

2. Much of this information can be found in my work, *Native American Pentecost: Praxis, Contextualization, Transformation* (Cleveland: Cherochala Press, 2012).
3. Clara Sue Kidwell, Homer Noley, and George E. Tinker, *Native American Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001), 12.
4. William G. McLoughlin, *Cherokees and Missionaries, 1789-1839* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 207-208.
5. Rayna Green and Melanie Fernandez, *The British Museum Encyclopedia of Native North America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 152-153.
6. Frank Blythe and Carol Cornsilk, "Spiral of Fire," *Indian Country Diaries*. PBS, <http://bit.ly/postcol5-168>, June 16, 2008. Walker is one of the few living links to the ancient oral history of the Cherokee.
7. James Mooney, "Myths of the Cherokee," *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution 1897-1898 by J.W. Powell Director*, in Two Parts (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1902), 274.
8. Randy Woodley, *Living in Color: Embracing God's Passion for Ethnic Diversity* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2001), 94-95.
9. *Ibid.*, 134-135.
10. Charles H. Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), 259-260.
11. Paul G. Hiebert, R. Daniel Shaw, and Tite Tienou, *Understanding Folk Religion: A Christian Response to Popular Beliefs and Practices* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), 20.
12. Laurence French and Jim Hornbuckle, *The Cherokee Perspective: Written by Eastern Cherokees* (Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1981), 126-128.
13. Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness*, 265-266.
14. *Ibid.*, 213.
15. Amos Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s): A Pentecostal-Charismatic Contribution to Christian Theology of Religions* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark).
16. Hiebert, Shaw, and Tienou, *Understanding Folk Religion*.
17. Woodley, *Living in Color*, 50.
18. Woodley, *When Going to Church Is Sin and Other Essays on Native American Christian Missions*, p. 144.
19. Woodley, *When Going to Church Is Sin and Other Essays on Native American Christian Missions* (Chambersburg: Healing the Land, 2007), 140.
20. James Treat, *Native and Christian: Indigenous Voices on Religious Identity in the United States and Canada* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 13.
21. Woodley, *When Going to Church Is Sin*, 27-28.
22. Kidwell, Noley, and Tinker, *Native American Theology*, p. 12.
23. Mk 14:22-25.
24. R. D. Shaw, "Contextualizing the Power and the Glory," *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 12.3 (1995): 158.
25. Kimberly E. Alexander and R. H. Gause, *Women in Leadership: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Cleveland, TN: Center for Pentecostal Leadership and Care, 2006), 198.

POSTCOLONIAL WHITENESS: BEING-WITH IN WORSHIP

Sharon R. Fennema

I was leading a workshop on intercultural worship planning in a medium-sized urban mainline Protestant church a few years ago, and as we began our time together, I asked people to break into small groups and introduce themselves to each other by talking about their racial background and cultural heritage. As people milled about, settling into their small groups, a white woman came up to me and said, "I'm not sure what to say. I mean, I don't really have a culture; I'm just American. Is that what you mean, just say that I'm American?" Another person, overhearing our conversation chimed in, saying, "Yeah, you know, I'm white; I don't think I have a lot to contribute to a conversation on race." These two sentiments illustrate what prompts me to write this essay. In the crucial work of developing the connection between liturgical studies and postcolonial criticism, attention must be paid to the intersections of dominance, privilege, and power centered in colonial whiteness. The tendency of colonizing whiteness to be "both invisible to itself and the norm by which everything else is measured,"¹ requires critical engagement, especially in the context of Christian worship, which affirms the equal citizenship of all people in the Body of Christ. Thus, the question that motivates this essay is "How can white North American Christians embody *postcolonial* whiteness in their liturgical practices, and what might that contribute to the transformation sought by postcolonial criticism?"

