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A focus on “Civil Rights and Inequalities” logically followed our discussions of human rights in 2015. Those earlier discussions explored, among other issues, the potent proposition that there exist universal values, embedded in the notion that we are all members of a single family; what we call humanity. The tension between that profound ideal and national sovereignty permeates the essays in Occasional Paper 5: “Human Rights in Action.” In short, the idea of universal rights challenges the power of nation-states to establish practices and policies that align with their own sense of specific identity but which may not always cohere with universal or even transnational values.

It was logical, therefore, to move to a discussion of how the notion of “rights” is expressed within the legal and political structures of the nation-state. Civil rights, unlike universal rights, have a legal status that applies to civilians within the geographical confines of the state. They may or may not align with the universal notion of human rights.

The history of civil rights does, however, exhibit national, transnational, and international dimensions. In the latter half of the twentieth century, in many contexts, there was an intensification of the struggle to achieve justice for those disadvantaged or discriminated against on the grounds of

---

1 As declared in the Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, “recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world” (United Nations General Assembly, 1948).
race, ethnicity, religion, sexual preference, gender, or inherited prejudice. Stories of those histories, frequently heroic and inspirational, permeate this collection. From the 1960s onward, the focus on equal rights for minorities led to a proliferation of protest and resistance movements: activism with political, economic, and social consequences. While these efforts may have had uneven levels of success, they nevertheless redefined the ways in which minorities became visible. Voices that had been muted became audible; histories that had been hidden emerged.

The fight for civil rights is not, however, a process that belongs only to history. It continues to be a part of the contemporary landscape in which we study and teach. As teachers, we have an ongoing responsibility to ensure that these stories continue to be told. As moral beings, we have the responsibility to ensure that what was won is not lost. Civil rights are fragile. There are also minorities whose histories have not yet been properly told and who are paradoxically and simultaneously invisible and vilified.

Civil rights are not a matter of consensus, whether in history or in contemporary environments. Specific civil rights may, for example, be historically important but are contested in view of evolving values: the Second Amendment of the US Constitution is an example. A further complication is that civil rights only apply to citizens within the confines of the nation-state. These rights are often related to civic duties in order to define what it means to be a citizen in law and in practice. Inevitably, therefore, those who do not belong to the “nation” do not enjoy the benefits of those rights. This brings into focus the dilemma of those excluded from citizenship: the stateless, refugees, in some contexts the Roma, the dispossessed, and those whose status is ambiguous.

This contested field of debate is reflected in many ways in this volume, in both theoretical and concrete contexts. There may, for example, be situations in which the rights of minorities are perceived to undermine the rights of other minorities. Simply, there are points at which the rights of some individuals may be seen as compromising the rights of others and, inevitably, the question of whose rights matter most becomes a source of conflict.
This volume does not, wisely enough, seek the impossible task of reconciling perspectives. Instead, CAPA’s objective is to allow these diverse and discordant voices to coexist and to create a field of argument and dispute marked by passion and intellect. These discussions reflect the fact that our individual and collective ideologies emerge out of a synthesis of reason and emotion, head and heart.

The bulk of these essays emerged from the CAPA Symposium on May 30, 2016. The urgency of the topic also led to other significant events that are represented here: Julius Coles’ powerful testimony of a childhood in segregated Atlanta at CAPA’s Civil Rights Reception (April 7, 2016 at the Center for Civil and Human Rights, Atlanta, Georgia) asserted the importance of memory; Peter Tatchell’s keynote address at CAPA’s globally-networked student conference held simultaneously in London, Dublin, and Florence (Civil Rights and Inequalities Student Day Conference, November 11, 2016) reflected his lifetime commitment to LGBT rights.²

In publishing these essays, CAPA does not, of course, express agreement or disagreement with the views of individual authors. Indeed, beyond a commitment to the fair and equal treatment of all people and support of the Universal Bill of Human Rights, we do not have a collective, organizational view that we endorse in any official sense.

We do, however, have an organizational commitment to address issues that are crucial within our academic agenda even if they raise uncomfortable and controversial matters. In the field of education abroad we have rightly and properly prioritized the welfare of our students abroad; but we also have to listen to academic and intellectual imperatives that impose an obligation to discuss often complex and difficult issues. That is precisely because we believe that those issues permeate the complicated and difficult world in which our students, emerging adults, will necessarily live.

CAPA’s learning objectives cohere around critical forces that shape contemporary experience: globalization, urban environments, social dynamics, and

² The acronym LGBT collectively refers to the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community. The variant LGBTQ also refers to those who self-identify as queer or “questioning” in terms of their sexual identities.
diversity. The purpose of our occasional papers is to analyze and explore challenging implications arising from these foci. We have, over the last seven years, grappled with themes such as the city as text, cosmopolitanism, national identities, war, and human and civil rights. The next task will be to explore the problematic discourses around globalization.

We want this work to enrich our research and teaching. We also hope that this work contributes to the broader environment of international education. We are committed to collective and collegiate dialogue. Our aspiration is to enhance the education of students at home and abroad by focusing on areas of knowledge that may not always be at the center of our collective consciousness. As a minimum, we want to suggest that we should be thinking about and discussing these topics. Together, they point towards a wandering, rocky, uneven pathway that may generate an educational agenda that better serves our children, their children, and all the children seeking to understand the world they have inherited.

Our work in international education is more important now than ever. We should be building bridges of understanding that are founded on respect and kindness across global, diverse communities; not building walls. While our core work may start with teaching and learning, our overarching objective is to prepare students for what is an increasingly interdependent global community.

This inclusive worldview has seemingly come under threat in recent months, and this should inspire us to work harder to teach our students to embrace the spirit of diversity and to expand their understanding of civil rights and inequalities both within and external to their own communities. Studying in another country inherently exposes students to differences, but our teaching and guidance can shape their analysis and exploration thereby leading to greater understanding of, and empathy for, others who may still suffer mistreatment and marginalization.

CAPA’s mission has always been to create supportive, engaging, and challenging learning environments in each of our global program locations that focus on this intentional analysis and exploration. We will continue to do so.
I want to thank all of those who contributed to this conversation in person and in print. If there is a single CAPA view it is that we need to have these discussions. They reach into the heart of our responsibilities as educators and as moral beings. We also share the conviction that we have a responsibility to defend the rights of minorities that have been painfully won; complacency is the enemy of justice. A statement attributed to Edmund Burke, the Anglo-Irish philosopher and politician, still resonates freshly and urgently in our own troubled times: “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.”

For me, the final inspirational thought resides in the words of Pastor Martin Niemöller in his poem, “First they came for the Socialists...”

First they came for the Communists  
And I did not speak out  
Because I was not a Communist  
Then they came for the Socialists  
And I did not speak out  
Because I was not a Socialist  
Then they came for the trade unionists  
And I did not speak out  
Because I was not a trade unionist  
Then they came for the Jews  
And I did not speak out  
Because I was not a Jew  
Then they came for me  
And there was no one left  
To speak out for me

---

3 The sources of the quotation are obscure (perhaps a letter to Thomas Mercer) and there are a number of variants. However, the power of the thought is reflected in the many politicians and thinkers who have cited this including John Stuart Mill and John Kennedy.

4 During his life, Niemöller wrote and rewrote this poem. Alongside a group of other German clergymen, he openly opposed Hitler, and was confined in the concentration camps of Sachsenhausen and Dachau before being released in 1945. Until his death in 1984, he continued to speak about the dangers of political apathy and was a leading voice for the importance of memory and vigilance in defense of humanity. For further details, see Wistrich (1995).
Civil Rights and the Limits of Freedom

The essays collected here demonstrate that the topic of civil rights is multi-layered, complex, and problematic. On the surface, the idea of civil rights is something that citizens of good will approve. At the most basic level, civil rights protect citizens from excessive government intrusion and give them permission, within certain constraints, to take actions they wish to take. Within the confines of the state, two kinds of liberty are defined: freedom from and freedom to; the limitations of state authority are established and other powers of action are devolved to the citizen. The boundaries between state authority and individual freedom are, thus, legally delineated.

However, civil rights are also conditioned by the situation of place and time. Historically, the rights of civilians have evolved according to the customs, habits, and politics of the time. In Athens in 500 BCE, there were an estimated 80,000 slaves making up over forty percent of the population.⁵ Centuries later, in 1860, there was a similar ratio of slaves in the US state of Georgia.⁶ Citizens had a legal right to own slaves and, conversely, slaves had few if any legal rights: they were essentially property.

This extreme example demonstrates that civil rights are bestowed by customs and conditions of geography, time, and ideological assumptions. Rights may be defined as protection from state authority. Simultaneously, rights define the areas in which citizens have freedom to choose to act as

---

⁵ There are, of course, many uncertainties around this figure. For further details, see Lauffer (1956: 904–916).

⁶ See, for example, contemporary census data discussed in The New York Times (1860).
they wish. How are such competing, and potentially contradictory, rights to be defined and balanced? Who is the arbiter of such judgment?

For Karl Marx, it was simply a question of power: “Between two rights,” he famously commented, “force decides” (1967: 225). The struggle for rights thus becomes a battle over which rights matter, which should dominate, as well as one over how principles of rights should actually be constructed and incorporated into law. This resonates with the contrasting philosophies of Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. For Hobbes, the function of the state is to constrain the natural violence of humanity. In these circumstances, government needs to limit those areas in which individuals have the freedom to operate in the interests of the security of all. Rousseau precisely reverses this view and argues that state power needs to be under the collective control of the people because they have a predisposition towards moral good and innate nobility. Thus, for Hobbes, civil rights should, by implication, be limited and controlled by strong central authority: the rights of citizens need to be curtailed to protect them from the unrestrained and malignant intentions of others. In contrast, Rousseau implies that civil rights should expand to limit state power, to give citizens freedom to act in ways that are naturally benign. Civil rights should, therefore, also be seen through the modifying lenses of philosophical, political, and ideological perspectives.

