

Agency and Resilience in the Face of Challenge as Civic Action: Lessons Learned from Across Ethnic Communities

James D. Anderson, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*
 Megan Bang, *Northwestern University*
 Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, *Arizona State University*
 Cati V. de los Ríos, *University of California, Berkeley*
 Kris D. Gutiérrez, *University of California, Berkeley*
 Deborah Hicks, *Partnership for Appalachian Girls' Education*
 Li-Ching Ho, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*
 Carol D. Lee, *Northwestern University*
 Stacey J. Lee, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*
 Maribel Santiago, *University of Washington*
 Vanessa Siddle Walker, *Emory University*
 Joy Ann Williamson-Lott, *University of Washington*

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	158
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND CIVICS EDUCATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY.....	165
Prologue: What Roles, Relations, and Responsibilities Do We Have with Each Other?, 175	
Act I: Erasure and Invisibility, 178	
Act II: On Attempts of Erasure's Permanency, 180	
Act III: Citizens of Multiple Nations—Living in Good Relations, 182	
Act IV: Native Nations, Leadership, and Educational Self-Determination, 184	
Epilogue: Who Could We Collectively Become?, 185	
References, 186	
AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION AS PREPARATION FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT, REASONING, AND DISCOURSE.....	190
Black Education Post Emancipation, 191	
Black Education During Legal Apartheid in the 20th Century: A Focus on the Work of African American Teachers, 192	

African American Efforts in the Post- <i>Brown</i> Era: Community Organizing and Social Movements, 197 Conclusion, 203 References, 203	
HISTORICIZING LATINX CIVIC AGENCY AND CONTEMPORARY LIVED CIVICS.....	206
The Disconnect Between Latinidad and School Civics, 208	
Historicizing Latinx Civics, 209	
Alternative Education Spaces, 210	
“Lived Civics”: The Ingenuity of Latinx Youth Cultural Practices of Political Participation, 214	
Youth-Led Immigrant Rights Movement: DREAMers and Anti-Deportation Techniques, 215	
Sanctuary Pedagogies in Homes and School, 215	
Digital Testimonios, Digital Protests, and Hashtag Movements, 216	
Black Lives Matter, 217	
Creative Performance and Songwriting with Corridos, 218	
Latinx Indigenous Communities’ Cultural Sustainability as Civic Practice, 218	
The Enduring Fight for Puerto Rican, Chicanx, and Latinx Studies, 218	
Conclusion: The Future of Latinx Civics Remains Intergenerational, 219	
References, 220	
ASIAN AMERICAN EXCLUSION AND THE FIGHT FOR INCLUSION.....	225
Representations of Asian Americans in K–12 Curricula, 229	
Conclusion, 231	
References, 231	
AN APPALACHIAN SPRING: HOPE AND RESILIENCE AMONG YOUTH IN THE RURAL SOUTH.....	234
Resilience and Strength in Appalachia, 235	
Pathways to Civic Engagement, 238	
References, 241	
LESSONS LEARNED: CONCLUSION.....	242

INTRODUCTION

Carol D. Lee and James D. Anderson

The United States is situated with a complex history. On one hand, it represents one of the most powerful examples of democratic governance in human history, but on the other, it is a nation born on the back of two holocausts—(1) the effects of the colonial takeover of the existing Indigenous nations resulting in a massive loss in the Indigenous populations surviving into the 19th century, and (2) the enslavement of millions of Africans followed by more than 100 years of legal apartheid (Jim Crow). Throughout its history, these and other racial and ethnic minority groups have historically wrestled with *de facto* and *de jure* discrimination and continue to disproportionately experience

inequalities. In addition, other marginalized groups have struggled to gain an equal footing in the United States, including first-generation immigrants at particular points in our history, those without legal citizenship status, those facing intergenerational poverty, those designated as disabled, women, members of the LGBTQ community, and certain religious minorities, among others. While each of these communities represents a unique American experience of overcoming adversity and developing a sense of collective agency and resilience, this chapter illustrates the stories of minoritized racial/ethnic communities in the United States, and includes a section on a rural White community in Appalachia.

In this chapter, the authors focus on how struggles around the meanings and enactment of citizenship and societal membership unfold in agentive education in these communities. They examine in historical and current contexts the factors and forces that shape what citizenship and community membership means—including opportunities and constraints—and how through civic action these communities demonstrated agency and resilience. In so doing, these groups moved the nation forward in coming closer to achieving the goals articulated at its founding—the preservation of the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These contestations over achieving the fullest sense of citizenship involved the utilization of complex knowledge in navigating the nation’s system of checks and balances, as well as imagining and crafting ways of interrogating established and entrenched powers in ways that cumulatively over time represent successive compromises. These include compromises that shifted balances of power. The examples of community agency in pursuit of the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness offered here are also intended to illustrate the complexity of what such pursuits involve and mean.

The equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment (“nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws”) is about persons, including citizens, aliens, and the undocumented. The most commonly referenced and frequently litigated phrase of the 14th Amendment is the equal protection of the law clause. Over time it has figured prominently in a wide variety of landmark Supreme Court cases, including *Plessy v. Ferguson* (segregated schooling), *Brown v. Board of Education*, *Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, and *Parents v. Seattle School District*, (racially discriminatory schooling), *Korematsu v. United States* (Japanese Internment), *Loving v. Virginia* (interracial marriage), *Afroyim v. Rusk* (right of citizenship), *Roe v. Wade* (reproductive rights), *Reed v. Reed* (gender discrimination), *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, *Grutter v. Bollinger*, and *Fisher v. Texas* (affirmative action in higher education), *Plyler v. Doe* (the right of children of undocumented immigrants to public education), and most recently, *Obergefell v. Hodges* (same-sex marriage).

Because we continue to live in times when so many dominant group Americans believe they have constitutional rights as “citizens” that do not extend to marginalized and undocumented groups, it is critical that civic education cultivates an awareness of the rights of persons under the equal protection clause in contradistinction to the rights of citizens. The fact that such rights are consistently denied speaks to the failure of democratic practice to live up to constitutional law and democratic principles. The case of *Plyler v. Doe* (the right of children of undocumented immigrants to public education) exemplifies a good civic lesson that distinguishes the rights of “person” under the U.S. Constitution.

Certainly, there are some once-settled questions being contested today, but citizenship cannot be included in the once-settled questions. From the Naturalization Act of 1790 to contemporary efforts to repeal the 14th Amendment, the question of citizenship reflects problems of racial ideology, nationality, and identity that remain with us since our colonial beginnings. Debates over citizenship have been continuously contested in theory, law, and politics throughout American history. Struggles over citizenship are issues that have zigzagged throughout the American experience, emblazoning the history of U.S. democracy with conflict and ambiguity whenever the question of citizenship has arisen. The bitter disputes of today echo loudly the issues of birthright citizenship, naturalized citizenship, racial heritage, assimilation, and national identity that were debated a century and a half ago during the passage of the 14th Amendment. Some of the major concerns voiced today—who is entitled to be a citizen, who should be allowed to enter the United States, how they should be treated when they do enter, can they be assimilated into the “American way of life,” and what are the social consequences—date back to the debates over the citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment and the concurrent amending of the naturalized citizenship act. Indeed, the long-standing struggles over citizenship and immigration have generated centuries of political debate, major judicial decisions, and stacks of federal and state legislation. Furthermore, disputes about citizenship and immigration invariably include an examination of what it means to be an American, cutting across the social fabric and interweaving themselves into issues of education,¹ law,² race (Diamond, 1998; Jung, 2005; Tyner, 1999), gender (Cott, 1998; Peffer, 1999; Yuval-Davis, 1997), class (Barrett, 1992), sexuality (Burgett, 1998; Sommerville, 2005), and national identity (Brenkman, 1993; Hollinger, 1997; Kerber, 1997; Smith, 1997; Vecoli, 1996). The citizenship question should be examined as the long citizenship struggle that is also manifested in contemporary orders to ban Muslims from entering the country, efforts to revoke the citizenship of American-born children of unauthorized immigrants, and calls for American citizens to “go back where they came from.” To be sure, these are provocative and sometimes explosive issues. Nonetheless, they are part and parcel of the long citizenship struggle.

The authors argue that understanding these histories over the meaning of citizenship and the examples of civic agency within different communities offered in this paper are important in efforts to prepare students to engage in civic reasoning, discourse, and action. These are stories that inspire hope that our system of government can be navigated, as well as stories that demonstrate how addressing the needs of those most vulnerable in our society also support the healthy development of all. They also demonstrate the complex processes of negotiating differences in point of view, in interests, in relations between majorities and minorities, and between the state and the individual.

These histories of ethnic minority communities navigating access to and the demands of citizenship represent a conundrum that may be particularly unique to the United States. The United States is a relatively young nation compared to others in the world. The construct of the nation–state is complex in human history as national borders shift

¹ *Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202 (1982), a Supreme Court case affirming the right of children of undocumented immigrants to public education (Barber, 2001; Gilreath, 1999).

² *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393, 400 (1857); *Elk v. Wilkins* 112 U.S. 94 (1884); *U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U.S. 649 (1898); *Takao Ozawa v. U.S.*, 260 U.S. 178 (1922); *U.S. v. Bhagat Singh Thind*, 261 U.S. 204 (1923); *Perez v. Brownell*, 356 U.S. 44 (1958); and *Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387 U.S. 253 (1967).

over time, influenced by patterns of migration and warfare. In many cases, the construct of ethnicity has a longer consistent history than nationality. For example, one finds ethnic groups such as the Roma distributed across national borders in Europe (e.g., Bulgaria, southern France, Hungary, Romania, Spain), but also in other parts of the world. In multi-ethnic societies such as the United States, people are often navigating multiple categorical identities, that is, the meaning and boundaries of ethnic identity (or multi-ethnic identity) and national identity. The mixed history of immigration policies in the United States (Ewing, 2008) along with discrimination focused on the Chinese, Irish, eastern European, Jewish, and most currently, Muslim and Latinx populations highlight these complexities. In each of these cases—spanning several hundred years—these populations have been targeted in both the media and public policies as “the other” and positioned negatively. At the height of the eugenics movement in the United States in the early part of the 20th century, short tests presumed to scientifically measure IQ were administered and policy briefs reported that these people were intellectually inferior and therefore should not be admitted into the country (Gould, 1981). These deficit meta-narratives were also picked up and reflected in the organization of and goals for schooling. It was not just a matter of segregation of populations by race/ethnicity, but also by the nature of their educational experiences (Tyack, 1974). One extreme example, of course, are the boarding schools to which Native American children were forced into during the late 19th century (Adams, 1995; Churchill, 2004).

The authors have consciously used the term ethnicity as opposed to race. The distinction is important for the very problem space this chapter seeks to explore. Race as a construct is relatively new in human history (Gould, 1981). It is a category created explicitly to warrant European colonization and efforts to enslave particular populations based on the argument that there are hierarchies of human communities that can be distinguished by skin color and that those determined to be “White” were superior; based on that innate superiority, they were authorized to subjugate those who were determined not to be “White.” Charles Mills (1997) in *The Racial Contract* provides a comprehensive history of the evolution and unfolding of this ideology. Interrogating this construct of race is deeply important to preparing young people to engage in civic reasoning and discourse precisely because the underlying assumptions behind the construct so deeply inform policies and practices along multiple dimensions across our history in the United States. There is substantive scientific evidence that there is no biological validity to the construct of race (Blackburn, 1998; Kolbert, 2018). It is an artificial category that has in interesting ways been contested across history. For example, there is evidence that when groups such as the Irish and Italians began immigrating in larger numbers to the United States, they were not considered White (Ignatiev, 1996). Policies around racial segregation have shifted over time in different regions of the country around whether a particular group was identified in policy as White (Williamson et al., 2007).

Ethnicity, on the other hand, places groups of people in history (Helms & Talleyrand, 1997). In particular, for peoples of African descent in the United States, ethnicity rather than race places them in a history that extends far back in human history, including beyond the period of enslavement of Africans in the Americas. However, there is also an additional complication even with ethnicity. In the context of the United States, pan-ethnicity emerges in unique ways. For example, immigrants from Colombia, Mexico,

and Venezuela become Latinx when they enter the United States; immigrants from China, Japan, and Vietnam become Asian Americans; and Indigenous nations and tribal communities—such as Cheyenne, Lakota, and Navajo—become Native American. People who are descendants of those enslaved from primarily west Africa, as well as persons of African descent who immigrate from Ghana, Jamaica, and Nigeria, become African American. In the case studies of education offered in this chapter aimed at preparing young people in these communities for civic engagement, one will see how the experiences in these communities reflect both pan-ethnic shared actions as well as distinct experiences by virtue of their intra-ethnic identities. While much of this chapter traces histories of educational efforts within these four broad pan-ethnic groups, it is equally important to understand how ethnicity plays out within European descent communities within the United States. At this point in American history, European descent ethnic group distinctions—English, Germans, Irish, Italians, etc.—do not have the political constraints they previously had in our history. For many, however, the distinctions still play out in terms of intergenerational family cultural practices and extended social networks beyond the United States. With all pan-ethnic immigrant groups, the generational status of families matters—first generation versus second and third generations.

With regard to African American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, Latinx, and Native American pan-ethnic groups, however, there are political and economic challenges that remain to be wrestled with through active civic engagement, civic engagement informed by reasoning, and through discourse both within these communities and across the nation. This chapter consciously includes a section on Appalachian communities for several reasons. First, poor White communities have and continue to be absent from discussions around equity and reaping the rewards of citizenship. Second, it is a community that also captures interesting dimensions of how we understand ethnicity and how it plays out in the United States. On one hand, historically White Appalachians tend to be of Scottish Irish backgrounds. On the other hand, the region includes a historic African American community (Affrilachia). While it is a community that historically and continues to wrestle with intergenerational poverty, it is also a community with evidence of resilience in how the community organizes its schools and communities to prepare young people to wrestle with the challenges of achieving the rewards of citizenship. The Appalachian community illustrates how issues of class and intergenerational poverty are systemic, and confound our assumptions about White privilege.

Additional attention in this chapter will be paid to citizenship questions that have particular histories with regard to African American, Latinx, and Native American populations. For Native Americans, of course, they represent the original inhabitants, the existing nations that were here when colonial powers invaded. There are Tribal nations that have complex sovereign status within the United States. African Americans who are the descendants of the enslaved did not immigrate to this country by choice. Despite the contentions over immigration from Central and South America today, there are Latinx populations in southwestern states who became part of the United States by virtue of annexation of territories that were originally part of Mexico. So, these histories are complex and must be understood in terms of civic discourse in the public domain. Their histories complicate our conception of citizenship.

The citizenship question—what it entails and what rights and opportunities it requires—must be understood in broader terms than the nation–state. If there is anything this recent COVID-19 pandemic has made abundantly clear, it is how we are interconnected as a human community across the world and across national borders. There are so many ways that our general health and well-being as humans in the 21st century are so deeply intertwined with knowledge, technologies, and economics developed within and across nations. In many ways, modernity is perhaps the most powerful construct at work across the world. Thus, the question arises not merely of what citizenship in a nation means, but equally important, what it means to be a citizen of the world. This question, a question of fundamental human rights, in many ways supersedes the question of national citizenship. As noted earlier, the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution states “nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” It does not say any citizen. These foundational ethical propositions are reflected in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948 after World War II. Article 1 states:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

This is virtually the same ethical proposition articulated in the U.S. Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.... That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.... That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

So, the ethical commitment to the idea of human rights is at the heart of civic reasoning and should inform and propel civic discourse and action. Understanding how ethnic communities in the United States have wrestled with this humanistic goal in the organization of schooling is important and a goal of this chapter. The authors understand in this work that education, broadly speaking, includes but is not limited to schooling. It includes work in communities as well as social and political organizing efforts. Social and political movements teach the public, albeit not necessarily with the same takeaways, and how these efforts have unfolded reflecting agency and resilience in these communities is important. Understanding the multi-faceted goals these communities have articulated is equally important as they grapple with what are often dual goals of national identity and sustaining the rights of these cultural communities to self-determination. In many ways, the complexities of these tensions are reflected in the kinds of conflicts the founders anticipated, structuring a system of government with checks and balances to provide ways to navigate complexities between majority and minority rights, individual rights and the state, scope of powers between federal,

state, and local governments, scope of powers among the three sectors of the executive branch, pathways through which the Constitution can be amended, and pathways for resistance. Ultimately, it is this complex civic problem space that young people need to understand and be able to interrogate.

Each of the sections that follow offer historical and contemporary illustrations of how these ethnic communities have organized schooling, have organized key stakeholders, and organized both schooling and informal educational experiences for youth with the explicit goal of preparing young people to wrestle with the complexities of civic engagement, including the need and responsibility for such engagement.

References

- Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875–1928*. University Press of Kansas.
- Barber, B. R. (Spring 2001). Public education and democracy. *Kettering Review*, 19(2).
- Barrett, J. R. (December 1992). Americanization from the bottom up: Immigration and the remaking of the working class in the United States, 1880–1930. *The Journal of American History*, 79(3), 996–1020.
- Blackburn, D. G. (1998). Why race is not a biological concept. In B. Lang (Ed.), *Race and racism in theory and practice* (pp. 3–26). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brenkman, J. (1993). The Citizen Myth: Civic Republicanism for a Multicultural Era. *Transition*, 60, 138–144.
- Burgett, B. (1998). *Sentimental bodies: Sex, gender and citizenship in the early republic*. Princeton University Press.
- Churchill, W. (2004). *Kill the Indian, save the man: The genocidal impact of American Indian residential schools*. City Lights Publishers.
- Cott, N. F. (1998, December). Marriage and women's citizenship in the United States, 1830–1934. *The Journal of American History*, 103(5), 1440–1474.
- Diamond, J. (1998, Summer). African-American attitudes towards United States immigration policy. *International Migration Review*, 32(2), 451–470.
- Ewing, W. A. (2008). *Opportunity and exclusion: A brief history of US immigration policy*. Immigration Policy Center.
- Gilreath, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Thomas Jefferson and the education of a citizen*. Library of Congress.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Helms, J. E., & Talleyrand, R. (1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1246–1247.
- Hollinger, D. A. (1997, September). National solidarity at the end of the twentieth century: Reflections on the United States and liberal nationalism. *The Journal of American History*, 84(2), 559–569.
- Ignatiev, N. (1996). *How the Irish became White*. Routledge.
- Jung, M.-H. (September 2005). Outlawing “coolies”: Race, nation and empire in the age of emancipation. *American Quarterly*, 57(3), 677–701.
- Kerber, L. K. (December 1997). The meanings of citizenship. *The Journal of American History*, 84(3), 833–854.
- Kolbert, E. (March, 2018). There's no scientific basis for race—it's a made-up label. *National Geographic*.
- Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Cornell University Press.
- Peffer, G. A. (1999). *If they don't bring their women here: Chinese female immigration before exclusion*. University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, R. M. (1997). *Civic ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history*. Yale University Press.
- Sommerville, S. B. (2005, September). Notes toward a queer history of naturalization. *American Quarterly*, 57(3), 659–675.
- Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Harvard University Press.
- Tyner, J. A. (January 1999). The geopolitics of eugenics and the exclusion of Philippine immigrants from the United States. *Geographical Review*, 89(1), 54–73.
- Vecoli, R. J. (November 1996). The significance of immigration in the formation of an American identity. *The History Teacher*, 30(1), 9–27.
- Williamson, J. A., Rhodes, L., & Dunson, M. (2007). A selected history of social justice in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 31, 195–224.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (Autumn 1997). Women, citizenship and difference. *Feminist Review*, 57, 4–27.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND CIVICS EDUCATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Megan Bang, *Northwestern University*

Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, *Arizona State University*

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the following for their invaluable feedback: Teresa McCarty, Emma Elliot-Groves, Anna Lees, Carol Lee, Ananda Marin, Shirin Vossoughi, Angela Booker, Paula Hooper, Kris Gutierrez, Jessica Marshall, and La'akea Yoshida.

Who could we collectively become?

What roles, relations, and responsibilities do we have with each other?

With other-than-human life?

With the land and the waters upon which all life depends?

How should we nurture and uphold those relations?

At the core of Indigenous education are our ancestral teachings about how to be a good human and live a good life, and to fulfill our responsibilities to be good relatives. We think of these as our ethical or axiological commitments in what we very reluctantly might call, in English, Indigenous civics. Central to these ancestral teachings are what we think of as communal responsibilities to intergenerational kin relations and how these senses of responsibility generate the routine practices of everyday life. Kin relations in this sense are not bound by human centrism or supremacy (e.g., Bang, 2016; Kimmerer, 2013; Wynter, 2003). Learning communal responsibilities is critical for young Indigenous people, and each generation has found different ways to reanimate and uphold these responsibilities, undeterred by colonial negations. Furthermore, Indigenous communities have continued to evolve their practices of teaching these responsibilities, despite the forced or coerced schooling imperatives imposed by settler-colonial nations like the United States. Settler-colonialism is defined as a form of coloniality characterized by the ongoing occupation by settlers of Indigenous territory, which form foundational societal structures and shape everyday life in the United States (Wolfe, 2006).

In this section, we focus on the Indigenous communities whose homelands are in what is now the United States, collectively referred to as American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. This term is intended to refer to the at least 1,100 Tribal nations, Alaska Native villages, Hawaiian homelands, and the many "off reservation" communities with which the United States shares these lands. Indigenous communities have unique political status, histories, cultures, knowledges, territories, and more; for example, there are more than 200 distinct Indigenous languages spoken by Indigenous peoples in the current United States, and Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives hold importantly distinct political status and historical experiences. We also recognize that there are many other Indigenous peoples in the United States, from First Nations peoples whose homelands are in what is currently called Canada, as well as the many other Indigenous peoples who have come to the United States under various conditional circumstances from other continents. Much of what follows could be relevant for civics education and the broader Indigenous diaspora but it is not our intent, or perhaps our place, to argue that here.

What roles, relations, and responsibilities do we have with each other? With other-than-human life? With the land and the waters upon which all life depends? Indigenous communities across time have adapted and imaginatively and resiliently created the conditions for the continuation of Indigenous forms of education and the cultivation of communal responsibilities in each new generation. In this section, we take up broad notions of education, and are particularly mindful of those contexts in which Indigenous ways of knowing and being in good relations continue to be taught, as well as the contexts of formalized schoolings that have more recent histories. While some of the historical harms inflicted on Indigenous peoples across history are better known, like those of boarding schools (e.g., Child, 2018; Lomawaima, 2018), we suggest that harm continues to emerge in routine classroom practices, both implicitly and explicitly, by teachers and by students, and is routinely unrecognized. Thus, we write this section aiming to support and amplify the ongoing efforts of Indigenous resurgence by Indigenous communities who continue to develop forms of their own civics education toward their own thriving. These efforts also have to prepare young people to resist the ongoing assimilative demands and process of erasure characteristic of systems of education defined by settler-colonialism. This section aims to articulate some of the core challenges of U.S.-based civic education for Indigenous youth and put forth aspects of Indigenous civics education as a way to fulfill our ongoing responsibilities to stop harm, and also to insist on the fullness of Indigenous sovereignty (e.g., Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002), the need for Indigenous or U.S. civics education, and continuing to develop our collective capacities to see the beautiful, brilliant, adaptive ways that young people, their families, and communities persist and change. We argue that grappling with the complex challenges of civics education for Indigenous youth, as well as learning from Indigenous communities' persistence, is consequential for all people. Indeed, it is fundamentally necessary for just democracies to be possible (e.g., Borrows, 2019).

So, how should we nurture and uphold our relations and responsibilities? From our perspectives, forming just, ethical, and sustainable societies—the endeavor any civics education should reach for—must be predicated on developing our collective capacities and responsibilities with the lands, waters, and peoples with which we live. Collective capacities and responsibilities are at the heart of Indigenous civics education. Collective capacities refer to the systems of relationships set in place within Indigenous communities to ensure the well-being of all life (e.g., relationships with lands, governance, child welfare, etc.) (e.g., Whyte, 2012). We use lands and waters here as expansive relational terms, not reductive to substances. In order to really engage the core question that this section opened with—*who could we become?*—one must also ask if civics education will continue to pursue forms of logic and practice that are predicated on the erasure of present and future sovereign Indigenous peoples (e.g., Deloria, 1974, 1979; Stanton 2019; Tully, 1995; Wilkins & Lomawaima, 2001). That is, can civics education cease to position Indigenous peoples as existing only in the past by creating a civics education that cultivates U.S. democracy's commitment to Indigenous thriving and sovereignty? Indeed, Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) have detailed the ways in which Indigenous thriving has been constructed as dangerous to U.S. democracy and is precisely opposite to the conditions of Indigenous inclusion in many schooling contexts, what are called "safety zones," over U.S. history. These safety zones are sterilized and stereotyped representations of Indigenous peoples crafted to legitimize the United States and its

harms (Benally, 2019). They and others (e.g., Beaulieu, 2006; Demmert et al., 2006; Lee & McCarty, 2017) have argued that until the cultural heterogeneity of Indigenous peoples and our full thriving is central to education and pedagogy, our inclusion will continue to be a source of harm and an erosion of democracy. Thus, any form of civics education aiming at a just democracy in the United States cannot be accomplished without understanding and reckoning with settler-coloniality, racism, and the histories and structures that have created the present.

Civics education has had, and continues to have, a role in the kinds of historicity that become commonplace in peoples' sensibilities in the present and in imagining the future. Thus, we also ask: Can civics education cultivate a vision of U.S. democracy that strives to strengthen collective capacities to understand the whats and hows of anti-colonial and anti-racist societies? Also, perhaps most expansively: Can civics education learn from Indigenous communal responsibilities—engaging Indigenous civics and civics reasoning in grappling with the question of how we should nurture and uphold relations—in ways that create the possibilities of thriving for not only Indigenous students but all students? There are whole fields of history, philosophy, and legal studies, among others, and generations of communal expertise, experience, and governance that have taken up versions of these questions with profound insights. We are not experts in these fields; we are educators. We are working to understand the implications of these fields for engaging young people and for civics education broadly, and write this to the fields of education. Megan is Ojibwe and Italian descent and studies human learning and development and the design of learning environments. Bryan is Lumbee and studies higher education and the development of Indigenous leadership and nationhood.

We suggest that the following five dimensions are necessary, but not sufficient, for civics education in North America that can cultivate our collective capacities to enact just, sustainable, and culturally thriving societies. These include (1) understanding and confronting the ongoing dynamics of settler-coloniality in U.S. history and narratives of the United States that perpetuate violence, erasure, and invisibility of Indigenous peoples; (2) developing the political and ethical commitments, namely the civic responsibility, to uphold Indigenous sovereignty and engage in nation-to-nation relations; (3) ethically holding and grappling with the heterogeneous conditions of migrations that differentially shape experiences and the racialization of “peoples of color, including Indigenous peoples from other places,” and subsequently the complex work of relational solidarities across communities toward collective thriving; (4) creating forms of education that cultivate collective capacity to understand and generatively engage Indigenous peoples, their histories, sovereignties, knowledge systems, and distinct experiences with racialization and its impacts on their communities; and (5) supporting the development of civics education for thriving Indigenous nations and engaging the broader possibilities they open toward liberatory futures for all peoples.

Accomplishing serious engagement with these dimensions is predicated on the ontological foundations of the conversation. The ontological foundations, or what Lyons (2000) has called the “terms of the debate,” and who sets them matters. U.S. civics education often unreflectively reproduces coloniality in a myriad of ways, but it is especially pronounced through reductive discourses of Indigenous peoples and their histories in ways that perpetuate the erasure of Indigenous sovereign presents and futures

in civic reasoning. This happens through the positioning of Indigenous peoples as of particular pasts, through the transformation of tribal diversity into singular discourses of race, and of racist processes of minimizing our knowledges, forms of governance, and ways of life. In short, U.S. civics education tends to be a site in which violence against Indigenous peoples is normalized and co-constructed with U.S. democracy itself. Part of our task here is to make plain how some forms of violence are lived and felt in U.S. civics education for Indigenous youth. However, this is not sufficient. Educators must also come to understand Indigenous peoples and Indigenous civics education from, and in service to, Indigenous communities. This section alone can only invite and motivate that. Accomplishing that would require much longer engagements and partnerships with Tribal nations. Perhaps this section can help to cultivate the relational conditions for such partnerships to be liberatory.

So, who could we collectively become? The positioning of Indigenous peoples sits at the ethical and political heart of U.S. history and democracy and who we could collectively become. The recognition of Indigenous peoples' ongoing sovereignty must be central, not momentary, to U.S. civics education if just forms of life are to be possible. We define sovereignty as the inherent rights of Indigenous peoples and their Tribal nations to determine their own futures. It is an inherent right; it is not defined by another government entity. However, it has come to manifest as a legal and political status that is established through the unique relationships between Tribal nations and the U.S. federal government. In creating the United States, not only did settlers remake their homelands on the territories of Tribal nations across North America through violence, but they also crafted and signed treaties that recognized Tribal sovereignty and territory. To protect their collective capacities, Tribal nations and communities signed these treaties, under various conditions, and in doing so, ceded 2 billion acres of land (though Indigenous peoples continue to engage with some ceded lands through subsistence rights), with the understanding that the three fundamental promises of health, education, and the general welfare of their peoples would be upheld (Deloria & Lytle, 1983). Treaty-making and these fundamental promises continue to be central parts of governance for both the United States and Indigenous peoples. Thus, civics processes in the United States have been fundamentally shaped by trust responsibilities to and with Indigenous peoples, and relations with Indigenous peoples have shaped the making of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and many other bedrocks of U.S. democracy.

