unfamiliar white face is found to be more trustworthy than an unfamiliar African American face, not because respondents were white, but because respondents of different races hold certain associations (images) of whites and blacks that influence their perceptions.[40] An implication for our discussion is that biased images about what is good and right seep into everyday decisions, no matter how liberal or enlightened our beliefs may be.

Responding Collectively to Coercive Mimeticism

Coercive mimeticism is the responsibility of everyone in the practical theology community; it is a conundrum that harms everyone and must be addressed collectively. A single theorist cannot legislate a grand plan for responding to coercive mimeticism. Eventually all members of the practical theology

---

36   Kwok Pui Lan draws on studies that document how Western biblical interpretation has been historically shaped by a European Orientalist agenda. Kwok Pui-lan, *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 4–5.

37   Liew, *Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics*, 3.

38   Damian A. Stanley et al., "Implicit Race Attitudes Predict Trustworthiness Judgments and Economic Trust Decisions," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108, no. 19 (May 10, 2011), 7713. doi:10.1073/pnas.1014345108. http://www.pnas.org/content/108/19/7710.abstract.

39   Stanley et al., "Implicit Race Attitudes," 7714.

40   Stanley et al., "Implicit Race Attitudes," 7713.

community must be involved in discerning collaborative action in the many settings in which the conundrum arises. Of course, the practical theology community does not only involve scholars; but coercive mimeticism is an academic conundrum. My hope is that as a practical theology community, we can become more culturally competent, empathic, and capable of empowering one another.

Given its systemic, historic, institutionalized nature, coercive mimeticism cannot easily be solved. Like other scholars, we practical theologians do not know how to operate within the academy without coercive mimeticism. For now, practical theologians must work from the modest places where we stand, feeling our way toward being a more life-giving scholarly community. In what follows, I propose three areas of work that involve small steps toward building a practical theology community less singularly on our scholarship, which is the foundation of the current community, but also more focused on how we relate to one another in ways that make us better servants.

Acknowledging the Mess We Are In

Admitting to ourselves and to one another that we are complicit in creating and maintaining a harmful, chronic conundrum involves taking the same baby steps repeatedly. The problem is that no one wants to keep in the forefront his/her role in the zoo of which Chow and Berger speak. For practical theologians who belong to the dominant group, being a zookeeper is shaming and embarrassing. Few people in the field, if any, intentionally practice racism, colonialism, or other forms of prejudice. These activities run counter to what many of my white colleagues espouse and which some actively seek to redress. Many white colleagues tire of acknowledging and implicitly feeling responsible for the alienation that unconscious representation, difference, and unequal power create. At the same time, minoritized scholars are weary not only of being zoo animals but also of continuing to acknowledge being oppressed. Change happens all too slowly, and it requires persistent vulnerability and enormous energy to name, much less engage, what few if any want to discuss. These are all good reasons that have kept practical theologians from becoming aware of coercive mimeticism. As importantly, these same reasons will continue to give us incentive to *minimize, forget,* or *ignore* the mess we are in despite its deleterious effects.

Acknowledging the ugliness of our situation entails being dedicated to learning, after the fact, how we avoid the hard work of addressing difference, power, and privilege and why we are motivated not to see, not to know, and not to discuss them. It means taking the time to notice and reflect when we have unwittingly returned to business as usual, slipping back into oblivious-

ness about the zoo despite our best intentions. For example, we might begin to discern a pattern of silences among colleagues when issues of "diversity" arise and explore together what the silences mean. Some might feel that they do not know enough about racism to speak competently about it. Others might feel that academic life should focus on ideas, not on personal dynamics between and among people. Some might feel that we should avoid discussing divisive issues that threaten the sense of community that we make efforts to build. Others still might feel that it is too dangerous or futile to speak about race, power, and privilege because no one can be trusted and nothing seems to change.

We need ongoing conversations that help us to stay with and patiently return to issues of racism and how it manifests as coercive mimeticism. Significant growth through dialogue cannot happen on a large scale in the field—not yet at least.