In his classic study of citizenship and social class, the theorist T.H. Marshall identified three distinct, but inter-related facets of citizenship: civil, political, and social. For Marshall, this had particular historical implications for matters of social justice and equality. The civil element, he argued, is that which comprises the rights necessary for individual freedom—such as liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought, and faith, the right to own property, and the right to justice. This element was relatively harmonious with the imperatives of capitalist society. By contrast, Marshall’s conception of political rights focused on the right of people to participate in the exercise of political power, while social rights emphasized more egalitarian aspects such as the right to basic forms of welfare, security, and to live life as a “civilised being” (Marshall and Bottomore, 1992: 149). Crucially, he argued that civil rights confer the legal capacity to strive for the things one would like to possess—but do not guarantee the possession of any of them. For instance, the right of freedom of speech has little substance if, from lack of education, you have nothing to say
which is worth saying, or no means by which to make yourself heard. There is, therefore, he argues, a complex relationship between civil, political, and social rights, one which is borne out by many of the chapters which follow.

**Civil Rights and Justice**

The idea of human rights derives from the converse principle that certain rights are universally applicable to all people beyond the specific conditions of time and place. The notion of the “human family” theoretically supersedes all conditional factors. Civil rights, in contrast, are amended and remade according to shifting values. They are also guaranteed by law only to those that are defined as citizens. They are a legal entitlement and a benefit of belonging to the nation-state.

Civil rights may also evolve in relation to changing notions of justice and injustice, inclusion and exclusion. The right to marry offers obvious and contemporary examples. Inter-racial marriage was only made legal across the United States in 1967 following the Supreme Court’s decision in the case of *Loving v Virginia* that the anti-miscegenation laws established by white Americans to maintain segregation were unconstitutional. Even in 2017, the right to marriage is limited in some contexts to relationships between a man and woman. In other contexts, the right has been expanded to include single-sex marriage and is the subject of a struggle to redress perceived injustice. In both cases, civil rights can be contested in so far as the rights of one group may infringe the rights or beliefs of another. In the case of same-sex marriage, there are those that argue that their religious principles are offended by equality of treatment within the institution of marriage. Similar arguments would have been made in earlier decades about inter-racial marriage. These two examples show the evolution of rights as a consequence of changing views and norms, sometimes as a result of civil rights struggles: the legalization of inter-racial marriage was a landmark decision within the struggle for civil rights in the 1960s, while the national legalization of same-sex marriage in the US in 2015 responded to more recent movements for LGBT rights.

The history of segregation and integration precisely indicates contested boundaries between communities. Defenders of segregation were, in essence, defining a version of civil rights intended to protect privilege. The
history of Apartheid is a dramatic demonstration of how civil rights may be delineated to protect privilege. From 1948 to 1994, South Africa excluded Black Africans from citizenship through the creation of impoverished areas (Bantustans) where they were required to live within what were, theoretically, to become self-governing nations. In practice, this was a system designed to designate Black Africans as developmentally inferior to whites and therefore unqualified to enjoy the privileges of citizenship. Drawing upon selected biblical sources, the architects of Apartheid argued that the system of racial segregation was natural and God-given.

Apartheid South Africa offers an extreme example of civil rights legally restricted to enforce segregation as a national policy. The Nationalist Government defined and enforced segregation through a series of increasingly repressive laws designed to redefine non-whites as beyond the boundaries of citizenship. The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act 1949 began the process of racial segregation. The Population Registration Act of 1950 went on to impose racial definitions on all residents, classifying the population into four groups: White, Black, Indian, and Colored. Social rights, political rights, economic status, and educational opportunities were largely determined by the group to which an individual belonged. Crucially, the “Colored” grouping included people regarded as being of mixed ethnicity, including those of European, Bantu, Khoisan, and Malay ancestry. The Group Areas Act of 1950 required the separation of these “races” according to those definitions. The notorious Pass laws of 1952 were designed to control freedom of movement by requiring all “Blacks” to carry official identification. These were followed by the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953, which enforced segregation of all public facilities (O’Malley, 1994-99). These legislative actions, with others, restructured South African society by defining full citizenship by “race.”

In direct contrast, civil rights are also presented as a historical struggle to include previously excluded groups from the full rights of citizenship: to redress discrimination against certain groups based on religion, race, sexual preference, caste, and class. Together, the essays in the first part of

---

7 The capitalization of these terms denotes their legal definitions under South African law at the time.
this volume by Julius Coles, Peter Tatchell, Abel Bartley, and Anthony Pinder trace an outline of the history of civil rights and illustrate the duality of the civil rights movements: the pursuit of justice was enacted in the courts and on the streets—legal action combined with political activism. The pursuit of civil rights is rarely a matter of consensus essentially because in expanding the rights of one group the rights, beliefs and privileges of another may be infringed or compromised. Civil rights are manufactured, sustained, or undermined by law; human rights may have very limited legal status but accrue moral authority.

The boundaries between civil and universal rights are not, however, impermeable. The trial and execution of defeated Nazi leaders at Nuremberg, for example, was justified by the assumption that there are standards of behavior legally applicable to all regardless of the legal systems operating in individual countries. However hideously inhumane, it was not technically illegal to plan and enact the eradication of the Jews and gypsies within Nazi Germany. Those actions were retrospectively defined as capital offences by reference to the idea that some laws are universally applicable regardless of national legal systems. This was not an uncontested view.

The defendants at Nuremberg were convicted of “crimes against humanity”: a standard created retrospectively by the Charter of the International Military Tribunal on August 8, 1945 (Avalon Project, n.d.). The tribunal was made up of representatives from France, the United Kingdom, the USA, and the Soviet Union—the allied victors. However justified the trial and its outcomes might be in a moral sense, the legal basis was certainly controversial even among those who believed in the essential justice of the outcomes. For example, Harlan Stone, Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court at the time, described the proceedings as a “sanctimonious fraud” and a “high-grade lynching party” (quoted by Harker (2016: 68).

Examples from the USA further demonstrate that rights are contested and reflect specific historical conditions. In 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment to the US Constitution formally abolished slavery and, thus, redefined national civil rights:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist
within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction\(^8\)

While granting freedom from slavery, this Amendment did not secure equal rights for African Americans. In the Southern states in particular, this Amendment was particularly unwelcome; the Confederates had just fought in a bitter civil war in order to maintain the “peculiar institution” of slavery and to protect their way of life. New and existing laws were thus used to ensure the continuation of discrimination and the privilege of white America.\(^9\)

The Second Amendment of the Constitution guarantees citizens the right to bear arms to ensure “a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state”: a right that extends historical circumstance following the American War for Independence. No such civil right exists anywhere in any other formal written constitution apart from those of Mexico and Guatemala. Specific national contexts create the rationale for civil rights and ensure change or continuity according to specific national conditions. Similarly, the right to worship may be applied across all faiths or be restricted. Thus, Muslims may worship publicly in Israel, but Jews and Christians are legally prohibited from public worship in Saudi Arabia. Nevertheless, as Carrie Campbell’s account in this volume of her experiences as an American Muslim demonstrates, freedom of religious expression in a free society may yet be confronted by xenophobia or intolerance. We cannot take such freedoms for granted, as Thomas Nolan powerfully argues in his exploration of the increasing militarization of everyday policing in the United States post 9/11.

Contrasting philosophies of colonialism indicate another significant historical distinction. In the case of France, for example, the colonial residents were theoretically full citizens. Legal rights applied, in theory at least, to all the territories under French colonial rule. No such conditions applied within the

---

\(^8\) January 31, 1865. Ratified by the states on December 6, 1865. United States Statutes at Large, volume 13: 567 (13 Stat. 567).

\(^9\) The paradoxical implications of the Thirteenth Amendment continue to cause controversy. The award-winning Netflix documentary, \textit{13th} (DuVernay, 2016), examines the history of racial inequality in the United States, focusing on the fact that the nation’s prisons are disproportionately filled with African Americans. The film-makers argue that the Amendment’s exception for involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime was used, and continues to be used, by white Americans to “enslave” African Americans through mass incarceration.
British Empire. The residents of Hong Kong had no right of residence in the UK. It was not until the British Overseas Territories Act of May 21, 2002 that the remaining residents of this fragment of empire gained citizenship in the UK (UK Statutes, 2002).

In 1971, the inhabitants of the Chagos Islands, a British colony in the Indian Ocean, were forcibly expelled from their homes by the British to make space for an American military base. This was an act that denied civil (or indeed human) rights to a population theoretically under the protection of colonial authority.

The most obvious example of contested civil rights (and one that impacts academia, as Giselda Beaudin’s analysis of “safe space” policies demonstrates) relates to free speech. We may have the theoretical right to express opinions; others have the right to be offended by those opinions. The line between our freedom and the rights of others not to be offended may be a matter of decorum and civil behavior, but it may also be defined legally. We are not free—at least in the vast majority of political jurisdictions—to incite prejudice, defend pedophilia, deny the Holocaust. Another current and related example is that of freedom of the press. As Bernardo Motta’s paper illustrates, this issue resonates particularly strongly at a time when this right, which was designed to protect and inform the citizens of the country, is under attack by a White House that accuses the media of fake news and, in February 2017, banned several news organizations from a press briefing.

Civil rights, as these several examples indicate, are contested and defended by appeal to ethics beyond national standards: human rights, religious principles, natural justice, political beliefs, and so on. Notions of justice are mutable and amended according to the habits and customs of time and place. This is not a straightforward matter, nor can it be understood outside of structures of political power and historical, geographical, or ideological contexts.