I come to this work in postcolonial liturgy in the tenuous position of being both white and a born-and-raised citizen of the United States, among the many other subject positions I inhabit and perform. These locations of privilege make my participation in the discourse of postcolonialism problematic, because, at its heart, postcolonialism represents a conceptual reorientation that both contests the colonial way of seeing things and privileges the experiences of those seeking to extricate

themselves from the history of imperial dominance as its source. Yet, as Kwok Pui-lan suggests, the colonial process is doubly inscribed, affecting both the colonized and the colonizer, so likewise, the postcolonial process must involve both the colonized and the colonizer.² Even as she insists that "subalterns who experience the intersection of oppressions in the most immediate and brutal way have epistemological privileges in terms of articulating a postcolonial . . . theology,"³ she concludes that because of the multiple subject locations that all people inhabit, both the former colonizers and the formerly colonized are able to engage in postcolonial criticism, from different starting points and with different emphases. So it is from my starting point as a white, North American Christian, and citizen of the United States, committed to the work of dismantling colonial hegemony and imperial domination, that I undertake this endeavor. The crucial start to this inquiry lies in understanding the invisible and normative dynamics of whiteness.

Much of the work aimed at bringing whiteness into view as an area of study has occurred in the context of racial discourses. In these racial frameworks, whiteness is understood both as a physical signifier (a "skin color") and social status. But, more importantly, it represents a category of persons associated with notions of power and privilege, because of the historical associations of whiteness with superiority. To be white comes with a cadre of advantages, not the least of which is the invisibility of one's own racial identity. Where ethnic and racial minorities are often identified almost exclusively by their race, the racial identity of whiteness is most often imperceptible and unacknowledged, functioning instead as a sort of universal against which other races exist in contrast. Whiteness serves as the normative backdrop against which racial minorities come into view as different from, and often less than, normal. The power afforded this status as "normal" is embodied in an extensive web of privileges, including, importantly, the ability to understand oneself as unraced or neutral in racial discourses. Whiteness comes with a sense of culturelessness because it is "just there," the atmospheric backdrop against which other cultures appear as exotic and unique. The comments made by the two white workshop attendees illustrate these understandings of whiteness poignantly, as they articulated their understandings of themselves as unraced or neutral in the context of conversation about race, and cultureless in the context of expressing a cultural identity.

In reality, we may recognize that "whiteness" is not a monolithic identity, but rather, embraces many different physical manifestations and ethnicities. We may also acknowledge that there is nothing about whiteness that is inherently superior to any other race. We may even be able to conceive of characteristics and attributes of "white culture," demonstrating that it is just one culture among many in our world. Yet, the privileges of whiteness in the United States and around the globe are undeniable. And

with these privileges comes the power so often wielded over others, both intentionally and unintentionally.

While it may be hard to imagine overt manifestations of the power and privilege that constitute whiteness in racial discourse being part of Christian worship practices, the operation of whiteness as both invisible and normative within worshipping communities in the United States is pervasive. Consider this conversation I recently witnessed in a worship planning meeting I was attending. A regular attendee of worship for whom English is a second language filled out a form offering his time and talents to the community. On that form, he indicated an interest in reading scripture for worship, so his generous offer to share his gifts was brought to the worship committee who arranges for volunteers to take part in various aspects of the service. A discussion ensued among worship committee members about whether or not it would be "appropriate" for him to read scripture. Concerns were voiced about whether his "accent" would "obscure" the text. One person thought that the reading would feel less artistically prepared and would not exemplify the excellence they strive for in the worship of Almighty God. Another wondered if the volunteer would be able to read it thoughtfully if he was not sure what it meant. It was finally decided that this volunteer would be asked to serve as an usher, a position for which he had not volunteered, instead. In all of these comments, the invisible privilege of whiteness is at play, serving as the normative backdrop against which a person from a minority racial group was viewed as different from and less than "normal," affecting the ability of the members of the committee to perceive him as an "effective" worship leader. The people on this worship committee were not ill-intentioned or uncaring. What is more, they are part of a worshipping community that dedicates itself to the work of racial justice. And it is perhaps interesting to note that not all of them were white. And yet, the invisibility of whiteness, its culturelessness, resulted in the marginalization of this volunteer. From the "neutral" position of whiteness as a universal measure, the volunteer was considered inadequate. When someone who speaks with "an accent" is excluded from worship leadership because of concerns for intelligibility or artfulness, the invisible cultural aesthetics of whiteness are likely at play.