We emphasize treaty rights and trust responsibilities because it is important to fuse the idea that while there is a history that speaks to the beginnings of the relationships between Indigenous peoples, the U.S. federal government, and larger questions around civics, there is also very much a present—that is, these relations are ongoing. Reframing non-Indigenous peoples' understanding of these relations to be something ongoing and not only historical are central to Indigenous futures. Indigenous peoples' relentless insistence on upholding treaty rights across U.S. history is in itself evidence of Indigenous peoples' remarkable agency and speaks directly to the difference in historicity undergirding Indigenous and U.S. civics. To be clear, the upholding of Indigenous sovereignty and U.S. trust responsibilities is not only the domain of Indigenous peoples. The cultivation of civic reasoning and everyday forms of communal life have always been implicitly, if not explicitly, in a dialogic relationship with treaties and should be

central to who all U.S. citizens understand themselves to be. If U.S. civics education seeks just and ethical democracies, it must, at minimum, work to cultivate all peoples' collective sensibilities and ethical responsibilities to nurture and uphold Indigenous sovereignty. Indigenous sovereignty is a shared endeavor, a continuing endeavor, and it is tied to the understanding of communal rights and collective responsibilities central to civics education, and more broadly, history and social studies. Thus, as educators consider what roles, relations, and responsibilities they should be cultivating with students, they must engage with Indigenous peoples' histories and sovereignties over the past, present, and future.

Critically important, however, is the recognition that not just any presences of Indigenous peoples in civics education will do. The conceptual presences, or absences, of Indigenous peoples' across time are routine sites in which U.S. nation-state perspectives are reproduced. These formations are also the educational interactions that tend to socialize people into what their communal and civic responsibilities are (or the justification of their absence) to Indigenous peoples (e.g., Sabzalian, 2019a). Alcoff (2007) argues that racialized societies are in a constant state of myth maintenance due to a desire to perceive their own actions as moral, or at least excusable. Indigenous scholars and allies have argued that that settler-colonial societies have a particular investment in forms of myth maintenance with respect to Indigenous peoples as a way to justify Indigenous land theft; Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) have called this form of myth maintenance "genesis amnesia" and Tuck and Yang (2012) discuss a similar concept as "settler moves to innocence" (see also Calderon, 2014a).

The United States is a settler-colonial nation. Settler-colonial myth formation rests on the perpetual erasure and dehumanization of Indigenous peoples—from these territories and others. One routine and problematic narrative in civics classrooms is that Indigenous people are of the past, have been eliminated, or that the state-sanctioned injustices inflicted on Indigenous people and territories are a part of ancient histories (e.g., Calderon, 2014b; Shear & Krutka, 2019; Shear et al., 2015). Important work by Shear et al. (2015) found that 86.6 percent of state-level standards relating to Indigenous peoples are related to pre-1900 content. These historicized positionings are often coupled with reductive or minimizing narratives that recreate hierarchical human organizations that are inflected through White and western supremacies. Meaning, civics classrooms routinely characterize Indigenous peoples' ways of life, relations to lands and waters, systems of governance, knowledges, beings, and even the very population sizes of Indigenous peoples and territories as explicitly and routinely less than, underdeveloped, unimportant, or entirely erased. It is important to note that civics is not alone in these forms of erasure; it is shared across many domains. A subtler yet equally harmful narrative is one that fabricates or elevates flattened constructions of Indigenous peoples' cooperation and consent to participate in the disfigured forms of life being imposed through violence. While U.S. history has reimagined treaty agreements as always peaceful and desired interactions between Tribal nations and newly settled colonists, they were often forced or coerced. Signing a treaty to avoid total genocide is not a just or humane form of consent or governance. These forms of erasure teach that sovereignty and Indigenous knowledges and ways of being are not central to contemporary struggles for justice and to collective problem solving and future-making.

Indigenous practices of sovereignty are more than abstracted concepts or only political terms for Indigenous peoples; they are the fabric of Indigenous peoples' everyday lives. Indigenous sovereignty and communal relationships are defined by forms of consent, reciprocity, and respect that considers mutual lives and lifeworlds, as evidenced in ceremonies, forms of Indigenous governance, and other intellectual traditions (Kimmerer, 2012; Simpson, 2014), and thereby are explicitly not defined by forms of coercion. They are how to show dignity and respect as living beings to one another. They are the ways in which knowledge systems are enfolded in day-to-day interactions, in generation-to-generation interactions, and in interactions with extended kin relations. Sovereignty in this sense is living and evolving—it is in the making and being of life; thus, sovereignty matters (e.g., Barker, 2005; Deloria & Lytle, 1998; Miller, 2006; NCSS, 2018). Routine cultural practices and everyday forms of life are fundamentally connected to sovereignty and the foundational promises and responsibilities that form the beginnings of the United States through treaties and accompanying trust responsibilities. Civics education engaging with Indigenous meanings of sovereignty could be central to helping all students develop into citizens that can live responsible lives and contribute to more just worlds (see a resonate argument from Jacob et al., 2018).

Excavating what Dahl (2018) names as “democratic theory’s implication in and dependence upon settler colonialism for its foundational value and logic” and transforming the conceptual terms with which educators teach about Indigenous peoples is paramount for creating just civics education (see also Haynes Writer, 2010). The ongoing formation of Indigenous peoples as historical is a central and deeply problematic conception that is reproduced in civics education, with devastating impacts to not only Indigenous peoples, but also people across the United States broadly. This formation creates the conditions for the negation of Indigenous peoples’ futures. It produces citizens who have no ethical attunements to the violence they are participating in or feel no ethical responsibility to stop them. Recent research examined the difference in people’s conceptions between those that supported Indigenous Peoples Day and those who wanted Columbus Day upheld. Those that wanted Columbus Day upheld had higher stereotyped perspectives about Indigenous people and stronger national identities, suggesting an oppositional correlated relationship between negative perceptions of Indigenous peoples and positive perceptions of national identity (Eason et al., 2021). Indeed, many people are socialized into denying Indigenous peoples’ presence as sovereign peoples as a necessary function of their pathways to justice. We suggest that this socialization is ubiquitous because Indigenous erasure is a necessary corollary to the continued occupation of Indigenous territories. They see the erasure and systematic denial of Indigenous peoples’ sovereign presences and futures as perpetuating an American mythology that makes Western constructions of human supremacy, its expressions of White supremacy, and coloniality normative (Brandzel, 2016). These dynamics are accompanied by repeated forms of the logics of *terra nullius* and (White) human entitlement to the use and extraction of life—dehumanized human life and other-than-human life. We are suggesting here that the denials of Indigenous peoples’ sovereign presences and futures are central conditions for civics and society, and yet, the denial does harm to everyone. A central challenge of civics education for all human beings is related to the climate crisis that has placed every single life on the planet at risk. Despite

this collective challenge, the logics of Indigenous erasure and denial continue to ignore opportunities to restore or cultivate right relations with lands and waters. Thus, continued dismissal of Indigenous peoples and their knowledge systems will prevent the necessary decision making and adaptive capacities for societies to thrive and survive. Indigenous scholars have argued for decades that engagement with Indigenous peoples and their ways of knowing are necessary and beneficial for all people (e.g., Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Douglas et al., 2020; Kimmerer, 2013; LaDuke, 1999).

A particularly central and growing challenge in the United States is in wading through dynamics of Indigenous erasure and processes of racialization that have unfolded over time and their current manifestations and dynamics both within Tribal communities as well as Tribal communities' relations with and across the broader United States, specifically with communities of color. Tribal nations are distinct political and cultural entities, each with their own homelands, histories, governments, cultural practices, languages, values, desires, and needs for civic education—not a uniform, racialized group. The collapsing and erasure of Indigenous nations as distinct peoples into a homogenized racial group are central to the erosion of Tribal nations' sovereignty (e.g., Brayboy, 2005; Calderon, 2014a; Sabzalian, 2019b). Indeed, processes of racialization and race-based rights (both arguments for racial inclusion and exclusion) are processes within settler-colonial nations that have been used as tools to erode Indigenous peoples' sovereign rights and to create ongoing discord within and between racialized communities. Importantly, for educators this means working with and beyond an understanding of civics education as tied to racial formations in the United States. For example, it becomes necessary to understand how settler colonialism has racialized entire populations through hierarchical human organization toward particular ends (e.g., Indigenous peoples as relegated to the past or eliminated, Black peoples being dehumanized and enslaved, linguistic assimilation and extinctions, exploitive and violent forms of labor, detention, and deportations particularly with immigrant, migrant, and undocumented communities). Coming to understand these dynamics is necessary not only for Indigenous peoples of these territories, but also for raced Indigenous peoples from other places that have come to have new identities, and for settlers that have created communities and life (e.g., Shear et al., 2018). The ways that people understand and transform the complexities and multiplicities of conditions of migratory pathways (e.g., from enslavement, to asylum, to desires for better lives, and many others) for the different communities and the histories that have unfolded to create the present will consequently shape all of our collective futures.

Communities and nations across the world are working toward grappling with what might be called “pluriversality” or what the Zapatistas refer to as “a world of many worlds” (e.g., Escobar, 2016; Jackson, in press), which carries important distinctions from multiculturalism. The United States is such a world and has been, though it works to deny this truth, often resulting in the racialization of Indigenous peoples into a single group. This has become increasingly complex over time as Indigenous communities are multi-racial communities and discourses of race are further fracturing ancestral systems of kin relations and belonging. The construction of race as a biological determinant has been engineered to socially disfigure Indigenous systems of belonging over U.S. history, creating logics of Indigenous personhoods and Indigenous citizenship based in biologies and blood quantum, not their genealogies (Reardon & Tallbear, 2012;

Tallbear, 2013). The reduction of Indigenous personhood to racialized constructions of human beings is so taken as truth by U.S. paradigms that U.S. policy over time has been engineered to “dilute” Indigenous blood lines through policies such as broad-scale federal relocation programs that engineered Indigenous peoples into mixed-race places such as urban centers, and was intended to promote interracial marriage (e.g., Krouse, 1999). Furthermore, these dynamics were all part of broader efforts for U.S. accumulation of Indigenous lands and the erosion of Indigenous nations.

While these issues are saturated across history, the reductive and racialized logics of biology born of White supremacy often governs Indigenous citizenship and belonging in ways that continue to be central challenges for Indigenous peoples today. These issues are particularly acute in federal court cases known as the “Freedman cases” or through “disenrollment cases” such as *Nooksak 306* (e.g., Galanda & Dreveskracht, 2015). The Freedman cases concerned questions about Indigenous citizenship of Black Indigenous peoples whose descendancy was intertwined with enslaved Africans and Cherokee people. In the *Nooksak* case, 306 tribal members who were active community members, who had been living on their tribal lands for generations, and who also had Filipino ancestry were disenrolled by the *Nooksak* Nation based on claims that their lineage was illegitimate or insufficient for Tribal citizenship. The dynamics of these cases become increasingly complex as United States law and domination was used to further erode Tribal sovereignty and Indigenous communities’ rights to self-determination. Even though we see these decisions as profoundly problematic and born of settler colonialism and racism, Indigenous communities have the sovereign right to decide their own citizenship. While we are absolutely in favor of engaging in collective activism and political diplomacy to change these inhumane decisions, mobilizing U.S. law to force it can be enactments of the erosion of Tribal sovereignty. These are examples of the profound perversities of intertwined settler colonialism and racism that are ever-present realities for Indigenous peoples.

Furthermore, the dynamics of racialization and legislative belonging based in biologized logics are not only relegated to specific communities or theoretical abstractions; for most Indigenous peoples, they are routine realities to navigate in other ways. For example, those considering partnership and childbearing often have to grapple with a kind of mathematics of blood quantum, citizenship, and documentation—a colonial impact calculus. This calculus can mean accepting how choosing to have children with someone from a different Indigenous nation than one’s own, or none at all, will impact the life course of future children. Of course, this is most importantly about culture and language, but it also impacts a child’s blood quantum and their documented belonging. Asking “Will my children have enough documented blood quantum to be eligible to be citizens of their Indigenous nations?” is a real question for many Native people. Issues of partnership, identity, and belonging have become an increasing focus of study and challenge for adolescent development (e.g., Schultz & Noyes, 2020).

The lived complexity of learning the interplay and liminality of Indigenous sovereignty and being racialized are central challenges that often impede Indigenous youth development (Brayboy, 2005), highlighting how important it is that educators take up issues of Indigenous sovereignty and racialization. Understanding the complexities of these dynamics is one of the demands placed on Indigenous youth today. This is central to the task of developing healthy identities, as well as the ethical and intellectual clarity

that we all will need of the next leaders who are tasked with navigating the challenges that all communities will face in the future.

To imagine and enact just futures for all living beings, we must engage with and examine the relational constructs that are settled, assumed, and normalized. Educators, in particular, are tasked with facilitating child and human development, often through civics education, and as such must understand how these constructs operate in order to imagine new worlds elsewhere to settler-colonial domination. The formation of Western-conceived nation-states globally rests on the simultaneous eradication of Indigenous nationhood and formation of racialized subjects (e.g., Wynter, 2003). Central to the ethical and political imagining for just worlds is the necessity to grapple with the co-constitution of race and processes of racialization alongside Indigenous erasure that together create paradigms of human supremacy and its dominant expression of White supremacy. That is, race—and the hierarchies that emerge from it—connected to the erasure of the original inhabitants of North America (Indigenous peoples) created the conditions for Western normativity to be the enclosed grounds of future formations (Lyons, 2000). Although these dynamics are foundational, they are not ontological for Indigenous people. Put plainly, Indigenous peoples being definitionally positioned as only a racial minority is an act of erasure because it claims race and not sovereignty as the singular grounds by which they will be known. It creates the conditions for Whiteness to be the central challenge for Indigenous peoples to live lives of wellbeing and thriving. Indigenous peoples' presences and futures being only engaged through discourses of racial inclusion erases our origins as peoples and creates the conditions for our personhood to be defined through Whiteness and the nation-state even if a racially just nation-state could be achieved. Racialized discourses are constructed by the settler-state, resulting in definitions designed to confine or constrain Indigenous peoples while exempting settler-states' responsibility for stealing land and dishonoring treaties (Coulthard, 2014). What is central here is to recognize how the politics of inclusion and recognition co-mingle in ways that perpetuate harm on Indigenous peoples, past, present and future, and how this perpetuation continues to harm all living beings.

To seriously engage Indigenous civics education would require sifting through these complex dynamics carefully as often these relations are animated through settled, normative perspectives of U.S. nation-state histories, practices, and rhetorical forms. This is a profound challenge, in part because the harms already inflicted, including the theft of lives and humanity, continue unabated. It is hard to create new worlds and relations that are not defined by negotiations, loss, or survival. Yet, communities have also created joyous, thriving life, despite relentless structural violence. Educators are tasked with facilitating human development; doing so without consideration of Indigenous sovereignty, they reify the conceptual foundations of settler colonialism and perpetuate harm against Indigenous students. Importantly, these dynamics have been in place long enough that many educators were also raised in these systems and perpetuate these problems unwittingly. Furthermore, the materials and systemic demands (e.g., standards) on educators indeed facilitate their participation in these ongoing harms (e.g., Shear et al., 2015). We consider it their responsibility to work toward disrupting these harms and also to deeply understanding how ancestral forms of agency, love, dignity, and continual worldmaking have made it possible for Indigenous peoples to continue, and to insist that the fullness and beauty of this also be a part of the work of

Indigenous civics. That is, they insist that the conceptual foundations of Indigenous peoples be more than colonial negations and racialized forms.

Indigenous children and youth are tasked with navigating these multiple demands and paradigms with respect to “civic life.” Youth must learn what their responsibilities are to and within their Indigenous communities, while also developing capacities to respond to the civic demands of life in relation to the United States. Centrally this has meant continuing to insist that the United States respect and uphold sovereignty and to fulfill its trust responsibilities per the law. Learning to skillfully assert that Indigenous people have the right to exist and to continue to develop as peoples is not a simple task. It is complicated by the need for Indigenous youth to also learn to refuse to allow these definitions to define who they are, and also who they may become. That is, the Indigenous youth must also learn to disallow the negations of their personhoods as Indigenous peoples to become their core sense of identity and intellectual life. These demands are, at best, incommensurate, and require a certain level of emotional, intellectual, and identity dexterity.

We suggest that it is more accurate to understand these demands as structuring a central task of Indigenous children’s childhoods to learn to navigate what Brayboy and Chin (2020) call *territory*. They define *territory* as the “simultaneous presence of the imaginary Indian and the absence of an actual Indigenous person” (Brayboy & Chin, 2020). They argue that the “logics of *territory* rely on disconnection—on obscuring the continuum of violence and domination” (p. 23). Their work importantly adds affective language to the dynamics of settler-colonialism—how it feels to experience these dynamics. We emphasize here the ways in which Indigenous students, classrooms, and schools enact *territory*. These demands stand in resonant tension with what Deloria called the affective dimensions of spatial knowing and the possibilities of human maturation for Indigenous people—but also all people (e.g., Deloria, 1979; Richardson, 2007). Living, present-day Indigenous students are regularly erased in learning environments—that is, they are subject to people enacting their ontological denial. Their real persons become absent while learning environments produce imaginary Indians. These dynamics structure their lived experiences beyond content in the classrooms—it structures the dynamics of their relations and routine interactions with peers, teachers, and staff. They learn that their personhood must become an incomplete aberration of their whole selves. Scholars have documented that the perpetual micro-assaults, a form of being pushed out, often result in school departure (Johnston-Goodstar & Roholt, 2017). While Indigenous communities have longstanding strategies to combat such systemic oppression, they are committed to futures where their children are no longer faced with these demands as a condition of their education. It is important for readers to recognize that our articulations here are wholly incomplete given the complexity of these challenges, and that the issues and ideas that they are trying to communicate are not new. Other Indigenous leaders and scholars before them have articulated and struggled to bring light to these issues for broader audiences (e.g., Horne & McBeth, 1999; Little Bear, 2006; Lyons, 2000).

We have chosen to utilize a vignette of Megan’s son’s experiences across three acts to concretize the conceptual ground that they have articulated and to mark what a lived experience of civics in schooling represents for Indigenous youth. We include a fourth act aimed at recognizing the forms of education that have emerged from

within Indigenous communities and the ways these give rise to fundamentally different forms of civic education. We utilize these vignettes to illuminate the lived resiliencies of Indigenous youth and Native Nations that do and must navigate the complexities of the demands articulated. The acts are introduced through a prologue of historical moments aimed at making clear the kinds of historicity persistently reflected in Indigenous communities' perspectives on civic responsibilities and the ways Native peoples have pursued these issues over generations. We end with an epilogue that we intend to demonstrate the echo of these issues currently and what might be central for movements toward just worlds in which Indigenous peoples help to lead.

Prologue: What Roles, Relations, and Responsibilities Do We Have with Each Other?

Indigenous communities have long engaged in robust systems of education that taught young people the many different aspects and demands of communal life. These forms of education ranged from understanding histories, sciences, spirituality, economics and trade, land and water stewardship, governance structures and practices, and child rearing, among many others. Indigenous education also taught people about civic responsibility, and there is no documentation of the creation of long-term imprisonment practices in Indigenous societies of North America. The point here is that Indigenous communities developed a sense of living together in ways that respected the rights of each other and created practices and routines on mutual consent, as well as the resolution of disputes and differences. Our purpose is not to detail this history—they are not historians—but it would be remiss to start a prologue that began with the great disruptions to these systems of education that came with contact and the beginnings of the United States. Thus, it is time to fast forward to the founding of the United States.

After the end of the Revolutionary War in 1789, the United States placed departments pertaining to Indigenous relations in the newly formed War Department. Some treaties that include trust responsibilities to education had already been ratified at this point. Three decades later, on March 3, 1819, the U.S. Congress passed a law called the Civilization Fund Act. The Act's intent was to provide monetary resources for missionaries to educate Indigenous peoples on reservations. More specifically, the Act noted "That for the purpose of guarding against the further decline and final extinction of the Indian tribes, adjoining the frontier settlements of the United States, are for introducing among them the habits and arts of civilization...." It continued by noting, "and an account of the expenditure of the money, and proceedings in execution of the foregoing provisions, shall be laid annually before Congress" (Prucha, 2000, p. 33). Embedded in the Act was a sum of \$10,000 to be used annually for these purposes. The fundamental goal of this was to "civilize" Indigenous peoples by assimilating them into a White education and ways of engaging the world. The timing of this Act is important because it was an early demonstration of the ideologies that guided the 1830 Indian Removal Act (IRA). The IRA set into place the possibilities for Andrew Jackson (known for his hostilities toward American Indian peoples) to push Indigenous peoples west. Removal included the so-called Five Tribes (Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole). Forms of education emerging within tribal communities on the heels of removal were fundamentally shaped by Jacksonian elimination policies and the Civilization

Fund Act laid the groundwork for further development of what is commonly known as Indian residential schools or boarding school era, infamously exemplified by the Carlisle Indian Industrial School founded by Richard Henry Pratt in 1879. While educational efforts that removed children from tribal communities with the intention of assimilating them had been in motion since as early as 1634 in what is now Maryland, as well as at both Harvard and Dartmouth in the same century, the Civilization Fund Act created the conditions for the emboldened scaling—through violent and coercive means—of these forms of educational policy.

Almost 100 years after the Civilization Fund Act, Seneca scholar Arthur C. Parker, in his classic article titled *The Social Elements of the Indian Problem* (1916), again names the civic challenges of the time. In his article, Parker writes, “We wish to lay down seven charges, out of perhaps many more, that the Indian makes at the bar of American justice. Whether the white man believes them or not, true or not, he cannot discharge his obligation to the red man until he considers them and understands that the Indian makes them because he at least feels that they are just” (p. 254). The seven charges included robbing the American Indian of:

- (1) freedom of actions; ... (2) economic independence; ... (3) social organization; ...
- (4) ... a race of men--the American Indian--of intellectual life; ... (5) moral standards and of racial ideals; ... (6) a good name among the peoples of the earth; ... (7) a definite civic status. (pp. 254–255)

These are serious claims published in the *American Journal of Sociology*, 8 years before American Indian peoples—the *original* inhabitants of the lands that would become the United States—would earn the right to vote. More specifically of education and “intellectual life,” Parker writes:

Human beings have a primary right to an intellectual life, but civilization has swept down upon groups of Indians and, by destroying their relationships to nature, blighted or banished their intellectual life, and left a group of people mentally confused.... The Indians must have a thought-world given back. Their intellectual world must have direct relation to their world of responsible acts and spontaneous experiences. (p. 258)

Parker points to the importance of relationships to land and the connections with their intellectual life. Despite this law many states continued to deny Indigenous peoples the right to vote through claims to their own state constitutions. Arizona, for example, did not allow Indigenous people to vote until 1948. Utah was the last state to allow Indigenous peoples to vote in 1962. More than 100 years later, American Indians continue to fight for their intellectual worlds and self-determining rights to engage in their own educational and schooling practices on terms that suit them. Two hundred years rush by with a blink of an eye as it relates to American Indian peoples and their education. The rush elides the erasure of the history, the presence of Indigenous peoples, and the multifarious acts of erasure themselves. Many of the challenges that Parker outlined in 1916 remain relevant and are an important part of understanding the civics of American Indian peoples.

Seventy years later, in 1987, a congressional hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs was held to introduce S.Con.Res.76, which was in essence a

renewed recognition of U.S. obligations to Indigenous nations. A remarkable set of leaders—Oren Lyons, Suzan Harjo, Vine Deloria, Jr., Richard Real Bird, and many others from multiple Tribal nations, including Crow, Lummi, Mille Lacs, Oneida, Onondaga, Quinault, and Red Lake—presented oral and written testimony at the hearing detailing the intellectual, political, and communal systems that Tribal communities have continued to cultivate. The session engaged and recognized that the ideals of democracy and systems of representation reflected across the Iroquois Confederacy as well as other Tribal nations served as the intellectual foundations of the U.S. Constitution. In their testimonies these intellectuals and Tribal leaders also argued that the legitimacy of the Constitution was inextricably bound to Indigenous nations. The bill passed in 1988 and contained four key points, including an acknowledgment of the historical debt of the United States to the Iroquois Confederacy and other Indian nations for their demonstration of democratic principles and their example of a free association of independent Indian nations (the founding of statehood); a reaffirmation of the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian tribes; a reaffirmation of the trust responsibility and obligation of the government to Indian tribes, including Alaska Natives; and an acknowledgment of the need to exercise good faith in upholding treaties with the various tribes. Importantly, the final clause of the bill reads:

Congress also acknowledges the need to exercise the utmost good faith in upholding the treaties with various tribes, as the tribes understood them to be, and the duty of a great Nation to uphold its legal and moral obligations for the benefit of all its citizens so that they and their posterity may also continue to enjoy the rights they have enshrined in the United States Constitution for time immemorial. (H.Con.Res. 331; see <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/100/hconres331/text>)

What is regnant here is that the relations between Indigenous peoples and the civic responsibilities of the United States have been constant—they are not bound to any singular time in history. A civics education that fails to fundamentally engage Indigenous peoples fails to uphold its legal and moral obligations. This starts with a serious and critical examination of “rights” and how these create belonging (what often is discussed through discourses of citizenship) as core concepts that much of civics education is built on.

We suggest that a fundamental issue in considering civics in the United States is the construction of the individual in relation to groups and what kind of ethics and logics this relational construal establishes. It strikes them that communal—or group—rights are often erased by what is a singular or preferred focus on individual rights and that this fundamental difference in construal is consequential to the core of what civics education is or can be. Stark and Stark (2018) argue for a return to relational paradigms of sovereignty, as distinct from rights based, which “foregrounds responsibilities to one another and creation, which sustains us all” (p. 17). This model of relations is central to Indigenous peoples and perhaps a core challenge for Indigenous learners to understand and navigate. Indigenous peoples recognize individual rights; however, individual rights are often placed secondary to an emphasis on group rights: the rights of a nation, or a community, or peoples. Furthermore, Indigenous rights are not wielded to exclude

or to create privileges for some. They are claims to fundamental dignities of life. The link between rights and responsibilities is an important one and fundamentally shapes what communal or civic responsibilities are. If Indigenous peoples are in relation with one another, with lands, with waters, and with ideas, they are necessarily responsible to and for these things—they are kin. One cannot divorce rights from responsibilities. These are not obligations; they are a recognition of and a maintenance of connections or relations. If we live well, the relationships are reciprocal; we care for others, who care for us. This is not to be confused with a *quid pro quo*, but one of mutual assistance, care, relationality, and kinship. This is the “why” of rights. In Indigenous communities, rights are made purposeful insofar as they enable people to fulfill their responsibilities to and with others. Many Indigenous knowledge systems are characterized by many sets of relationships and responsibilities that give rise to the how of cultural and communal practices. Taking up these multiplicities of meanings could enhance the education of all young people.

Civics is often rooted in the past; it is in histories of new countries, sacred documents, and aspirational moments and treatises. This raises a question of how to make sense of beginnings and origins. What kinds of historicities are engaged in formulating a collective present and future? As noted elsewhere (Brayboy & Chin, 2020; Brayboy & Tachine, 2021; Vaught et al., in progress) beginnings and origins are not always the same things. Indigenous peoples’ communal rights (held by communities and nations but embodied in individuals) are located in the lands and waterways from which Indigenous peoples emerged. Our origin stories tell us that we are of the Earth. These are our origins and beginnings. Civics starts with some other place. It is located in a document, and may be the Magna Carta, Plato’s *Republic*, or the Declaration of Independence. These are beginnings, but not origins. Indigenous peoples emerged from the earth, waters, and sky, and have dwelled in place since it birthed us, and continue to live here now and into the future. Indigenous peoples respect and honor the past, but actively refuse being locked in and through it. The continued absence of these realities within civics education are acts of epistemic violence that perpetuate White supremacy and settler colonialism (e.g., Seawright, 2014).

What does this mean for civics education? Our response exists in four parts, centered by Indigenous peoples’ present and future, in their communities and in their children, or, in this instance, Megan Bang’s son. Bryan Brayboy’s sons could find their places in these narratives; so could Megan’s daughters, or our nieces, nephews, and grandchildren. We include our work as educators and scholars in the final act, with the intention of rooting these issues in lived presences, in relational presences, and in the learning experiences of young people in the midst of forms of civic education across the multiple contexts of their lives.

Act I: Erasure and Invisibility

When my (Megan’s) high schooler, who is a citizen of Walpole Island Ojibwe First Nation and Navajo Nation, was assigned to read the Declaration of Independence for school, I bought him the “Merciless Indian Savage” t-shirt that is common across Indian country and suggested he wear it to class. We laughed that he should sit under the “Blackhawks” hockey flag that hung in his classroom, too. His school civics project

could start with him going to every “Blackhawks” flag in the school and taking a picture with different Native t-shirts on, and then making a meme that says “Where are the Natives?”