Creating Alliances across Difference

Honest, open conversations between and among people across race and power differentials can only be practiced one-on-one or in small groups of people where trust and shared commitment can, over time, gradually deepen and grow organically and authentically. Of course, nearly everyone has friends, family members, or colleagues who are of another race. However, we need more than the acquaintanceships and the kind of functional relationships that we have with most colleagues, which require little personal investment or risk. Merely being in mixed company, even if habitually, is not enough. In fact, primarily cultivating "professional" and "non-personal" relationships only serves to inhibit if not foreclose the kinds of conversations and work that must take place.

We need to partner individually with someone of a different social location to help us see what we cannot and do not want to see. What I have in mind is deep, regular engagement across difference as we practice anti-racism and empathy on an everyday basis, as we go about the work of practical theology. By developing such close relationships, we can increasingly serve as a staunch ally, gadfly, and muse to one another. We need an ally who is trustworthy, who is committed to helping us address our complicity with racism, and who mirrors to us our capacity to be better. We need a colleague who we feel understands what it is like, for example, to be white and held accountable for power and privilege we never asked for, or to be minoritzed and forced to participate in our own captivity. We need a loving gadfly to challenge our assumptions about race and bring us consistently and gently back to tension that we would rather not face within ourselves and between us. We need a muse

to inspire us to speak more powerfully from our own experiences of race and culture. Of course, our partner(s) needs all the same things from us. If a reader manages to develop a relationship with *one* colleague in practical theology (or elsewhere) with whom to engage this work, the reader will have achieved a vital accomplishment.

New alliances that bridge differences in race and power can also be formed within small groups. Of course, participating in small groups that help people become more culturally competent is a more challenging venture than working one-on-one. Pastoral theologian Sharon Thornton provides a simple example when she describes being a white pastor at a Japanese American church in Chicago. Over time, Thornton is "adopted" by this small community.[41] She writes, "As I grew within my new community, I was changed, not by choice or necessarily by design, but through a gradual process that involved having my previous worldview challenged, modified, and complicated. Becoming adopted by my new community involved relinquishing some of the assumptions I had grown up with [in a family of British descent]."[42] Thornton admits that the process of relinquishing assumptions is not easy because it involves a sense of grief, as one loses "what is given, stable, and secure."[43] However, relinquishment is nothing less than an act of faith that can be enlivening, as one gains new eyes for beholding, appreciating, and being influenced by the life worlds of others.[44] Few of us may have the experience of being a minority in an unfamiliar culture for long periods of time or being "adopted" by another community. However, the challenge of relinquishing the familiar confronts us every time we research faith communities that are "other" to us.[45]

Ultimately, we are working toward forming alliances within small groups constituted of diverse members, which is the most challenging task of all. Each

---

41   Thornton could not write as eloquently about pastoring a Japanese American church had she not fallen in love with Fumitaka Matsuoka, who is Japanese American. Likewise, in writing about racism, Matsuoka would be less able to reach a wide audience had he not been in the habit of practicing conversation with Thornton across race. Thornton and Matsuoka model the kind of deep one-on-one relationship that I describe.

42   Sharon G. Thornton, "America of the Broken Heart," in *Realizing the America of Our Hearts: Theological Voices of Asian Americans*, ed. Fumitaka Matsuoka and Eleazar S. Fernandez (St. Louis, MO: Chalice, 2003), 204.

43   Thornton, "America of the Broken Heart," 204.

44   Thornton, "America of the Broken Heart," 204.

45   For an example of a theorist who is challenged and informed by the "otherness" of the faith community that she studies, see Mary McClintock Fulkerson, *Places of Redemption: Theology for a Worldly Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

person will tend to work, however consciously, to create and sustain group cohesion, often at the expense of addressing issues that create tension. Diverse small groups become settings in which to practice the cultural competence, empathy, and sensitivity learned in more established relationships where we have given and received much support.