When we look at whiteness from the perspectives of postcolonial critique, a slightly different focus comes into view. In order to understand what *postcolonial* whiteness might look like, it is important to explore what whiteness came to be and mean in colonial contexts. Under the mechanisms of colonialism, whiteness functions less as the normative backdrop it is in racial discourse and more as an assumed right to dominate others, even where "white" might be associated with a minority identity. It is hard to imagine in colonial contexts, where colonizers were an extreme racial minority, that their whiteness was "invisible." Rather, its extreme visibility

served the purposes of domination through its deployment as superiority. Colonial whiteness, understood as a superiority, fostered practices of domination that denied the basic humanity of people of other racial/ethnic origins. Thus, whiteness becomes not only a signifier of power and privilege, as in the racial discourses, but also a symbol and enactment of displacement, domination, and claim-staking. While the invisibility and normativity of race serves as a component of the colonial system, particularly grounding foundational claims of the inferiority of indigenous peoples, it is only one component of a broader system of domination. Moreover, the legacies of this domination far outlast the demise of colonial rule. Even after decolonization, the cultural domination of whiteness persists, in colonized minds, bodies, spirits, and societies. As Alfred Lopez points out, "the cultural residues of whiteness linger in the postcolonial world as an ideal, often latently, sometimes not," and this ideal undergirds the continuation of colonial domination pervasively, beyond the boundaries of governance.⁴ With colonialism, racial differences are transformed into hierarchies that allow, if not necessitate, domination and subjugation. Postcolonial criticism helps us see that whiteness serves a cultural imperative achieving the designs of colonialism.

According to Ania Loomba, colonialism can be defined as "the conquest and control of other people's lands and goods."⁵ As such, modern colonializing drew colonizers and colonized into complex economic relationships, characterized by the dominance of whiteness. If colonialism was the means by which capitalism achieved global reach and influence, then the myth of white supremacy was the conduit through which people's land and goods were appropriated. At its heart, the colonizing force of whiteness turned the colonized person in to an object, a thing that could be (and was suited to be) owned, controlled, and used for profit. Thus, colonization becomes more than conquest of lands and goods; it is the ownership of the very people themselves. While in the context of race, whiteness embodies normativity and privilege; in the context of colonialism, whiteness embodies superiority, domination, and objectification. They are interrelated, but distinct.

How might this colonial understanding of whiteness help us understand and analyze Christian worship practices? Consider the ways in which the dynamics of domination associated with whiteness are manifested in the symbols of color related to the Christian liturgical year. Christian congregations whose patterns of worship are shaped by a lectionary, and, increasingly those who simply follow the contours of the liturgical year with its progression from the seasons of Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany to Lent, Easter, and Pentecost, often mark these seasonal changes with a predominant symbolic color: purple (or blue) for Advent and Lent, green for Epiphany, red for Pentecost, and white for Christmas and Easter.⁶ It is clear that whiteness is considered the appropriate color for the high holy

days in the Christian calendar (Christmas and Easter, but also the Baptism of Jesus, the Transfiguration, and Trinity Sunday), serving as a symbol of purity, honor, goodness, blessedness, sacredness; whiteness is associated with the manifestation of the Divine. While other colors mark other seasons, the only holy days where the color black is considered appropriate are Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and Holy Saturday, the "darkest" days of the liturgical year, associated with extreme penitence and the tremendous effects of sin and evil in the story of salvation history—holy, yes, but indelibly linked to human frailty and sinfulness. Drawing on images from scripture that associate God's presence with light and whiteness,⁷ the colors of the liturgical year reinforce the dominance of whiteness.⁸ The same logic of whiteness (understood as a superiority) that fostered practices of domination, denying the basic humanity of people of other racial/ethnic origins, underlies the color symbolism of the liturgical year, reinforcing the idea that whiteness is holy, a more fitting symbol for the Divine. While this analysis may seem facile, only scratching the surface of the way in which whiteness is deployed as domination in the context of worship, the subtle and pervasive messages of colonial whiteness embodied as superiority that justified the understanding of people of other races as objects that could be owned and controlled, shape and form Christian worshippers at a fundamental level through the symbolic uses of the color white in the liturgical year.