First to note, Megan’s son is navigating citizenship across four nations: Walpole Island, Canada, Navajo Nation, and the United States. He is a citizen of Walpole Island Ojibwe First Nation, Navajo Nation, and the United States. He is eligible for citizenship in Canada. The past and the present come together here in deeply lived ways for him. There is an aspirational document that frames the United States origin story. That document is called the Declaration of Independence. Its second paragraph opens thusly, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” These are aspirational statements, even though their formations were also deliberately exclusionary. Twenty-nine paragraphs (or statements) later, the document reads, “He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.” Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness married to the merciless Indian savages. There is no acknowledgment that the Constitution and the bicameral legislature and generally the three bodies of government are rooted in structures credited to the Haudenosaunee (often referred to as the Iroquois Confederacy). The past erases the contributions of Indigenous peoples and frames us as savages. In the current moment, however, the lesson for civics is that Megan’s son is surrounded by caricature that erases and makes his present-day status invisible. While these experiences may not be central for Indigenous children who attend Tribal schools or on-reservation K–12 public schools, it is important to recognize that only 24 percent of school-age Indigenous youth go to schools that are on reservations and even fewer are Tribally controlled schools. Another and important way of saying this is that 76 percent of Indigenous children live in urban and suburban contexts where they are often the only, or one of very few, Indigenous children. That is the experience of being minoritized in these ways and is a normative experience for Indigenous youth. For children who have completed their K–12 schooling on-reservation who are college-going, they too will come to face these dynamics, as only 8.7 percent of college-going Indigenous students go to Tribal colleges, expanding the number of Indigenous youth who experience these demands. These dynamics are routine and shared by Indigenous youth; they are not exceptional. Thus, while these issues are exemplified in particular ways in this vignette, to mindfully and genuinely engage Indigenous peoples and civic education in the 21st century is to make them visible and present as both peoples who once were, who still are, and who could and should be leaders for all communities in the future. The stories of the past are rooted in violence, land theft, and failure to live up to the promises embedded in treaties and laws. They are also rooted in rich inventions and nuanced knowledge systems that are relevant today for not only Indigenous peoples, but everyone else as well. The past is connected to communal senses of care and relationality. In the 21st century, the presence is in the 5.4 million Indigenous peoples in the United States and in their roles as children, mothers, grandparents, chief executive officers, teachers,

stay-at-home dads, and many other contributors in today's world. Indigenous people should not be only seen as caricatures tied to sports teams or as mythical figures from the past. The visibility must be on terms that do not create entrapments to colonial conquest. Presence must prevail over absence.

Act II: On Attempts of Erasure's Permanency

We (Megan's family) live on our original territories in an intergenerational home, on the shores of Lake Michigan and close to the Chicago river and other waterways that have been central to the movement of our people. The place that is the homelands of the Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi people—the three fires people. We live in a place that has been an inter-tribal place since time immemorial where the diaspora of tribal nations—Sauks, Meskwakis, Kickapoos, Hochunk, Menominee, Miami and others—would frequent for trade and exchange. We live in a place where a Black man, Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, married a Potawatomi woman, Kitiwaha, in the 1770s, had two children, and made life here as the political claims to the territory between the French, English, Spanish, and eventually the United States unfolded across their lifetimes. We live in a place that was ceded through a number of treaties over time starting in 1795 that were focused on our waterways, eventually leading to the Treaty of Chicago that began in 1821 and more later in 1833. We live in a place where Indigenous leaders contested the validity of some of these treaties, where Black Hawk led a resistance of Sauks, Meskwakis, and Kickapoos to resettle on their original territories—an effort that was met with open gunfire by a frontier militia orchestrated by U.S. officials. We live in a place where others would contest the legitimacy of the ceding of these homelands for decades, and centuries to come. We live in a place now called Evanston, founded by John Evans, the former governor of the Colorado Territories, whose leadership is responsible for the Sand Creek Massacre of Cheyenne and Arapaho peoples, and whose fortune that the town was founded on was made by his policy work of opening the West for land grabbing and railroads.

We live in a place whose histories of migrations and segregation is present in every turn in the city, in the legacies of schooling, in the reparations that hang in the air and the ballot. The streets we travel are named after this history in every way, with Tribes' defeats and generals' names valorized at every turn. The town and schools don't celebrate Native Heritage Month at all. I used to think, and mostly still do, that heritage months were an implicit ceding of invisibility in all the other months. But [having] no month, just nothing about Native peoples at all, has a surprising sting of ontological denial and dismissal of history, of relevance, of personhood. It's not that there's nothing. The town held the Custer Street Fair for years. The fair was moved to another town in 2019. Some students have asked for Indigenous Peoples Day, though it hasn't manifested substantively. My children have been asking for several years that the schools at least create a land acknowledgment and that teachers be trained to implement it, but there's been little traction and they endure the territory in schooling every day. The plea, for a day, of an acknowledgment, of some form of legibility, is really more about the desire to have some way of asserting our presence, our right to be.

Thankfully, we live in a place where the oldest urban Indian Center in the country was formed by peoples who survived forced, coerced, and chosen migrations here through relocation policies. We live in a place where there are dozens of community organizations that create programs and opportunities for all of us to continue to learn and nurture our responsibilities. We live in a place where Nimkii continues to learn about his kin relations and communal responsibilities through programs, community members, and elders—and from the lands and waters our ancestors have always been in relations with. We live in a place where people travel to other tribal communities to continue to learn and exchange. Where we travel to Walpole, to Navajo. We live in a place where community members work to revitalize their language use. We live in a place where we continue to make life together as Native peoples grounded in our own sovereignties and civics, despite coloniality.

There are many places like Evanston, built on or through the violent removal and killing of Indigenous peoples. Many of the individuals who live in those places are unaware of the history or the beginnings of the place. The history begins with the sign on the side of the road that reads “Evanston, est. 1863.” The term “est.” erases much of what came before; those erasures are permanent, so much so that, without irony, Indigenous Peoples Day is ignored, while the tradition of the Custer Street Fair continues. Evanston could be anywhere and everywhere. The civics of the 21st century must be aware of the beginnings of its current state. History and presence matters. While those who live in Evanston are physically distant from Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho peoples, the “est. 1863” should be linked there. The massacre of Cheyenne and Arapaho people in the territories in which John Evans was the governor allowed those lands to be opened, and railroads to be built. The building of railroads led to Evans creating wealth, and his ability to buy land—that land he bought is the original territories of the three fires peoples and has contested legal history. This is what established Evanston. This is what continues to define Evanston.

We would argue that one role of civics education in the 21st century is to recognize these presences and these connections. Land becomes place when peoples imbue it with meaning. There can be, however, different meanings attached to the same set of lands, making the same land different places. There is an opportunity to expand meanings of the interconnections between peoples and place in both the past and present. People should know where they live and its histories to understand its present and future.

Given the legalized required participation in schooling and its current state of practice, schools and schooling create significant developmental challenges for Indigenous youth who, like all youth, are trying to make their way in the world and figure out issues of identity, belonging, and purpose. They must not only learn to survive and navigate the onslaught of epistemic violence and ontological denial of their very existence that schooling imposes, but they must also learn their roles and responsibilities in their Tribal nations. Indeed, Indigenous youth must learn the truth that U.S. democracy is imposed on Indigenous peoples (Champagne, 2005; Dahl, 2018), and “wielded with impunity as the first and most violent weapon of mass destruction” (Grande, 2015, p. 50). However, these critical perspectives alone are not sufficient for Indigenous civics education. Indeed, criticality alone in civics education, even if focused on injustices, can participate in erasure. Criticality alone creates the conditions for Indigenous youth to

form identities, their knowledge, their reasoning based in the harm, in coloniality, in racism, in the negation of who they are as Indigenous people. This can put in motion forms of life that put the problems of harm and coloniality above the work of making life with kin relations. This is not only true for Indigenous youth; the problems of criticality alone are shared with other youth and communities.

Many Indigenous nations and communities have developed their own forms of education that have centered teaching and learning in Indigenous culture, language, and traditions while also cultivating youths' capacities to contribute to Tribal nations' needs and to navigate non-Indigenous societies. Rough Rock Community School in Rough Rock, Navajo Nation, Arizona, that opened in 1966, is such a place. While the school has significantly transformed over the years, its core vision states, "Our students will be resilient, lifelong learners who are skilled in the Diné language and culture, college and career ready and contributing citizens in a global multicultural society" (see www.roughrock.k12.az.us). The school continues to educate hundreds of Indigenous youth annually. It is the first American Indian community-controlled school and played a key role in advancing American Indian Self Determination. It also was the first contemporary school in the United States to teach in and through Diné language, marking a turn from colonial ontologies in education. In 2013, tribes in Washington State in partnership with the office of public instructions, created the State-Tribal Education Compact Schools that mark an important new era of Tribally developed forms of schooling that best serves Tribal communities' needs. These are but two examples of thousands. What is crucial to recognize is that like continuing to demand the recognition of Tribal sovereignty, Tribal communities have continued to create forms of education, including Indigenous civics, toward community well-being.

Act III: Citizens of Multiple Nations—Living in Good Relations

As Nimkii, Megan's son, prepares to hunt this fall, so we and our extended family have our traditional foods. He is also learning of our ancient treaties with the deer people who have agreed to feed us if we rightly treat them and the lands and waters we share. We are also reading our treaties with human peoples, those with the United States and with Canada. He is frustrated that we have to navigate Illinois hunting lotteries to access lands. He wishes we could just go to Canada to hunt at Walpole. We are talking about how we will be hunting in a place close to where Black Hawk led resistance. We are learning about why the protection of our lands and our hunting, fishing, and harvesting rights is fundamental to who we are, even if on ceded lands. We haven't been taught that the treaty with the deer people [is] amended because of our treaties with the United States or Canada. We are thinking about what the fires in the West mean for Native Nations there, the places that raised him through much of his childhood and that he carries love and responsibility for. We are discussing why re-learning our language is important. Why things like blood quantum and epigenetics are growing challenges for Native nationhood. Why passing the Violence Against Women Act has been hard or how policies of assimilation, relocation, or the cutting of supply chains of basic subsistence to reservation communities is a persistent strategy of the United States. Why structural data invisibility of Native people in the census or with COVID-19 is so harmful. Why when he is 18, voting in tribal elections is important but also voting in American

elections is important. About how many of our relatives have served in the military and why they have done that. We are talking about how the foundations of democracy aren't an American invention and are reflected in the Haudenosaunee confederacy. How Native peoples have always had our own political systems and expectations about how to be a good member of our communities. How those are different across our Nations and not all the same. Why our ongoing struggle for existence is a problem of structure and ongoing practice—not a historical exception. How it's a fundamental challenge that we as Native people have to grapple with as central to our life. We seem to always end these conversations on the core of our ancestral teachings of mino-biimadaziwin—that our job is to continually work at being a good human being, to live an ethical life. He is learning why it is important that he is upholding our treaty with the deer people. He is learning to understand our place and responsibility as human people with our lands, waters, and our extended kin relations, [and with] other humans as well as the rest of life we share places with. The politics of that basic idea are hauntingly complicated in a settler-colonial state and yet central to his adolescence.

The lives of Indigenous peoples are complicated because of multiple citizenships and, equally, our lack or denials of citizenships. The fact that Nimkii (Megan's son) hunts is not just to feed his family and be in good relations. It is, as Megan and her family have constructed it, fulfilling his treaty rights. While Indigenous peoples have, in some ways, pushed the past away, it is important here. The 1885 Treaty of Walla Walla noted that tribal peoples could hunt and fish "at all usual and accustomed places and stations." The right to do so has extended beyond the Yakama peoples who signed the treaty. The other lessons being imparted to young Indigenous peoples (like children) is that they are part of different nations. They have responsibilities across those nations. They have challenges in them because of the tensions between the nations. History matters; so does power. The United States has long-standing relationships with Tribal nations and communities rooted in treaties, in their promises, and in their recognition of a unique status. Simultaneously, because so many have either never learned or have forgotten the beginning (borrowing from Bourdieu and Passeron, they suffer from genesis amnesia), Indigenous children must continue the fight to fulfill their responsibilities—to animate their sovereignty (Stark & Stark, 2018). This work is to make sure they remember and have the territory, the space, and the possibilities of enacting their responsibilities (Coulthard & Simpson, 2016; Deloria, 1979), and to recognize that they have a membership; that is, they are part of a community or nation besides the U.S. memory and beyond a politic of colonial recognition.

With that memory comes elements; as noted earlier, responsibilities. Act III is a direct commitment to be in good relation with other peoples, with place (lands that have been imbued with meaning), with knowledge, and with ourselves. Relationships matter and they must be recognized, honored, nurtured, and maintained. They are reciprocal. We care for others and they care for us. The land feeds us, and we care for it. Indigenous civics education starts with communal rights and the concomitant responsibilities. It teaches about how people should nurture and uphold relations. How people should uphold responsibilities across generations—past, present, and future. All of this emanates from the fundamental relationships between rights and responsibilities that Indigenous civics is grounded in.

Act IV: Native Nations, Leadership, and Educational Self-Determination

What does self-determinations look like? I, Bryan, asked myself [this] as I reflected on my travels across the United States and engagements with Indigenous peoples who are working toward creating futures of their own making. I reflected on the work of the Kamehameha Schools, established through the trust of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, that seeks to meet the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children to engage in high level schooling, including Hawaiian language and culture. She passed away in 1884; the almost 400,000 acres she left as a gift to shepherd her peoples through education is now worth approximately \$12 billion. The foresight and love of the gift and visions humble me.

I consider the Waadookodaading immersion school founded to ensure the continuation of Ojibwe language. The name means “a place where people help each other.” It teaches the language and the culture rooted in relationships and larger notions of relationality. It had created the conditions for elders to talk and walk homelands with Ojibwe youth, totally in Ojibwe again.

And, I think about the fishing camps throughout Alaska, the northwest continental United States, the great lakes or the hunting camps throughout the Midwest, Northeast, Southwest, and Southeast where children learn to not only provide for their families, but to also learn how to be in relation to place and the animals that inhabit that space. This is where children learn to be members of their communities and parts of their place. I realize that learning is ubiquitous; so is teaching and foresight.

Communities continue to show extraordinary commitment and care to regenerating Indigenous civics despite a wide range of conditions and ongoing stressors. For example, Kamehameha schools, building on the foresight, care, and generosity of Bernice Bishop, educates more than 6,000 Native Hawaiian children per year. It provides them with opportunities to excel in a schooling environment while also ensuring that they have the opportunity to learn their language, customs, culture, and have a sense of pride knowing that they can be both grounded as members of their community and excel in school. Waadookodading has a very different context and history as a public Bureau of Indian Education school, 3,500 miles away, for Ojibwe children to be immersed in their language and culture while excelling in school. They think and process in Ojibwe while also facing the challenges of the 21st century. The camps along the Yukon River, in communities in northern Arizona, where Nimkii hunts, and in Robeson County, North Carolina, are places where children learn to be in good relations with all around them and they hear lessons on the importance of schooling. In our work with Indigenous communities, neither of us have ever had anyone say that learning to read, write, and do math is unimportant; what many members of Indigenous communities have said is that the ability to learn to do those things should not come *at the expense* of learning to be in good relations with other humans, animals, and places, or at the expense of their own languages, cultural practices, and fulfilling their responsibilities. There is a clear vision that one can, in fact, do both; that is wisdom, generosity, and foresight.

Learning happens in and through doing. We learn to be in relations with one another and place through big acts and small ones, by understanding that we learn

in and through place. Additionally, we learn “book knowledge” and the education of communal rights and responsibilities. Issues of “civics” and questions about what young people need to learn about political systems, about governance, and communal participation is not a new question—all societies grapple with this and these challenges change over time. They are necessary to being in good relations with and in imagining and enacting our futures. The erasure of Indigenous peoples and contributions from the public sphere of civics education does not mean that we are not engaged in self-determining acts. Imagine if all young people were given the opportunities to learn about these remarkable endeavors and the forms of life communities continue to strive for.

Epilogue: Who Could We Collectively Become?

We are in a moment pregnant with the potential of change and the desperate need for change. We began writing this in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic and the 2020 national elections, when there was a national debate raging around the importance of “patriotic education” that wanted to protect the United States against the naming of the ideology of White supremacy, or the grappling with realities of the nation’s complex history. It seemed there was an argument for civics education to be nationalist in a way that many were very concerned was a turn from the possibilities of democracy. Civics education has always been participating in particular nationalist discourse with respect to Indigenous peoples and to U.S. history. What we are proposing here is potentially a disruption of the “origins” or neat stories of the United States. The intent is to reframe commonly held beliefs that are known to be mythical. Brayboy and Chin (2020) argue that myths become truth through erasures and violence. We reject that framing of re-examining history; we are almost 250 years away from these aspirational words: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness,” and Americans’ histories, realities, and presences are not equal. Calls for the inalienable right of Indigenous sovereignty are viewed with derision and framed as undermining and forestalling equitable futures because they continue to be seen as a threat to individual rights. Asserting communal rights, Indigenous rights, is not unpatriotic. Nor does it have to mean the denial of individual rights or persons. But civics education must recognize sovereignty and the original inhabitants of the lands that now comprise the United States for any forms of justice to exist. We refuse to end our work here in the negation; civics education has the potential to lead in addressing the questions with which this section began. Across this section, we have worked to animate and explicate five necessary dimensions for creating a civics education that can achieve what we continue to think possible, if all people work to do the following:

1. Understand and confront the ongoing dynamics of settler-coloniality in U.S. history and narratives of the United States that perpetuate violence, erasure, and invisibility of Indigenous peoples;
2. Develop the political and ethical commitments, meaning the civic responsibility, to uphold Indigenous sovereignty and engage in nation-to-nation relations;

3. Ethically hold and grapple with the heterogeneous conditions of migrations that differentially shape experiences and the racialization of “peoples of color, including Indigenous peoples from other places,” and subsequently the complex work of relational solidarities across communities toward collective thriving;
4. Create forms of education that cultivate collective capacity to understand and generatively engage Indigenous peoples, our histories, sovereignties, knowledge systems, and distinct experiences with racialization and its impacts on Indigenous communities; and
5. Support the development of civics education for thriving Tribal nations and engaging the broader possibilities they open toward liberatory futures for all peoples.

The broad scale implementation of these dimensions we suggest would support the development of new generations capable of dreaming who we might collectively become in ways that are not enclosed by harm. Engaging issues of U.S. civics and Indigenous civics carefully and deeply raises important questions and possibilities not only for Indigenous youth but also youth whose own communal histories and conditions of forced enslavement or migration to the United States intersect with settler colonial paradigms to imagine beyond their negations as well. Civics education that meaningfully engages Indigenous peoples and paradigms could cultivate the ethical sensibilities to foreground relations and responsibilities with each other rather than individualisms and hierarchies of harm. It could cultivate leaders with the knowledge and sensibilities needed to address the challenges of the 21st century, particularly those around adapting to a changing climate, environmental decline, and transforming the layers of social systems that produce ongoing violence and are implicated in the roots of the current relations between human peoples and the places we live; those that see transforming the social, political, and economic assumptions and arrangement of life that have created them as ripe with possibilities for nurturing new forms of life and new forms of relations. The construction of relations and positions of Indigenous peoples globally, past, present, and future, is core to this endeavor for all peoples.

References

- Alcoff, L. M. (2007). Epistemologies of ignorance: Three types. In S. Sullivan & N. Tuana (Eds.), *Race and epistemologies of ignorance*. SUNY Press.
- Bang, M. (2016). Towards an ethic of decolonial trans-ontologies in sociocultural theories of learning and development. *Power and privilege in the learning sciences: Critical and sociocultural theories of learning*, pp. 115–138.
- Barker, J. (2005). *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in Indigenous struggles for self-determination*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Beaulieu, D. (2006). A survey and assessment of culturally based education programs for Native American students in the United States. *Journal of American Education*, 45(2), 50–61.
- Benally, C. (2019). “You need to go beyond creating a policy”: Opportunities for zones of sovereignty in Native American history instruction policies in Arizona. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 58(3), 11–33.
- Borrows, J. (2019). *Law’s Indigenous ethics*. University of Toronto Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, culture and society* (1st ed.). Sage Publications.
- Brandzel, A. L. (2016). *Against citizenship: The violence of the normative*. University of Illinois Press.
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425–446.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., & Chin, J. (2020). On the development of territory. *Contexts*, 19(3), 22–27.

- Brayboy, B. M. J., & Tachine, A. R. (2021). Myths, erasures, and violence: The immoral triad of the Morrill Act. *NAIS*, 8(1), 139–144.
- Calderon, D. (2014a). Speaking back to manifest destinies: A land education-based approach to critical curriculum inquiry. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(1), 24–36.
- Calderon, D. (2014b). Uncovering settler grammars in curriculum. *Educational Studies*, 50(4), 313–338.
- Champagne, D. (2005). Rethinking Native relations with contemporary nation-states. In D. Champagne, K. J. Torjesen, & S. Steiner (Eds.), *Indigenous peoples and the modern state* (pp. 3–23). AltaMira Press.
- Child, B. J. (2018). The boarding school as metaphor. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 57(1), 37–57.
- Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Dahl, A. (2018). *Empire of the people: Settler colonialism and the foundations of modern democratic thought*. University Press of Kansas.
- Deloria, V. (1974). Religion and revolution among American Indians: Religious politics and modernity in conflict. *Worldview*, 17(1), 12–15.
- Deloria, Jr., V. (1979). Self-determination and the concept of sovereignty. In R. D. Ortiz (Ed.), *Economic development in American Indian reservations* (pp. 22–28). University of New Mexico Press.
- Deloria, Jr., V., & Lytle, C. M. (1983). *American Indians, American justice*. University of Texas Press.
- Deloria, Jr., V., & Lytle, C. M. (1998). *The nations within: The past and future of American Indian sovereignty*. University of Texas Press.
- Deloria, Jr., V., & Wildcat, D. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Fulcrum Publishing.
- Demmert, W. G., Grissmer, D., & Towner, J. (2006). A review and analysis of the research on Native American students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 45(3), 5–23.
- Douglas, V., Purton, F., & Bascuñán, D. (2020). Possibility not difficulty: Difficult knowledge in K–12 classrooms as opportunities for renegotiating relationships with Indigenous perspectives and knowledges. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 66(3), 307–324.
- Eason, A. E., Pope, T., Becenti, K. M., & Fryberg, S. A. (2021). Sanitizing history: National identification, negative stereotypes, and support for eliminating Columbus Day and adopting Indigenous Peoples Day. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 27(1), 1–17.
- Escobar, A. (2016). Thinking-feeling with the Earth: Territorial Struggles and the Ontological Dimension of the Epistemologies of the South. *AIBR: Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, 11(1), 11–32.
- Galanda, G., & Dreveskracht, R. (2015). Curing the tribal disenrollment pandemic: In search of a remedy. *Arizona Law Review*, 57(2), 383–474.
- Grande, S. (2015). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought* (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Haynes Writer, J. (2010). Broadening the meaning of citizenship education: Native Americans and tribal nationhood. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(2), 70–81.
- Horne, E. B., & McBeth, S. (1999). *Essie's Story: The Life and Legacy of a Shoshone Teacher (American Indian Lives)*. Bison Books.
- Jacob, M. M., Sabzalian, L., Jansen, J., Tobin, T. J., Vincent, C. G., & LaChance, K. M. (2018). The gift of education: How Indigenous knowledges can transform the future of public education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 20(1), 157–185.
- Jackson, M. (In press). Critique's coloniality and pluriversal recognition: On care as the ecological ground of justice. To appear in J. Savarese & V. Chartrand (Eds.), *Unsettling colonialism in the Canadian criminal justice system: A reader*. Athabasca University Press.
- Johnston-Goodstar, K., & Roholt, R. V. (2017). "Our kids aren't dropping out; They're being pushed out": Native American students and racial microaggressions in schools. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 26(1–2), 30–47.
- Kimmerer, R. (2012). Searching for synergy: integrating traditional and scientific ecological knowledge in environmental science education. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 2(4), 317–323.
- Kimmerer, R. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants* (1st ed.). Milkweed Editions.
- Krouse, S. A. (1999). Kinship and identity. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 23(2), 73–89.
- LaDuke, W. (1999). *All our relations: Native struggles for land and life*. South End Press.

- Lee, T. S., & McCarty, T. L. (2017). Upholding Indigenous education sovereignty through critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy. In D. Paris & S. Alim (Eds.), *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 61–82). Teachers College Press.
- Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged worldviews colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 77–85). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Lomawaima, K. T. (2018). Indian boarding schools, before and after: A personal introduction. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 57(1), 11–21.
- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2002). When tribal sovereignty challenges democracy: American Indian education and the democratic ideal. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 279–305.
- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *“To remain an Indian”: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. Teachers College Press.
- Lyons, S. R. (2000). Rhetorical sovereignty: What do American Indians want from writing? *College Composition and Communication*, 51(3), 447–468.
- Miller, R. J. (2006). Tribal cultural self-determination and the makah whaling culture. In *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in Indigenous struggles for self-determination* (pp. 123–151). University of Nebraska Press.
- NCSS (National Council for the Social Studies). (2018, March). *Toward responsibility: Social studies education that respects and affirms Indigenous peoples and nations* [Position statement]. NCSS. <https://www.socialstudies.org/social-education/82/3/toward-responsibility-social-studies-education-respects-and-affirms>.
- Parker, A. C. (1916). The social elements of the Indian problem. *American Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 252–267.
- Prucha, F. P. (2000). *Documents of United States Indian policy* (3rd ed.). University of Nebraska Press.
- Reardon, J., & TallBear, K. (2012). “Your DNA is our history”: Genomics, anthropology, and the construction of Whiteness as property. *Current Anthropology*, 53(5), S233–S245.
- Richardson, T. A. (2007). Vine Deloria Jr. as a philosopher of education: An essay of remembrance. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 38(3), 221–230.
- Sabzalian, L. (2019a). *Indigenous children’s survivance in public schools*. Routledge.
- Sabzalian, L. (2019b). The tensions between Indigenous sovereignty and multicultural citizenship education: Toward an anticolonial approach to civic education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 47(3), 311–346.
- Schultz, K., & Noyes, E. (2020). “Then who are you?”: Young American Indian and Alaska Native women navigating cultural connectedness in dating and relationships. *Genealogy*, 4(4), 117.
- Seawright, G. (2014). Settler traditions of place: Making explicit the epistemological legacy of white supremacy and settler colonialism for place-based education. *Educational Studies*, 50(6), 554–572.
- Shear, S. B., & Krutka, D. G. (2019). Confronting settler colonialism: Theoretical and methodological questions about social studies research. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 47(1), 29–51.
- Shear, S. B., Knowles, R. T., Soden, G. J., & Castro, A. J. (2015). Manifesting destiny: Re/presentations of Indigenous peoples in K–12 U.S. history standards. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 43, 68–101.
- Shear, S. B., Sabzalian, L., & Buchanan, L. B. (2018). Affirming Indigenous sovereignty: A civics inquiry. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 31(1), 12–18.
- Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Duke University Press.
- Stanton, C. (2019). “Now you can’t just do nothing”: Unsettling the settler self within social studies education. *Social Education*, 83(5), 282–289.
- Stark, H. K., & Stark, K. J. (2018). Nenabozho goes fishing: A sovereignty story. *Daedalus*, 147(2), 17–26.
- TallBear, K. (2013). Genomic articulations of indigeneity. *Social Studies of Science*, 43(4), 509–533.
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79, 409–428.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*, 1, 1–40.
- Tully, J. (1995). *Strange multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vaught, S. E., Chin, J. A., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (Book manuscript under review). The school-prison trust: Conquest carcerality and Indigenous youth.
- Whyte, K. P. (2012). Now this! Indigenous sovereignty, political obliviousness and governance models for SRM research. *Ethics, Policy & Environment*, 15(2), 172–187.
- Wilkins, D., & Lomawaima, K. (2001). *Uneven ground: American Indian sovereignty and federal law*. University of Oklahoma Press.

- Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler-colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.
- Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257–337.

AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION AS PREPARATION FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT, REASONING, AND DISCOURSE

Vanessa Siddle Walker, *Emory University*

James D. Anderson, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

Joy Ann Williamson-Lott, *University of Washington*

Carol D. Lee, *Northwestern University*

This historical overview of African American education focuses on efforts within the community from Reconstruction through the 21st century to design and carry out educational efforts aimed at preparing young people to understand, resist, and wrestle with the challenges to citizenship rights rooted in the nation's history of slavery, legal apartheid, and ongoing structural impediments to full equity. These efforts involve professional educators working collaboratively within schools and professional associations, families and community members taking the lead, and influences of social, political, and cultural theorists over the decades. These efforts also involve alliances among community, professional, and social movement organizations. This history is offered as evidence of agency around addressing the challenges of civic engagement, and as a consequence, civic reasoning and discourse that go beyond political organizing around desegregation of schools, representing internal priorities within the African American community over the centuries. This history is not intended to suggest that there is a monolithic conceptualization of how to prepare African American youth for taking on the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship, but rather to convey that despite heterogeneity there has been a consistent, internally-driven set of efforts rooted in beliefs about the power of this community not seeing itself simply as subjects and objects of oppressive beliefs, practices, and policies, but rather consisting of agents of its own change.

This section is organized chronologically with a focus on three distinct eras: immediate post-emancipation, the early to middle 20th century, and post-*Brown v. Board of Education* through the early 21st century. Black agency existed in each epoch, though it looked different depending on the context. Black educators, parents, and activists morphed and evolved their efforts to deploy schools and educational spaces for racial uplift and to promote full citizenship and civic participation. What remained constant was a deep appreciation for Blackness in all forms—history, culture, values, institutions, and in Black people themselves—and a belief that a high-quality education steeped in civic preparedness was worth fighting for. Each new generation built on the foundation of their education ancestors to move the battle forward.