Civil Rights and Inequalities

Inequality is one of the most serious challenges facing the word today. In his *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists* (2011), the geographer Danny
Dorling notes that, although “few people would say that they agree with injustice...nevertheless, we live in an unjust world” and he argues powerfully that, at least in the Global North, injustice is caused less frequently by lack of resources than by widespread beliefs that, in practice, work to create and perpetuate it. Such beliefs may be presented as entirely natural or self-evident, yet they are in fact socially and historically contingent.

These inequalities may result from embodied differences; for example, John Woolf explores the evolution of disability rights and their connections with representations of the disabled body in popular culture. Other essays focus on the global struggle for equality in terms of sexuality (Tatchell), and race and ethnicity (Bartley and Pinder). These papers, and Richard Maguire’s investigation of calls for enhanced rights for members of youth subcultures, also remind us of the various ways in which we separate ourselves from others—and that the boundaries of debate and consensus are ever-shifting. Anthony Gristwood’s paper on the global city analyzes a troubling landscape of profound social and economic inequalities driven by contemporary globalization, but also reveals a crucible for activism and progressive change.

By definition, civil rights apply to citizens of the state; others not defined fully as citizens are excluded. This implicitly or explicitly creates the conditions for inequality. For example, later in this volume, William New outlines the shameful history of Europe’s treatment of the Roma, a “forgotten minority,” who have been—and continue to be—subject to overt discrimination, persecution, and hidden forms of social exclusion across the continent. Civil rights are intrinsically unequal in so far as they apply exclusively as a privilege of specific citizenship. There are instances of extending civil rights across nation-states in transnational alliances. Thus, membership of the European Union implies acceptance of rights that include labor conditions, the removal of capital punishment, the right of free movement, for example: these conditions transcend the civil rights of individual nation-states but are not universally applicable to territories outside of the specific region. They may also be seen as undermining the sovereignty of nation-states and their democratic legitimacy. Such issues of civic engagement and political citizenship are debated by Helene Guldberg and Michael Woolf’s essays on the causes and aftermath of the EU (Brexit) Referendum of June 2016.
Thus, while human rights are ethically grounded in principles of universal equality, civil rights embody distinctions between nation-states, between citizens and non-citizens: they guarantee rights for the included and exclude others. The civil rights guaranteed by law for citizens of the United Kingdom are not the same as those of Americans, South Africans, Argentinians, Chinese, or North Koreans. We may—or may not—assume that these differences are “moral” but, in any case, they are expressions of concrete political and historical conditions as well as distinct national identities and imaginations.

Civil Rights and Education Abroad

Our visceral, emotional response to the notion of civil rights is instinctively positive, but that response requires modification through a nuanced review of national and historical conditions. As these essays amply demonstrate, civil rights are not a matter of consensus but reveal a field of inquiry within which paradoxes lurk, enigmas reside. Most notably, assumptions that civil rights necessarily align with equality may be mistaken. The papers in this volume by Eric Hartman, Mike Klein, Nora Larkin, and John Reilly directly address this contested terrain in the context of the classroom and experiential learning, and offer indications of some of its possibilities for pedagogic innovation, active citizenship and meaningful community involvement, and career-building.

The conditional and situational dynamics that create civil rights reveal much about the history, customs, habits, and politics of separate nation-states. When students study abroad, their curriculum explicitly or implicitly extends beyond specific disciplines. “Abroad”—the locations in which they study—is itself an integral part of the curriculum, shaping students’ perceptions, attitudes, and identities, as Michael Woolf argues in the case of Africa as an international education destination. The subject of civil rights thus offers a field of analysis that illuminates that environment and enhances understanding of conditions that create distinctive national identities. It offers access to significant historical, philosophical, geographical, and political distinctions. A study of civil rights offers a means of understanding that which divides us and, thus, that which unites us. These are topics at the heart of what we aspire to teach students.
The Civil Rights Movement didn’t begin in Montgomery and it didn’t end in the 1960s. It continues on to this very minute.

Julian Bond
Editors’ Notes

Julius Coles was the guest of honor at CAPA’s Civil Rights Reception on April 7, 2016 at The Center for Civil and Human Rights in Atlanta, Georgia.

In introducing Julius Coles, the following points were raised:

Atlanta has a unique place in the Civil Rights Movement in the USA. This museum is redolent with history and worthy of awe. It commemorates groups and individuals who by sheer force of will and courage changed the world.

It is entirely appropriate that Julius Coles should be the guest of honor in this place.

Julius Coles grew up in a world characterized by racial prejudice and segregation, but those conditions did not constrain his spirit or intellect. Throughout his life, he has challenged parochial boundaries to take us beyond myopia to a common sense of shared humanity.

All museums demonstrate and assert the importance of the past. Julius Coles reminded us that we have a duty to bear witness and a sacred responsibility not to forget:

“People tend to forget those bad dog days in American history but I firmly believe that history should not be forgotten and Americans need to be reminded of this so society will never move back. We must move forward in a more positive manner towards a fully-integrated society that has yet to be achieved in America to date.”
Those of us who were privileged to be at this event will not forget the deeply moving presentation given by Julius Coles, without notes and with eloquent passion. What follows is an edited transcript of that presentation. Its relevance to the history of civil rights and to the responsibilities we carry into an uncertain future makes this an important introduction to what follows in this volume.

The Red Clay of Georgia

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Washington, August 28, 1963

Dr. King gave us a profound vision. As a son of the red clay of Georgia, that was my aspiration as a child: to live, to associate, and to be part of humanity. Being raised in Atlanta, Georgia, in the early part of my life I did not feel part of that humanity. I go back to remember what it was like to be a black in the South, fifty years ago, in this country. I do not go into that past to make you angry or to make you think that I am bitter about my experiences but to say that we must remember so that we do not make the same mistakes in the future.

I go back in a reflective mood to recall what it was like to be black in America, in Atlanta, and to be raised in a completely black environment with little contact with my fellow white Americans. Atlanta has often said of itself: “we are the city too busy to hate.” I can say to you that growing up in this city, there was a lot of hate; there was a lot of discrimination; many derogatory things were done to blacks. Yet there were also many positive things that came out of living in this city in those times.

Atlanta had a very large black professional community. Doctors, lawyers, educators, and other highly-educated people lived here. It was the largest educational center for African Americans in the country so the black community was in many ways self-sufficient although contained and restrained within two areas of the city. We lived behind very closed invisible barriers
on the South Side and in the north. The South Side was defined, on the one hand, by where the new football stadium is, and, on the other, by the Chattahoochee River. That was where the black community lived and began slowly to grow. It is easy to forget, however, that when I grew up here, this was more like a small Southern county town with a total population of about 250,000.

It was not the city we know today with a population of almost seven million people. In the post-Olympic period, Atlanta was transformed. It is not the city into which I was born. Growing up in Atlanta I lived in an entirely black community. It was not possible to go to the major movie houses but only to the one or two open to blacks. There was a white movie theater, the Fox, that allowed blacks to attend but they were restricted to a black section called “the buzzards’ roof” with a separate entrance for blacks on the exterior of the theater. We could not ride at the front of the bus but had to ride in the rear. Most of the black community, outside of the professional class, served in menial jobs in construction, for example, or as servants to the white community.

Looking back, this was a strange, divided environment. You had poor people who were black; you had poor whites; you had rich whites; and you had rich blacks. Ironically, Atlanta had the largest and wealthiest black community in the USA even during segregation.

Auburn Avenue was known as the “black Wall Street”; it had its own banks, insurance companies, financial and commercial institutions. Those blacks who had money in Atlanta could buy land and build beautiful homes. Nowhere in the USA did blacks live better than they did in this city. No other city in the USA had such large areas of prosperous black communities.

Atlanta became an educational mecca for African Americans. The Atlanta University Center is an association of four major institutions entirely devoted to black higher education. Outside of the association, Morris Brown

10 The summer Olympic Games took place in Atlanta from July 19, 1996 to August 4, 1996.
11 John Wesley Dobbs (1882-1961), an African-American civic and political leader, described Auburn Avenue as the “richest Negro street in the world.”
12 The Atlanta University Center Consortium, located in the heart of metropolitan Atlanta, is the world’s largest consortium of African-American private institutions of higher education. Originally formed in 1929, the Consortium is a non-profit organization that operates on behalf of its member institutions: Clark Atlanta University, Morehouse College, Morehouse School of Medicine, and Spelman College (Atlanta University Center Consortium, n.d.).
College, founded in 1881, and the Interdenominational Theological Center founded in 1958, also contribute to the rich landscape of African-American higher education institutions within the city. These institutions, all operating within the boundaries of Atlanta, were a magnet for talented young black people and a myriad of alumni have had major impacts on American life in many different contexts, from politics to entertainment, academia to medicine.\footnote{The list of distinguished alumni is longer than can be listed here. The Atlanta University Center website lists, by way of example: Marian Wright Edelman, Esther Rolle, Pearl Cleage, and Keisha Knight Pulliam (Spelman College); Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Julian Bond, Spike Lee, Edwin Moses, and Samuel L. Jackson (Morehouse College); James Weldon Johnson, Amanda Davis, and Emmanuel Lewis (Clark Atlanta University), and Regina Benjamin (Morehouse School of Medicine) (Atlanta University Center Consortium, n.d.).}

But, growing up here as a child was, despite all this wealth and talent, an experience scarred by segregation. We could not go to downtown restaurants; we could not go to the major movie houses; we could not go everywhere we wished. When we had contact with the white community, it was mostly in the role of servitude. In the types of jobs my brother and I were able to get as black students of Morehouse College, we were pool porters, waiters; we were short order cooks making hamburgers and hotdogs for white people; we cleaned toilets and picked crabgrass from golf courses. We did not have access to the kinds of experiences that are available to black students today: an internship at one of the great financial institutions was beyond our horizons. We may have been high achievers at Morehouse College, but we also inhabited the constrained world of those within our community who had little or no education. We were “blacks,” and whether we were educated or not made no difference.