Creating new alliances that traverse race and power destabilizes the politics of "cross-ethnic representation" that Chow describes. Some "taken-to-be-true" images of the "other" may be revealed, explored, and tested. While many of us will likely continue, at moments, to operate in terms of familiar images, we have the opportunity to revise them. As Thornton describes her own process of relinquishing Eurocentric assumptions, the process is neither "smooth" nor "seamless" nor completely "voluntary" nor "rational."[46] Her insights suggest that images of the "other" cannot be reasoned or shifted entirely, but must be altered through the slow process of cultivating intimate relationships with those who do not share our perspectives and experiences in terms of race. In "living experiences together," as Winnicott would say, we know the possibility of *continuing* to explore and amend what we have taken to be the case.

For most of us (practical theologians), continuing to acknowledge the painful predicament of coercive mimeticism and cultivating alliances across race in intimate settings are the work of a lifetime. The most important decision each of us must make is whether or not cultivating deep relationships across difference is optional. It is within the power of each person to decide how open we are to encounters with those who do not share our social location and how much time and energy we are willing to devote to making alliances across difference. One can come up with any number of excuses, which are among the many resistances to relinquishing what we know and are used to.

Identifying and Challenging Racializing Practices

A practical theology community that is gaining strength by acknowledging our complicity with racism and by building new alliances across difference has the simultaneous task of learning to identify and challenge racializing practices— both after they emerge and as they arise. Racializing practices are those that race people according to various dominant cultures, often while being taken for granted.

Racializing practices shape the dynamics of "rhetorical spaces" in practical theology. Feminist theorist Lorraine Code writes, "Rhetorical spaces... are

---

46   Thornton, "America of the Broken Heart," 204.

fictive but not fanciful or fixed locations, whose (tacit, rarely spoken) territorial imperatives structure and limit the kinds of utterances that can be voiced within them with a reasonable expectation of uptake and 'choral support': an expectation of being heard, understood, taken seriously."[47] In rhetorical spaces, argues Code, *who* is making claims, *where*, and *why* determine how reality is construed, as certain claims about experience are acknowledged while others are ignored, critiqued or discounted.[48] Code describes the dynamics of negotiating rhetorical spaces in terms of voicing claims, being heard, and support for claims being "echoed" (my words) in the process of determining what counts as knowledge. These auditory images are a version of Winnicott's notion of mirroring (a visual image which conveys the importance of being seen in a way that contributes to one feeling alive).[49] In both cases, Code and Winnicott draw attention to the importance of validation and the intersubjective nature of human knowing (in the case of Code) and relational nature of human maturing (in the case of Winnicott).

Uncovering the racializing practices within practical theological discourse in both speaking and writing requires recognizing how we are all affected by racism. Focused exclusively on "the work," we persistently ignore or forget that the field is shaped not only by the content of what is presented or published but also by a hidden layer of politics that determine what is written or taught, how the field is narrated, and who are understood to be the major players. Code helps us to consider how the processes of discourse in practical theology actually "remake and alter" representations of experience or reality.[50] To unmask and challenge racializing practices, conversation partners working across difference would need to help one another become sensitive to the unspoken, normative principles by which knowledge is produced.

Mostly without conscious thought, normative principles are operationalized through cultural practices that give white scholars (perhaps men more than women) confidence in the "choral support" they receive for their ideas. They have reasonable expectations that they will be "seen" by their white peers

---

47   Lorraine Code, *Rhetorical Spaces: Essays on Gendered Locations* (New York: Routledge, 1995), ix.

48   Code, *Rhetorical Spaces*, x.

49   Winnicott is attentive to the impact of images in one's environment that form a human being, particularly the image of mother's face as she responds with loving attentiveness, distractedly, or not at all. As if looking in a mirror, we see her face and by her response to us we sense who we are. D.W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (London; New York: Routledge, 2005), 151.