The authors identify particular strategies that Black educators and their allies employed at different times and in different contexts to empower the Black community to initiate change. Strategies like the creation of separate schools, the development and teaching of a counter-curriculum, and the inclusion of Black-themed content are threaded throughout Black educational history. These and the other strategies discussed below highlight the fact that Black people have never been mere subjects of White supremacy but agents of empowerment who sought to teach subsequent generations about citizenship and the demands of civic reasoning and discourse.

Black Education Post Emancipation

This section begins with initiatives in the African American community at the end of the Holocaust of Enslavement. During slavery, it was illegal for African Americans to learn to read or write, facing penalties of severe physical punishment and even death. As a consequence, African Americans saw literacy as a tool in their efforts to be liberated, viewing literacy as endowing not only potential economic uplift but equally important community empowerment.

Upon emancipation it became readily apparent that the former enslaved population emerged from the “peculiar institution” with a vision of citizenship that included a civic commitment to universal education. The underlying foundation of their social and political movement for universal education rested on their deep sense of self-reliance, self-determination, and their newly acquired citizenship, specifically the power of Black men to vote and shape the politics of the postbellum South. From the outset the former enslaved population envisioned universal education based on state constitutional provisions, statutes, and local regulations of public education. They could not achieve their vision, however, until they were able to register to vote under military Reconstruction in 1867.

Meanwhile, from the outbreak of the Civil War until military Reconstruction, the Freed People built a “Sabbath School System” throughout the South that operated mainly in the evenings and on weekends. The Sabbath schools reached thousands of children and adults unable to attend weekday schools. By 1869, the Freedmen’s Bureau offered a conservative estimate of more than 1,500 Sabbath schools enrolling more than 107,000 students. Such schools were established, paid for, and sustained by Black communities as part and parcel of their movement for freedom and equality. Still, the Freed People’s most important campaign to implant a new vision of universal education in the South was the incorporation of tax-supported public education into southern state constitutional law.

Under the Military Reconstruction Acts passed in 1867, Congress empowered its occupying armies to register all eligible male voters (only men could vote at the time) and call for new state constitutional conventions. Consequently, the former Confederate states witnessed for the first time the massive registration of Black male voters as well as their critical participation in reshaping southern constitutions. Of the approximately 630,000 Whites and 750,000 Freed People that registered in 10 former Confederate states, newly registered Black voters comprised a majority in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. The South immediately saw a new and different civic vision inserted into southern constitutional law.

Some of the new civic values included tax-supported universal public education, the explicit forbidding of racially segregated schooling in the constitutions of South Carolina and Louisiana, and the barring of school segregation in the Mississippi constitution. More importantly, with their newfound political power, the Freed People set on a course to build a system of free and equal public education. Although the Freed People did not accomplish all they envisioned, they effectively changed the course of southern education from Reconstruction until the end of the 19th century. To be sure, education curriculum and facilities were not exactly equal in all categories between Whites and African Americans, but the postbellum political power acquired by Black voters and the education equality principles inserted into the new southern

constitutions established and sustained a system of relative equality from emancipation to the end of the 19th century.

The political power of Black voters and the resulting system of more or less educational equality maintained from Reconstruction to the dawn of the 20th century stands in marked contrast to the era of disenfranchisement and gross education inequality of the Jim Crow era. As southern Whites recaptured southern state governments in the late 19th century, they altered or eliminated the provisions calling for funding equality between Whites and Blacks as well as clauses explicitly forbidding or failing to embrace racially segregated schooling. In their place, the White “redeemers” as they were called created a legally mandated system of racial segregation and inequality, attended by an elaborate set of unwritten and customary practices of racially separate and unequal schooling. This system remained intact for the first seven decades of the 20th century, in spite of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision that declared it unconstitutional in 1954.

Black Education During Legal Apartheid in the 20th Century: A Focus on the Work of African American Teachers

Coming out of Reconstruction (1865–1877) into the early 20th century, African Americans faced re-structured challenges under the period of Jim Crow. During this era of legal segregation, Black teachers played a significant role in the preparation of young people to engage with systemic racism. They carried out this work through the organization of curricula, liberatory pedagogical practices, and professional organizations of Black educators that advocated politically. Their work always existed as a counternarrative to the work to preserve White supremacy.

In 1919, Georgia educator Mildred Lewis Rutherford, a verbal advocate for restoring lost knowledge about the Confederacy, announced at a meeting of United Confederate Veterans that she would crusade for the “truth of history.” She expressed her concern that 81 percent of White students studied from Georgia texts that did not elevate states’ rights, including the right of secession; noted slavery as the rationale for the war between the states; focused on the cruelty of slaveholders; and elevated Lincoln. The Rutherford Committee’s subsequent publication, *A Measuring Rod to Test Text Books*, became the guide she and other White women used to conform the Georgia curriculum into a way of allowing schools to become the conduit through which the wisdom of Jim Crow and restriction of Black opportunity could be perpetuated through the training of generations of White citizens (McRae, 2018). Collectively, they erased African American history from textbooks and crafted a celebratory American history, with “great leaders and great causes, thus producing proud patriotic [White] citizens” (McRae, 2018, p. 144).

Many historic texts assume that Rutherford and subsequent generations of efforts by White women to elevate White superiority through textbooks created reduced aspirations among Black educators and their students (Ferguson, 2002). Unfortunately, these characterizations fail to illuminate the power of the Black educator working in concert with their local, state, and national organizations and using their interconnected network to infiltrate the curriculum of Black schools. In at least four ways, Black education became a means through which the plans of Rutherford could be disrupted. These include the utilization of a counter-curricular strategy, the weaponizing of civics, the building of resilient students, and the modeling of civic activity.

One way that Black educators countered strategies to construct a history dominated by White glory and laudable values and victories was a counter-curricular strategy that infused Black history into the visual and invisible curriculum of Black schools. While Rutherford would not formally introduce her plan to elevate Whiteness in national memory until 1919, Black educators already understood the ways Blacks were diminished in the nation in the years after Reconstruction. As early as 1908, when race violence became particularly viral, they already understood the need to counter in schools the public representations of who Black children could be and how Black history appeared in schools (Givens, 2021; Walker, 2018). By 1915, Carter G. Woodson, a former educator of 30 years, had launched the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History. He used this organization and his presence in teacher association meetings to introduce Black educators widely to curricular materials that could be used to infuse Black culture into Black school communities (Givens, 2021).

Throughout the decades that followed, teachers countered the substandard and southern-perspective textbooks with a viable counter-curriculum for Black students that infused Black art, history, and culture in varied ways through many southern, segregated, Black schools (Walker, 2018). The educators utilized oratory contests and dramatic presentations to celebrate the poetry of Blacks, and they enthusiastically embraced Woodson's vision of Black history week as a yearly celebration of Black accomplishments (Givens, 2021; Walker, 2018). In addition to pedagogically countering the limited historical textbooks, the numerically-strong Black teacher organization in Georgia also fought directly against the lack of inclusion of Black accomplishments in the textbooks. It was an organizational fight for the inclusion of Blacks in textbooks that was echoed in other ways in other states across the South over decades (Walker, 2018).

However, in addition to crafting a counter-parallel plan of Black infusion to refute American's diminishment of their contributions and humanity, Black educators also intentionally weaponized civics education. This second plan coincided with the year Rutherford proclaimed her intent to reclaim the values of the Confederacy in textbooks. Her plan was rejoined indirectly by a Black educator also from Georgia, Lucy Laney, during the annual meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1919. Laney proclaimed that Black educators had already been working to overthrow inequality. However, now they would begin a new strategy: "We are going to start anew in a way we know is going to be effective. We are going to start at the bottom with the children. We'll teach them history, vote, government" (Walker, 2018, p. 154). Laney also imagined a generational strategy, but a different one that would allow Black educators to appear to school boards to be fulfilling state mandates as they taught civics education. In reality, however, she was articulating an intent to lay a curricular foundation for resistance.

The ways educators embraced Laney's vision of using civics to create a generational strategy for resistance is evident in remaining materials from varied schools that exemplified engaged democratic activities in segregated schools. In 1924, when the first public high school for Black children since Reconstruction opened in the state of Georgia, Booker T. Washington High School, Principal Charles Harper began to teach lessons on political awareness. As the years progressed, he involved all students and the surrounding community in aggressive campaigning and electoral activities as students in the Independent and Progressive Parties fought for power and were rewarded

with office-taking during elaborate ceremonies in the courtyard in front of the school—complete with bands, banners, and flags for the winning party (Walker, 2018).

In the 1930s, the principal at Valena C. Jones School in New Orleans, Louisiana, organized her entire elementary school into a republic. Each classroom represented a state with elected officers that ranged from governor, lieutenant governor, treasurer, secretary of state, senators, judges, police officers, and so on. The students were required to develop parliamentary procedures, make rules, and pass resolutions for the good of the republic. A generation later, at Beach High School in Savannah, Georgia, the students created a plan to get everyone in the city registered to vote (Walker, 2018). In the 1960s, Principal Ulysses Byas crafted a plan to allow students to practice democracy through engagement in a student self-regulated democratic study hall. These select examples of activities encouraging segregated Black students to learn the principles of democracy appeared in numerous schools throughout the South (Walker, 2009, 2018).

Principal Byas explained the sentiment for the focus on civics set in motion by Laney. According to Byas, by creating a curriculum that taught students what America was supposed to be, the students would be able to learn that they were the victims of unfair American practices. He explained that people had to know someone did something to them, and that when people know that they are being harmed, the foundation is laid to become indignant. Ultimately, indignance at mistreatment would lead to change. The accuracy of Byas's 1960 summation about the role of civics in the Black schools is presciently captured in the *Atlanta Daily World* in 1932. Referring to the democratic practices the editors witnessed in the Booker T. Washington High School in Atlanta, the paper observed: "If the young of today are trained in the use of the ballot ... these same young people ... will not sit passively ... and let themselves be barred from complete citizenship" (Walker, 2018, p. 4). In 1938, the paper foresaw the birth of a civil rights movement because of the curricular strategy utilized in Black schools.

In a third, equally significant strategy, Black educators built students who had the resilience to counter oppression. In English classes, teachers appropriated European poetry such as "If" or "Invectus" and insisted that Black children across the South memorize these and other poems with similar ideas. Lines such as "keeping [their] heads when all around them were losing [theirs] and blaming it on [them]" or being victimized by the "bludgeonings of chance" but having an "unconquerable soul" helped build students whose heads might later be "bloody, but unbowed" (Walker, 2018, pp. 155–156). As far as White school boards could discern, the teachers were teaching poetry. Yet, the teachers themselves reportedly gave messages to students that told them to make sure they were listening to the words. Put another way, as students memorized particular selected poems—importantly, the same poems across the South—the wording created a foundation to enable numbers of children across states to believe they could achieve in a segregated and oppressive world. Through the intentioned messaging in their literature, the teachers built resilient, self-efficacious students who would refuse to be daunted because of challenging circumstances (Walker, 1996, 2018).

The intentioned messaging also appeared in assemblies and widely-embraced Black teacher beliefs. Inside and outside classrooms, principals and teachers taught the students to aspire and to believe they could be anything they wanted to be, despite the truth that segregation confined their job opportunities (Walker, 2018). At assemblies, one principal reminded students that they needed to "love themselves" as Black people,

notwithstanding the negative images they encountered in White America (Walker, 2018, p. 153). He told them they were more than the Little Black Sambo character that the Julius Rosenwald Foundation, through its library fund, first put into Black schools, and that indeed the pharaohs of Egypt looked like him, like them. In his words and the many replications in the other mandatory assemblies that comprised part of the curricula of Black schools, teachers and principals intentionally prepared the students to have the confidence to create and live in a world the educators fully expected would one day be created. As one president of the teachers' organization explained at a teachers' meeting in 1944, the job of the Black educator was to prepare the children "for the world of tomorrow" (Walker, 2018, p. 153). Through verbal affirmations, the teachers repeatedly engaged this process of resilience-building.

A final form of citizenship activity might also be observed among Black educators in Black schools, although this activity is less visible to students in earlier decades. This aspect is one where the educators engage in and model democratic practices. Through their organizations, the educators lobbied state school boards, federal education agencies, presidents, and others as a way of forcing into public conversation the need to provide equality for Black schools. In the earliest decades of the formation of NAACP chapters, educators were among the people who launched these chapters. In the 1940s, some educators led citizenship groups to spur registration in the Black community. By the 1950s, their activities included encouraging Black educators to register to vote, taking students to register to vote, marching to protest inequality, and running for public office. Throughout, the educators used their classrooms and school assembly platforms to repetitively affirm students to believe they could become a part of America (Walker, 2018). Indeed, among the activities that led to the infamous Bloody Sunday in Selma was the marching of Black teachers, an activity some youth reported as having inspired their own engagement (Crosby, 2015).

Rutherford may have intended the continuation of Jim Crow and limited civic participation through her plan for textbooks, but throughout their years in segregated schools, Black educators engaged in counter-messaging designed to address directly the reductionist vision for Black children planned by Rutherford and many others. Their success can be measured by the students they produced—the Martin Luther King Jr.s and Thurgood Marshalls and Oliver Hills, Blacks smart enough to overthrow the system under which their educators labored. It can be measured by the multitude of southern Black children, educated in segregated schools, who one day did begin the process of resistance now referred to as the Civil Rights Movement (Favors, 2019). To suggest that Black people had no resilient response to the plans of Whites against them is to miss fully the work of Black educators in Black segregated schools.

Importantly, the counter-messaging or the different kind and quality of literacy and civic reasoning envisioned and practiced by African Americans in the Jim Crow era rested squarely on the choices their ancestors made during the antebellum and Reconstruction eras. The first generation of post-slavery Black educators was comprised of men and women who struggled successfully to become literate under the oppressive constraints of slavery (Williams, 2005). They carried into the post-slavery environment complex and complicated historical experiences learned over nearly 250 years of slavery. As Phillip D. Morgan (1998) documents, on the eve of the American Revolution, nearly three-quarters of all African Americans in mainland British America lived in the

Chesapeake and Low Country region. This regional concentration provided structural support for the creation of a distinctive African American culture and the intergenerational transmission of patterns of meaning and shared values within the constraints of a dominant slaveholder's culture. Folklorist Roger Abrahams characterized this subterranean process as two cultures living "cheek to jowl for a matter of centuries, entertaining each other, subtly imitating each other in selective ways, but never fully comprehending the extent and meaning of these differences" (Abrahams, 1992, p. xxiv). As for African Americans, over the centuries within shared spaces, they accumulated new historical experiences that they transformed into cultural practices, institutional arrangements, and alternative belief systems and through which they interpreted, arranged, and hammered out the meaning of education for their communities, even as they interacted with powerholders imposing severe constraints on them. Hence, it should come as no surprise that they emerged from slavery with a distinctive consciousness of literacy and long-standing conceptual models in which dominant values of literacy were borrowed, redefined, and transmuted into their own ideas of civil society. Within the walls of dominance and subordination, African Americans created and recreated a distinctive and resilient value system of education and civic reasoning.

In 1883, Richard R. Wright, principal of Augusta, Georgia's "Colored High School" (later renamed E.A. Ware High School), was sworn and examined by what is now the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor & Pensions. The Senate Committee toured southern states to collect evidence on the conditions of capital, labor, and education in support of the Blair Education Bill that proposed millions of dollars in support of primary and secondary education (Jenkins & Peck, forthcoming). Although the Bill never became law, the Committee collected volumes of information on labor, capital, social, education, and racial conditions in the southern states. Being the principal of the first and only public high school for Black students in the State of Georgia made Wright a prime educator to interrogate about race, education, and labor in the postwar South. Following a series of questions about "colored farm laborers and farmers" in the state of Georgia, the investigation shifted from issues of labor and education to a query by Senator Henry Blair regarding Wright's views on the "Race Question." Wright readily understood the inquiry as an interrogation of his views regarding the comparative superiority and inferiority of the Black and White "races." His response provides a window into the history and civics taught in Black schools (Blair, 1885). One can only imagine the Committee's (which included senators from Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Virginia) reaction to Wright's understanding of arguments about race, particularly presumptions of White supremacy. As he informed the committee:

It is generally admitted that religion has been a great means of human development and progress, and I think that all the great religions which have blest this world have come from the colored races—all. In other words, what is called the Aryan race has not originated a single great religion. I believe, too, that our methods of alphabetic writing all came from the colored race, and I think the majority of the sciences in their origin have come from the colored races. (Blair, 1885, p. 813)

Realizing that he was speaking to an all-White committee that routinely extolled the supremacy of White civilizations, beginning with Egyptians, Wright expressed his belief in the Egyptians as a Hamitic or colored race:

Now I take the testimony of those people who know, and who, I feel are capable of instructing me on this point, and I find them saying that the Egyptians were actually woolly-haired negroes. In Humboldt's *Cosmos* ... you will find that testimony, and Humboldt, I presume, is a pretty good authority. The same is stated in Herodotus, and in a number of other authors with whom you gentlemen are doubtless familiar. Now if that is true, the idea that this negro race is inherently inferior seems to me to be at least a little limping. (Blair, 1885, p. 813)

The mere fight against teachings of Black inferiority compelled Black educators to resist both teachers and pedagogical content exalting White supremacy. W. H. Spencer, who spent 8 years as a teacher in public schools in Columbus, Georgia, objected to the employment of southern White teachers in Black public schools because they would teach White supremacy to Black children. Having taught in and observed schools that employed southern White teachers, Spencer observed that White teachers "would always teach [Black] children that they were inferior" (Blair, 1885, p. 580). Consequently, Spencer stressed the need for Black teachers and anti-racist White teachers.

Jelani M. Favors has documented this subterranean process ("second curriculum") in his long history of Black college student activism (Favors, 2019), and Vanessa Siddle Walker has done the same for Black public educators during the Jim Crow era (Walker, 2018). The "Hidden Heroes" of the Jim Crow era stood on the shoulders of the first post-slavery generation of African American educators. Although their definitive story is yet to be told, anecdotal testimony provides windows into the nature and content of their pedagogical beliefs and civic reasoning. The testimony of two prominent Black educators in the early 1880s gives a clue as to how they evolved education values of their own.

Thus, the campaign by Mildred Lewis Rutherford to foster a false narrative of Confederate honor and White supremacy echoed loudly the resistance and counter-curriculum activities that Black educators like Wright and Spencer waged during the Reconstruction and Gilded eras. From an outer gaze and a position of dominance, Jim Crow's champions failed to understand that White power was not the whole story, and not even the main story. For African American educators and students, the main story unfolded off-stage, beyond the direct observation and control of Jim Crow power-holders. This off-stage or second curriculum was produced and reproduced over generations, transmitting values and fundamental meanings that contradicted the teachings of White supremacy and undermined the constraints of Jim Crow power relations. Shaped and modified for each new epoch, African American subterranean culture, including its counter-curriculum, constantly evolved a resiliency and civic reasoning angled toward a democratic citizenship of freedom and equality. In vital respects, the counter-curriculum in Black culture is the most democratic value system in American history. It is no wonder that the products of this value system fed their ideological descendants, who continued the assault on systemic racism and social and economic inequality.

African American Efforts in the Post-Brown Era: Community Organizing and Social Movements

The particular nature of Black agency would necessarily change after the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision that declared legal segregation of K-12 schools by race unconstitutional. The change was slow, though. Southern states did not rush to

desegregate their schools and states outside the region were not bound by the decision, which meant racial segregation in schools continued there, too. Even when school desegregation did occur, Black students often suffered. Though some contemporaneous scholars and federal reports absolved schools of responsibility and pointed to Black communities and families as the root of Black underachievement (Coleman et al., 1966; Mosteller and Moynihan, 1972), others indicted schools and school officials for perpetuating White privilege and White supremacy (Clark, 1965; Hamilton, 1969). More contemporary scholars make the same argument that schools deliberately stunt Black educational and therefore civic potential. Black students encounter an alienating curriculum and pedagogy that privileges White vantage points, a cultural disconnect between school environments and Black students' social and cultural backgrounds, a system of tracking that targets them for remedial or special education classes, and continued underfunding of predominantly Black schools (Horsford, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Lomotey, 1990).

An additional consequence of desegregation efforts that did occur was the massive loss of Black teachers and administrators in desegregated schools (Hudson & Holmes, 1994; Picott, 1976) as well as closing of all Black schools (Cecelski, 1994). Anderson (2006) offers a comprehensive overview of the political maneuverings behind this decimation of the Black teaching force in the South post *Brown v. Board of Education* and how these shifts in teachers, administrators, and all Black schools are entailed in long-standing legal structures to constrain and redirect Black education. These shifts in the teaching force matter for efforts in the community to use education as a tool for empowering Black students to resist racism and develop the dispositions to use the tools of citizenship to empower the African American community.

As has been previously discussed, Black communities never sat idly and allowed Black children to be demoralized, demonized, and undereducated. The same held true for the post-*Brown* era, and the effort to bolster the quality and relevance of education for Black youth continues into the 21st century. Fed up with the large discrepancy between expected results and actual achievements of Black children in desegregated schools, Black communities and activists have taken several paths to deploy education and schools as a means to make real the promises of the Constitution. Three of those paths include forcing changes to existing schools, creating alternate formal schooling options, and creating informal educational opportunities.

One way that Black educators in the post-*Brown* era sought to remake existing schools was through the community control movement. As a thoroughly democratic idea, community control allowed community residents to participate in policy making, have more power over hiring and curricular decisions, and more fully link the school to the community. Advocates argued that the inclusion of Black-centered materials, use of students' backgrounds as a springboard for learning, incorporation of different perspectives of reality into the classroom, and connection of education to real-life situations and the community—all of which were lacking in White-controlled schools—boosted students' self-esteem, feelings of belonging, and cultural pride. Such an education produced well-rounded and intelligent individuals ready to use their knowledge to initiate social reform and improve the conditions of the communities from which they came.

The most famous community control effort took place in the predominantly Black and Puerto Rican New York City neighborhood of Ocean Hill-Brownsville in 1968.

Parents and community members there took advantage of a new opportunity put forth by the New York City Board of Education that allowed residents to elect their own local school boards with power over curricular and personnel decisions. They moved quickly to infuse Black content in the curriculum and hire teachers who knew and valued Black and Puerto Rican children. They argued these and other changes would transform local schools into the kind of institutions that emphasized unity and collective responsibility and taught students “that you are a person, that you are of value, that you are of worth” (Perlstein, 2004, p. 127; see also Podair, 2002). Famed author and activist James Baldwin applauded the community control experiment as an antidote to what New York schools (and other White-controlled schools) regularly taught Black children:

It is the school that makes vivid to the child his helpless inferiority. It does this by having no respect whatever for the child’s experience.... The school assures him ... that he deserves his condition.... When the school is finished with him ... he is ready for the streets, the needle, the jail, the army, the garment center, ready to be used in nearly any way whatever. (Baldwin, 1974, pp. xi–xii)

The community control movement was larger than the Black community or New York City schools. Local activists across the country sought to de-bureaucratize the system and create smaller districts with increased community input. In many ways, their efforts echoed far older initiatives, some from even before public schools existed in any meaningful way, to allow parents and community members to determine how their children’s schools would be run (see Jefferson Letter to Cabell, 1816). Though those initiatives focused on White parents and communities, 1960s Black activists commandeered and repurposed the argument for local control for their own ends in their battle to upend White supremacy and instill in students cultural pride and civic principles and sensibilities.

The same spirit of remaking existing schools in the image of their local communities—as well as accurately representing the breadth of the American populace—can be found in the battles over curriculum and pedagogy in today’s schools. There, Black educators (and allies) leverage their demands for Black representation with a desire to increase the educational and life chances of other minoritized groups. While their educator ancestors needed to create (sometimes surreptitiously) a counter-curriculum for segregated Black schools, today’s educators devise curricular innovations for children in *all* American schools. For instance, they have advanced the notion of multicultural education, which is defined by Banks and Banks (2004) as “an idea, an educational reform movement, and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students, and students who are members of diverse racial, ethnic, language, and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school” (p. 1). Similarly, advocates of culturally responsive pedagogy or culturally sustaining pedagogy argue that schools should be places that either connect learning to students’ cultural knowledge and lived experiences (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995) or as sites that “perpetuate and foster—to *sustain*—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling and as a needed response to demographic and social change” (Paris & Alim, 2014, p. 88, 2017). The demands and guiding principles of Black Lives Matter activists fit here, as well (Black Lives Matter, n.d.).

These curricular and pedagogical efforts, like those of their Black educator ancestors, seek to transform existing schools into spaces that promote social transformation, justice, and human dignity and are explicit manifestations of how Blacks deployed schools to instill in students civic reasoning toward a democratic citizenship and equality.

A second way Black communities have modified and evolved their tactics to achieve the educational and civic potential of Black youth in the post-*Brown* era is through the creation of alternate formal schooling options. Like W. E. B. Du Bois before them, they do not fall for the trap of equating *segregated* schools with *separate* schools. As Du Bois declared in 1935,

separate schools for Black youth are needed just so far as they are necessary for the proper education of the Negro race. The proper education of any people includes sympathetic touch between teacher and pupil; knowledge on the part of the teacher, not simply of the individual taught, but of his surroundings and background, and the history of his class and group; such contact between pupils, and between teacher and pupil, on the basis of perfect social equality, as will increase this sympathy and knowledge. If this is true, and if we recognize the present attitude of white America toward black America, then the Negro not only needs the vast majority of these schools, but it is a grave question if, in the near future, he will not need more such schools. (Du Bois, 1935, p. 328)

Black independent schools were born from this impetus (Ratteray, 1992; Rickford, 2016; Shujaa, 1994). Many African American parents come to the conclusion that mainstream schools fail to provide their children with an education that prepares them to be productive citizens able to face the challenges of an increasingly technological and global society. With the centering of Black knowledge systems, cultures, and histories, the expectation is that children will be encouraged to understand themselves as a part of the African Diaspora, important contributors to the progress of the human race, and agents in social reform equipped to uplift and strengthen the Black community (Asante, 1987, 1991; Karenga, 1993).

The African-centered educational movement was a major community-based effort from the 1970s forward (Lomotey & Brookins, 1988; Shujaa, 1994). The Council of Independent Black Institutions was founded in 1972 and served as the organizational umbrella for independent African centered schools in cities across the country—including Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, DC, among others. These schools in many ways were a natural outgrowth of efforts in the Black community to affirm education as a tool for community empowerment through developing students with a strong sense of identity, rooted in a comprehensive understanding of African and African diaspora history and culture (Bethune, 1939; Bond, 1935). These efforts were directly influenced by the work of scholars and activists like Arthur Schomburg who, with John Edward Bruce, established the Negro Society for Historical Research in 1911, an organization connected to efforts leading to the establishment of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture in 1926 in New York City; and Carter G. Woodson, who established the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in 1915, wrote the prophetic volume *The Mis-education of the Negro* in 1933, and whose work and advocacy inspired what has become Black History Month in February of each year. Similar attention to a shared Black culture rooted in African traditions was also

reflected in the arts in movements such as the Harlem Renaissance during the 1930s and 1940s and again in the Black Arts Movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

It should be further noted that there is parallel focus in the fields of Black psychology and human development on immersion in the study of African, African diaspora, and African American history and culture, especially as principles derived from such studies are embodied in pedagogical practices and contribute both to a positive sense of identity as well as positive academic outcomes (American Psychological Association Task Force on Resilience and Strength in Black Children and Adolescents, 2008; Bowman & Howard, 1985; Boykin & Bailey, 2000; Chavous, 2000; Hale-Benson, 1986; Sellers et al., 1998; Spencer et al., 2003). Among the two oldest schools in this tradition still operating are the New Concept School of the Institute of Positive Education (established in 1972) and the Betty Shabazz International Charter Schools (established in 1998), both in Chicago (Lee, 1994). While many of these Afrocentric schools started as independent, some are currently serving as either charter schools or public schools. These schools serve as exemplars of community-centered schools in the Black community established to build a strong sense of community and agency to prepare new generations of young people who understand the need for and urgency of being active in civic life in order to address inequities experienced by peoples of African descent in the United States.

Advocates of Afrocentric schools, a subset of Black independent schools, argue that it is valuable in all K–12 subjects, not just the arts or humanities where such content is often relegated. Carol Lee (1994), for example, describes how, at the New Concept School, students working through a unit on aeronautics built a model wind tunnel and studied air pressure, air lift, and the nature of aerodynamics while researching the story of the Tuskegee Airmen. Those studying architecture tested the strength of certain shapes in construction as well as the Egyptian pyramids.

Another, though now defunct, example of an Afrocentric educational model is the set of schools created by the Black Panther Party. As the fifth point in its Ten-Point Program, the Panthers proposed “an education for our people that exposes the true nature of this decadent American society. We want education that teaches us our true history and our role in present-day society. We believe in an educational system that will give to our people a knowledge of self. If a man does not have knowledge of himself and his position in society and the world, then he has little chance to relate to anything else” (quoted in Heath, 1976, p. 249). The Panthers’ vision was most fully realized in their Oakland Community School (OCS), a model for Afrocentric schools operated by Panthers and others across the country that was operational from 1971 to 1982. It ran year-round and educated hundreds of students in its lifetime. The school implemented (to varying degrees) pedagogically progressive ideas with an Afrocentric twist. The mission of the school shifted over time but was always anchored in serving the local community and equipping Black youth with the mindset, skills, and knowledge they needed to succeed (Brown, 1992; see also Huggins & LeBlanc-Ernest, 2009). The school drew recognition from Black community members, lawmakers, and an assemblyman for its efforts. In 1977, California Governor Edmund “Jerry” Brown issued OCS a commendation for its high quality work (Brown, 1992).