**Booker T. Washington High School**

I was a student at Booker T. from 1954 to 1959 here in Atlanta. When I was there we had around 3,000 students. This was one of only six high schools that were accessible to African-American students in the city of Atlanta. My mother studied there; Lou Sullivan was also a student, as
indeed was Dr. Martin Luther King.\textsuperscript{14}

In the 1950s, Booker T. High represented a very limited choice for African-American high school students. It was an entirely black environment in terms of teachers and students, and that brought some other issues. Within that community, there were very significant socio-economic divisions and students who were discontent and dissatisfied with their status. This created an environment of significant unease.

In my five years at Booker T. High, I saw life and death: a kid was stabbed to death in the hall and a baby was born. It is commonplace to have policemen in the corridors of high schools these days, but this was much rarer in the 1950s. It was a tough place. We had a full-time, armed policeman patrolling the corridor. We had shakedowns in which we had to put our arms up against the wall while we were searched for knives and guns. Very often barrels full of dangerous weapons were collected.

So, I was a young man, aspiring to be scholarly and successful in life—scared even to use the toilet. In my five years there, I do not think I ever went to the bathroom! I might be robbed and my school money taken, or I might be beaten up because some kids did not like the way I looked, or because I was a studious student, and thus a “cissie” in some eyes.

You had to learn to be streetwise in that environment, and I did. One night, in sight of my house, I was almost beaten up by a gang. I resorted, firstly, to prayer: “Oh Lord, please let me get home,” and then to persuasion. It turned out that they thought I had gotten into a fight with someone and beaten them. Using my best skills of rhetoric, I managed to convince them that the opposite was true and that I was the beaten party so they allowed me to leave unharmed, presumably feeling that one defeat a day was enough.

\textsuperscript{14} Louis Sullivan served as the Secretary of the US Department of Health and Human Services from 1989 to 1993. He was the founding President of Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta. In addition to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. (civil rights leader), Booker T. can list many other outstanding graduates including Romae T. Powell (judge), Asa Yancy (surgeon), Mabel Smith Lott (psychologist), Lyndon Wade (Urban League director), and Lucille Palmer Perrino (educator).
Being streetwise taught me a lot that is still relevant today: most obviously, communication skills and self-protection.

There were other difficulties. We were mostly issued with secondhand text books inherited from white schools which no longer needed them. The school system in itself enforced discrimination and enhanced the sadness that came with knowing you were in inferior schools consciously underserved by authorities.

Despite this adversity (and my fear of going to the bathroom), I was elected as Vice President of the student body. In many ways, despite the conditions in which we struggled to learn, my years at Booker T. were wonderful. There was one constant in the black community: we had dedicated black teachers who made heroic efforts, despite the conditions, to teach these kids.

They even taught Russian back in the 1950s. The valedictory speaker—which I was not—went to Harvard and there are many, many other examples that are a testament to their commitment to us.

These teachers were fantastic. They took us from where we were towards where we ought to be. These were people profoundly dedicated to their profession. So, although I was raised in a black community in a highly-segregated society, I can say that I had good teachers who were dedicated to helping me to achieve what I dreamed of achieving.

And There was Mum and Dad

I also owe a huge debt to my parents. My mother was a school teacher. Every night she instinctively seemed to understand that I had not done so well. In short, I was at public school all day and, at night, in home school presided over by my mother. She really worked on both me and my brother.

She was like a typical “Black Jewish Mother.” She had decided that my brother would be the doctor and I was going to be the lawyer. My brother did not disappoint her. He became a Board-Certified surgeon. However, when I went to Morehouse, I decided that I wanted to study political science. Even at the cost of disappointing my mother, I could not get beyond the fact that I found studying law so deeply boring.
My father was a school teacher who became a postal worker. He was a strong believer in education being a key factor for success in life. He could be looked upon as the “push” in my life with my mother being the “pull.”

**Moral Rearmament**

In the tenth grade, I was given the opportunity to go to the first integrated performance in the city of Atlanta. I was not obliged to sit in a segregated section for the first time. In the movie houses to which you were admitted, and there were not many, the blacks were required to sit in the upper section. In these modern times, I still say an internal “wow” when I go through the front door of a theater. We are conditioned by our histories.

Something else of deep significance happened to me in the tenth grade. I encountered for the first time a group of people called Moral Rearmament. When they came to Atlanta, they carried a message that I had never heard before in my life. They gave me a vision of a world living and working together in harmony. There were Russians, Chinese, Indians, and Africans talking about living in a global community in peace. In the tenth grade, I decided that I wanted to live in that world, to be a *Citoyen du Monde*.

**Citoyen du Monde**

Throughout my student years at Morehouse College, my desire was to become “a citizen of the world.” I wanted to extricate myself from the narrow racist confines of Atlanta, to escape the South, to become a part of humanity; to live, in short, as a person beyond the restraints of prejudice. Morehouse College gave me that opportunity and took me from my poor educational background to a point where I could be competitive wherever I wanted to go and in whatever school I chose for study.

---

15 The Moral Rearmament movement grew up in the immediate years preceding World War II in Europe. The movement was founded by a Christian evangelist, Frank Buchman. The global political crisis was, he argued, “fundamentally a moral one. The nations must re-arm morally. Moral recovery is essentially the forerunner of economic recovery. Moral recovery creates not crisis but confidence and unity in every phase of life” (Buchman, 1955: 46). In the years after World War II, the movement thrived. It focused on international reconciliation and understanding based around four moral absolutes: purity, unselfishness, honesty, and love. Its influence faded by 1961, but it had an important, if sometimes controversial, role in relaying a consistent message on an international platform.
As part of my education, Morehouse College sent me abroad twice. The first opportunity was in 1961 when I was nineteen years old. I had spent all of my life in a black educational system so it was perhaps ironic that my first experience abroad was in Africa. My brother was already in Medical School and my parents had little disposable income, so raising the funds to pay the fees was problematic. I was Secretary of the Student Government and proposed a motion that the students should donate $1 each to fund my venture! Not only did it pass, but to my astonishment the dollars arrived. Perhaps that is a small indication of the degree to which Morehouse is a unique community.

I went to Senegal and Mali on a volunteer project. This was the first occasion in which I was able really to engage with white students who were on the same program. I saw that I was not as dumb as I had believed. I could compete with these guys and girls. I think that was the first experience in which I began to feel some confidence in myself and not to think of myself as an inferior being.

The second overseas experience that most shaped my life was the result of a gift of $3,000 from Charles E. Merrill Jr., a trustee at Morehouse. The condition of the award was that I left the USA for a year and did not return at all in those twelve months. I was also to travel mostly alone. This may not have aligned with current concerns with health and safety, but it was the key experience that remade my consciousness. It is an example of how even one person can transform the lives of those around them.

In those days, we went abroad on ships. On the student ship that left the USA, there were four Spelman women and six Morehouse men: ten black students on a ship with between 1,500 and 2,000 white students. There were some problems there; they did not want to interact with us.

Morehouse College with its sister institution Spelman College, has a critical role in the history of African-American experience in the USA. It was founded in 1867 (two years after the end of the Civil War): “The mission of Morehouse College is to develop men with disciplined minds who will lead lives of leadership and service. A private historically black liberal arts college for men, Morehouse realizes this mission by emphasizing the intellectual and character development of its students. In addition, the College assumes special responsibility for teaching the history and culture of black people” (Morehouse College, n.d.) Along with Spelman College, these institutions have had a profound impact upon the lives of generations of African-American students.
My year in Europe made me a human being. I came back after fifteen months a militant *Citoyen du Monde*. Even though Europe had its problems, for the first time in my life I could be with anyone I wanted. I could go wherever I wanted to go and not feel any restrictions. I could ride a motorcycle. I hitchhiked from Le Havre (France) to Finnish Lapland, and throughout all of Western Europe to North Africa. I even hitchhiked across Morocco and Algeria. At the age of twenty and on my own, I traveled throughout Europe. $3,000 took me into new spaces in which I am now entirely comfortable.

I was in Greece *en route* to the ship to return to the USA when Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. gave his speech at the Washington march.\(^{17}\) My first reaction was anger. I felt that we had been dreaming for too damn long. I was ready to fight, but I was also at the point where I did not want to come back to my own country but to remain in Europe where I felt liberated. That is how I felt at that point, torn and divided.

Two things brought me back to my country. I had to graduate from college. If I had not, it would have broken my mother’s heart. I also came back to face the reality of my country.

**The Civil Rights Movement**

I was a student leader at Morehouse but a foot soldier in the civil rights struggle. My parents were very afraid that if I became a leader in the struggle I would, at some point, get arrested. My mother taught in the public school system and my father worked in the Federal Postal Service. They had real fears that my arrest would lead to reprisals against them. I promised that I would respect those anxieties which were certainly a sign of those times. Nevertheless, I participated in the sit-in at Rich’s Department Store. I was there when Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was arrested and taken to Redsville Prison.\(^{18}\)

In the history of those times, too much credit is given to the Kennedys. I

---

\(^{17}\) “I Have a Dream,” August 28, 1963.

\(^{18}\) Wednesday, October 19, 1960: students organized a sit-in at the segregated Magnolia Room restaurant in Rich’s Department Store, the largest in Atlanta. Over fifty demonstrators were arrested including Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. The following afternoon, protest intensified and more than 2,000 students closed sixteen segregated lunch counters.
did not feel the love and warmth that people have for the Kennedys. I felt that they were part of an American “aristocracy” and neither of them had a great record on civil rights.

When you look at the politicians of those times, it was really Lyndon Baines Johnson who fought for the civil rights legislation. The assassination of Kennedy created the atmosphere in which it was possible for him to achieve his objectives, but it was Johnson’s determination that made the rhetoric a reality. People are critical of “The Great Society,” but it had a real impact on black lives.  

The towering figure was Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. He spent a semester as a professor of religion at Morehouse and, as Secretary of the Student Government, I interacted with him quite often.