50   Code, *Rhetorical Spaces*, x.

in ways that help to maintain their sense of authority, encourage their development as scholars, and ground them in a sense of belonging to rhetorical spaces in practical theology. Beaudoin and Turpin identify some of these taken-for-granted practices in their chapter on white practical theology in *Opening the Field*, for example, a focus on the individual, white supremacy, and orderliness and procedural clarity.[51] In addition, there are myriad, subtle practices that communicate to nonwhite scholars what language, values, and assumptions will allow their scholarship to be recognized and appreciated by white readers of practical theology. Scholars of color who have climbed the ranks of the academy have been so well trained in these practices that these habits may be difficult to identify. Colleagues working across difference can help one another see what one's own group is perhaps less able to see.

Writing confessionally about race is an example of a racializing practice. Chow argues that Asian Americans and other scholars of color are expected to "confess" repeatedly, in this case, expected to divulge the "ethnic secrets" of their group.[52] This chapter is a form of public confession, as I try to open up my experience of writing the Asian American practical theologies chapter in *Opening the Field*. Similarly, the *Opening* chapter attempts to provide an inside view of Asian American approaches to practical theology.

In practical theology, there is particular openness to confessional forms of writing because experience is taken seriously as a basis for understanding practices. Confession can be found in spiritual autobiographies,[53] narratives or testimonies in preaching and teaching,[54] and practical theological methods that accommodate the subjective.[55] It is not unusual for scholars to write personally and even vulnerably as part of their approach to practical theology.[56] Chow writes that in the West there has been a turn toward the self-referential, especially as a response to the rejection of metanarratives in postmodernity.[57]

51   Beaudoin and Turpin, "White Practical Theology," 255–59.

52   Chow, *Protestant Ethnic*, 116.

53   For example, see Denise M. Ackerman, *After the Locusts: Letters from a Landscape of Faith* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003).

54   For example, see Anne Streaty Wimberly, *Soul Stories: African American Christian Education* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994).

55   For example, see Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore, "Dynamics of Religious Culture: Ethogenic Method," in *International Handbook of the Religious, Moral and Spiritual Dimensions in Education, Vol 1*, ed. M. de Souza et al. (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 2006), 415–31.

56   For example, see James Newton Poling, *Rethinking Faith: A Constructive Practical Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011).

57   Chow, *Protestant Ethnic*, 112–13.

What makes confessing problematic for scholars of color, says Chow, is that confessing fulfills white expectations of ethnic availability to be seen and known as other.[58] "Confessing" is not my "native" style of speaking or what would be considered normative within my own Japanese American community. However, I write confessionally about race in conformity with a practice that is valued and intelligible to those in the center of the field, which suggests that I tacitly accept my captivity in the zoo. At the same time, because I seek not only to identify but also to unsettle coercive mimeticism, I must speak outside the bounds of what is expected, offering images that destabilize what is taken for granted so that we might try to take alternative steps together. If I do not, colleagues will remain unaware of my experience, and I aid the perpetuation of coercive mimeticism.

Confessing for white theorists is neither required, nor common, nor encouraged. Some white scholars situate themselves as authors; naming particulars such as gender, socio-economic background, racial heritage, and sometimes sexual orientation. This practice acknowledges that an author's context matters, affecting how scholarship is approached. However, white colleagues rarely write *confessionally* in terms of whiteness. As in other fields, white practical theologians are not expected to be articulate how their whiteness, their experience of it, and their formation in it affects their thinking, research, and writing.

Beaudoin and Turpin's chapter is a striking departure that challenges the practice of not writing about whiteness. Their writing is not confessional in the sense that they speak personally, but more in the sense that they address what is regarded as unnecessary and is uncomfortable for white scholars to discuss. By transgressing white privilege, it feels vulnerable and honest. If more white colleagues reflected critically about their whiteness, it would shift the practice of confession from being a coercive practice for those on the margins to a practice that involves "epistemic responsibility" in Code's words. One might argue that not all scholarly conversations require one to discuss one's race, but coercive mimeticism does not belong to study of race alone. Not accounting for one's race in scholarly writing perpetuates racializing practices in the rhetorical spaces of practical theology.