Boarding schools and homeschooling are additional examples of alternative formal schooling options. For instance, The Piney Woods School in rural Mississippi is an

independent coeducational boarding school that focuses on the education of Black students from the United States and abroad. It embodies what Akoto (1992) found to be the case at other historically Black boarding schools: that their attention to cognitive development, the cultural orientations of the child, and social and emotional maturation create lasting positive impacts on students (see also Alexander-Snow, 2011). Some parents turn to homeschooling for similar reasons. According to Puga (2019), homeschooling parents even consider their decision to be an act of protest against the racism and alienation their children experienced in formal schooling contexts (see also Mazama, 2015; Mazama & Lundy, 2012).

A third way the Black community has sought to improve the educational conditions and outcomes for Black youth in the post-*Brown* era is the creation of informal educational spaces. The most famous example of informal education as empowerment, resistance, and politicization was the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's Freedom Schools in Mississippi in summer 1964. The Freedom Schools blended the teaching of traditional academic subjects and what they called a "Citizenship Curriculum" with the explicit purpose of "train[ing] people to be active agents in bringing about social change" (Mississippi Freedom School Curriculum—1964, 1964/1991, p. 9). Charles Cobb, an architect of the schools, argued, "If we are concerned with breaking the power structure, then we have to be concerned with building up our own institutions to replace the old, unjust, decadent ones which make up the existing power structure" (Cobb, 1963/1991, p. 36). Students, then, were expected to use their newfound knowledge to force changes in their formal schools and work for racial equity inside and outside the classroom.

Evidence indicates that students did, in fact, use their knowledge to challenge Mississippi power structures. Students at one Freedom School wrote their own version of the Declaration of Independence and argued, "In the course of human events, it has become necessary for the Negro people to break away from the customs which have made it very difficult for the Negro to get his God-given rights.... We do hereby declare independence from the unjust laws of Mississippi which conflict with the United States Constitution" (Freedom School Students of St. John's Methodist Church, Palmer's Crossing, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1964/1991, p. 35). Others expanded legal protections for school-aged youth by challenging the prohibition against wearing "freedom buttons" on school grounds (*Blackwell v. Issaquena Board of Education*, 1966; *Burnside v. Byars*, 1966). Still others reflected back on their time in a Freedom School as an inspiration for future activism. As former student Eddie James Carthan put it, "The Freedom Schools shaped my future, my thinking, my outlook on life, they challenged me to do the things I've done and to have the mindset that I have. If I had to attribute anything to my community involvement, I would attribute it to my attending the Freedom School" (Hale, 2016, p. 1). Lastly, the Children's Defense Fund continues the tradition of Freedom Schools through summer literacy and cultural enrichment programming (Children's Defense Fund, n.d.).

Another example are rites of passage programs for Black youth, which focus on the aspects of a child's development and learning that occur outside any formal schooling context. The purpose of such programs, according to Warfield-Coppock (1992, p. 472), is "instilling a strong, positive sense of self and achievement in African American youth and returning a sense of empowerment to African American families

and communities.” Black youth engage in a set of activities or celebrations that mark the transition from one stage of life to another but also bond them together, integrate them into the wider Black community, and reinforce cultural traditions. For instance, the Brotherhood/Sister Sol’s Rite of Passage Program, in New York City, offers weekly sessions that encourage critical thinking skills, leadership development, global awareness, and community responsibility for Black and Latinx youth (The Brotherhood/Sister Sol, n.d.). Those that complete the program create an “Oath of Dedication” and assume additional leadership roles in the organization.

Conclusion

Black community efforts, whether before or after *Brown*, that link education to the creation of the good and just society are the ideological descendants of ancestors like the abolitionist and author Frederick Douglass. After being told by his enslaver that learning would “forever unfit him to be a slave,” he remembered, “from that moment, I understood the pathway from slavery to freedom” (Douglass, 1845/1988, pp. 58, 59). Douglass understood the benefits of education beyond his own literal personal freedom. As he told a group of Black students in 1894, “Education ... means emancipation. It means light and liberty. It means the uplifting the soul of man into the glorious light of truth, the light only by which man can be free. To deny education to any people is one of the greatest crimes against human nature” (Douglass, 1894, p. 12). It is this pursuit of light, truth, and emancipation that has propelled Black communities in their battle to remake schools or in their creation of alternative spaces, and it is this pursuit that can propel American education—and democracy—forward.

References

- Abrahams, R. D. (1992). *Singing the master: The emergence of African American culture in the Plantation South*. Pantheon Press.
- Akoto, K. A. (1992). *Nationbuilding: Theory and practice in Afrikan centered education*. Pan Afrikan World Institute.
- Alexander-Snow, M. (2011). The Piney Woods School: An exploration of the historically Black boarding school experience in shaping student achievement, cultural esteem, and collegiate integration. *Urban Education, 46*(2), 322–341.
- American Psychological Association Task Force on Resilience and Strength in Black Children and Adolescents. (2008). *Resilience in African American children and adolescence: A vision for optimal development*. American Psychological Association.
- Anderson, J. D. (2006). A tale of two “Browns”: Constitutional equality and unequal education. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 105*(2), 14–35.
- Asante, M. K. (1987). *The Afrocentric idea*. Temple University Press.
- Asante, M. K. (1991). The Afrocentric idea in education. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 170–180.
- Baldwin, J. (1974). Introduction. In R. Campbell (Ed.), *The chasm: The life and death of a great experiment in ghetto education* (pp. ix–xx). Houghton Mifflin.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bethune, M. M. (1939). The adaption of the history of the Negro to the capacity of the child. *Journal of Negro History, 29*, 9–13.
- Black Lives Matter. *Black Lives Matter at school*. <https://www.blacklivesmatteratschool.com/13-guiding-principles.html>.
- Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of Education*, 363 F.2d 749 (1966).

- Blair, H. W. (Chair). (1885). *Report of the Committee of the Senate Upon the Relations Between Labor and Capital and Testimony Taken by the Committee in five Volumes*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bond, H. M. (1935). The curriculum of the Negro child. *Journal of Negro Education*, 4(2), 159–168.
- Bowman, P., & Howard, C. (1985). Race related socialization, motivation and academic achievement: A study of Black youths in three generation families. *Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 24, 134–141.
- Boykin, A. W., & Bailey, C. (2000). *Experimental research on the role of cultural factors in school relevant cognitive functioning: Synthesis of findings on cultural contexts, cultural operations and individual differences*. Howard University and John Hopkins University.
- Brown, E. (1992). *A taste of power: A Black woman's story*. Pantheon Books.
- Burnside v. Byars*, 363 F.2d 744 (1966).
- Cecelski, D. S. (1994). *Along freedom road: Hyde County, North Carolina and the fate of black schools in the South*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Chavous, T. M. (2000). The relationships among racial identity, perceived ethnic fit, and organizational involvement for African American students at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 26(1), 79–100.
- Children's Defense Fund. *The CDF Freedom Schools model*. Children's Defense Fund. <https://www.childrensdefense.org/programs/cdf-freedom-schools>.
- Clark, K. (1965). *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. Harper and Row.
- Cobb, C. (1963/1991). Prospectus for a summer Freedom School program. *Radical Teacher*, 40(Fall), 36.
- Coleman, J., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Crosby, E. (2015). *The Selma voting rights struggle: 15 key points from bottom-up history and why it matters today*. Teaching for Change. <https://www.teachingforchange.org/selma-bottom-up-history>.
- Douglass, F. (1845/1988). *Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass, an American slave*. Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Douglass, F. (1894, September 3). *An oration delivered at the Manassas Industrial School, Manassas, Virginia*. The Frederick Douglass Papers, Library of Congress. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mfd&fileName=49/49002/49002page.db&recNum=0&itemLink=/ammem/doughtml/dougFolder9.html&linkText=7>.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). Does the Negro need separate schools? *Journal of Negro Education*, 4(3), 328–335.
- Favors, J. M. (2019). *Shelter in a time of storm: How Black colleges fostered generations of leadership and activism*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Ferguson, K. (2002). *Black politics in new deal Atlanta*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Freedom School Students of St. John's Methodist Church, Palmer's Crossing, Hattiesburg, Mississippi. (1964/1991). Declaration of Independence. *Radical Teacher*, 40(Fall), 35.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Givens, J. (2021). *Fugitive pedagogy: Carter G. Woodson and the art of Black teaching*. Harvard University Press.
- Hale, J. N. (2016). *The Freedom Schools: Student activists in the Mississippi Civil Rights Movement*. Columbia University Press.
- Hale-Benson, J. (1986). *Black children: Their roots, culture and learning styles*. John Hopkins University Press.
- Hamilton, C. V. (1969). Race and education: A search for legitimacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 38(4), 669–684.
- Heath, G. L. (1976). *Off the pigs!: The history and literature of the Black Panther Party*. Scarecrow Press.
- Horsford, S. D. (2011). *Learning in a burning house: Educational inequality, ideology, and (dis)integration*. Teachers College Press.
- Hudson, M. J., & Holmes, B. J. (1994). Missing teachers, impaired communities: The unanticipated consequences of *Brown v. Board of Education* on the African American teaching force at the precollegiate level. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 63(3), 388–393.
- Huggins, E., & LeBlanc-Ernest, A. D. (2009). Revolutionary women, revolutionary education: The Black Panther Party's Oakland community school. In J. Theoharis, K. Woodard, & D. F. Fore (Eds.), *Want to start a revolution? Radical women in the Black Freedom Struggle* (pp. 161–184). New York University Press.
- Jefferson, T. (February 2, 1816). *Letter to Joseph C. Cabell*. Founders Online, National Archives. <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/03-09-02-0286>. [Original source: Looney, J. J. (Ed.). (2012). *The papers of Thomas Jefferson* (Retirement Series, Vol. 9, September 1815 to April 1816, pp. 435–439). Princeton University Press.]

- Jenkins, J. A., & Peck, J. (2020). The Blair Education Bill: A lost opportunity in American public education. *Studies in American Political Development*, 34(2), 1–25.
- Karenga, M. (1993). *Introduction to Black studies*. University of Sankore Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Lee, C. D. (1994). African-centered pedagogy: Complexities and possibilities. In M. J. Shujaa (Ed.), *Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox of Black life in White societies* (pp. 295–318). Africa World Press.
- Lomotey, K. (Ed.). (1990). *Going to school: The African American experience*. State University of New York Press.
- Lomotey, K., & Brookins, C. (1988). The independent Black institutions: A cultural perspective. In D. T. Slaughter & D. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Visible now: Blacks in private schools* (pp. 163–183). Greenwood Press.
- Mazama, A. (2015). *African Americans and homeschooling: Motivations, opportunities and challenges*. Routledge.
- Mazama, A., & Lundy, G. (2012). African American homeschooling as racial protectionism. *Journal of Black Studies*, 43(7), 723–748.
- McRae, E. G. (2018). *Mothers of massive resistance: White women and the politics of White supremacy*. Oxford University Press.
- Mississippi Freedom School Curriculum–1964. (1964/1991). *Radical Teacher*, 40(Fall), 6–34.
- Morgan, P. D. (1998). *Slave counterpoint: Black culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake & Lowcountry*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Mosteller, F., & Moynihan, D. P. (1972). *On equality of educational opportunity: Papers deriving from the Harvard University Faculty Seminar on the Coleman Report*. Random House.
- Paris, D., & Alim, S. H. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85–100.
- Paris, D., & Alim, S. H. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Perlstein, D. H. (2004). *Justice, justice: School politics and the eclipse of liberalism*. Peter Lang.
- Picott, J. R. (1976). A quarter century of the Black experience in elementary and secondary education, 1950–1974. *The Negro Educational Review*, 27(1), 45.
- Podair, J. E. (2002). *The strike that changed New York: Blacks, Whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville crisis*. Yale University Press.
- Puga, L. (2019). “Homeschooling is our protest”: Educational liberation for African American homeschool families in Philadelphia, PA. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(3), 281–296.
- Ratteray, J. D. (1992). Independent neighborhood schools: A framework for the education of African Americans. *Journal of Negro Education*, 61(2), 138–147.
- Rickford, R. J. (2016). *We are an African people: Independent education, Black Power, and the radical imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Sellers, R. M., Chavous, T. M., & Cooke, D. Y. (1998). Racial ideology and racial centrality as predictors of African American college students’ academic performance. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24(1), 8–27.
- Shujaa, M. J. (1994). Afrocentric transformation and parental choice in African American independent schools. In M. J. Shujaa (Ed.), *Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox of Black life in White societies* (pp. 361–376). Africa World Press.
- Walker, V. S. (1996). *Their highest potential: A school community in the segregated South*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Walker, V. S. (2009). *Hello professor: A Black principal and professional leadership in the segregated South*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Walker, V. S. (2018). *The lost education of Horace Tate: Uncovering the hidden heroes who fought for justice in schools*. The New Press.
- Warfield-Coppock, N. (1992). The rites of passage movement: A resurgence of African-centered practices for socializing African American Youth. *Journal of Negro Education*, 61(4), 471–482.
- Williams, H. A. (2005). *Self taught: African American education in slavery and freedom*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. The Associated Publishers.

HISTORICIZING LATINX CIVIC AGENCY AND CONTEMPORARY LIVED CIVICS

Maribel Santiago, *University of Washington*
Cati V. de los Ríos, *University of California, Berkeley*
Kris D. Gutiérrez, *University of California, Berkeley*

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Professor Rubén Donato and Colorado District Judge Martin Gonzales (Alamosa, Colorado) for sharing their expertise on historical Latinx resistance as context for this paper, Professor Sonia Nieto for her thoughtful and substantive feedback, and Professor Chris Zepeda-Millán for sharing his insight on contentious Latinx politics.

We bring to this discussion of civic action among Latinx populations in the United States an expanded notion of agency and resilience and a reframing of civics as a form of lived Latinx civics (Cohen et al., 2018; de los Ríos & Molina, 2020). Here, we use resilience not to talk about individuals but instead locate resilience in larger sociocultural systems (e.g., families, communities, institutions, and organizations). This notion of resilience focuses on groups of people developing and employing agentic practices, both with ingenuity and in ways that amplify culture. In particular, we focus on ecological resilience in which diversity is not a deficit but an essential resource of any resilient and sustainable ecology across longer time scales and institutions (Gutiérrez, 2016). While the focus of this section is on Latinx peoples in the United States, we are mindful of the shared histories of legal, social, and educational inequities Latinx communities have endured, as well as the significant variance experienced by Latinx peoples. By situating the histories of resistance and agency in their particular geographical, historical, local, linguistic, and sociopolitical specificities, we hope to call attention to the forms of exclusion from civics and citizenship experienced by Americans of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin.³ These forms of exclusion were explicitly designed (in codified law and in lived practices) to limit access to social and educational institutions, as well as political, cultural, and economic life.

We engage in this conversation about Latinx civics mindful of the critiques against the term “Latinx.” The term is meant to bring under an umbrella category different communities from distinct nations and racial backgrounds that have to some extent a shared colonial past and linguistic history such that they can be grouped for political purposes. However, in an effort to create a unifying term, several racial nuances are ignored, flattening out differences and histories that matter. For example, some argue that “Latinx” centers Spanish/European ancestry, marginalizing Indigeneity, and ignoring African roots (Banks, 2006; Bost, 2003; Santiago, 2019a). The term also does not take into account differences between Latin American nations and does not include the Caribbean, nor does it consider the distinct immigration experiences that

³ We focus on the experiences of communities of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin, as these are the two cultural communities for which there is the most literature, but recognize the shared history of experiences across a more pan-Latinx analysis. There are limited documented histories of central and southern American origin communities in the United States.

are intertwined with colonialism (Salazar, 2019). Puerto Ricans, for example, are U.S. citizens because Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States. Yet, Puerto Ricans are misidentified as Latinx immigrants from other nations (Doubek & Campbell, 2018). It is within this context that we discuss Latinx civics, fraught with complexities regarding race/ethnicity, nationality, citizenship, and language.

Of relevance to this section, we consider the consequences of this homogenization on addressing documented accounts of Afro-Latinx civic agency. Latinx are racially diverse and it is this racial ambiguity and constantly changing relationship to immigration and language that U.S. political and social structures have used to disenfranchise Latinx communities (Santiago, 2019b). As a result, Latinx communities have developed various forms of resistance practices in response to the shifting labels imposed on them and their attendant forms of oppression. Some of these histories have been more well-documented than others.

For example, while there is a well-known history of civic activism in Afro-Latinx communities, there are few academic accounts recorded before the 1970s, as racializing practices categorize Afro-Latinx peoples as either Black or Latinx. As a result, documented Afro-Latinx civic agency before the 1970s is difficult to find despite their rich histories of activism. Such dichotomous forms of racialization relegate their presence as historical actors to one group, thus erasing their complex racial experiences and unique historical contributions as Afro-Latinx people. The few documented events of Afro-Latinx resistance surfaced in the late 1960s when many Puerto Ricans embraced an identity rooted in the African diaspora and Blackness. Black nationalism helped inform and develop these identities (Torres & Velázquez, 1998). However, the documented Black Puerto Rican experiences are not representative of other Afro-Latinx, such as Afro-Colombianx or Afro-Cubanx. Thus, it is challenging to discuss Afro-Latinx contributions when social and historical structures have obscured their identities and experiences. We note this history, as it is important to discuss shared civic engagement and histories of U.S. Latinx people without promoting reductive notions of what it means to be Latinx.

At the same time, where there is oppression, there is resistance and rich forms of learning and cultural and civic life, in which civics are appropriated in the home and community's cultural practices. These are also intergenerational forms of learning in which agentic and resistance practices are situated in cultural and sociopolitical practices. Here, we draw on a transformative understanding of agency generally defined as "breaking away from the given frame of action and taking the initiative to transform it" (Virkkunen, 2006, p. 49), while moving from "independently acting individuals into a collective subject of sustained transformation effort" (Virkkunen, 2006, p. 43). Our theoretical and empirical work on agency focuses on people becoming historical actors in which people negotiate everyday dilemmas and push against the intentions of systems and their designers (Gutiérrez, 2020). As we will discuss, historical actors repurpose tools, such as the law, toward new ends, and to resist local and historical sociopolitical inequities (Gutiérrez et al., 2019). For example, one such response, as detailed below, involved engaging with the legal system, the development of new forms of schooling that privileged educational dignity, and engagement in intergenerational linguistic, cultural, and civic practices in the home and community to make possible new forms of participation across institutions in which one's full humanity could be

realized. Such analyses necessarily require explicating the fundamental notion of what counts as citizenship, civics, agency, and resilience.

The Disconnect Between Latinidad and School Civics

Civics education in K–12 classrooms tends to focus on themes related to patriotism, government, and laws. This common pedagogical approach is a reflection of how state social studies content standards privilege narrow ideas about what counts as civics and citizenship. Social studies education researchers have acknowledged these limitations and instead emphasize the need for pedagogical approaches that consider greater complexity of what counts as civic agency (Jaffee, 2016; Salinas & Alarcón, 2016; Salinas et al., 2016; Torney-Purta et al., 2007). Researchers have proposed a number of strategies toward this end. For example, classroom simulations may help empower students of color to engage in political processes (Lo, 2017). Action research positions students as civic agents who research a community problem and develop and implement action plans (Levinson, 2015). These pedagogical approaches, although promising, do not directly address the civic divide between schools and home. For example, some Latinx translingual youths—those who draw from multiple languages, symbol systems, and modalities of communications from their unitary semiotic repertoire (Canagarajah, 2013; García & Wei, 2014)—deploy Spanish as a civic tool. Many Latinx students regularly translanguage—move fluidly across their “named languages” (Otheguy et al., 2015)—as they attain, sharpen, and share political and civic information. While not all Latinx youth identify as bi/multilingual, even Latinx students who identify as monolingual often have their language practices marked and sorted (Brooks, 2019; Flores et al., 2015) based on how their bodies are racialized in classrooms (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

School’s narrow understanding of language has supported racialized “common sense” notions of “Standard English” as the primary medium through which civic education can be taught and engaged (Haney-López, 2003). As Luis Moll (1998, p. 8) has argued, “The most common strategy in education ... is simply to accommodate the status quo, without addressing the receiving context or taking into account the diversity of the children in the schools.” Historically, the ideals of U.S. citizenship and what counts as civically-informed people converge around ideas of a White Anglo-Saxon nation of English-dominant speakers who embody middle-class markers. Thus, the language practices of many Latinx bi/multilingual students and their families and the everyday cultural practices of which they are a part are often not recognized or viewed as a rich resource for learning civics (Salinas et al., 2016). However, the socializing mechanisms of schooling have helped to sustain notions of the “ideal civic participant” as an English-speaking citizen engaged in a particular set of civic practices that do not always index the civic dispositions, discourses, and linguistic identities of Latinx youth.

We push back on social science research that argues that Latinx families are the least likely to participate in political activism (Bloemraad et al., 2011; Martinez, 2005). Employing a “lived civics” framework, we delineate the savvy ways that Latinx youth and families indeed have done and continue to “do” politics across modes and languages. We expand Cohen et al.’s (2018) concept of “lived civics” as it provides fecund soil for thinking about the community-based literacies through which Latinx youth explore issues of related concern, contest racialized narratives, and resist oppressive

legislation and practices in their communities. A lived civics framework sees students' lived experiences as the critical starting point to explore and interrogate inequality and applicable methods for social change. School-based civics content delivery frequently engages current event discussions, simulations of democratic processes, and service learning projects often steeped in White middle-class norms (Mirra & Garcia, 2017; Rubin, 2012; Salinas et al., 2016; Vickery, 2015). These approaches, however, too often fail to explicitly address the interests, racialized and linguistic identities (Jaffee, 2016; Salinas & Alarcón, 2016), and lived experiences of Latinx youth, "whose perspectives on the state and democratic processes are often dramatically different than so-called mainstream attitudes" (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 2). This section builds on these approaches that conceptualize meaningful civic learning experiences as those that connect deeply to the racialized and linguistic identities and lived cultural experiences of historically marginalized Latinx youth (de los Ríos & Molina, 2020). Such approaches are attuned to the increasingly consequential and complex ways that advanced technologies intersect with issues of race, power, immigration, language, literacies, and historical and contemporary in/equity.

In the following sections, we first historicize and exemplify civic agency across three salient approaches taken up by Latinx communities: (1) a legal case that centered youth and community lived experiences, (2) alternative education spaces that prioritized Mexican identity and culture, and (3) community organizing that engaged in confrontational actions modeled after Black power movements. We then situate contemporary forms of lived civics across Latinx communities and showcase several of the agentic practices through which Latinx youth and families continue to participate in their historical and current struggle for self-determination and civil and educational rights and dignity as they advocate for their well-being. As argued here, activism and resistance have always been central to the social fabric of Latinx communities' livelihoods, identities, and lived practices. The aim here is for this discussion of the lived civics of Latinx communities to further research on Latinx civics and provide the field with more expansive and situated understandings of Latinx communities' agentic and resistance practices that advocate for a new kind of civics for social and structural change.

Historicizing Latinx Civics

Legal Advocacy: Francisco Maestas et al. v. George H. Shone et al. in Alamosa, Colorado (1912–1914)

Francisco Maestas et al. v. George H. Shone et al. is one of the first documented legal challenges to Mexican-origin school segregation. As in other school districts, Alamosa, Colorado, had no school segregation laws on the books against Mexican-origin children. Up to this point, it was customary for Mexican-origin children to attend White schools. However, in 1910 the new school district policy required Mexican-origin children to attend "Mexican schools" to segregate them from White children (Donato et al., 2017).

In response, community members formed the Spanish American Union to challenge the segregation order. Whereas other challenges to Mexican school segregation relied on support from the Mexican consulate (Donato & Hanson, 2017), the Alamosa community came together to mobilize through a multi-pronged approach. Initially, parents

met with school officials and made their grievances known via local newspapers to no avail (Donato et al., 2017). When this proved unproductive, the community led one of the first school boycotts rather than to send their children to the “Mexican school.”⁴

Unlike other cases—such as *Mendez v. Westminster* and *Gonzales v. Sheely* (Valencia, 2005)—that would follow *Maestas*, the *Maestas* et al. attorney did not apply the “other White” legal strategy, which claimed that Mexican-origin children were White and therefore should have access to White schools. Instead, the *Maestas* et al. attorney “used the Colorado State Constitution to challenge segregation because it was illegal for schools to distinguish and classify children in public schools according to color or race” (Donato et al., 2017, p. 4). Rather, it was the school district attorney who argued that Mexican-origin children were White, and, as such, could not be racially segregated.

The racial dodging made language (instead of ethnicity) a key aspect of the court trial. School district officials and their attorney argued that Mexican-origin children lacked English proficiency to attend White schools. Attending segregated schools would allegedly offer Mexican-origin children a more supportive environment where they could learn English (Donato et al., 2017). The plaintiffs challenged deficit ideas about bilingualism, specifically that Mexican-origin children could not speak English, when in fact they could. The Spanish language became a proxy for racial segregation, one that was repeated in other regions of the country (Saenz, 2004). The language argument was one of many legal loopholes (Santiago, 2019c) along with claiming that Mexican-origin children were racially Black (Donato & Hanson, 2017) or Indigenous (Madrid, 2008) that was enacted in various parts of the country.

Alternative Education Spaces

Colegio Altamirano in Hebbronville, Texas (1897–1958)

With either poor or no schooling facilities, Mexican-origin families sought to create an educational space for their children where one did not exist. These informal and formal learning spaces became known throughout Texas as *escuelitas* (Barrera, 2006). *Escuelitas* were community initiated, funded, and controlled (Goetz, 2020), which gave parents and other community members the opportunity to develop their own curriculum—one grounded in Mexican culture, identity, philosophy, and Spanish language.

Colegio Altamirano was one of the longest running *escuelitas* to offer such an education to Mexican-origin children in Texas. Initially funded through middle class Tejanos and later continued with *mutualista* (Mexican-origin community-based mutual aid groups) support, school organizers sought out well-educated teachers and resources for their students (Goetz, 2020). The school was named after Mexican philosopher Ignacio Manuel Altamirano (Barrera, 2006), an *Indigena* Mexican nationalist novelist and philosopher (Rulfo, 2014), whose name is reflective of the values and philosophy that the school, its educators, and students hoped to espouse. “The *escuelita*’s goals were also to ‘prepare every Mexican child with the knowledge of their mother tongue to facilitate the learning of the English language.’ A bicultural existence was essential in the new social order” (Salinas, 2001, p. 84).

⁴ The first Mexican-origin led school boycott took place only 2 years earlier in San Angelo, Texas (De León, 2015).

Spanish was the primary vehicle for retaining Mexican nationalist identity, culture, and ideals. Tejano families in Hebbronville did not see preparing their children to participate in the United States and retaining Mexican identity as dichotomous; in other words, lived civics was multicultural and multilingual where their Mexican origins supported them to excel (Mireles, 2006). Many *escuelitas* relied heavily on Spanish-language newspapers in part because of the limited financial resources to purchase textbooks (Goetz, 2020). This meant that children enrolled in *escuelitas* read about such topics as the Mexican Revolution (1910–1920), el Partido Liberal Mexicano’s struggle for political and economic freedom, labor organizing, separation of church and state, and the need for free press and speech. As a result, *escuelitas* became a unique space that invested in preparing children to become active civic agents in the United States, but one founded on Mexican Revolutionary ideals.

Alternative Mexican Schools in Chicago (1910–1940)

During this same time period 1,400 miles away, Mexican-origin families were leading similar alternative Mexican schools in Chicago. As early as 1910, families and community members relied on their networks with supporters of the Mexican Revolution to create community-led educational programs. Fearing a “demexicanization” process that students were encountering in schools, these alternative education spaces were meant to supplement a U.S. education system that dismissed and devalued Mexican culture and knowledge (Rios, forthcoming).

Similar to Colegio Altamirano, the Chicago alternative schools relied on a form of transnational pedagogy. Whereas Hebbronville families relied on their proximity to Tamaulipas, Mexico, to access curricular resources in Spanish and hire Mexican teachers, Chicago community members took a different approach. In this case, many of these alternative schools were framed around a 1920s nationalist identity and philosophy that permeated during and after the Mexican Revolution (Rios Perez, forthcoming).

Like in *Maestas* and Colegio Altamirano, Mexican-origin families in Chicago recognized that English was the language of power in the United States. Hispanos, Tejanos, and Midwestern Mexican-origin families understood that English was necessary to navigate in the United States; “language functioned as a signifier for power, and the *escuelitas* operated as a vehicle for communities to negotiate” (Goetz, 2020, p. 3). Although English was the necessary language, Spanish was the language of resistance. Speaking Spanish in a space where it was actively discouraged challenged negative stereotypes of Spanish and bilingualism. It also defied the notion that civic identity in the United States was exclusively tied to English, White identity, and culture.

Escuelitas in Texas and the various alternative schools in Chicago were part of coordinated efforts to retain Mexican identity in direct defiance of Americanization. The schools’ sustainability across different geographic locations and time scales, and their grounding in revolutionary ideology, were more than happenstance. Efforts to resist Americanization and center Latinx cultural practices continued long after *escuelitas* and alternative schools closed their doors. Huelga (strike) schools in Houston (as part of an effort to boycott Houston Independent School District in the early 1970s), Escuela Tlatelolco in Denver (1971–2017), and the current Academia Cuauhtli in Austin, Texas, are all a part of a 100-year legacy of Mexican-origin resistance against narrow ideas of

who and how one is considered a civic agent in the United States. “Escuelita history from the late 19th century to the mid-20th century provides us not only with an origin story for Mexican American studies but also with the paradoxical understanding that a decolonized space in the margins can also be a liberating force in the center” (Goetz, 2020, p. 168).