I remember when many in the black community demonstrated against the civil rights leaders, accusing them of selling out to the whites. On one very tense occasion, King was brought to the church at Fair and Ashby Streets while shouts of “Uncle Tom” drowned the voices of the black leadership. People were ready to lynch them that night.

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. quietened the furious and potentially violent audience and then mesmerized them with the power of his presence and the eloquence of his voice. Everyone there left feeling love and warmth for each other. He rebuilt the community. To see and hear the power of King was to experience awe.

I remember meeting him much later on a plane returning from Africa. I walked towards the back of the plane and there was Dr. King. I asked why he was there, not in first class or, at least, in business. It says something about the character of the man: he chose not to travel first class; he chose not to travel business class. Interestingly enough, most of the people on the plane did not recognize him. He was just another black man, but for me he was like God—Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. at the back of the plane.

19 “The Great Society” was arguably the largest reform agenda since Roosevelt’s New Deal and civil rights was an integral part of Johnson’s vision: “The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time” (Johnson, 1964).
I remember many times when I was in his presence as a student at Morehouse. Most clearly, I remember the things that he said that have been an inspiration to me throughout my life:

First, we must develop and maintain the capacity to forgive. He who is devoid of the power to forgive is devoid of the power to love. This simply means that there is some good in the worst of us and some evil in the best of us. When we discover this, we are less prone to hate our enemies.\(^{20}\)

**The Road Ahead**

I lived in Washington for over thirty years, but Atlanta has always been my home. I have always wanted to come back even though I have carried the burden of some unpleasant memories of things that have happened to me and to my community.

If I look at the progress we have made, and we have made tremendous progress, it is clear that we are not fully integrated, nor are we the multicultural society we claim to be. We have increased our tolerance for each other but, here in Atlanta, you see very little socialization between blacks and whites. We still go to black and white churches. Even though there is a sprinkling of blacks in white churches, and whites in black churches, it is little more than tokenism. We do not eat together. We do not socialize together. We do not party together and we do not live together even though residential integration is a lot more common now than it was when I was growing up in this city. Whites still live in basically a white community and blacks still live in basically a black community.

As a student, I always thought that the British were prejudiced, and I tended to bypass London to go straight to Paris. Today, London is truly much more multicultural and multiracial than many cities in the USA, including New York. I look at Europe and see the transformation it is undergoing, especially London, and wonder why we cannot be like that.

I lived in Southern Africa in Apartheid times and saw the régime in the

\(^{20}\) “Loving your Enemies,” Sermon, November 17, 1957, Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, Montgomery, Alabama.
flesh. It reminded me of my childhood in segregated Atlanta. In the twenty years since the end of Apartheid, they have come a long way. When you look at where we have gone in some 200 years, you have to wonder why we have not made more progress. We have not yet realized the dream of a multiracial society in which all are judged by their character rather than by the color of their skins.

There is a lot to do yet and more to learn; this above all: “We must all learn to live together as brothers—or we will all perish together as fools.”

21 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Commencement Address for Oberlin College, June 1965, Oberlin, Ohio.
Editors’ Notes:

On November 11, 2016, CAPA The Global Education Network hosted a student conference on Civil Rights and Inequalities. This conference was held simultaneously at the London, Florence, and Dublin program centers, with participants connected through CAPA's global learning technology.

The keynote address was given by Peter Tatchell. Peter has been campaigning for human rights, democracy, LGBT freedom, and global justice since 1967. He exemplifies the ineffable strength of the human spirit to oppose cruelty, prejudice, and injustice. In these troubled days, his voice seems ever more significant; his vision ever more urgent.

Peter Tatchell received the Gandhi Foundation International Peace Award 2016 at a ceremony in the Houses of Parliament in London on October 31, 2016. The Gandhi Foundation citation states:

Peter Tatchell’s consistent dedication over many decades, and single-minded pursuit in promoting human rights, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights in particular, has helped to engender a greater understanding in the public mind of these important issues and created the conditions to allow laws protecting minority groups to be implemented. He has consistently been at the forefront of progressive movements, from anti-apartheid to Palestinian rights, nuclear disarmament, democratic reforms in the Middle East and campaigns against draconian anti-terror laws in the UK. He has achieved this through his conviction and non-violent protest, which are the hallmarks of the guiding principles espoused by Mahatma Gandhi.
The topic for his keynote speech was the Global Struggle for LGBT Rights; what follows is an edited transcript of the speech which he presented with the passion of a man who has given decades of his life to this cause. Those students in attendance in all locations were moved and inspired by his words and sense of purpose. All at CAPA felt humbled and privileged to experience his contribution.

The theme of this discussion is the global struggle for LGBT human rights. In many Western countries—in fact in most Western countries—there has been huge progress towards LGBT equality in the last three or four decades.

But the global picture is much bleaker. We still have a situation where over seventy countries have a total prohibition on same sex relations, with nearly half of them explicitly criminalizing sexual relations between both men and women. These seventy-plus countries amount to over one-third of the 193 countries in the world. The penalties range from just a few years’ imprisonment, right up to life imprisonment. And in several Muslim-majority countries, the death penalty is the punishment for having sex with a person of the same gender. For hundreds of millions of LGBT people around the world, major challenges remain: they have no recognition or protection of their human rights—in fact, they face criminalization, harassment, discrimination, and hate crime on a massive scale.

Shockingly, even today, there is no international human rights convention that explicitly recognizes that LGBT rights are human rights. None of the major international human rights conventions—like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights and so on—explicitly state that people are entitled to equal treatment and protection against discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. Instead, slowly and gradually these international human rights instruments have been interpreted to protect LGBT people against unequal treatment. For example, the clauses which state that everyone is entitled to equal treatment and to protection against discrimination have, in the last two decades or so, been interpreted to include LGBT people, and we have seen a series of resolutions in the United Nations Human Rights Council condemning discrimination and violence against LGBT people.

The first really significant United Nations initiative on this issue goes back more than twenty years to 1994 when a Tasmanian gay man took a case to
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what was then the United Nations Human Rights Committee to argue that the criminalization of homosexuality in the Australian state of Tasmania, with a penalty of twenty-one years imprisonment, was a violation of his human rights. To its great credit, the UN Human Rights Committee ruled that: yes, it was indeed a violation of the anti-discrimination provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This was the first significant UN initiative to uphold LGBT rights.

Then, in 2008, the UN General Assembly considered a declaration against the discrimination and violence affecting LGBT people worldwide. It was signed by sixty-seven member states—a minority of the 193 UN members, but a significant minority nonetheless. This was the first time the issue of LGBT rights had ever been presented to the UN General Assembly. It was a real milestone.

The securing of LGBT human rights has, on a global scale, been very limited, patchy and long-delayed. In the last five years, three different resolutions have been considered by the UN Human Rights Council endorsing and supporting the principle of LGBT human rights. This is progress, but that is still very much a minority view within the total United Nations membership. Only about one-third of UN member states tend, to varying degrees, to support LGBT human rights. We have also witnessed attempts in the United Nations Human Rights Council to block the appointment of a UN expert on LGBT rights. It is clear that sexual orientation and gender identity is still a very contentious issue and still grounds for much dispute.

In addition, let us consider what is happening within the Commonwealth. The UK is the founder and a current member of the Commonwealth which is today a free association of nations, most of which were former British colonies in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The Commonwealth is formally committed to human rights, equality, non-discrimination, and personal freedom. Yet, thirty-six out of the fifty-two member states still have a total criminalization of same-sex relations. That goes completely against the principles of the Commonwealth Charter to which every Commonwealth member country is supposed to adhere.

Those thirty-six member states of the Commonwealth comprise over half of the seventy-plus countries in the world that still criminalize same-sex relations.
For example, Trinidad and Tobago, a Commonwealth country, has a maximum penalty of twenty-five years imprisonment for homosexuality; Malaysia has a maximum penalty of twenty years plus flogging; and there is life imprisonment for same-sex relations in several Commonwealth nations, including Uganda, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Guyana, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania. That is severe punishment. In addition, in parts of two Commonwealth countries, Nigeria and Pakistan, LGBT people can be put to death in the Muslim-majority areas which have Sharia law.

In all of its six decades of existence, the Commonwealth summits have never once discussed LGBT human rights issues. In fact, in the twenty-five to thirty years that I have been involved in lobbying the Commonwealth, they have explicitly refused or ignored our appeals. The hundreds of millions of LGBT people in the Commonwealth cannot even get our persecution discussed, let alone condemned and overturned. Indeed, Commonwealth Secretary-Generals have made only mild and passing condemnations of homophobic, biphobic, and transphobic victimization. The year 2011 was the first time any Commonwealth Secretary-General had ever spoken out on LGBT issues, and that was only because I wrote a piece in *The Guardian* newspaper highlighting the massive scale of LGBT persecution in the Commonwealth. It created such uproar and embarrassment that the Secretary-General felt obliged to respond by publicly criticizing homophobic discrimination—so the first time. He did it again, three or four times more, repeating that criticism. But overall, we do not perceive any drive—no real leadership—to address LGBT rights from the Commonwealth Secretariat and its human rights officers.

In contrast, at the United Nations, the two Secretary-Generals, Kofi Annan and Ban Ki-moon, have spoken out more strongly and consistently against the persecution of LGBT people. Despite the lack of majority support within the UN, they have, to their great credit, challenged homophobia and the oppression suffered by LGBT people. So, there is some international leadership, but it is limited and not replicated on a global scale.

When we look at the current global situation, we see there are existing or emerging LGBT movements in every country in the world; some of them clandestine and underground because activists would face imprisonment or worse if they were discovered. These movements are also found in many unlikely
countries. For example, Honduras has seen the emergence of vocal and courageous LGBT movements despite the sustained killing of LGBT people by death squads—over 200 LGBT activists have been assassinated in the last decade. Nevertheless, LGBT people still organize, still protest, still campaign, and still march, despite the scale of violent homophobia and the risk to their own lives.