Looking at these formulations of whiteness, it is hard to imagine how it could ever serve the work of dismantling colonial hegemony and imperial domination, the transformations at the heart of postcolonial critique. In fact, whether conceived of as normative or superior, the privilege and dominance of whiteness seems inescapable. Alison Bailey describes the dilemma this way, "If I embrace the idea that being white is an unchangeable fact about my identity, and if white privilege is made possible by this system, then questions about how white people should act with regard to privilege can only be cast in terms of a choice between finding complex ways to use privilege safely or divesting from privilege."⁹ Bailey suggests that, rather than understanding whiteness as an essential racial identity tied inexorably to particular physical attributes, like skin color, we might be better served by understanding whiteness as a kind of style, a way of being in the world that, while related to physical traits, is not entirely dependent on them. Thus someone could act "whitely" without having light-complected skin, and persons who have white physical attributes could potentially *not* act in "whitely" ways.¹⁰ It might be helpful to think of these ways of being in the world, this whiteness as scripts. These scripts include "racism [as] a social/political system of domination that comes with expected performances, attitudes and behaviors, which reinforce and reinscribe unjust hierarchies."¹¹ In this context, it becomes possible to think about how one might find one's way out of the seemingly

inescapable exercises of privilege and power associated with whiteness. If whiteness is less an essential identity and more a way of being in the world, then, even if I cannot disavow myself and with the privilege others afford to me based on my perceived race, I can refuse to inhabit ways of being that promote white supremacy and replace them with habits that do not reinforce racial hierarchies.¹² Part of the process of transformation suggested by racial discourse is making the privilege of whiteness visible. And part of the process of transformation suggested by postcolonial discourse is disavowing practices that reinforce dominance and superiority. But also, part of both of these processes is making oneself accountable for privilege by collectively exploring strategies for redressing the effects of colonial racism. This, I believe, is the key to cultivating *postcolonial* whiteness.

In his introduction to *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, Alfred J. Lopez proposes that the crucial task of postcolonial whiteness resides in embodying the contours of what philosopher Martin Heidegger called *Miteinander*: Being-with. He argues, "It is the learning of a postcolonial *Miteinander*, this being with others after the fact of domination, abuse and outright murder of them, that constitutes the ground of the most important negotiation between erstwhile colonizers and colonized that postcolonial studies can offer."¹³ This Being-with requires an honest assessment of whiteness and the ways in which one inhabits whiteness in relation to histories of oppression and domination of others. The powers and privileges of whiteness must be uncovered. It also requires a more nuanced understanding of the ways in which power structures the relationships between those in the dominant group and those subjected to that dominance. But, more than anything, Being-with requires mutual recognition between whiteness and its "others" in such a way as to reveal their interdependence. Key to the cultivation of Being-with is the fostering of a spirit of interrelatedness with others. As Bailey might say, we need to learn to perform a new script of whiteness, a post-empire whiteness that operates with mutual recognition in solidarity.

The "Being-with" that Lopez identifies as the primary gesture of postcolonial whiteness recognizes that we cannot understand ourselves outside of the relationships we have to and with others. These relationships reveal, embody, and rely upon our interdependence on one another, and that interdependence is indispensable to us. They also rely on a fundamental reorientation from positions of colonizer over colonized, oppressor over oppressed, to reciprocal relations between equal human beings. The moment of encounter with another, and the recognition of our interdependence, brings both a reckoning and a responsibility: reckoning with the realities of privilege and dominance; responsibility for transforming those realities. The mutuality being fostered by postcolonial whiteness is not a feel-good affirmation of difference (e.g., I'm OK, you're OK),

but rather a fundamental orientation toward mutual flourishing that radically challenges and seeks to unravel white privilege, domination, and the assumptions about supremacy that undergird them.