Shortly after the end of Colegio Altamirano and other alternative education systems, the Black and Brown power movements emerged. While previous forms of Latinx resistance in the Southwest, for example, centered around Mexican nationalism, Black and Brown movements of the 1960s and 1970s, although distinct in a number of important ways, were both grounded in revolutionary philosophies and advocated self-liberation and self-determination (Farmer, 2017; Muñoz, 2007). Similar to the generations of activists before them, the Young Lords, Brown Berets, and other youth organizations across various Latinx communities centered their activism in their cultural identities. Puerto Rican youth emphasized their Blackness and saw themselves as part of a Black diaspora, whereas Chicax youth claimed indigeneity (San Miguel, 2005; Torres & Velázquez, 1998). In the Southwest, the Chicax movement was exemplified through resistance practices such as the 1968 student walkouts (Bernal, 1998; Muñoz, 2007). What remained constant across generations was Chicax youth’s demand for access to a quality education that centered their histories and cultural identities (García & Castro, 2011; Gutiérrez, 1998).

Community Organizing

Preserving household and community culture, including their histories and home language, was a common goal across many Latinx communities. Puerto Rican-origin families, like Mexican-origin families in Texas and Chicago, organized after school programming to challenge Americanization efforts (Sánchez-Korrol, 1996). Although both groups made similar demands, Puerto Rican-origin families took a distinct approach. Parents and families in New York, for example, took the lead in demanding transformative change through community organizing. Unlike the previous examples of legal challenges and the formation of alternative schools, Puerto Rican-origin families in New York did not try to gain access to existing schools or create new spaces for education. Instead, New York parents sought out to create leadership positions for themselves and youth in existing schools and community. Afro-Latinas were pivotal in leading some of these major efforts.

ASPIRA (1961–Present)

Schools have often been sites of contestation for Puerto Rican and Mexican-origin families and thus served as the impetus for these communities to create alternative spaces that supported the development and maintenance of rich cultural practices and future community leaders. Antonia Pantoja—an Afro Puertorriqueña—held such a vision that led to the development of ASPIRA, a Puerto Rican advocacy organization (Pantoja, 2002). Although she believed her work as ASPIRA’s director to be her most important accomplishment, Pantoja, a well-established community organizer and social worker, also helped create the Hispanic Young Adult Association (later the

Puerto Rican Association for Community Affairs), and the Puerto Rican Forum, which in addition to ASPIRA became the contexts for Puerto-Rican civics learning and action (Pantoja, 2002). Of relevance to the focus of this section, ASPIRA's multigenerational and cultural approach embodied the tenets of a lived civics.

ASPIRA was more than a service agency for Puerto Ricans; it sought to create a youth-led movement. Through local high school-based ASPIRA clubs, the organization helped aspirantes develop "positive identification with their community" (Pantoja, 2002, p. 100), with the purpose of identifying and addressing community issues. As was the case with Mexican-origin alternative schools, ASPIRA sought to instill in ASPIRA youth (aspirantes) a sense of agency grounded in Puerto Rican identity. As Nieto (2018) has noted, the organization was "dedicated to teaching young people about their culture, history, and reality" (p. 8), as learning about and developing a strong connection to their Puerto Rican origins helped prepare aspirantes to advocate for Puerto Ricans as youth and later in life as adults. Successful aspirante-led efforts included protesting the City University of New York's entrance requirements, which made it difficult for many Puerto Rican youth to attend available post-secondary institutions (Pantoja, 2002). ASPIRA's 60-year history of multigenerational activist engagement has given rise to and supported meaningful youth-led movements.

Community-Controlled Schools in New York (1966)

While ASPIRA gained significant local and national prominence, other Puerto Rican organizations also engaged communities in a range of agentic civics practices. After years of attempting to work with district officials to improve schooling conditions for their children, African American and Puerto Rican parents turned to grassroots efforts. United Bronx Parents—led by Evelina López Antonetty, an Afro Puertorriqueña—shifted their strategy from seeking partnership with schools to employing more confrontational political methods—practices more aligned with those of the Black power movement (Lee, 2014). The tension between the school district and community members came to a head in 1966, when African American and Puerto Rican parents successfully boycotted I.S. 201 in Harlem in an effort to gain community control of the school after the Board of Education ruled that I.S. 201 "would be integrated because it would be half black and half Puerto Rican" (Lee, 2014, p. 173). As with Mexican Americans in Houston 4 years later (San Miguel, 2005), school officials exploited Puerto Ricans racial complexity, categorizing Puerto Rican students as White to abide by school integration policies while still denying students access to White schools—thus, ensuring the continuation of segregation and White supremacist actions.

The result of the community control effort was a community-elected governing board that oversaw three decentralized school districts (Pritchett, 2002). Similar to *las escuelitas* in Texas and alternative schools in Chicago, Puerto Rican community members hired Puerto Rican teachers and centered Puerto Rican culture, but this time also privileged Black culture and history. The resulting "culturally nationalist pedagogy" (Lee, 2014, p. 169) was grounded in Puerto Rican and Spanish speaking identity as the "basis for their political empowerment" (Lee, 2014, p. 2). As with the Mexican-origin resistance practices, Puerto Rican community members emphasized the importance of their children learning English to function and advocate for themselves in the United

States, but not at the expense of Spanish. This activism would eventually lead to the establishment of P.S. 25, the first bilingual school in the Northeast, which continues to operate a bilingual program today (Lee, 2014). This emphasis on bilingualism led to greater advocacy for bilingual education for Puerto Rican students, including the 1974 ASPIRA Consent Decree that established bilingual education in New York City public schools (Santiago, 1986).

In this section, we have historically situated the resilience and agentic resistance practices of various Latinx communities in asserting their right to participate fully in civic life with their identities, cultural histories, and aspirations intact. Through the centering of Latinx cultural practices, parents and community members leveraged with intentionality Latinx history, culture, and home language to support the development of children's agentic practices.

“Lived Civics”:

The Ingenuity of Latinx Youth Cultural Practices of Political Participation

The past two decades have been replete with grassroots movements composed of Latinx, immigrant-origin, and other youth of color working to dismantle racial and systemic inequality. Increasing cruelty enacted against Latinx families through legislation—including detention and family separation of asylum seekers, anti-sanctuary city policies, termination of Temporary Protected Status, and efforts to rescind Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) protections—coupled with aggressive anti-immigrant rhetoric have served as fertile grounds for Latinx communities to respond agentively and hone youths' critical literacies to name their worlds (Ayon, 2016; de los Ríos, 2019; de los Ríos & Molina, 2020; Pallares, 2014; Terriquez et al., 2018; Zepeda-Millán & Wallace, 2018). Scholars argue that Latinx family discussions in the home about these experiences of marginalization can foster a sense of collective responsibility to elicit social change (Wallace & Zepeda-Millán, 2020). Toward that end, there has been an expansion in creative lived political action among Latinx young people and families.

One prominent example is the rise of young Latina girls in Texas employing “activist quinceañeras,” in which they leverage their cultural rite of passage practice of “quinceañeras” (sweet 15 birthday parties) as a site for mass voter registration for their families, friends, and greater neighborhood (Pinetta et al., 2020). These young women and their families often work in partnership with youth advocacy groups like “Jolt Initiative” who oversee and run the voter registration logistics for their predominantly Latinx guests at their quinceañeras (Gamboa, 2019). This practice has become a prominent act of resistance and has spread across Latinx youth communities around the nation. Latinx youth movements for justice are drawing from a number of innovative civic strategies, like “activist quinceañeras,” to bring awareness to their communities' intergenerational concerns and often do so through “communal actions” (Wray-Lake et al., 2018). In this next section, we briefly highlight other recent and notable ways that Latinx youth and families are leveraging their ingenuity for political participation in their grassroots communities.

Youth-Led Immigrant Rights Movement: DREAMers and Anti-Deportation Techniques

Undocumented immigrant youth and their allies have been leading one of the most vibrant, creative, and inclusive youth social movements of the 21st century (Patler, 2018; Patler & Gonzales, 2015; Terriquez et al., 2018; Zimmerman, 2016). Shortly after the bipartisan legislative proposal called the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act (the DREAM Act) made its initial congressional appearance in 2001, there was a steadfast charge of immigrant youth-led activism focused on raising awareness for the DREAM Act (Olivas, 2020). Most versions of the DREAM Act argued it would provide conditional permanent residency for certain eligible undocumented young adults who were brought to the United States as children, and a possible eventual path to citizenship (Patler, 2018).

When the latest version of the DREAM Act failed to pass in the Senate in December 2010, many undocumented youth began to take their own “autonomous path” (Márquez-Benitez & Pallares, 2016) that rejected the criminalization of their parents, denounced the need for youth exceptionalism, and instead worked to foster a larger and more inclusive undocumented community (Pallares, 2014). Terriquez (2015) noted the important early leadership of multiple marginalized identities like undocumented LGBTQ students at various levels of leadership within the broader movement and how it catalyzed “intersectional mobilization,” which Terriquez defines as high levels of activism among an oppressed subgroup within an already marginalized constituency.

Various sit-ins, hunger strikes, protests, and social media campaigns were initiated and conducted by youth-led activist organizations in efforts to urge the Obama administration to stop deporting undocumented young people (Zimmerman, 2011). Later, youth-led activism evolved with DACA, the discretionary program established by President Obama in 2012, which emerged out of congressional failure to enact comprehensive immigration reform. The greater undocumented youth movement’s shift to civil disobedience reflects how the undocumented youth-led movement changed to one that has “increasingly used direct action to bring attention to broader issues of immigrant, civil, and human rights as a strategy for social and policy change” (Zimmerman, 2011, p. 14). Since 2013, the youth immigrant movement and its allies have primarily concentrated on executive action to stop deportation, rather than advocate for legalization, with an emphasis on individual anti-deportation cases to underscore the contradictions and abuses of immigration policy (Márquez-Benitez & Pallares, 2016).

Sanctuary Pedagogies in Homes and School

Immigrant communities in the United States continue to live in what has been theorized as “the enforcement era” (Chen, 2020). In this climate, many parents are pushed to negotiate and model strategies for overcoming complex oppressive forces impacting their and their children’s everyday livelihoods. For example, when targeted Latinx neighborhoods become sites of hyper immigration enforcement, immigrant and mixed-status families swiftly learn to shift their routes to K–12 school and work, change their routines, and everyday cultural practices to protect themselves from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE; Valdivia, 2019). In her Southern California

study, Valdivia has theorized these intergenerational family practices as “strategies for sanctuary-making.” Some of these sanctuary making practices have included changing the time parents and children leave to and come home from school and work, sometimes leaving several hours before or after the designated time. Another example Valdivia provides is families choosing to shop and pay more at grocery stores like Sprouts and Trader Joe’s, which are found primarily in White affluent neighborhoods, instead of Mexican grocery stores like Vallarta and Northgate situated in working-class Latinx neighborhoods, where ICE officers tend to congregate.

Taking up a lived civics framework in schools urges a reconsideration of the narrow push to assimilate students into existing political systems by attending to students’ identities and localized civic perspectives, allowing them the space to reimagine and enact new social futures. One example is a school’s appropriation of the familiar Catholic Mexican religious ritual of Posadas as a means for mobilization and raising awareness around targeted political issues and policies through candle-lit processions with family members, school actors, and the local labor community. The Social Justice Posadas model (de los Ríos & Molina, 2020; de los Ríos et al., 2015, 2016) is a partnership founded in 2008 between a high school Chicanx/Latinx Studies program and a prominent day laborer center in Southern California. In its appropriation, this spiritually-grounded cultural ritual is reinterpreted through an immigrant rights lens. The central metaphor of Mary, Joseph, and baby Jesus seeking refuge in the original Posadas cultural practice is replaced with immigrants seeking sanctuary, human rights, and pathways to citizenship. This approach transforms civic pedagogies of rote memorization of knowledge about the branches of government into participatory inquiry in which students pursue scholarly readings and remedies to self-identified community issues like immigration enforcement. Students in this partnership have led participatory research projects, created and circulated media to raise awareness that matter to them, conducted close readings of local, state, and federal legislations impacting immigrant families, as well as mobilized to halt rampant police checkpoints in their communities and contributed to the larger passing of California Assembly Bill 60, Safe and Responsible Driver Act, in 2014.

Digital Testimonios, Digital Protests, and Hashtag Movements

Latinx activist communities have increasingly leveraged new media technologies to participate bi/multilingually in U.S. civic and political life, especially through digital testimonios (Benmayor, 2012; Zimmerman, 2016), translingual podcasts (de los Ríos, 2020), and digital protests and hashtag movements for racial justice (Bonilla & Rosa, 2015). Specifically, scholars have studied how young people engage in “participatory politics” (Kahne et al., 2015) to challenge anti-Latinx, anti-Black, and anti-immigrant sentiments, practices, and policies. Bonilla and Rosa (2015) emphasize the power of digital protests and hashtag movements within Black and Black Latinx struggles for racial justice. Bonilla and Rosa contend that some of the most important hashtag campaigns that emerged out of #Ferguson were targeted at “calling attention to both police practices and media representations, suggesting that social media can serve as an important tool for challenging these various forms of racial profiling” (p. 8). Another example of online contentious politics includes Zimmerman’s (2016) study of Latinx undocumented youth’s “coming out” events where they declared their legal status at

protests and meetings and across social media, including digital stories, blogs, and podcasts. As a form of participatory politics, Zimmerman refers to these practices as forms of “transmedia testimonios” in which activists give accounts of their immigration experiences, reveal their legal status, and document their participation in civil disobedience. Through the concept of digital and transmedia testimonio, Zimmerman demonstrates how undocumented youth agentically expand the confines of state-sanctioned public spheres and what it means to participate politically.

Black Lives Matter

Latinx communities’ support of and participation in the Black Lives Matter movement have been overwhelmingly strong (Hope et al., 2016; Zepeda-Millán & Wallace, 2018). An essential part of the Black Lives Matter movement is that it advocates for *all* Black lives concentrating on those who “have been marginalized within Black liberation movements,” especially women and members of the LGBTQ community. This call to action inherently also includes the lives of Afro-Latinx and Black Latinx people, which make up a significant portion of the Latinx community in the United States. According to a 2016 Pew Research Center survey, one-quarter of the nearly 60 million Latinx people residing in the United States identified as Afro-Latinx or Afro-Caribbean, or of African descent with roots in Latin America.

As Lorgia García-Peña (2020) recently stated, “Two struggles—Black liberation and immigrant rights—are intertwined and must be confronted together, which means acknowledging there is racism in the project of Latinidad.” With increasing calls to recognize and dismantle anti-Blackness in the greater pan-Latinx community by grassroots activists and academic scholars, it is important to recognize the vital leadership and civic participation of Black Latinx people in the Black Lives Matter movement. Importantly, moreover, Black Latinx and non-Black Latinx communities are increasingly hitting the streets to participate in the Black Lives Matter protests nationally and internationally throughout Latin America (Campos Lima, 2020).

There are certainly a number of historical reasons for this renewed focus on Black identities; notably, the Black and Brown power activists of the 1960s emphasized Black and Latinx identities that previous generations had not (San Miguel, 2005). This reconciliation with Indigeneity and Blackness is part of a larger history that continues to evolve today. For example, Krista Cortes (2020) documents Afroboriqua mothering as an AfroLatinx⁵ multi-generational practice in spaces that center Blackness through Afroboriqua cultural practices and activism in the California Bay Area. In this space, Bomba workshops are more than dance and music classes. They function as sites of intergenerational cultural resistance, continuing traditions that were once banned to repress rebellions while simultaneously fostering kinship, revolutionary parenting, and Black Boriqua activism that challenged homophobia on the island and celebrated queerness in the community.

⁵ We echo Cortes’s (2020) use of the terms “AfroLatinx” and “Afroboriqua” to describe her scholarship, as she argues that those two identities are inextricable and intertwined.

Creative Performance and Songwriting with Corridos

Broadly, songwriting can be a vehicle through which young people navigate and assert their multiple identities. Youth songwriting often draws from issues of personal, social, and political importance and is shared with audiences such as family members and peers (Deroo & Watson, 2020; Kinney, 2012; Watson & Beymer, 2019). For many Mexican and Central American-origin youth, Mexican regional music remains an indelible part of their transnational youth popular culture (García-Hernández, 2016; Villa, 2019), where the close reading, songwriting, and cultural performance of corridos (border ballads) have been theorized as critical and creative translingual forms of resistance (de los Ríos, 2018, 2019).

Corridos—Mexican ballads that embody the musical, poetic, and oral tradition of struggle (Paredes, 1958)—have historically been seen as “for the *pueblo* ... one of the most typical expressions of the Mexican masses” (Simmons, 1957, p. 7). Like a grassroots form of news and journalism, the Mexican corrido once disseminated news about the battles of the 1910 Mexican Revolution and future combat to the general populace. Corridistas (balladeers) would put current events into songs, attuning the structure and cadence in its traditional form (Paredes, 1958). As a form of intergenerational storytelling, Latinx youth have drawn on their unitary linguistic repertoire to author, compose, and perform corridos across digital platforms and physical spaces—like public school campuses—to bring awareness to issues that matter to them, including harmful ICE policies and practices, linguistic racism, and social in/justice (de los Ríos, 2019). Some of the most recent examples include the virality of originally authored and performed corridos in Spanish critiquing the mass shooting in an El Paso, Texas, Walmart targeting Mexican communities (Blanco, 2019) as well as corridos in support of #BlackLivesMatter and racial justice (Hermanos Herrera, 2020).

Latinx Indigenous Communities’ Cultural Sustainability as Civic Practice

Similar to other Latinx activism, comunidades Indígenas from Latin America also resist erasure through cultural practices, specifically through teaching youth music, religion, literature, and languages. As in Tejas, Colorado, Illinois, and New York, Maya Guatemalan community members in Los Angeles have also created their own educational settings, in this case, courses to teach Maya-origin youth K’iche’ and Q’anjob’al to children of Mayan immigrants (Batz, 2014). Again, these minoritized Indigenous languages are of particular importance in terms of maintaining an Indigenous cultural identity and rebuffing attempts to homogenize Indigenous people as part of a Latinx diaspora with its Spanish language hegemony. Youth learning their Indigenous languages is also fundamental to advocacy. Indigenous youth engage in sophisticated translanguaging practices when they interpret for previous generations who must navigate legal (Carcamo, 2016) and public services unavailable in their minoritized Indigenous languages (Miller, 2020).

The Enduring Fight for Puerto Rican, Chicanx, and Latinx Studies

Civic action is situated in emergent social movements and their historical antecedents. The historical struggles for Ethnic Studies are rich and robust, and they

have long centered Latinx people's histories, literary traditions, cultural perspectives, linguistic practices, and self-determination. Movements for Latinx Studies—especially Puerto Rican Studies and Chicana/Mexican American Studies—sought to create spaces for Latinx communities within K–12 and higher education institutions, similar to ASPIRA and community-controlled schools in New York in the 1960s. The fight for Ethnic Studies has spanned more than 60 years, providing the context for youth-led movements to sustain their intergenerational, multi-racial, multi-ethnic, and multilingual character and civic solidarities.⁶

The dismantling of Arizona's Tucson Unified School District's Mexican American Studies Program by far-right xenophobic elected officials in 2012 was once again a struggle for curricular autonomy and transformation—a struggle that led to large-scale civic actions. These included youth-led community protests, sit-ins, walkouts, and online petitions and campaigns to protect the reputable Mexican American Studies Program (Cabrera et al., 2013; Cammarota, 2016; Ginwright & Cammarota, 2011; Otero & Cammarota, 2011). The subsequent rise in intergenerational grassroots campaigns to establish Ethnic Studies courses in school districts across the country, especially in California (Cuahtin et al., 2019; de los Ríos, 2017), continue the legacies of activism that have worked to socially and politically transform educational institutions.

Conclusion: The Future of Latinx Civics Remains Intergenerational

With the centrality of the Black Lives Matter social movement and the consequential Presidential election in the United States, the urgency of civic engagement was heightened dramatically in 2020. The Trump administration's unfettered discrimination toward Latinx and immigrant families further amplified Latinx youth's social consciousness and political participation, particularly in the Southwest (Wray-Lake et al., 2018; Zepeda-Millán & Wallace, 2018). As Wray-Lake et al. (2018, p. 201) argue, "Latinx youth are actively making sense of what today's political context means for them, their futures, their families, and their ethnic/cultural groups, often in emotional terms." The result was increased everyday engagement in participatory politics, intergenerational grassroots organizing, and the reinvention of traditional cultural practices to participate politically in their communities (de los Ríos & Molina, 2020).

⁶ Throughout the 1960s, Latinx students—alongside their Black, Indigenous, and people of color student peers—were inspired by civil rights movements, as well as global struggles for liberation, to instantiate a youth-led social movement to challenge the canon of the university and its settler-colonial histories. Initially identified as "Third World Studies" (Okiihiro, 2016), the essence of the demand for Ethnic Studies was inspired by the everyday lived civic practices of those resisting racism internationally and to politically align themselves against imperialism and empire throughout the Global South. The fight for Ethnic Studies was a multi-ethnic, multi-racial, and multilingual coalition of young people that culminated in the longest student strike in U.S. history at San Francisco State University (Umemoto, 1989). Within this coalition, Latinx high school and college students organized to challenge and replace Eurocentric curricula and, instead, establish and institutionalize their own curricular autonomy (Bernal, 1998; Bonilla, 1987; García & Castro, 2011; Muñoz, 2007; Rodríguez, 1990). The resulting development of Puerto Rican Studies and Chicano/Mexican American Studies served to address the many racial inequalities endemic in both K–12 and universities, as well as their erasure of Latinx people and their history of contribution. Although this struggle was "lived civics" at a broader scale, it too centered Latinx history, cultural perspectives, and linguistic practices as a means to disrupt the settled curriculum.

Thus, despite the important geographic and cultural heterogeneity in Latinx communities, the intergenerational character of their resistance, revival, and civic practices persists, with parents, grandparents, and other family members involving younger generations in side-by-side participation in cultural practices. It is through these intergenerational practices that youth have “learn[ed] about the marginalization and systemic barriers affecting the Latinx community” (Pinetta et al., 2020, p. 9). Through these parental and caregiver cultural practices, young people can develop a “sense of collective responsibility to help members of their community who are in need” (p. 9). Oftentimes, such responsibility manifests itself through intergenerational lived civic actions and participation in social movements that advocate for the well-being, humanity, and civil and educational rights of Latinx people as exemplified in the activist quinceañera, Social Justice Posadas, and the Black Lives Matter movement described previously.

In closing, we hope this discussion has called attention to the expansive ways Latinx communities have enacted lived civics historically and in the current moment. We argue that ecologies help to confer resilience and transformative agency and that such understandings should trouble extant notions of such constructs—constructs that are predicated on understandings of agency and resilience as intrapersonal rather than interpersonal accomplishments. Furthermore, we have pushed on civics education conceived ahistorically and principally in terms of access to participation; instead, this section asks participation into what? It has also elaborated, instead, transformative forms of participation as essential to rethinking what counts as civic engagement, its practices, and social organization in cultural communities.

References

- Ayon, C. (2016). Talking to children about race, inequality, and discrimination: Raising families in an anti-immigrant political environment. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 7, 449–477.
- Banks, T. L. (2006). Mestizaje and the Mexican mestizo self: No hay sangre negra, so there is no blackness. *Southern California interdisciplinary Law Journal*, 15(2), 199–234.
- Barrera, A. (2006). The “little schools” in Texas, 1897–1965: Educating Mexican American children. *American Educational History Journal*, 33(2), 35–45.
- Batz, G. (2014). Maya cultural resistance in Los Angeles: The recovery of identity and culture among Maya youth. *Latin American Perspectives*, 41(3), 194–207.
- Benmayor, R. (2012). Digital testimonio as a signature pedagogy for Latin@ studies. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(3), 507–524.
- Bernal, D. D. (1998). Grassroots leadership reconceptualized: Chicana oral histories and the 1968 East Los Angeles school blowouts. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 19(2), 113–142.
- Blanco, L. (2019, August 9). El Paso and the strength of the Mexican corrido. *KQED*. <https://www.kqed.org/arts/13863441/el-llanto-de-el-paso-corrido-walmart-shooting>.
- Bloemraad, I., Voss, K., & Lee, T. (2011). The protests of 2006: What were they, how do we understand them, where do we go? In K. Voss & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Rallying for immigrant rights* (pp. 3–43). University of California Press.
- Bonilla, F. (1987). Puerto Rican studies and the interdisciplinary approach. In S. Arroyo and M. Sánchez (Eds.), *Toward a renaissance of Puerto Rican studies*. Atlantic Research and Publications.
- Bonilla, Y., & Rosa, J. (2015). #Ferguson: Digital protest, hashtag ethnography, and the racial politics of social media in the United States. *American Ethnologist*, 42(1), 4–17.
- Bost, S. (2003). *Mulattas and mestizas: Representing mixed identities in the Americas, 1850–2000*. University of Georgia Press.
- Brooks, M. (2019). *Transforming literacy education for long-term English learners: Recognizing brilliance in the undervalued*. Routledge.

- Cabrera, N. L., Meza, E. L., Romero, A. J. & Rodriguez, R. C. (2013). "If there is no struggle, there is no progress": Transformative youth resistance and the school of ethnic studies. *Urban Review*, 45(1), 7–22.
- Cammarota, J. (2016). The praxis of ethnic studies: Transforming second sight into critical consciousness. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 19(2), 233–251.
- Campos Lima, D. (2020, June 22). Black Lives Matter is inspiring demonstrations all over Latin America. *America: The Jesuit Review Magazine*. <https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2020/06/22/black-lives-matter-movement-latin-america-protests>.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). Negotiating a translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 40–67.
- Carcamo, C. (2016, August 9). Ancient Mayan languages are creating problems for today's immigration courts. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/local/california/la-me-mayan-indigenous-languages-20160725-snap-story.html>.
- Chen, M. H. (2020). *Pursuing citizenship in the enforcement era*. Stanford University Press.
- Cohen, C., Kahne, J., & Marshall, J. (2018). *Let's go there: Race, ethnicity, and a lived civics approach to civic education*. GenForward at the University of Chicago.
- Cortes, K. L. (2020). AfroBoriqua mothering: Teaching/learning blackness in a Bay Area AfroPuerto Rican community of practice. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 127–146.
- Cuahtin, R. T., Zavala, M., Sleeter, C., & Au, W. (Eds.). (2019). *Rethinking ethnic studies*. Rethinking Schools.
- De León, A. (2015). *Tejano West Texas*. Texas A&M University Press.
- de los Ríos, C. V. (2017). Picturing ethnic studies: Photovoice and youth literacies of social action. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 61(1), 15–24.
- de los Ríos, C. V. (2018). Toward a corridista consciousness: Learning from one transnational youth's critical reading, writing, and performance of Mexican corridos. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 53(4), 455–471.
- de los Ríos, C. V. (2019). "Los músicos": Mexican corridos, the aural border, and the evocative musical renderings of transnational youth. *Harvard Educational Review*, 89(2), 177–200.
- de los Ríos, C. V. (2020). Translingual youth podcasts as acoustic allies: Writing and negotiating identities as the intersection of literacies, language and racialization. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*.
- de los Ríos, C. V., & Molina, A. (2020). Literacies of refuge: "Pidiendo posada" as ritual of justice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 52(1), 32–54.
- de los Ríos, C. V., López, J., & Morrell, E. (2015). Toward a critical pedagogy of race: Ethnic studies and literacies of power in high school classrooms. *Race and Social Problems*, 7(1), 84–96.
- de los Ríos, C. V., López, J., & Morrell, E. (2016). Critical ethnic studies in high school classrooms: Academic achievement via social action. In P. Noguera, J. Pierce, & R. Ahram (Eds.), *Race, Equity and Education: Sixty years from Brown* (pp. 177–198). Springer.
- Deroo, M. R., & Watson, V. M. N. (2020). "Air I breathe": Songwriting as literacy practices of remembrance. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 52(2), 158–179.
- Donato, R., & Hanson, J. (2017). "Porque tenían sangre de 'Negros'": The exclusion of Mexican children from a Louisiana school, 1915–1916. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal*, 11(1), 125–145.
- Donato, R., Guzmán, G., & Hanson, J. (2017). *Francisco Maestas et al. v. George H. Shone et al.*: Mexican American resistance to school segregation in the Hispano homeland, 1912–1914. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 16(1), 3–17.
- Doubek, J., & Campbell, B. (2018, July 11). Hate crime charges filed against man who harassed woman over Puerto Rico flag shirt. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2018/07/11/627929289/video-of-man-harassing-woman-over-puerto-rican-flag-shirt-prompts-investigation>.
- Farmer, A. D. (2017). *Remaking Black power: How Black women transformed an era*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(3), 149–171.
- Flores, N., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2015). Looking holistically in a climate of partiality: Identities of students labeled long-term English language learners. *Journal of Language Identity & Education*, 14(2), 113–132.
- Gamboa, S. (2019, June 24). A quinceañera adds voter registration to her celebration to boost Latino voting. *NBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/quincea-era-adds-voter-registration-her-celebration-boost-latino-voting-n1019236>.