The emergence of these movements, particularly in repressive homophobic countries, has, sadly, provoked a serious backlash in about fifteen to twenty countries. It is not just that things are continuing to be bad, they are getting worse. These countries include Russia, Morocco, Cameroon, Syria, Uganda, Egypt, Azerbaijan, Nigeria, Brunei, India, Chad, Zambia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Burundi, Malaysia, Iraq, and Ethiopia.

What is happening is truly shocking. Two years ago, Brunei, a member of the Commonwealth, introduced an extremely harsh version of Sharia law which allows for the stoning to death of women who have sex outside of marriage and of LGBT people. Ethiopia, which had no tradition of homophobic persecution, has ratcheted up severe persecution, with police raids, arrests, imprisonments, and mob violence. A similar trend is exploding in Indonesia—a country previously not noted for anti-LGBT witch-hunts. All these backlash countries have either passed new anti-gay laws, like the law that was promulgated in Russia in 2013, or they have re-instated criminalization, as happened in India, or they have enforced existing laws with renewed vigor.

Some countries embody extreme contradictions. There are death squads that target LGBT people for so-called “social cleansing” in Brazil and Mexico. Yet, same-sex marriage is legal in Brazil. Most of the major cities and states have laws that protect LGBT people against discrimination in the workplace, housing, and so on. The same paradoxes are apparent in Mexico. Mexico City recognizes same-sex marriage. Some parts of Mexico have anti-discrimination protections. Yet, right-wing death squads also target LGBT people for assassination.

A couple of years ago, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission—now renamed Outright International—produced a damning report on the intensified repression of LGBT people in Iraq since the war in 2003. They cited examples of Shia death squads going out and targeting known or
suspected LGBT people; shooting them dead in their homes, in the street, or at their workplace. Other extreme punishments have been meted out. For example, gay men have been arrested, force-fed laxatives, and then had their anuses sealed up with superglue so that they suffer agonizing pain and their intestines burst. This is an extreme form of torture and murder carried out by Shia militias and death squads, some of which have been linked to the Iraqi government. Some murders of LGBTs appear to have been orchestrated from Iraqi government ministries which were, at the time, being backed by the US, Britain, and other coalition countries.

In Syria today, the so-called Islamic State pursues a policy of arresting and executing known or suspected gay and bisexual men, without trial. As far as we know, no lesbians have been killed, although they probably would be if they could find them. IS has been mostly killing these men by throwing them from tall buildings, and if they do not die after they fall, IS organizes mobs to stone them to death.

In Singapore, a High Court case sought to overturn the ban on homosexuality—a legal ban that was imposed by the British colonial administration in the nineteenth century. That law was retained after independence. Sadly, the High Court decided against decriminalization: it ruled in favor of maintaining the ban.

It is easy to feel depressed and disheartened given the anti-LGBT backlash that we witness in many countries. Understandably, some people feel pessimistic because we hoped that, although progress may be slow, LGBT rights would move steadily forward, not backward. However, the important thing to bear in mind is that the backlash countries are a small minority: about fifteen or twenty countries out of 193.

You could also, optimistically, look at backlash as both a negative and a positive sign. The backlash is happening because the LGBT communities and their straight allies are making progress. It is precisely because progressive change is being powered forward that the backlash is happening. The bigots are seeking to roll back the ever more visible LGBT minority and thwart their bid for reform.

Backlash has been part of the history of every social movement down the ages. It is worth remembering that the black Civil Rights Movement in the
United States in the 50s and 60s also provoked a backlash, with violent attacks on African Americans actually increasing during the civil rights era. It was a bigoted reaction against the gains that were being made by black activists and their communities. As horrible, tragic, and undesirable as it is, backlash is often a sign of progress. It signifies that people seeking advances in human rights and to overturn discrimination are getting a reaction from people who want to keep things as they are.

Overall, there is still mostly forward progress globally. In the last few years, we have witnessed the decriminalization of homosexuality in Mozambique, the Seychelles, the Pacific island states of Nauru and Palau, Northern Cyprus, Belize, and the African state of São Tomé and Príncipe. Gains are being made. In India, we have a fairly right-wing BJP government under Prime Minister Modi, but even there, in that party and that government, some voices have spoken out for the decriminalization of homosexuality, and the Supreme Court has said it will reconsider whether the anti-gay law should remain on the statute book.

The right to same-sex marriage has been won in recent years in Ireland, Slovenia, Colombia, the United States. Even in the Pitcairn Islands—home to only forty-eight people—the government voted for marriage equality, saying that as far as they knew there are no gay people and there were certainly no gay couples on the island, but that they wanted to support the principle that if there ever should be, they will have equal rights. Bravo!

Long before Britain and the US, countries like South Africa, Argentina, and Uruguay legislated same-sex marriage. In these cases, non-Western countries led the way. There is now a push for same-sex marriage in Nepal, Vietnam, Cuba, and Taiwan. Vietnam has repealed its ban on same-sex marriage and calls for equal marriage rights for LGBT couples are now being voiced, although it is not entirely clear if, and when, this will happen.

Meanwhile the African continent is one of the main bastions of homophobia in the world today, with two-thirds of African countries maintaining laws against same-sex relations. But even there, there are signs of change. The African Commission on Human Rights, a body affiliated to the African Union which represents all African member states, issued a declaration against anti-LGBT discrimination and violence. This was a complete surprise, but it sent a very important signal to African countries: the human rights arm of the main rep-
resentative body of African nations was standing for the principle of LGBT equality and non-discrimination.

Ugandan MPs attempted in 2011-2013 to pass a new bill which threatened, among other things, the death penalty for repeat homosexual offenders. Before it got through parliament, the death penalty clause was removed, but the revised version still instituted very severe penalties for same-sex relations. Although signed off by the president, the courts soon afterwards threw it out on a technicality—notably, that there had not been a quorum in parliament when the bill had been approved. There have, since then, been successive attempts to introduce new, similar legislation but none have yet succeeded.

That would indicate to me that things are beginning to change in Uganda. We are seeing more and more civil society organizations, not just LGBT ones, speaking out against anti-LGBT oppression. Even the main opposition party, the Forum for Democratic Change, speaks out against homophobic laws and discrimination. That is a really positive sign. We have also seen a minority of Christian organizations condemn the victimization of LGBT people. Bishop Christopher Senyonjo, who was part of the Church of Uganda which is a member of the worldwide Anglican and Episcopal communion, spoke out for LGBT rights many years ago and was denied the right to preach or officiate. They even took away his pension. But he continues to be a vocal black, African, and Christian bishop who defends LGBT human rights. Increasingly, a few other brave Christian pastors are following in his footsteps.

Although things are pretty bleak in Russia, there have been the occasional victories. The St. Petersburg-based LGBT group, Coming Out, was prosecuted for promoting homosexual propaganda, but they were acquitted. Despite police repression of many LGBT pride parades, successful pride demonstrations have taken place in St. Petersburg. At the event in 2016, for the first time there were no arrests and no mob attacks. I went to Moscow four times to support their bid to hold a pride parade. I witnessed and personally suffered the thuggery of neo-Nazis, ultra-nationalists, and Russian Orthodox fanatics. So, the positive change in St. Petersburg offers a small glimmer of hope.

In 2015, I also went to Serbia to support Belgrade Pride, and it went ahead without incident. However, it required 5,000 riot police and the complete closure of the city center to the public for that to happen. Only the presence of
the riot police in full gear prevented far-right nationalists and neo-Nazis from attacking the parade. I remember going to a gay club the night before and having to pass through a line of twenty riot police with shields, batons, and visors just to get inside. That is how bad things are in Serbia. Yet, once again, things are beginning to change. On the bright side, a poll this year suggested that an increasing minority of Serbian people accept that LGBT people should not be persecuted. There is still a way to go, but progress is being made.

As mentioned earlier, in Singapore they failed in the courts to get homosexuality decriminalized. Despite this, there is a huge popular movement of LGBT people and straight allies who support equality. They have an annual Pink Dot protest at which people turn up wearing pink, holding pink candles, and forming a gigantic pink heart. This year, nearly 30,000 people turned out. For a tiny island state like Singapore, that is a huge number and a significant proportion of the population.

Overall, I would argue that although there is a backlash, it is in a minority of countries and represents a temporary blip. The global trend is towards greater LGBT acceptance and equality. I know personally so many inspiring activists who are taking great personal risks. In Sudan, where homosexuality is punishable by death, a handful of activists organized and set up a clandestine LGBT movement. Then they had the audacity—the guts—to try to liaise privately with government officials to seek the decriminalization of homosexuality. That took real courage. They were endangering their liberty and their lives. Sadly, information about this overture got out and these activists were threatened with arrest and even execution. They had to go underground or flee the country. Yet this shows the kind of courage we see from LGBT defenders in many parts of the world, even where homophobic tyranny is extreme.

As we look at the continued global challenges and current movements for LGBT civil rights, it is helpful to reflect on the history of other civil rights struggles and recognize that change, even change that at one time would have been unthinkable, does happen.

When I began campaigning for LGBT rights in the late 1960s, it was virtually impossible to get LGBT issues covered in the media because they were simply regarded as disgusting, foul, and obnoxious—but we did not allow that to deter
us. We kept on pushing and pushing. When I co-founded OutRage!\textsuperscript{22} in Britain in 1990, our strategy was to change the law, social institutions, and public attitudes. At that time, the primary LGBT group in Britain was Stonewall and their only focus was on changing the law; our view was that (a) it is going to take a long time, and (b) it is no good having good laws if public hostility remains.