Perhaps the journey toward cultivating liturgical practices that embody postcolonial whiteness begins with creating non-dominating encounters with difference in the context of worship. These encounters must go beyond the surface-level engagement of what John Witvliet calls "ethnotourism"¹⁴ or the self-aimed gestures of inclusion that rely on the power of an in-group to invite or include "others," reaching toward a deeper level of interrelationality, that is, understanding oneself and one's community as integrally related to and constituted by others. How might we imagine worship practices that create an encounter with another, that foster the recognition of our interdependence, bringing both a reckoning with the realities of privilege and dominance and a sense of responsibility for transforming those realities?

In the context of twenty-first-century Christian worship practices in the United States, one of the most common encounters with difference happens through music. Even in communities perceived to be racially, ethnically, and culturally monolithic, music from different cultures is often sung, played, and experienced. Increasingly, this takes the form of purposefully incorporating so-called "global music" in the context of worship.¹⁵ The sincere desire motivating this movement in most worshipping communities is, as Michael Hawn puts it, for "worshippers in the United States [to] experience the drama of salvation from a different cultural perspective . . . in order to understand and more fully appreciate the sacrifice and salvation of the Incarnation."¹⁶ Tied to both an affirmation of the Incarnation as a manifestation of the Holy in the specificity of a human life as it is lived concretely located in culture and race, and the affirmation of the unity and equality called for by our membership in the Body of Christ, the theological practices fostered by these musical encounters have the potential to embody the modalities of postcolonial whiteness. Yet, too often, they fall short of becoming a postcolonial gesture, instead embodying the colonial domination and racial privilege of whiteness.

When white Westerners "take" the music of cultures from other parts of the globe without attending to the power dynamics at play, it serves to renew the binary between colonizer and colonized instead of dismantling it. It is a play of power and domination that suggests that whiteness has an inherent right and ability to appropriate the cultural expressions of another group of people. When music from different cultures is chosen to make worship more lively, emotional, or exciting, without regard to the specificity of its context, it serves to exorcize other cultures, creating a rift between "us" and "them" rather than establishing our interrelationality.¹⁷ When music is used to represent a culture, for example, singing a song in Spanish on Cinco de Mayo, it embodies a kind of tokenism,

reductionistically portraying a culture based on one expression and asking that expression to "represent" the vast complexities of a group of people in a superficial way. When intercultural engagement with music is not rooted in developing an understanding of the cultures and peoples from which the music originates, or when it masks and hides the dynamics of colonialism at play in the music itself, then it risks promoting communal-ity at the expense of recognizing difference. If these methods for engaging in intercultural musical encounters serve to reinforce the colonizing power of whiteness, how might different approaches embody *postcolonial* whiteness and contribute to the transformation sought by postcolonial criticism? The hymn "Many and Great, O God, Are Your Works / Wakantanka Taku Nitawa" can serve as a case study.

This hymn, known primarily by the title "Many and Great," is included in many of the hymnals produced by mainline Protestant denominations in the United States in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, including the United Methodist, Chalice, and New Century hymnals, among many others. It is commonly identified as the "Dakota Hymn," described in the *New Century Hymnal*, for example, as "the best-known Native American hymn."¹⁸ It is often sung as a purposeful encounter with difference by worshipping communities seeking to honor and engage the cultures of the indigenous peoples of the United States, sometimes in conjunction with holidays such as Columbus Day/Indigenous People's Day. What this practice and the identification as the "Dakota Hymn" masks, however, is the colonial play of power embodied in its composition and usage.