- García, M. T., & Castro, S. (2011). *Blowout!: Sal Castro and the Chicano struggle for educational justice*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- García-Hernández, Y. (2016). Sonic pedagogies: Latina girls, mother–daughter relationships, and learning feminisms through the consumption of Jenni Rivera. *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, 28(4), 427–442.
- García-Peña, L. (2020, June 8). Dismantling anti-Blackness together. *NACLA*. <https://nacla.org/news/2020/06/09/dismantling-anti-blackness-together>.
- Ginwright, S., & Cammarota, J. (2011). Youth organizing in the wild west: Mobilizing for educational justice in Arizona! *Voices in Urban Education*, 30, 13–21.
- Goetz, P. (2020). *Reading, writing, and revolution: Escuelitas and the emergence of a Mexican American identity in Texas*. University of Texas Press.
- Gutiérrez, J. A. (1998). *The making of a Chicano militant: Lessons from Cristal*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2016). Designing resilient ecologies: Social design experiments and a new social imagination. *Educational Researcher*, 45(3), 187–196.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2020). When learning as movement meets learning on the move. *Cognition and Instruction*, 38(3), 427–433.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Becker, B., Espinoza, M., Cortes, K., Cortez, A., Lizárraga, J. R., Rivero, E., & Yin, P. (2019). Youth as historical actors in the production of possible futures. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 26(4), 291–308.
- Haney-López, I. A. (2003). *Racism on trial: The Chicano fight for justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Hermanos Herrera. (2020, June 11). *Black Lives Matter* [Video]. <https://www.facebook.com/jorgeandherreravideos/10110825732252606>.
- Hope, E. C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M. I. (2016). Participation in Black Lives Matter and deferred action for childhood arrivals: Modern activism among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(3), 203–215.
- Jaffee, A. T. (2016). Social studies pedagogy for Latino/a newcomer youth: Toward a theory of culturally and linguistically relevant citizenship education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(2), 147–183.
- Kahne, J., Middaugh, E., & Allen, D. (2015). Youth, new media, and the rise of participatory politics. In D. Allen & J. S. Light (Eds.), *From voice to influence* (pp. 35–55). University of Chicago Press.
- Kinney, A. (2012). Loops, lyrics, and literacy: Songwriting as a site of resilience for an urban adolescent. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(5), 395–404.
- Lee, S. S. (2014). *Building a Latino civil rights movement: Puerto Ricans, African Americans, and the pursuit of racial justice in New York City*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Levinson, M. (2015). Citizenship and civic education. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of educational theory and philosophy*. Sage. <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:12701475>.
- Lo, J. C. (2017). Adolescents developing civic identities: Sociocultural perspectives on simulations and role-play in a civic classroom. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 45(2), 189–217.
- Madrid, E. M. (2008). The unheralded history of the Lemon Grove desegregation case. *Multicultural Education*, 15(3), 15–19.
- Martinez, L. (2005). Yes we can: Latino participation in unconventional politics. *Social Forces*, 84(1), 135–155.
- Márquez-Benitez, G., & Pallares, A. (2016). Not one more: Linking civil disobediences and public anti-deportation campaigns. *North American Dialogue*, 19(1), 13–22.
- Miller, L. (2020, May 1). Indigenous immigrants face coronavirus language barrier. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-05-01/la-me-indigenous-immigrants-language-barriers-coronavirus>.
- Mireles, J. G. (2006). *Life along the border: A landmark Tejana thesis* (M. E. Cotera, Ed.). Texas A&M University Press.
- Mirra, N., & Garcia, A. (2017). Civic participation reimaged: Youth interrogation and innovation in the multimodal public sphere. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 136–158.
- Moll, L. C. (1998). Turning to the world: Bilingualism, literacy and the cultural mediation of thinking. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 47, 59–75.
- Muñoz, C. (2007). *Youth, identity, power: The Chicano movement*. Verso Trade.

- Nieto, S. (2018). A woman for all seasons: Learning from the wisdom of Antonia Pantoja. In J. S. Brooks & A. H. Normore (Eds.), *Leading against the grain: Lessons for creating just and equitable schools* (pp. 5–13). Teachers College Press.
- Okihiro, G. Y. (2016). *Third world studies: Theorizing liberation*. Duke University Press.
- Olivas, M. A. (2020). *Perchance to DREAM: A Legal and Political History of the DREAM Act and DACA*. New York University Press.
- Otero, L. R., & Cammarota, J. (2011). Notes from the Ethnic Studies home front: student protests, texting, and subtexts of oppression, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24(5), 639–648.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Pallares, A. (2014). *Family activism: Immigrant struggles and the politics of noncitizenship*. Rutgers University Press.
- Pantoja, A. (2002). *Memoir of a visionary: Antonia Pantoja*. Arte Público Press.
- Patler, C. (2018). “Citizens but for papers”: Undocumented youth organizations, anti-deportation campaigns, and the reframing of citizenship. *Social Problems*, 65(1), 96–115.
- Patler, C., & Gonzales, R. G. (2015). Framing citizenship: Media coverage of anti-deportation cases led by undocumented immigrant youth organisations. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41, 1453–1474.
- Pinetta, B. J., Martinez, S. B., Cross, F. L., & Rivas-Drake, D. (2020). Inherently political? Associations of parent ethnic-racial socialization and sociopolitical discussions with Latinx youths’ emergent civic engagement. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 66(1–2), 94–105.
- Pritchett, W. E. (2002). *Brownsville, Brooklyn: Blacks, Jews, and the changing face of the ghetto*. University of Chicago Press.
- Rios Perez, M. (forthcoming). *Subjects of resistance: Education, race, and transnational life in Mexican Chicago, 1910–1940*. Rutgers University Press.
- Rodríguez, C. E. (1990). Puerto Rican Studies. *American Quarterly*, 42(3), 437–455.
- Rubin, B. C. (2012). *Making citizens: Transforming civic learning for diverse social studies classrooms*. Routledge.
- Rulfo, J. (2014). *Altamirano: Vida, tiempo, obra* (J. Miguel, Ed.). Centro de Estudios Sociales y de Opinión Pública.
- Saenz, T. A. (2004). Mendez and the legacy of Brown: A Latino civil rights lawyer’s assessment. *African-American Law & Policy Report*, 6, 194–201.
- Salazar, M. (2019, September 16). The problem with Latinidad. *The Nation*. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/hispanic-heritage-month-latinidad>.
- Salinas, C. (2001). El Colegio Altamirano (1897–1958): New histories of Chicano education in the southwest. *The Educational Forum*, 65(1), 80–86.
- Salinas, C., & Alarcón, J. D. (2016). Exploring the civic identities of Latina/o high school students: Reframing the historical narrative. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 18(1), 68–87.
- Salinas, C., Vickery, A. E., & Franquiz, M. (2016). Advancing border pedagogies: Understandings of citizenship through comparisons of home to school contexts. *The High School Journal*, 99(4), 322–336.
- Sánchez-Korrol, V. (1996). Toward bilingual education: Puerto Rican women teachers in New York City schools, 1947–1967. In A. Ortiz (Ed.), *Puerto Rican women and work: Bridges in transnational labor*. Temple University Press.
- San Miguel, G. (2005). *Brown, not White: School integration and the Chicano movement in Houston*. Texas A&M University Press.
- Santiago, I. (1986). *Aspira v. Board of Education* revisited. *American Journal of Education*, 95(1), 149–199.
- Santiago, M. (2019a). Güeras, Indigenas y Negros: A framework for teaching Mexican American racial/ethnic histories. In M. Gross & L. Terra (Eds.), *Teaching and learning the difficult past: Comparative perspectives*. Routledge.
- Santiago, M. (2019b). Historical inquiry to challenge the narrative of racial progress. *Cognition and Instruction*, 37(1), 93–117.
- Santiago, M. (2019c). A framework for an interdisciplinary understanding of Mexican American school segregation. *Multicultural Education Review*, 11(2), 69–78.
- Simmons, M. E. (1957). *The Mexican corrido as a source for interpretive study of modern Mexico 1870–1950*. Indiana University Press.
- Smith, R. M. (1997). *Civic ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history*. Yale University Press.

- Torney-Purta, J., Barber, C. H., & Wilkenfeld, B. (2007). Latino adolescents' civic development in the United States: Research results from the IEA civic education study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(2), 111–125.
- Terriquez, V. (2015). Intersectional mobilization, social movement spillover, and queer youth leadership in the immigrant rights movement. *Social Problems*, 62(3), 343–362.
- Terriquez, V., Brenes, T., & López, A. (2018). Intersectionality as a multipurpose collective action frame: The case of the undocumented youth movement. *Ethnicities*, 18(2), 260–276.
- Torres, A., & Velázquez, J. E. (1998). *The Puerto Rican movement: Voices from the diaspora*. Temple University Press.
- Umemoto, K. (1989). "On strike!" San Francisco State College strike, 1968–1969: The role of Asian American students. *Amerasia Journal*, 15(1), 3–41.
- Valdivia, C. (2019). Expanding geographies of deportability: How immigration enforcement at the local level affects undocumented and mixed-status families. *Law & Policy*, 41(1), 103–119.
- Valencia, R. (2005). The Mexican American struggle for equal educational opportunity in *Mendez v. Westminster*: Helping to pave the way for *Brown v. Board of Education*. *Teachers College Record*, 107(3), 389–423.
- Vickery, A. E. (2015). It was never meant for us: Towards a Black feminist construct of citizenship in social studies. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 39(3), 163–172.
- Villa, L. (2019). Not your tío's corrido: 9 artists redefining regional Mexican music. *Remezcla*. <https://remezcla.com/lists/music/9-artists-redefining-regional-mexican>.
- Virkkunen, J. (2006). Dilemmas in building shared transformative agency. *Activités*, 3(1), 43–66.
- Wallace, S. J., & Zepeda-Millán, C. (2020). Do Latinos still support immigrant rights activism? Examining Latino attitudes a decade after the 2006 protest wave. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(4), 770–790.
- Watson, V. W. M., & Beymer, A. (2019). Praisesongs of place: Youth envisioning space and place in a literacy-and-songwriting initiative. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 53(4), 319.
- Woodard, T. (2020, February 3). Why a quinceañera is a perfect place to register new Texas voters. WFAA. <https://www.wfaa.com/article/features/originals/why-a-quinceaera-is-a-perfect-place-to-register-new-texas-voters/287-895b27f1-0693-4ded-adfb-064fd75faaeb>.
- Wray-Lake, L., Wells, R., Alvis, L., Delgado, S., Syvertsen, A. K., & Metzger, A. (2018). Being a Latinx adolescent under a Trump presidency: Analysis of Latinx youth's reactions to immigration politics. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 87, 192–204.
- Zepeda-Millán, C., & Wallace, S. (2018). Mobilizing for immigrant and Latino rights under Trump. In D. Meyer & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *The resistance: The dawn of the Anti-Trump opposition movement* (pp. 90–108). Oxford University Press.
- Zimmerman, A. M. (2011). A dream detained: Undocumented Latino youth and the DREAM movement. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 44(6), 14–17.
- Zimmerman, A. (2016). Transmedia testimonio: Examining undocumented youth's political activism in the digital age. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 1886–906.

ASIAN AMERICAN EXCLUSION AND THE FIGHT FOR INCLUSION

Li-Ching Ho, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*

Stacey J. Lee, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*

The Asian American category represents incredible diversity along ethnic, linguistic, religious, generational, historical, and social class dimensions. The 1980 U.S. Census grouped Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders together into the category of Asian and Pacific Islander (API), which further broadened the pan-ethnic category. The diversity of the API category has been a subject of debate for decades, with many scholars and community activists calling for disaggregated data (Espiritu, 2006; Lee & Kumashiro, 2005). A growing number of Pasifika community leaders (Pacific Islanders), for example, have pushed back on the API category, arguing that Pacific Islanders have a distinct history linked to colonization, displacement, and dislocation, which make their struggles similar to those of other Indigenous communities (Gegeo, 2001).⁷ This section will focus on those categorized as Asian Americans (e.g., those with origins in East Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Indian subcontinent). Despite important differences among Asian Americans, this group shares a common experience of exclusion from the United States, and from the early 20th century to the present, Asian Americans have challenged, resisted, and advocated for inclusion in the United States. By examining historic and contemporary examples of Asian American agency regarding citizenship, the authors highlight both common experiences shared by those categorized as Asian Americans and the important differences within the group. Furthermore, they discuss the ways that Asian Americans have been represented in the K–12 curricula.

Asian American students have consistently reported high levels of racist harassment related to their perceived level of English proficiency, immigrant background, and culture, and this discrimination has been associated with increased levels of mental stress (Lee et al., 2009), depressive or anxiety disorders (Gee et al., 2007), and suicide ideation (Choi et al., 2020) among Asian American youth. Notably, levels of anti-Asian sentiment and discrimination have historically increased significantly during periods of national domestic and foreign policy crisis. For example, the economic challenges faced by the United States in the 1980s fueled the rise of anti-Japanese sentiment (Heale, 2009) and more recently, the COVID-19 pandemic and the xenophobic rhetoric surrounding the pandemic has resulted in significant anti-Chinese sentiment. Indeed, the image of Asian Americans as perpetual foreigners is a central racializing discourse that has framed Asian American experiences in the nation since the 19th century, reflecting what political scientist Claire Jean Kim refers to as a form of civic ostracism that casts Asian Americans as “immutably foreign” (2000, p. 16). In contrast to White immigrants who are absorbed into the nation within a generation, Asian Americans remain identified as perpetual foreigners even when they have been in the United States for multiple generations.

As a result, the history of Asian Americans has been marked by struggles to be included in the nation. For example, the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which barred Chinese immigration and declared Chinese immigrants ineligible for naturalization, made Chinese immigrants the first group to be subjected to exclusionary

⁷ See the Pacific Islander Community Association (PICA-WA) website at <http://www.picawa.org>.

immigration policies. The rhetoric surrounding Chinese exclusion relied on ideas that Chinese immigrants were permanently alien and therefore threatening to the nation (Lee, 2003; Ngai, 2004; Takaki, 1998). The anti-Chinese sentiment that fueled the Chinese Exclusion Act quickly extended to a broader anti-Asian sentiment that targeted Indian, Japanese, and Korean immigrants, which ultimately restricted immigration to the United States for other Asian groups for decades (Lee, 2003).

Anti-Chinese activists in the late 19th century also attempted to strip U.S.-born children of Chinese immigrants of the right to birthright citizenship, arguing again that people of Chinese descent were incapable of assimilation. In 1895 anti-Chinese exclusionists denied Wong Kim Ark, a California native who had visited China, the right to re-entry based on the argument that Wong Kim Ark was not a U.S. citizen. Wong Kim Ark hired an attorney and filed a writ of habeas corpus, claiming the right to reenter the United States as a native-born citizen under the 14th Amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court case of *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (1898) ultimately affirmed birthright citizenship to all persons regardless of race (Lee, 2003).

The perception of Asian Americans as being “forever foreigners” (Tuan, 1998, p. 18) and not full American citizens regardless of their generational status is perhaps best exemplified by the 1944 *Korematsu* case. The *Korematsu v. United States* Supreme Court case is the most well-known of the three cases challenging the Japanese American internment during World War II (the other two being *Hirabayashi v. United States* and *Yasui v. United States*). The three cases collectively challenged President Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066 that detained 120,000 Japanese Americans, most of whom were native-born U.S. citizens, in remote internment camps. Under the guise of military necessity, the U.S. government, without any proof, accused Japanese Americans of being disloyal to the United States, and alleged that they were engaged in, or predisposed to engaged in, acts of espionage or sabotage (Serrano & Minami, 2003). It took almost four decades before Fred Korematsu’s criminal conviction was overturned in 1983 due to the efforts of two Nisei (second generation Japanese Americans) attorneys and their supporters (Hashimoto, 1996). Concurrently, grassroots civil society organizations such as the Japanese American Citizens League launched a successful redress campaign, which resulted in the formation of a federal commission to examine the government’s actions, proclamations by Presidents Ford and Reagan acknowledging the that the internment was unjust, and the passage of the Civil Liberties Act in 1988 (Tateishi & Yoshino, 2000).

As with other minoritized communities, Asian Americans’ struggle for inclusion and belonging in the United States has involved the fight for educational opportunities, including access to public schools. In the 1870s and early 1880s there were approximately 3,000 Chinese children living in California, with most of the population in San Francisco. Despite the large number of Chinese children in San Francisco, however, there were no public schools that allowed Chinese children. In 1884 Joseph and Mamie Tape, Chinese immigrants, sued the San Francisco Board of Education for denying their daughter admission to the local school because of her Chinese ancestry. In 1885 the Superior Court ruled in favor of the Tapes, and the California Supreme Court later upheld the decision. California exclusionists responded by passing an act authorizing segregated schools for Chinese students (Ngai, 2012).

The U.S. Supreme Court case of *Lum v. Rice* (1927) involved the American-born daughter of Chinese immigrants, Martha Lum, who had been denied entry to the White

school in their town of Rosedale, Mississippi, on the basis of her race. In *Lum v. Rice* the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously upheld the decision of the Mississippi Supreme Court, citing the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision. Although the *Lum* decision was not officially overturned until the Supreme Court outlawed school segregation in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision, Chinese families were able to gain access to White public schools for their children in some Delta towns by the late 1930s and to many by the late 1940s (Lee, 2017).

While early Asian American resistance to exclusion focused on single ethnic groups, during the Civil Rights era, Asian American activists embraced pan-ethnic identities as Asians and/or Asian Americans. By organizing multiple national-origin groups under a pan-Asian label, Asian American activists focused on common experiences with racial discrimination. This instrumental response allowed relatively small ethnic groups to form a bigger voice in the fight against racism (Espiritu, 1993). Asian American activists during this period also built cross-racial coalitions with other communities of color to fight against racism, economic inequality, and global imperialism (Maeda, 2005; Prashad, 2002).

Significantly, Asian American activists during this period rejected the characterization of Asian Americans as “model minorities” that the dominant group used to silence the concerns raised by Civil Rights activists (Maeda, 2005; Pulido, 2008). In the post-Civil Rights era, student activists, including Asian American college students, demanded cultural recognition in the form of Ethnic Studies and since the 1980s, resistance to the model minority stereotype has been central to the work of Asian American Studies (Prashad, 2006). The rise of an Asian American political consciousness and resistance to the use of the model minority stereotype was important because it was a repudiation of the stereotype’s assimilationist, exploitative, and racist assumptions. The model minority characterization, for example, not only ignored the diversity of the lived and material realities of different Asian American groups but also simultaneously situated Asian Americans within the larger national myth of progress and freedom while positioning them as a clearly defined Other within a national racial order dominated by White Americans (Wu, 2013).

The Asian American population has grown tremendously since the Civil Rights era and the demographic changes have created new challenges to uniting under a common racial category. Asian Americans from Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent argue that the Asian American category privileges East Asians and masks the diverse histories and experiences of Asian Americans. Critical refugee scholar Yen Le Espiritu (2006, p. 418) has argued that “if Asian Americans are to build a self-consciously pan-Asian solidarity, they need to take seriously the heterogeneities among their ranks and overcome the narrow dominance of the professional class and that of the two oldest Asian American groups.”

While some Asian Americans trace their histories in the United States back more than six or seven generations, many more live in immigrant or refugee families. Among more recent arrivals, some have relatively clear pathways to legal citizenship but others face exclusionary immigration policies. Notably, there has been an increase in the deportation of immigrants with criminal convictions, including Southeast Asians who came to the United States as refugees (Chen, 2019). The United States has repatriation agreements with Cambodia and Vietnam, and is currently negotiating with Laos

to accept nationals with final removal orders (Mentzer, 2020). Approximately 16,000 Southeast Asian Americans have received final orders of deportation since 1998, most for criminal convictions for which they have already served time. Although some Asian Americans, including some Southeast Asian Americans, have extensive transnational ties, most of the Southeast Asians who are at risk of being deported do not have strong ties in Southeast Asia. Crucially, the Southeast Asia Resource Action Center and other Southeast Asian American organizations have been active in fighting for immigration policies that are “grounded in the principles of fairness, family, and second chances” (SEARAC, 2020).

Although the dominant narrative surrounding undocumented immigrants focuses on Latinx communities, approximately 1.7 million undocumented immigrants are of Asian descent (Ramakrishnan & Shah, 2017). Many undocumented Asian immigrants live in relative social isolation in the shadows, which makes them vulnerable to exploitation and their children isolated from social capital (Yoshikawa, 2011). However, some undocumented Asian Americans have ventured out of the shadows to organize for immigration rights. In fact, the “original Dreamer,” Tereza Lee, is a Korean American who continues to fight for immigration reform 19 years after she inspired the first DREAM Act. The fight for comprehensive immigration reform, including the rights of undocumented immigrants, has led to collaborations between Asian American youth groups and older established Asian American organizations. For example, the organization Revolutionizing Asian American Immigrant Stories on the East Coast (RAISE), a pan-Asian undocumented youth-led group, has been working with the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Central to RAISE’s mission is the disruption of the “model minority racial tokenism” that erases the struggles within the Asian American community (RAISE, 2020).

As Asian American communities continue the fight for equity and justice in the 21st century, there has been a growing divide among Asian Americans regarding the role of cross-racial coalitions. Some Asian Americans view the interests of Asian Americans as being separate from the interests of other groups of color, while others argue that Asian Americans should stand together with Black, Indigenous, and Latinx communities. Attitudes regarding affirmative action, for example, reflect the diverse opinions regarding cross-racial solidarity among Asian Americans. In 2014, Students for Fair Admissions sued Harvard, alleging that the holistic admissions process, which considers the whole person including racial background, discriminates against Asian Americans. A vocal coalition of Asian American organizations joined the call to end affirmative action, and have embraced the stereotype of Asian Americans as deserving model minorities in their fight. Chinese Americans are the most vocal opponents to affirmative action among Asian Americans, but there exists a significant generational divide whereby younger Chinese Americans are much more likely to support affirmative action than their parents’ generation (Poon & Wong, 2019). While anti-affirmative activists have received a lot of attention in the media, a much larger number of Asian American organizations support affirmative action and the related goals of remedying the legacies of systemic racism against all communities of color, expanding definitions of eligibility, and democratizing education. Not insignificantly, Asian Americans who support affirmative action have criticized the model minority stereotype for failing to capture the diverse experiences of Asian Americans and for the implicit anti-Blackness

at the core of the stereotype. The Federal Court upheld Harvard's race conscious admissions in October 2019, but the battle continues with Asian Americans on both sides of the debate actively engaging in advocacy.

Representations of Asian Americans in K–12 Curricula

Ideas and perspectives regarding Asian Americans are produced and reproduced through the formal curricula, and for decades, Asian Americans have consistently struggled for equitable representation within K–12 school curricula. Groups such as the Sikh Coalition and the Lao Advocacy Organization of San Diego, for example, have fought for the inclusion of different voices within social studies curricula in large part because of the increased levels of discrimination, bullying, and hate crimes that have occurred, especially post-9/11 (Constante, 2017, 2019). Some of these groups have achieved several notable legislative and policy successes, including the passing of a California bill mandating the teaching of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Hmong history in schools and the development of revised social studies standards in Tennessee to include Sikhism (Constante, 2019).

Studies reviewing how Asian Americans are represented within social studies curriculum standards and textbooks across the country have similarly noted that how marginalized Asian American stories are to the dominant historical narratives. Within the formal curriculum, scholars have found that Asian Americans are primarily situated historically within particular time periods, for example, early Chinese immigration in the 19th century and the Japanese American internment in World War II (An, 2016). This representation is deeply problematic because it perpetuates stereotypes and renders invisible the complicated and diverse experiences of Asian Americans (e.g., Filipinos, Indians, Koreans, Vietnamese) over time (Harada, 2000).

Even when Asian American experiences are included in the curriculum, their stories are depicted in assimilationist ways that do not challenge the master narrative of American progress, freedom, and opportunity. For example, the various forms of prejudice faced by Chinese and Japanese Americans in the late 19th century and in the 1940s are part of the narrative of Asian Americans overcoming discriminatory obstacles, working hard, and eventually achieving the American dream (Suh et al., 2014). This problematic portrayal of Asian Americans as model minorities not only serves to reinscribe the existing racial hierarchy within the United States, but also ignores the continuing economic and social disparities both within the Asian American population and between Asian Americans and Whites (Wu, 2013). For instance, while textbooks highlight the overall economic successes of Asian Americans, they fail to note that higher proportions of Asian American families (e.g., Vietnamese and Chinese families) live below the federal poverty level (Harada, 2000) or that Southeast Asian youth are at a higher risk of juvenile delinquency or dropping out (An, 2016). As Rodriguez and Kim (2018) point out, a singular Asian American immigrant narrative cannot address the significant differences in the experiences of an immigrant who is a well-educated, highly paid professional fluent in English, and a political refugee with minimal formal schooling and a limited command of English.

Asian Americans, are, in addition, frequently depicted as passive agents in textbooks and curricular standards. Many curricula, for instance, greatly minimize the

civic actions taken by early Chinese railroad workers and Japanese American internees (e.g., strikes, protests, and petitions) to resist the unjust and harsh treatment that they received. Similarly, the significant role of Filipino farmworkers fighting for increased worker rights in the farmworkers movement is omitted, with the curriculum standards largely focusing on the role of Mexican farmworkers and leaders such as Cesar Chavez (An, 2016). In a similar vein, most of the state curriculum standards are largely silent about the role of Asian Americans during the Civil Rights Movement even though scholars have documented how Chinese and Japanese Americans joined the multiethnic coalition supporting the NAACP in its civil rights lobbying and also for its work in landmark civil rights cases such as *Brown v. Board of Education* (Wu, 2013).

The diverse histories of immigration among Asian Americans pose significant challenges to conventional conceptions of state-based citizenship and national identity that are promulgated in schools. In many ways, however, the lived experiences of Asian Americans strongly suggest that a society-based *transnational* citizenship framework is far more relevant than a state-based conception of citizenship (Fox, 2005) because the transnational networks and activities of Asian Americans have shaped the multiple identities, mores, and affiliations of generations of Asian Americans in a myriad of ways. Studies, for example, have shown how different groups of Asian Americans such as Chinese Americans and Filipino Americans have consistently been engaged in political, civic, and economic activities across national boundaries, thus resulting in conceptions of citizenship that are more *flexible* and fluid (e.g., Ong, 1999; Rodriguez, 2002). Simultaneously, many Asian American groups, including Pakistani Americans, continue to be associated with cultural, religious, or familial networks that transcend state boundaries. These networks, especially when positioned in oppositional ways to narrowly defined national discourses about citizenship, can potentially contribute to a sense of alienation or feelings of what Ghaffar-Kucher (2015) calls “imagined nostalgia” (p. 203)—an idealized conception of a time and place—of the home community. It is, however, important to note that these transnational networks are not unique to the Asian American community but instead mirror the kinds of global linkages, discourses, and structures that have historically been an integral part of U.S. society (Coloma, 2006).

Much of the civic education curricula found in schools, however, presumes a unitary national identity and a conception of citizenship that is primarily centered on the nation–state. This conception of citizenship is deeply problematic for students, especially Asian American students, because it ignores the many global networks and transnational cultural, economic, and familial linkages that exist within communities within the United States. This limited citizenship framework, furthermore, does not recognize students’ fluid and multiple constructions of identities and affiliations that exist independently of their formal legal status. South Asian immigrant youth, for example, need to navigate multiple affiliations that impact their linguistic, religious, class, and cultural identities (Maira, 2008).

Such curricula, in addition, frequently explicitly or implicitly juxtapose “good” American culture or values with the “problematic” home culture or religion of students, thus positioning these students as outsiders. Studies, for instance, have shown how teachers’ perspectives of Islam as oppressive send young Pakistani American youth messages that being a Muslim is not compatible with being an American (Ghaffar-Kucher, 2015). Notably, in spite of these problematic constructions of citizenship within

the curricula and in schools, other studies have also shown that young American Muslims from communities with significant transnational links actively draw on their different identities and affiliations to assert their place in U.S. society, address injustices, and call for greater inclusion (El-Haj et al., 2011).

While the scholarship on the representation of Asian Americans in the formal curriculum paints a bleak picture, there is growing evidence that Asian American communities are creating culturally relevant civic engagement opportunities for Asian American youth in community-based organizations (Chan, 2009; Kwon, 2013; Lee et al., 2020). These programs build on Asian American youths' cultural backgrounds, teach leadership skills, offer opportunities to discuss issues of importance to their communities, and encourage civic agency (Nygren et al., 2006).

Conclusion

As this brief discussion of Asian American civic engagement demonstrates, Asian Americans represent a complex and heterogeneous pan-ethnic group with varied histories and experiences in the United States and wide-ranging responses to exclusionary policies and practices. Despite the vast differences among Asian American groups, all are subjected to the stereotypes of Asian Americans as perpetual foreigners and/or model minorities. In the face of exclusion and discrimination, however, Asian Americans have always been active agents in fighting for justice and inclusion. The diversity of experiences and perspectives within the Asian American category and the active agency of various Asian American communities are not adequately reflected in the national narratives regarding Asian Americans or in the curricula on Asian Americans. Moving forward, the authors call for a more nuanced representation of Asian American perspectives in national dialogues and in the curriculum. Finally, they call for a more inclusive and broader definition of citizenship that incorporates and recognizes the complexities of the multitude of national and transnational affiliations that exist within many Asian American communities, and indeed within many other communities. A narrowly defined state-based conception of citizenship and national identity that positions other transnational identities and affiliations as inferior or antithetical to the values of the national community will serve to further marginalize diverse Asian American youth. Nevertheless, the authors are heartened by the willingness of many Asian American youth to challenge racist hierarchies, actively assert their rights and place within the larger national community, and work toward a more just and inclusive society.