Our model was the US black Civil Rights Movement. When African Americans were ignored by Congress and the President, and their lobbying efforts were cast aside, they resorted to the Gandhian tradition of non-violent direct action and civil disobedience to shame and embarrass the people in power. This included public protests which would get media coverage and thereby raise public awareness of the scale of discrimination and segregation experienced by African Americans in the Deep South. That strategy has, more or less, been the template of all successful social movements, and so it has been for me and my LGBT freedom struggle.

In the 1990s, OutRage! undertook a direct action protest every second or third week. As a result, we were in the headlines day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, and that created awareness about LGBT issues that previously most people had no idea about. For example, very early on we staged a same-sex kiss-in at Piccadilly Circus to protest the way in which same-sex couples were being arrested and convicted for merely holding hands, kissing, or cuddling in a public place. This kiss-in received a huge amount of media coverage—TV, radio, and the press. It brought home to millions of people in Britain that same-sex couples could be arrested, convicted, and fined for simply expressing affection. It also created a public backlash against the police. Even some people who were opposed to homosexuality thought that these arrests were a waste of police resources, that they were not fair, and that they were unjustified. In fact, the police were so ashamed and embarrassed that, one hour before our protest, they announced that from that time onwards, no same-sex couple would be arrested for merely expressing affection. So, before we even staged the protest, we won the battle of public opinion.

\textsuperscript{22} OutRage! was a home-grown British queer rights movement committed to radical, non-violent direct action and civil disobedience with activists who took their inspiration variously from the suffragettes, the American black Civil Rights Movement, and from ACT UP and Queer Nation in the US. See \url{http://outrage.org.uk/} for further details.
The frequency of such protests resulted in a drip, drip, drip effect. The first time people saw our LGBT protests, many were shocked and the homophobes were angry. But after the thirtieth time, many of those people just shrugged their shoulders and said, “it’s them again.” Some people began to listen to what we were saying and, gradually, more and more people came around to the idea that the law was unjust and had to change. In this way, we built up the public momentum for change, which then gave the politicians the confidence to legislate that change. Politicians had avoided legislation, as they believed the majority of society was homophobic, biphobic, and transphobic. With our strategy, politicians got the message: public opinion is changing, and therefore they can have the confidence to change the law.

Today, we now also have the added advantage of the Internet and cellphone technology that is connecting the whole world. We are becoming a global community—a global human family. I regularly hear from isolated LGBT people in countries like Pakistan, Ghana, and Papua New Guinea. They are learning that they deserve equal rights, not from their government or from any sources in their country, but from LGBT websites and through social media. They are able to see and learn from what is happening in Britain, the United States, as well as many other countries and see that change is possible. This knowledge is incredibly psychologically empowering for isolated, vulnerable people. It gives them hope.

I am absolutely confident that, one day—though probably not in my lifetime—we will be living in a world in which LGBT people have acceptance across the globe. And I think when that happens, the divisions and the distinctions between LGBT and straight will begin to fade because, if no one cares what your sexual orientation or gender identity is, there is no need to shout it or defend it because with acceptance no one will care who loves whom. People will be free to be who they are and what they want to be as we move beyond prejudice and labels to a point where we just see the human being and accept that sexual and gender diversity is part of the natural spectrum of human life.

In conclusion, queer freedom is an unstoppable global trend. It knows no borders, it transcends all nations and all cultures. One day we will make homophobia, biphobia, and transphobia history. Although queer freedom has been long delayed, it cannot and will not be denied.
My research on the internationalization of HBCUs was born of two passions—black folks and international affairs. As a toddler in the early 1960s, I often rode on my father’s back and buried my face in his massive afro as he toured, on foot, the streets of North Philadelphia passing out pamphlets on Pan-Africanism. I would fall asleep in folding chairs as he led community outreach meetings that promoted economic development and social change and educated black residents of North Philly that protest strategies could be just as effective in the struggle against racial injustice in the North as they were against segregation in the South.

As an undergraduate student at Temple University in the 1960s, my father’s voice was a familiar one in the Black Power Movement in Philadelphia. The Columbia Avenue Riots of August 1964, almost a year after my birth, would spark a new spirit of militancy in young black people, like my father, who would begin to question not only the pace of racial change in Philadelphia but the very goals of integration.

Beginning on August 28, 1964, in response to a rumor that police officers killed a pregnant black woman at 22nd Street and Columbia Avenue, groups of young black Philadelphians roamed the streets of North Central Philadelphia for three nights, looting white-owned stores and scuffling with the police. Though the Columbia Avenue Riot was not a political protest with an explicit set of demands, it underscored a growing desire among black residents of inner-city Philadelphia for alternatives to the integrationist civil rights agenda.

Seven months after the Columbia Avenue Riots, young black activists, like my twenty-three-year-old father, protested to desegregate Girard College.
To them, the institution’s all white student body and ten-foot high walls, provocatively located in the heart of black North Philadelphia, were symbols of the failure of the city and of its liberal civil rights coalition to take seriously the needs of poor and working class black communities. The Girard protests, which peaked at seven months of daily picketing, constituted another moment of transition from civil rights to Black Power that would shape my father and our family moving forward.

By 1975, my father would make a full commitment to Pan-Africanism. As a result, he moved to Togo, West Africa where he directed the field operations for the late Leon Sullivan’s OIC (Opportunities Industrialization Centers), a cooperative development and job training organization. This move to Africa, and the three years that would follow, would serve as the foundation of my global consciousness for the rest of my life.

With regard to raising their children, my parents were engaged in a shared endeavor—to ensure that we possessed a healthy sense of black pride and to encourage our global competence to flourish and bloom. As a result, my adult life has been spent living and working all over the world in the private and public sector, and ultimately higher education.

Educated at two HBCUs, I have been most concerned with celebrating these spirited and sacred places which shaped me and generations of African Americans. Yet, as a researcher of internationalization at HBCUs and having served as the senior international officer at two of them, I was especially nervous about what I might find. Would the empirical data and facts result in sterile findings? Would my passion for black people and experience as a practitioner in international affairs meet a dismal record of internationalization at HBCUs?

Slowly, some HBCUs are dealing better than others with the realization that the development of a comprehensive internationalization plan is one of the salient issues facing twenty-first century higher education. More importantly, this means that it is imperative to ask tough questions of the HBCUs that are not improving in this regard. Much of the research on internationalization has been applied to the vast majority of predominately white institutions (PWIs) of higher education in the United States.
However, before I could focus my research on the current state of internationalization at HBCUs, I wanted first to explore their past. HBCUs represent another segment of the Academy whose historical responsibility has been to provide a sense of hope for the African-American community at large. A community having experienced such egregious and horrific assault could not afford institutions of higher learning with such a narrow mission of individual uplift solely.

If HBCUs represent the largest education consortium of minority-serving institutions in the United States, then without a doubt these centers of intellectual thought and activism also represent a resource for transforming the collective status of African Americans.

African Americans have always believed in education as transformative, redemptive, and liberating. Even in the dark and desolate circumstances of forced servitude, African Americans understood that there was an intrinsic power in knowledge. Perhaps because a cultural system of customs, laws, attitudes, and behaviors conspired to prevent us from the act of knowledge, we ached for the opportunity.

An unmistakable global vision aggressively sprouted from the charter missions of HBCUs. As these institutions came into being against a backdrop of horrific hatred and racial brutality, the student learning goals HBCUs crafted were the results of black folks’ triumph over struggle and a richness of racial pride borne of deprivation. A natural progression from these institutions’ early establishment was the production of graduates who were concerned with global processes, interested in diverse cultures, in possession of intercultural skills, and preparing for local and global citizenship.

HBCUs have a long, deep history of academic exchanges with Africa and African universities that range from the highly practical facilitation of economic and technological development, to the intensely intellectual. Many of the international programs established at HBCUs have long histories such as those at Clark Atlanta, Howard, and Lincoln Universities, whose international programs are just as old as their institutions. Often springing from the missionary work of religious groups, HBCUs utilized their meager resources to establish, broaden, and strengthen linkages with Africa and Africans long before the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs were ever created.
As early as 1899, Tuskegee Institute (now University), under the leadership of Booker T. Washington, was instrumental in establishing academic linkages with Africa by sending a team of agricultural experts to improve cotton production in the former German African colony of Togo.

As a way to highlight the early internationalization of HBCUs, I would like to point to just a few examples of early international student mobility which they enabled. As colonial rule was being consolidated throughout the continent, it was virtually impossible for Africans to receive a college education there. Yet, word traveled steadily to Africa of the wellspring of HBCUs being established in the United States. Cheyney University (Pennsylvania) was the first in 1837, followed by Lincoln University (Pennsylvania) in 1854, Wilberforce University (Ohio) in 1856, Fisk University (Tennessee) in 1866, Howard University (Washington, DC) and Morehouse College (Georgia) both in 1867, Hampton University (Virginia) in 1870, and Tuskegee University (Alabama) and Spelman College (Georgia) in 1881.

By the 1880s, Southern African men and women were being sent to US institutions, mostly to the all-black Wilberforce University (Ohio), under the auspices of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The noted South African feminist Charlotte Manye was one of the first to be admitted to, and graduate from, Wilberforce with a BS degree in 1901. Consequently, it can be said that Manye and her African female colleagues were both empowered and vexed by their observation of the provocative North American feminist discourse that began to gain momentum at the time.