As the case of Beaudoin and Turpin's chapter demonstrates, the courage and wisdom to challenge coercive mimeticism comes from small groups where there is sufficient trust and support. Their chapter emerged within a small, face-to-face meeting of authors over the course of several days. To analyze the

58   Chow, *Protestant Ethnic*, 115.

situation using Chow and Berger's analogy, when Beaudoin and Turpin real-
ized that the white authors in the book project were in the role of zookeepers,
they refused to remain in that role. Their chapter was a gesture of empathy,
in effect saying to the scholars of color on the project, "If your work is going
to be subjected to racialization, we (white authors) can subject ourselves to it
as well." By turning a critical gaze on themselves, they disturbed the privilege
of whiteness not being scrutinized, giving others (including people of color)
the "right to look."[59] The chapter was the result of a spontaneous, collective
response to coercive mimeticism—perhaps not only for the purpose of filling
an intellectual gap, which it did, but also to practice being a more just practical
theology community.

My own writing that challenges power and privilege within practical theol-
ogy emerges from working one-on-one and in small groups, where I felt heard
and valued by white colleagues. I would not have dared to speak publicly or to
write about coercive mimeticism without their encouragement, support, and
feedback. White and minoritized colleagues underestimate their own capacity
to give hope in taking on together what is hard—not only by writing critically
but in being with and for one another.

Coercive mimeticism is a conundrum from which we will probably never be
completely free, but I see pockets of hope for the field. When I participate in
small breakthroughs, where colleagues engage in honest conversation about
race and power, I take heart. When I read brave pieces of scholarship, like
Beaudoin and Turpin's chapter on white practical theology or Dreyer's work on
reflexivity, I feel that I am not alone. I am encouraged by a growing interest in
postcolonial theory, which is being addressed by theorists in multiple subdis-
ciplines of practical theology. There seems to be a willingness to look within,
recognizing oppression not only in faith communities but also within our own
ranks. Perhaps a young field like practical theology must reach a certain stage
in its development to be able to tolerate and respond well to internal critiques
of power and privilege within the field. Perhaps this essay, and this larger book,
will serve to facilitate that constructive and collaborative movement.

Bibliography

Ackerman, Denise M. *After the Locusts: Letters from a Landscape of Faith*. Grand Rapids,
MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

---

59   Mirzoeff, *The Right to Look*.

Andrews, Dale P. "African American Practical Theology." In *Opening the Field of Prac-
tical Theology: An Introduction*, edited by Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S.
Mikoski, 11–29. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.
Arisaka, Yoko. "Asian Women: Invisibility, Locations, and Claims to Philosophy." In
Women of Color and Philosophy: A Critical Reader, 209–34, edited by Naomi Zack.
New York: Blackwell, 2000.
Beaudoin, Tom and Katherine Turpin. "White Practical Theology." In *Opening the Field
of Practical Theology: An Introduction*, edited by Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon
S. Mikoski, 251–69. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.
Berger, John. *About Looking*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
Cahalan, Kathleen A., and Gordon S. Mikoski, eds. *Opening the Field of Practical Theol-
ogy: An Introduction*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.
Cheryan, S., & Bodenhausen, G.V. "Model Minority." In *Routledge Companion to Race &
Ethnicity*. Edited by S.M. Caliendo and C.D. McIlwain, 173–76. New York: Routledge,
2011.
Chow, Rey. *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Columbia
University Press, 2002.
Code, Lorraine. *Rhetorical Spaces: Essays on Gendered Locations*. New York: Routledge,
1995.
Cooley, Charles Horton. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1902.
Du Bois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Rockville, MD: Arc Manor, 2008.
Espiritu, Yen Le. "Asian American Panethnicity: Challenges and Possibilities." In *The
State of Asian America: Trajectory of Civic and Political Engagement; A Public Policy
Report*, edited by Paul M. Ong, 119–36. Los Angeles: LEAP Asian Pacific American
Public Policy Institute, 2008.
Fulkerson, Mary McClintock. *Places of Redemption: Theology for a Worldly Church*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Gonzáles, Justo L. *The Changing Shape of Church History*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice, 2002.
Goto, Courtney T. "Asian American Practical Theologies." In *Opening the Field of Prac-
tical Theology: An Introduction*, edited by Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S.
Mikoski, 31–44. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.
Jennings, Willie James. *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race*.
New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
Jones, Serene and Paul Lakeland, eds., *Consructive Theology: A Contemporary Approach
to Classical Themes*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005.
Kim, Nami. "The 'Indigestible' Asian: The Unifying Term 'Asian' in Theological Dis-
course." In *Off the Menu: Asian and Asian North American Women's Religion and
Theology*, edited by Rita Nakashima Brock, Jung Ha Kim, Kwok Pui Lan, and Seung
Ai Yang, 23–44. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007.