References

- An, S. (2016). Asian Americans in American history: An AsianCrit perspective on Asian American inclusion in state U.S. History Curriculum Standards, *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(2), 244–276.
- Chan, W. Y. (2009). Supporting Asian-American civic engagement: Theory and practice. *The Foundation Review*, 1(2), 7.
- Chang, R. S. (2013). The invention of Asian Americans. *UC Irvine Law Review*, 3(4), 947–964.
- Chen, M. (2019). Southeast Asian refugees are the latest victims of Trump's deportation crackdown. *The Nation*. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/southeast-asian-refugees-deportation>.

- Choi, Y., Park, M., Noh, S., Lee, J. P., & Takeuchi, D. (2020). Asian American mental health: Longitudinal trend and explanatory factors among young Filipino- and Korean Americans. *SSM–Population Health*, 10, 100542.
- Coloma, R. S. (2006). Disorienting race and education: Changing paradigms on the schooling of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 9(1), 1–15.
- Constante, A. (2017, August 4). Tennessee to include Sikhism in public school standards. *NBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/tennessee-include-sikhism-public-school-curriculum-n789771>.
- Constante, A. (2019, May 9). How advocates are writing Asian American stories back into history books. *NBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/how-advocates-are-writing-asian-american-stories-back-history-books-n1001561>.
- El-Haj, T., Bonet, S., Demerath, P., & Schultz, K. (2011). Education, citizenship, and the politics of belonging: Youth from Muslim transnational communities and the “War on Terror.” *Review of Research in Education*, 35, 29–59.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (1993). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities*. Temple University Press.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (2006). Toward a critical refugee study: The Vietnamese refugee subject in US scholarship. *Journal of Vietnamese Studies*, 1(1–2), 410–433.
- Fox, J. (2005). Unpacking “transnational citizenship.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 171–201.
- Gee, G. C., Spencer, M., Chen, J., Yip, T., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2007). The association between self-reported racial discrimination and 12-month DSM-IV mental disorders among Asian Americans nationwide. *Social Science & Medicine*, 64(10), 1984–1996.
- Ghaffar-Kucher, A. (2015). “Narrow-minded and oppressive” or a “superior culture”? Implications of divergent representations of Islam for Pakistani-American youth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 18(2), 202–224.
- Gegeo, D. W. (2001). Cultural rupture and indigeneity: The challenge of (re) visioning “place” in the Pacific. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(2), 491–507.
- Harada, V. H. (2000). *The treatment of Asian Americans in U.S. history textbooks published 1994–1996 (ED448072)*. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED448072>.
- Hashimoto, D. M. (1996). The legacy of Korematsu v. United States: A dangerous narrative retold. *UCLA Asian Pacific American Law Journal*, 4, 72–128.
- Heale, M. (2009). Anatomy of a Scare: Yellow Peril Politics in America, 1980–1993. *Journal of American Studies*, 43(1), 19–47.
- Kim, C. J. (2000). *Bitter fruit: The politics of black-Korean conflict in New York City*. Yale University Press.
- Kwon, S. A. (2013). *Uncivil youth: Race, activism, and affirmative governmentality*. Duke University Press.
- Lee, E. (2003). *At America’s gates: Chinese immigration during the exclusion era, 1882–1943*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Lee, S., Juon, H. S., Martinez, G., Hsu, C. E., Robinson, S., Bawa, J., & Mah, G. X. (2009). Model minority at risk: Expressed needs of mental health by Asian American young adults. *Journal of Community Health*, 34, 144–152.
- Lee, S. J. (2017). The (In)Flexibility of racial policies: Chinese Americans access to White schools in the Jim Crow south. In T. McCarty & A. Castagno (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Education Policy*. Routledge/Taylor Francis.
- Lee, S. J., & Kumashiro, K. (2005). *A report on the status of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education: Beyond the “model minority” stereotype*. National Education Association. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED569217.pdf>.
- Lee, S. J., Xiong, C. P., Pheng, L. M., & Neng Vang, M. (2020). “Asians for Black lives, not Asians for Asians”: Building Southeast Asian American and Black solidarity. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 51(4), 405–421.
- Maira, S. (2008). Citizenship, dissent, empire: South Asian Muslim immigrant youth. In K. Ewing (Ed.), *Being and belonging: Muslims in the United States since 9/11* (pp. 15–46). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mentzer, R. (2020, February 24). Hmong leaders rally against Trump Administration deportation push. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2020/02/24/808071758/hmong-leaders-rally-against-trump-administration-deportation-push>.

- Ngai, M. M. (2004). *Impossible subjects: Illegal aliens and the making of modern America*. Princeton University Press.
- Ngai, M. M. (2012). *The lucky ones: One family and the extraordinary invention of Chinese America*. Princeton University Press.
- Nygreen, K., Ah Kwon, S., & Sánchez, P. (2006). Urban youth building community: Social change and participatory research in schools, homes, and community-based organizations. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1–2), 107–123.
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Duke University Press.
- Poon, O., & Wong, J. (2019, February 25). The generational divide on affirmative action. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/views/2019/02/25/views-chinese-americans-affirmative-action-vary-age-opinion>.
- Prashad, V. (2002). *Everybody was Kung Fu fighting: Afro-Asian connections and the myth of cultural purity*. Beacon Press.
- Prashad, V. (2006). Ethnic studies inside out. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 9(2), 157–176.
- Pulido, L. (2008). *Black, brown, yellow and left: Radical activism in Los Angeles*. University of California Press.
- RAISE (Revolutionizing Asian American Immigrant Stories on the East Coast). (2020). RAISE: Our mission. <https://raise-nyc.squarespace.com/new-page>.
- Ramakrishnan, K., & Shah, S. (2017). One out of every 7 Asian immigrants is undocumented. <http://apidata.com/blog/asian-undoc-1in7>.
- Rodriguez, N. N., & Kim, E. J. (2018). In search of mirrors: An Asian Critical Race Theory content analysis of Asian American picture books from 2007 to 2017. *Journal of Children's Literature*, 44(2), 17–30.
- Rodriguez, R. M. (2002). Migrant heroes: Nationalism, citizenship and the politics of Filipino migrant labor. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(3), 341–356.
- SEARAC (Southeast Asia Resource Action Center). (2020). *Immigration overview*. <https://www.searac.org/programming/national-state-policy-advocacy/immigration>.
- Serrano, S., & Minami, D. (2003). *Korematsu v. United States*: Constant caution in time of crisis. *Asian Law Journal*, 10(1), 37–50.
- Suh, Y., An, S., & Forest, D. (2014). Immigration, imagined communities, and collective memories of Asian American experiences: A content analysis of Asian American experiences in Virginia U.S. history textbooks. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 39(1), 39–51.
- Takaki, R. (1998). *A history of Asian Americans: Strangers from a different shore*. First Back Bay, Boston.
- Tateishi, J., & Yoshino, W. (2000). The Japanese American incarceration: The journey to redress. *Human Rights*, 27(2), 10–11.
- Tuan, M. (1998). *Forever foreigners or honorary Whites? The Asian ethnic experience today*. Rutgers University Press.
- Yoshikawa, H. (2011). *Immigrants raising citizens: Undocumented parents and their children*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wu, E. D. (2013). *The color of success: Asian Americans and the origins of the model minority*. Princeton University Press.

AN APPALACHIAN SPRING: HOPE AND RESILIENCE AMONG YOUTH IN THE RURAL SOUTH

Deborah Hicks,⁸ Executive Director, *Partnership for Appalachian Girls' Education*

Gabrielle,⁹ also known as Gabby, is an adolescent girl growing up in a remote corner of the Blue Ridge Mountains, in the heart of Southern Appalachia. The boundaries of her community, known to most as Laurel, are marked on one side by the East Tennessee state line and on the other by the beautiful Laurel River. She lives in what locals would call a *holler*—a place where the hills give way to clearings for roads and clusters of homes and other buildings. In every direction, mountains and hills mark the landscape, and on these hills, wood-frame homes are scattered alongside single and doublewide trailers. Finally, standing tall are the small rural churches that are central to community life.

It is a beautiful place to grow up in America, but life in this remarkable landscape does not work for young people quite as it may appear to outside visitors. For starters, there is the unique challenge of being an adolescent youth in a place so removed from the schools and town centers that offer ladders of opportunity. In the 1980s, Gabby's rural school district began a process of consolidation that started with bringing all middle school youth to a single school. As a result, Gabby's bus ride to the county's one middle school can now be up to *2 hours one way*, over winding roads for most of the journey. In 2015, the historic rural school in Laurel, once a K–12 community school, closed for good as a public K–5 school. Now, even kindergarten children face long bus rides to reach the nearest elementary school. Afterschool and summer learning opportunities are tenuous and difficult for many families to juggle. Virtual learning in the time of COVID-19 has deepened issues of inaccessibility related to broadband access and tools for connecting; 40 to 50 percent of students in Laurel have no internet access from their homes.

Yet, Gabby and other young people see the world outside in terms of possibilities. Gabby is a gifted, imaginative student with a special love for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. She can imagine becoming an inventor. "Sometimes when I see things, I just close my eyes and imagine how it works," she says. "When I got to the Leonardo daVinci page in a *National Geographic* magazine, I was like 'Wow!' He was kind of like me ... I draw things, and I call them my inventions."

The United States and other modern economies tend to think of inequalities and hardships from living in poverty as an "urban" problem. In the opening of the third decade of the 21st century, national attention has justly and rightfully turned to the suffering experienced by communities of color in cities. But what about young people such as Gabby, and the tens of thousands of other young working-poor and working-class White youth growing up in rural parts of Appalachia, as well as throughout small towns in the Southeast, Midwest, and Northwest? Shouldn't these youth have opportunities that will enable them to achieve their full potential and future careers, such as a career Gabby might envision for herself as a scientist?

⁸ The author is grateful to Shirley Brice Heath for her insightful comments about an earlier draft of this section, and remains fully responsible for this final version and its content.

⁹ All student names are fictional.

The author makes a point of confession here of growing up in a small town in the Blue Ridge Mountains. Her hometown has things in common with the hundreds of communities such as Laurel scattered throughout Appalachia and the South. It is partly for this reason that in 2010, she was drawn to found the Partnership for Appalachian Girls' Education, or PAGE.¹⁰ In its second decade, PAGE is helping girls growing up in some of the South's most vulnerable and economically distressed areas become empowered learners and critical thinkers, prepared to engage and connect locally and globally. What can this experience teach us about creating opportunities for civic engagement among youth growing up in America's invisible poverty: the poverty known for generations by working-poor and working-class people, most of them White, in Appalachia?

Resilience and Strength in Appalachia

For some, the very word Appalachia conjures up images of White poverty. It is easy to remember photographs taken by Dorothea Lange or James Agee, or the "War on Poverty" pilgrimages of presidents and presidential hopefuls to front porches in West Virginia and Eastern Kentucky. Maybe, one can picture more contemporary images of families, including children, paying a heavy price for the opioid epidemic that has cut an especially destructive path through rural, historically White communities. Images of political conservatism emerge, too, with many of these connected to the election of Donald Trump in 2016. Some would go so far as to place the blame for the 2016 election results on working-poor and working-class Whites in places such as Appalachia. This ignores the fact that hedge fund managers in Greenwich were equally, though perhaps more quietly, part of a broad-based coalition of Trump supporters in 2016—and beyond (Osno, 2020).

News stories tend to focus on the distressing statistics. In a 2019 ranking of the "25 Worst Counties" in terms of poverty, education, and quality of life by the news and opinion publication *24/7 Wall Street*, 12 of the most distressed counties were in Appalachia (Stebbins & Sauter, 2019). A special report in *The Guardian* chronicled life in what U.S. Census Bureau surveys from 2008–2012 recorded as the poorest White town in America: Beattyville, in Eastern Kentucky's Lee County. The article's portrayal of a community in the grip of the opioid epidemic is painfully captured in its header: "America's poorest white town: abandoned by coal, swallowed by drugs" (McGreal, 2015).

These injustices and the many obstacles to opportunity are *part* of what needs to be seen, heard, and understood by those outside of Appalachia. They capture the unavoidable realities: life can be hard in this beautiful part of the rural South. For generations, people in the region have suffered from persistent poverty and lack of sustainable, healthy jobs; from the environmental destruction of their mountains and poisoning of their water by outside corporations; from the lack of educational opportunity for students in rural communities; and now from the devastating impact of the opioid epidemic on families and whole communities.

Stories from inside Appalachia help capture what life can be like in America's most invisible poverty. Consider for instance the poisoning of Appalachia's water, one of the

¹⁰ See <https://pageprograms.com>.

region's many natural resources. Ron Rash, a novelist and professor of Appalachian Studies, writes in a *New York Times* op-ed piece about the drinking water in Eastern Kentucky's Knott County (Rash, 2016). "Some of it is brown. Some of it is yellow. Some of it smells like sulfur," Rash quotes from an interview with Brent Hutchinson, who directs the Hindman Settlement School in Knott County. Years of problems—from coal mining, industrial waste, old pipes—have gotten too little attention on a national level. The destruction of Appalachia's mountains has drawn more attention, and justly so, to the ways in which rural people have paid a heavy price for cheap energy. In the documentary film *Hillbilly* (Rubin & York, 2019), co-producer Silas House tells of 3-year old Jeremy Davidson in southwestern Virginia, killed by a half-ton boulder. The boulder was dislodged during the illegal cutting of a road for a strip-mining operation above the family's singlewide trailer. It barreled downward, crashing through the walls of the trailer and onto the bed where Jeremy was sleeping.

We need to bring to national visibility these stories and injustices, and to demand justice, human rights, and environmental rights in Appalachia. Of equal importance to these stories of poverty, exploitation, and pain, however, are stories of hope, resilience, and resistance. The author is often reminded in her educational work in the Blue Ridge Mountains that the students and families served are proud and strong. They sometimes resent the degree to which the word Appalachia, especially for those living outside the region, calls up images from America's War on Poverty that persist in today's media coverage. Local residents want people to see a more complex and hopeful region where families, communities, and local schools and churches have created the bedrock for young people to look toward a more positive future in which they can become leaders.

Elizabeth Catte, a public historian who lives in Virginia, points out in *What You Are Getting Wrong About Appalachia* that stock narratives and stereotypes do not begin to capture the history and resilience of this region (Catte, 2018). Young people are more than ready to share the complex stories of the region they know, *their* Appalachia. Some are joining youth across the nation and world in advocating for human rights, racial justice, and environmental justice. Black writers, educators, intellectuals, and artists have been inspired to write about their Appalachia, sometimes using the term Affrilachia. Before any of us can imagine the new communities that would engage youth from this region, we need to look and listen more deeply to understand the diversity of strengths that already exist there. A good place to start would be with three things that people in rural Appalachia value above all else: family, church, and community.

Life in the small towns and communities PAGE serves is shaped by the special meaning of *place* for people who, as locals might say, have generations in the soil. It means one thing to be from the Laurel community; another to be from Spring Creek. Each of these communities has its own tightly knit families, churches, and community centers. *Family* is of greatest importance in local communities. This is an enormous source of strength for young people, especially when their immediate families suffer the effects of opioids or poverty. Time and time again, adult members of extended families step forward in selfless ways to parent children whose biological parents are unable to fully care for them. Great aunts, Mamaws (grandmothers), and other extended family members take on parenting roles with total care and commitment. Their caretaking is supported by local churches that serve more than a religious function. Rural churches serve as centers of community life. Even the smallest, most rural communities are

known by their churches. On Sundays, song, prayer, and good homecooked food in the fellowship hall provide grounding for later civic engagement.

Then, there are the small schools, which are also centers of community life. One of the saddest moments in the author's 11-year history as a social entrepreneur in Appalachia was watching the closing of the Laurel community's beloved small school, once a K–12 community school set in a beautiful mountain valley next to Laurel Creek. From the large sunny windows of the now empty classrooms can still be seen the creek and the green of the woods behind it. Local teachers from the community itself, some having either gone to the school or were daughters and sons of former teachers, taught each student as though he or she were a cherished member of an extended family. "You knew you were supported and you knew that everybody's life mattered.... That's what our school was like," says Cynthia Belcher, a former K/1 teacher at Laurel School who had attended the school herself. With the loss of local jobs in Laurel, the demise of family farms and tobacco crop subsidies, and the movement of families closer to steady sources of work (e.g., Walmart, Lowe's, consolidated public schools), enrollment in Laurel School declined from 99 students in 2000 to 49 K–5 students in 2015. At an emotional meeting of the local Board of Education, held in a packed school auditorium, Laurel School was permanently closed as a public school. "It felt ... to me like a *death* because it was such a big part of my life," narrates Deborah Chandler, who graduated from Laurel School and had been a teaching assistant there.¹¹

The impact of these rural school closings for local people and communities has been profound. Members of the communities served in PAGE still talk about the closing of their schools with sadness and anger. They feel the loss deeply and acutely. In some instances, small rural schools have been reimagined as community or cultural centers and still function as centers of community life. Local people struggle to make these reimagined spaces more than museums or relics of the past, when schooling was place-based and integrated with community in a way that cannot be replicated in consolidated schools.

In a more positive vein, young people in Appalachia are heirs to the strong community value placed on local schools and teachers—now embodied in stories. Oral histories passed down from parents, elders, and other locals provide them with a sense of strength and identity: this is *my* history too. Education in this sense serves as even more than a "ladder of opportunity," as today's corporate-oriented educational language might frame things. It serves as a way in which young people can develop identities that are tremendous resources for civic engagement: pride in their regional identity, a feeling of place-based belonging, an expectation to work hard and achieve, and a deep respect for learning. Small rural schools may have been more progressive models of education than we could imagine in the sense of preparing youth for civic life and leadership.

A final resource for youth growing up in Appalachia thrives in the colleges and other educational institutions found across the region. These can serve as stepping stones leading students like Gabby to achieve their imagined futures. Private funding and visionary leadership have yielded exemplary models of postsecondary education

¹¹ See <https://pageprograms.com/the-girls-projects/interdisciplinary-labs/installations/the-laurel-school>.

for working-class rural students. A leading example is Berea College in Kentucky, founded in 1855 by abolitionists. In its first year of opening just after the Civil War, Berea served 96 Black students and 91 White college students. Since that beginning, Berea has become known for making a 4-year liberal arts college degree accessible for all. No student in need of financial aid (this includes most of the College's students) pays tuition. Berea College is known for high-quality stretching throughout its programs, teaching, and various centers. The renowned feminist scholar bell hooks is one among the many Berea College faculty who create a progressive educational experience of the highest quality for students. Many, like bell hooks, are themselves from the Appalachian region. Generations of working-class students have found their way into civic engagement through regional schools and colleges such as Berea College. They experience economic opportunity and racial justice on campus and carry these principles with them back into their communities and out into the world.

Pathways to Civic Engagement

Time and time again, when living or working inside Appalachia, the strength and resilience of local people and communities stand out above all else. On the one hand, the strengths of local communities spring from the bedrock values of family, church, and school. Then, there are the strengths of Appalachian people themselves. Grit, expectations of hard work, and a strong sense of place-based identity appear over and over in memoirs from this part of America.

How then can we build on these strengths while creating new opportunities for youth growing up near the former coalfields of Eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, or the former tobacco-growing farmlands of Western North Carolina or Southwest Virginia? This is a question that takes us back to Gabrielle, an imaginative student growing up in a remote corner of the Blue Ridge Mountains. She reflects efforts in the PAGE initiative to provide the innovative education that could help her achieve her full potential. Rather than reinvent the educational wheel from scratch, PAGE has drawn on some existing traditions and models of success—both from within the region and beyond—to create new pathways to opportunity. Educators need to imagine new kinds of community that can empower youth to think of themselves as engaging in the future, both locally and beyond as global citizens. Lessons learned from PAGE as well as prior decades of inspiring place-based teaching can help point out new pathways to building communities of discourse and action.

One of these lessons connects to the popular mantra of *Think Locally, Act Globally*, and the many variations on this theme. Education that can empower rural youth needs to reimagine the synthesis between the two: local place-specific education and new ways to connect and engage with global communities. A synthesis of the two can yield promising kinds of teaching and learning to prepare young people to lead and engage in progressive, effective ways. PAGE strives for this creative synthesis through first building on the traditions of place-based education in the region served. Settlement schools provide one inspiration for the work done in PAGE. Schools such as the Hindman Settlement School and the Pine Mountain Settlement School in Eastern Kentucky have since the early 1900s served as models of progressive, site-specific education, combining studies of literacy and humanities, environmental education and

farming, and Appalachian arts and storytelling. Similarly, PAGE has looked to the Blue Ridge Mountains as a living laboratory for study of the humanities, science, and the arts. Students engage with new digital tools to tell their stories, and those of people, places, plants, and even the night sky from the vantage point they have in places such as Laurel and Spring Creek. PAGE's year-round learning opportunities integrate critical and cultural studies of the region, what some would term *Appalachian studies*. In order for rural students to be engaged citizens of the world, they must first understand their unique places and voices within it. They need a language for talking with pride about regional identities, and for *talking back* to the most demeaning stereotypes about hillbillies and poor Whites.

Part of this synthesis involves reimagining the role of diversity in place-based rural education. PAGE seeks out the narratives that may have been less historically visible in Appalachia. In 2018, an Interdisciplinary Lab engaged teams of veteran 8th and 9th grade PAGE participants in a multimedia project about two historic schools. The story of one of these small schools, Laurel School, was more familiar to some students who, like Gabby, came from this rural community. The second, the Anderson Rosenwald School, was less familiar to many. The two-room wood-frame school is set on a side road in the Mount Olive community in Mars Hill, North Carolina. It was one of many Rosenwald schools built in the rural South for Black children in the time of segregated schooling through a matching grant from Julius Rosenwald (then-president of Sears, Roebuck & Co.) and community donations of funding and labor. This is a critical part of the story of education in Appalachia, and an important story of the partnerships that PAGE hopes to build. Youth participants did oral history interviews with community activists seeking to reclaim the school as a community space and museum. The young people learned and applied skills in still photography and videography; they then edited the multimedia content for an evening exhibition. On an unforgettable July evening, guests moved between two installations in classrooms that had been transformed into stories, voices, and images from two historic schools.¹²

Diversity must also of course be experienced in global ways. PAGE makes a deliberate effort to help girls in Appalachia connect and engage in new ways with global communities and their histories. PAGE acts on this goal through a literature program that strives for deep, reflective engagement with books: what the child psychologist and Harvard University professor Robert Coles once described as a "literature of social understanding" (Coles, 1989). It has been a joy and an education in teaching to watch another student, a girl living in a holler called Lumptown not far from the former Laurel School, devour book after book in PAGE. Her selections included the memoir by Nobel Prize laureate and girls' education activist Malala Yousafzai: *I Am Malala*. Another student once shared that the most memorable experience she had in all her years in PAGE was getting to know an elderly woman who had once known Anne Frank, when both were growing up Jewish in pre-war Amsterdam. This high school student, looking back at her years in PAGE, remembered most vividly her close reading of *The Diary of Anne Frank*—brought to life by a lengthy engagement with a woman who could speak of Anne Frank with the particularity that makes this diary so heart wrenching and important.

¹² See <https://pageprograms.com/the-girls-projects/interdisciplinary-labs/installations>.

Malala Yousafzai and Anne Frank are voices, current and past, in a new global community that Gabby and her peers will create in Appalachia. It is critical that they see themselves as becoming able to move comfortably between deep engagement with their own local communities and thoughtful, imaginative engagement with global voices. It is within our reach to make this kind of engagement possible in “classrooms”—that is, interdisciplinary, lab-like spaces for designing, reading, and creating. We can strive for the best mingling of place-based teaching ideas—such as settlement schools and small rural schools—with global thinking *and* action. New digital tools make it possible to connect across geographic distances in empowering ways, guided by wise teaching and time for the reflective assessment of here and there, then and now.

The second lesson learned in PAGE is closely related to the first. The organization has learned over the course of a decade that the humanities—story, literature, and history, integrated with visual and documentary arts—have a critical role to play in preparing young people for civic engagement. PAGE’s interdisciplinary labs have historically been humanities labs, where even the youngest participants create digital stories, do oral history research, create podcasts, and design site-specific projects that integrate writing, research, the visual arts, and new technologies. Working deeply with story, digital literacy, and extended discourse helps these young people acquire critical thinking skills and confidence. In PAGE’s literature program, girls learn that each member of a small reading group has an important role to play in the understanding of complex stories, characters, and themes. In these learning contexts, with a student:teacher/intern ratio that never exceeds 10:1, PAGE participants learn how to engage with diverse ideas and other voices. They experience a supportive place for finding their own voices, for becoming young leaders in a learning community where they cannot fail. This is a beginning point for civic engagement.

Building on the ways that Berea College, small rural schools, and settlement schools have built community and created opportunity for rural students, PAGE hopes to help girls and young women in Appalachia connect, learn, and lead in new ways. It is a long haul that requires sustained commitment. What community leaders in Appalachia most dislike about educational research is the tendency of university teams to come in with a bold new idea and enthusiastically implement a project with a fresh influx of grant dollars, only to leave after 3 to 5 years with no plan for sustainability. Creating more civic engagement among rural White youth will require building relationships and partnerships over time, *with* local educators and community people, and in collaboration with education colleagues across the nation.

It is inspiring to imagine the new coalitions that could emerge with such investments in rural education. Even in communities that might, based on recurring stereotypes and assumptions, appear lost from the devastation of opioids and the demise of coal mining and tobacco farming, one can find incredible energy. Youth in Appalachia are hungry for new opportunities that will enable them to become part of national and global conversations and movements. The desire to innovate expressed by young Gabby in Laurel, a Blue Ridge Mountain community, is no anomaly but part of a larger opportunity, if we can only seize it.

References

- Catte, E. (2018). *What you are getting wrong about Appalachia*. Belt Publishing.
- Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination*. Houghton Mifflin.
- McGreal, C. (2015, November 12). America's poorest White town: Abandoned by coal, swallowed by drugs. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/nov/12/beattyville-kentucky-and-americas-poorest-towns>.
- Osnos, E. (2020, May 3). How greenwich republicans learned to love Trump. *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/05/11/how-greenwich-republicans-learned-to-love-trump>.
- Rash, R. (2016, November 18). Appalachia's sacrifice. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/19/opinion/appalachias-sacrifice.html>.
- Rubin, S., & York, A. (2019). *Hillbilly* [Film]. Passion River.
- Stebbins, S., & Sauter, M. B. (2019, March 21). The Worst Counties to Live in. *24/7 Wall Street*. <https://247wallst.com/special-report/2019/03/21/the-worst-counties-to-live-in-4>.

LESSONS LEARNED: CONCLUSION

Carol D. Lee

Citizenship is complicated and multifaceted. One dimension entails basic human rights, regardless of one's legal status within the nation-state. Another dimension is legal and has a complex history of evolution within the United States. Native Americans have a unique position within this legal construct because of the 574 federally recognized Tribal nations and additional 63 state recognized tribes, 229 federally recognized Alaska Native villages, the Hawaiian homelands with their own systems of governance, and those who live largely outside of such Tribal nations and reservations. A third dimension relates to people's identities living within the United States, often involving multiple identities because the United States is essentially a nation of immigrants—some by choice and others forced. As Chua and Rubenfeld (2018) observe, "For all its flaws, the United States is uniquely equipped to unite a diverse and divided society.... Its citizens don't have to choose between a national identity and multiculturalism. Americans can have both. But the key is constitutional patriotism. We have to remain united by and through the Constitution, regardless of our ideological disagreements."

There are multiple take aways from the histories of efforts in ethnic communities in the United States to achieve the rights of citizenship as articulated in the country's founding documents. The first is the clear evidence of agency within communities, despite facing significant historical and persistent challenges. These histories provide clear and convincing evidence of how educators, families, and community stakeholders have played key roles in organizing both supports that have been independent of government services and simultaneously organizing to recruit government services and changing laws and institutional practices. They demonstrate that despite poverty, racism, and structural discrimination, communities still have agency and power. These communities are not simply subjects, but most importantly, agents. These complex histories are alive today and provide powerful lessons within and across communities.

A second take away is the evidence of the impactful roles that teachers can play when organized and connected to communities, and of how community-based organizations can prepare young people to be productively engaged as active agents of change.

A third take away is the importance of understanding the history and evolution of laws, judicial decisions, and institutional practices that illustrate the complexities and nuances of the nation's wrestling with the meaning of citizenship and with conundrums in the civic domain. How these laws, judicial decisions, and institutional practices shifted by virtue of civic engagement demonstrates the breadth of pathways through which civic decision making can unfold.

Finally, these histories are inspirational. They provide clear and convincing evidence of how communities, despite facing persistent political and economic challenges, demonstrate agency in creating visions of empowerment and in organizing structures and practices—within institutions and within families—to prepare members of each generation to be active participants in building a more democratic space for all.

The authors made the decision to craft this chapter because these histories are largely unknown in the general public or in the field of education, broadly speaking.

These histories need to be incorporated in the public education system as well as part of the training of teachers and others working in the public education sphere.

Reference

Chua, A., & Rubenfeld, J. (2018). The threat of tribalism. *The Atlantic*, 322(3), 78–81.