The composer of the hymn, Joseph Renville, was an explorer and a fur trader who ran a trading post on the Mississippi River called Fort Renville. Renville, who is reported to have been the child of a French canoe man and a Sioux woman, is credited with inviting missionaries to bring Christianity to the Dakota people with whom he traded.¹⁹ He worked with these same missionaries to translate part of the Bible into the Dakota language.²⁰ Together, Renville and the missionaries composed the words of the hymn, based at least to a degree on Jeremiah 10:12–13. The tune for the song was created by incorporating sonic qualities associated with Dakota music, especially its harmonic and rhythmic structures, and adapting it to a more European hymnic style. The missionaries Stephen R. Riggs and Thomas S. Williamson used this music and the biblical translation created by Renville to "Christianize" the Dakota people. This missionary work resulted in the US-Dakota conflict of 1862, which ended with the imprisonment of many Dakota people and their dislocation to reservations in South Dakota and Nebraska. It is still sung by the Santee Dakota in their native language.²¹

The complexities of the composition of this hymn as one both taken from and used by the Dakota people, as both native to and serving to

missionize these indigenous peoples, is masked by the common understanding and usage of it as the "Dakota Hymn." Without a deeper understanding of the missionary context in which it was composed and deployed, the possibilities for cultivating a non-dominating encounter with difference in the context of worship are limited. A more fulsome understanding of the context of the hymn fosters the "Being with" of postcolonial whiteness, requiring mutual recognition between whiteness and its "others" in such a way as to reveal their interdependence. Moreover, such a recognition of interdependence has the potential to facilitate a reckoning with the realities of privilege and dominance, as well as a commitment to transforming those realities. Imagine, for example, a worship service during which the story of this hymn is told, the scripture upon which it is based is read, the hymn itself is sung, a time of confession related to colonial dominance and privilege is enacted, and a commitment to the transformation of systems of oppression is expressed and embodied in a ritual act such as sharing communion. This kind of sustained engagement, I believe, is key to embodying the mutuality characteristic of postcolonial whiteness as a fundamental orientation toward shared flourishing that radically challenges and seeks to unravel white privilege, domination, and the assumptions about supremacy that undergird them.

Key to the transformation of this liturgical action from colonial to postcolonial is the process of contextualization that both guards against misappropriation and empowers communities to sing in solidarity with those of different times, locations, and cultures. It refuses the impulse to make use of music as a cultural artifact for the benefit of one community over another by taking up the biblical imperative to "rejoice with those who rejoice and weep with those who weep" on a global scale.²² Worshipping communities cannot accomplish this interrelationality, this solidarity, without knowing something about those with whom we seek connection through intercultural musical encounters. Part and parcel of this kind of intercultural engagement is a sense of cultural humility.²³ Cultural humility includes:

- Commitment to self-evaluation and self-critique
- What assumptions and beliefs shape us in intercultural encounters?
- Addressing power imbalances
- How is power at play in this encounter? How might we make the distribution of power more equitable?
- Developing mutually beneficial partnerships
- How can we cultivate a sense of interrelationality, not simply one accepting or including the "other"?
- Maintaining an interpersonal stance that is open to others
- How can we recognize, appreciate, and embrace difference without relying on privilege or dominating another?²⁴

Communities of faith that approach worship keeping these questions in mind can begin to cultivate a postcolonial whiteness that reaches toward a deeper level of interrelationality.

In a panel presentation honoring the work of interfaith scholar Jane I. Smith at Harvard Divinity School, theologian Daniel Madigan suggests that one of the keys to dialogue among differences, whether of religion, culture, and/or race, is how we understand the grammar of the first-person plural. Key to this grammar of "we" that grounds Madigan's approach to dialogue is not objectifying the other, "not a 'we' studying an 'it,'" but rather, a "we gradually discovering a sort of 'we-ness' which goes beyond 'us' and 'them,'" ²⁵ that does not define oneself over and against another. It is also not a "we" that erases differences, does not distinguish otherness, producing instead a commonality that masks the dynamics of power, privilege, and domination at play in our encounters. The "we-ness" Madigan identifies is reflected in actions that affirm our belonging to one another, our interrelatedness and interdependence, without subsuming our differences. It is, I believe, to this kind of "we-ness" that the work of postcolonial whiteness calls Christian worshipping communities. Cultivating encounters with difference in the context of worship that refuses both objectification and domination of others, as well as a false sense of commonality that masks the play of power and privilege, is the work to which postcolonial critique calls us and the task to which the liberatory gospel of Jesus Christ compels us.