Kim-Cragg, HyeRan. "Between and Beyond Asian-ness: A Voice of a Postcolonial Hybrid Korean-Canadian Diaspora." In *What Young Asian Theologians Are Thinking*, edited by Leow Theng Huat, 90–102. Singapore: Trinity Theological College, 2015.

Kwok, Pui-lan. *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2005.

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. *What is Asian American Hermeneutics? Reading the New Testament*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.

Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Translated by Howard Greenfeld. Expanded edition with an introduction by Jean-Paul Sartre and afterword Susan Gilson Miller. Boston: Beacon, 1991.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. *The Right to Look: A Counterhistory of Visuality*. Durham, NC: Duke University, 2011.

Moore, Mary Elizabeth Mullino. "Dynamics of Religious Culture: Ethogenic Method." In *International Handbook of the Religious, Moral and Spiritual Dimensions in Education, Vol 1*, edited by Marian de Souza, Kathleen Engebretson, Gloria Durka, Robert Jackson and Andrew McGrady, 415–431. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 2006.

Osajima, Keith. "Asian Americans as the Model Minority: An Analysis of the Popular Press Image in the 1960s and 1980s." In *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies*, edited by Gary Okihiro, Shirley Hune, Arthur A. Hansen, and John M. Liu, 164–74. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press, 1988.

Poling, James Newton *Rethinking Faith: A Constructive Practical Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2011.

Robinson, Elaine A. *Race and Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2012.

Rodríguez, Rubén Rosario. *Racism and God-Talk: A Latino/a Perspective*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Shaffer, Leigh S. "From Mirror to Self-Recognition to the Looking-Glass Self: Exploring the Justification Hypothesis." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 61 (2005): 47–65.

Spivak, Gayri Chakravorty. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography." Chap. 12 in *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Stanley, Damian A., Peter Sokol-Hessner, Mahzarin R. Banaji, and Elizabeth A. Phelps. "Implicit Race Attitudes Predict Trustworthiness Judgments and Economic Trust Decisions." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108, no. 19 (May 10, 2011): 7710–15. Accessed May 15, 2015. doi:10.1073/pnas.1014345108.

Thornton, Sharon G. "America of the Broken Heart." In *Realizing the America of Our Hearts: Theological Voices of Asian Americans*, edited by Fumitaka Matsuoka and Eleazar S. Fernandez, 200–13. St. Louis, MO: Chalice, 2003.

Visweswaran, Kamala. "Predicaments of the Hyphen." In *Our Feet Walk the Sky: Women of the South Asian Diaspora*. Edited by Women of South Asian Descent Collective, 301–12. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute, 1993.

Wimberly, Anne Streaty. *Soul Stories: African American Christian Education*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994.

Winnicott, D.W. *Home Is Where We Start From*, edited by Clare Winnicott, Ray Sheperd and Madeleine Davis. New York: Norton, 1986.

Winnicott, D.W. *The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment; Studies in the Theory of Emotional Development*. New York: International Universities Press, 1965.

Winnicott, D.W. *Playing and Reality*. London; New York: Routledge, 2005.