NOTES

1. Henry Giroux, "Racial Politics and the Pedagogy of Whiteness," in *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*, ed. Mike Hill (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 305.
2. Kwok Pui-lan, *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 127.
3. Ibid.
4. Alfred J. Lopez, "Introduction: Whiteness after Empire," in *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, ed. Alfred J. Lopez (Albany: SUNY Press, 2005), 1.
5. Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2005), 8.
6. For more on this symbolism, see Hoyt L. Hickman, Don E. Saliers, Laurence Hull Stookey, and James F. White, *The Handbook of the Christian Year* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1992), especially pp. 288–289.
7. Consider, for example, the gospel reading associated with the Transfiguration, where Jesus was "transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his clothes became dazzling white." Matthew 17:2 (NRSV).
8. For a more in-depth postcolonial critique of the ways in which the symbols of light and darkness are employed in liturgy, see Michael N. Jagessar and

Stephen Burns, *Christian Worship: Postcolonial Perspectives* (Oakville, CT: Equinox, 2011), 37–50.

9. Alison Bailey, "Despising an Identity They Taught Me to Claim," in *Whiteness: Feminist Philosophical Reflections*, ed. Chris I. Cuomo and Kim Q. Hall (New York and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 95.
10. Baily draws the terms "whiteness" and "whiteness" from Marilyn Frye, who coined them in her article "White Woman Feminist," in *Willful Virgin: Essays in Feminism* (Freedom, CA: Crossing, 1992). Bailey, "Despising an Identity," 96.
11. Bailey, "Despising an Identity," 96.
12. Ibid., 98.
13. Lopez, "Introduction," in *Postcolonial Whiteness*, 6.
14. John D. Witvliet, "The Virtue of Liturgical Discernment," in *Music in Christian Worship: At the Service of the Liturgy*, ed. Charlotte Kroeker (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 95.
15. From a postcolonial perspective, the term "global music" is problematic because of the ways in which it relies on notions of Western music as "music" and all other musics as "global," recreating the dynamics of colonizer and colonized with their concomitant power relationships in the terminology surrounding music.
16. C. Michael Hawn, "Reverse Missions: Global Singing for Local Congregations," in *Music in Christian Worship: At the Service of the Liturgy*, ed. Charlotte Kroeker (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 99.
17. "During the 19th century...the exotic, the foreign increasingly gained, throughout the empire, the connotations of a stimulating or exciting difference, something with which the domestic could be (safely) spiced...representing whatever was projected onto them by the societies into which they were introduced...a significant part of imperial displays of power and the plenitude of empires." Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 94–95.
18. *New Century Hymnal* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1995), 80.
19. Lois Willand and Jon Willand, "History of the Dakota Hymn Lac que Parle," unpublished pamphlet, Chippewa County Historical Society and Minnesota Historical Society, 2002.
20. Gertrude Ackerman, "Joseph Renville of Lac que Parle," *Minnesota Historical Society Magazine* 12.3 (1931): 244.
21. Willand and Willand, "History of the Dakota Hymn Lac que Parle."
22. Romans 12:15 (NRSV).
23. Melanie Tervalon and Jann Murray-García, "Cultural Humility Versus Cultural Competence: A Critical Distinction in Defining Physician Training Outcomes in Multicultural Education," *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 9.2 (May 1998): 117.
24. Tervalon and Murray-García, "Cultural Humility," 117–125.
25. Daniel Madigan, "Muslims, Christians and Interfaith Dialogue: A Panel Discussion in Honor of Jane I. Smith," Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, MA, April 16, 2012.