Then there is the case of Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. West African attendance at Lincoln was initiated by Nnamdi Azikiwe who received his Bachelor’s degree from Lincoln in 1930 and his Master’s degree in 1933 from the University of Pennsylvania. It was Azikiwe who inspired Kwame Nkrumah and other West Africans to study in the US and particularly at Lincoln where African students received a great deal of financial assistance. African students studying at US black colleges during pre-independence were different from their African colleagues pursuing degrees in British universities. Africans at British institutions were encouraged to join the small, educated elite on their return home. However, African students attending Lincoln had different ideas. As Ghanaian Ako Adjei (a Lincoln colleague of Nkrumah’s) explained:
Those going to England had no nationalist spirit, but looked upon England as their home...Our idea was complete independence...It was schools like Lincoln that trained black young men and women to stand on their own feet (Sherwood, 1996: 30)

African students at HBCUs during the 1930s were doing much more than merely standing on their feet. They were standing tall enough to lead nations one day. For example, Nnamdi Azikiwe, a Lincoln classmate of poet Langston Hughes (1929), Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall (1930), and musician Cab Calloway (1930), would become the first President of Nigeria on October 1, 1963. Dr. Hastings Kamuzu Banda, a graduate of Wilberforce Institute (now Central State University) in 1928 and Meharry Medical College in 1937, became the first President of Malawi on July 6, 1966. Kwame Nkrumah, a 1939 graduate of Lincoln University who earned his Master of Science degree in education from the University of Pennsylvania (1942), would go on to become the first President of Ghana on July 1, 1960.

These achievements of Africans should not be viewed as purely anecdotal, but used instead to underscore evidence of the success of the charter missions of HBCUs, which was to produce the most profound intellectual and creative achievements of black people. Their early charters strategically emphasized social justice for black people everywhere. Alas, the charge of HBCUs was so resounding and revolutionary that young idealists, even from pre-independent Africa, came to their hallowed halls seeking human fulfillment and, subsequently, to contribute to the internationalization of black folks’ legacy of triumph over adversity.

As Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was completing his freshman year at Morehouse College in 1945, Morehouse President, Benjamin Mays, said in a radio address:

It will not be sufficient for Morehouse College...to produce clever graduates, men fluent in speech and able to argue their way through; but rather honest men, men who can be trusted in public and private—men who are sensitive to the wrongs, the sufferings and injustices of society and who are willing to accept responsibility for correcting the ills (Mays, quoted in Colston, 2002: 30)
Mays defined education as a moral experience that motivates one to be concerned about others, especially those who are oppressed and treated unjustly (Willie and Edmonds, 1978). In addition, though Mays was not representative of all HBCU presidents, his ideologies and concepts of social change were certainly aspirations for many. The idea of reform, of social change for a just society, is recurrent in the literature on the history and purposes of black colleges. The historical pre-eminence of this mission is attested to by both the number and quality of black professionals and leaders who have graduated from HBCUs in all fields of human endeavor (Hedgepeth, Edmonds and Craig, 1978).

The purposes of black colleges are the products of many historical currents, some of which flowed together quietly, while others erupted in agonizing public controversy. In order to underscore this point, Gregory Kannerstein, former Dean of Students at Haverford College, said the following:

Black colleges have grappled with the demands of inculcating academic values while not neglecting ethical and moral values, of serving educational goals while serving the community, of being open to all while remaining committed to a specific constituency, of responding to the pathology while promoting health, and of combatting social injustice while never swerving in allegiance to American society (1978: 30)

First, it is imperative that HBCUs examine carefully their unique history and mission when deciding how best to approach internationalization. Secondly, in order to integrate successfully a sustainable internationalization strategy, HBCUs should look for the international dimensions and implications in their missions that have historically fostered humanism, social idealism, imagination, and an awareness of the contradictions and accidents of the human predicament.

My dual passions—black folks and international affairs—led me to my research agenda. The advocacy for social change and equality my parents modeled throughout my childhood was carefully nurtured and developed throughout my tenure as a Morehouse student and refined even more as a doctoral student at Clark Atlanta University. Perhaps the most effective articulation of institutional commitment to internationalization will come
from the HBCUs who decide to tackle internationalization on their own terms and in an effort to put their own unique imprint on internationalization in US higher education.

Finally, and in the spirit of HBCU oratory tradition, I leave you with the words of William Ernest Henley as they frame the resilience of the HBCUs I have come to know and love:

Out of the night that covers me,
   Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
   For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance
   I have not winced nor cried aloud.
Under the bludgeonings of chance
   My head is bloody, but unbowed.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears
   Looms but the Horror of the shade,
And yet the menace of the years
   Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate,
   How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate,
   I am the captain of my soul.

“Invictus” (1888)
Public school integration has played a crucial role in establishing social and economic equality for African Americans in America by creating an impetus for total integration in the society. This paper examines one specific school system, Duval County in Jacksonville, Florida, in order to illustrate the vast challenges faced by African Americans in efforts to gain important civil rights.

Duval County school desegregation resulted from a long, difficult battle waged by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). NAACP lawyers successfully challenged an entrenched white structure that was unwilling to change. Desegregationist leaders faced opposition from some African Americans and from white conservatives alike but successfully pushed the fight. This history follows.

After the Civil War, white Southerners looked to create legal assurances that their supremacy would be maintained. This included mandated segregation in all southern school systems; in Florida, these guarantees were codified in the 1885 State Constitution.\(^{23}\)

In order to make sure no one misunderstood their intentions, written statutes forbade white children from using the same books used by African-American children, and books used in white schools had to be stored in separate facilities from those used in black schools. The state constitution also required separate attendance zones for white and African-American students (Woodward, 1974: 102).

During the 1930s and 1940s, African Americans began an aggressive campaign to push civil rights issues to the forefront of the national agenda. Organizations such as the NAACP began to challenge the separate but equal policy established by *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 by attempting to force school districts to equalize the huge disparity between teachers’ pay for white and African-American teachers (Walch, 1990: 23). County officials were reluctant even to discuss the matter, so black teachers appealed to the courts for relief (Scott, 1974: 64).

The equalization suits were part of an NAACP national strategy that challenged salary inequities among teachers. This strategy lasted five years and produced more than $25 million in salary adjustments. Teacher salary equalization suits symbolized a greater struggle for economic and social equality in World War II. The *Pittsburgh Courier’s* Double V campaign coupled with President Roosevelt’s executive order 8802, outlawing employment discrimination in war industries, signaled a change in direction for the civil rights struggle. The Double V campaign encouraged African Americans to fight for freedom at home, not only in Germany. As Edgar Rouzeau, a writer for the *Pittsburgh Courier*, noted in February 1942:

> When Negro teachers in the South take their city governments to court on a question of salary equalization, they prove themselves to be champions of the Negroes’ cause and therefore worthy of the greater democracy to which we all aspire. That, too, is good racial strategy

The civil rights struggle developed into a national war waged at the local level. For the Duval County school district, there was some success. By June 8, 1942, the Duval County Board of Public Instruction offered a compromise pay equity plan. While there were some concerns about elements of the plan, on June 20, NAACP lawyers accepted the bargain. The decision was both a moral and tangible victory. The school system had acknowledged that inequities existed, and it was forced to correct them. African Americans also realized that they could use the courts to challenge the inequities produced by the Jim Crow system.

---

24 *Baltimore Afro-American*, December 14 and 27, 1941.
25 *Pittsburgh Courier*, February 14, 1942.
26 *Pittsburgh Courier*, June 20, 1942.
After World War II, despite intense opposition from white Southerners, the federal government, through the courts, began to protect minority rights and to pay greater attention to African-American civil rights issues (Franklin and Moss, 1994: 461). From 1952, the NAACP mounted a nationwide legal assault on racial segregation in public schools. The organization sued in South Carolina, Virginia, Kansas, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. The legal action challenged *de jure* school segregation and the “separate but equal” principle used by Southern and some Northern states to guarantee racial segregation in all areas of social life. Veteran civil rights attorney Thurgood Marshall argued the case for the NAACP (Sitkoff, 1981: 20).

The NAACP aspired ultimately to destroy Jim Crow. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren lobbied his fellow Justices to make an unequivocal landmark decision. He called for a unanimous vote so that no one could mistake the Court’s intentions. On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in *Oliver Brown et al. v. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* that to segregate a child on the basis of color was inherently unequal and violated the Fourteenth Amendment’s equal protection clause. Then, on May 31, 1955, in a follow-up case, the High Court ruled that the nation must make “a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance” with the *Brown v. Topeka* ruling. The Court did not establish a timeframe for desegregation, however, so each city, county, and state delayed implementing the decision. A long, city-by-city struggle to desegregate the public schools followed (Sitkoff, 1981: 21-22; Franklin and Moss, 1994: 367).

The *Brown* decision resulted in no immediate changes in the Duval County school system.\(^{27}\) It was not until the late 1950s that an environment emerged which was conducive to challenging segregation. When Frank Hampton led a group of African-American citizens in attacking racial segregation on municipally-owned golf courses, his actions inspired others to fight racial segregation on other fronts. By 1960, the NAACP was ready to challenge the school system, believing that the only way to ensure quality education would be to create an integrated system.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{27}\) *A Program of Education in Duval County Negro Schools*, October 1955, Florida A&M University Black Archives, Jacksonville folder.

School desegregation in Duval County would become a small battlefront in a national struggle for civil rights. What started as a bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, had turned into a massive movement to destroy Jim Crow (Sitkoff, 1981: 18). Charles Silberman wrote in *Crisis in Black and White*: “And now, as might be expected, the closer Negroes come to full equality, the angrier they become over the disparities that remain” (Silberman, 1964: 65).

Late in 1959, Jacksonville’s African-American leaders decided to challenge Florida’s school segregation laws. They knew that a challenge on the state level must precede the desegregation of the Duval County school system. They elicited support from the NAACP to attack segregation using the Fourteenth Amendment.29

The NAACP devised a four-point strategy. The first step was to apply legislative pressure. The NAACP wanted to work with sympathetic white legislators, including those who openly supported integration, to pressure Duval County to desegregate the schools. The second step was to apply administrative pressure, encouraging African-American school administrators to have their supervisors alter their policies. Third, the NAACP sought to apply judicial pressure to force Duval County’s school board to change its organization and structure.30 The last strategy focused on cultivating public opinion on both sides of the racial divide.31

On December 6, 1960, Sadie Braxton filed the first legal challenge to school segregation in Duval County. A class action suit asked the school board to allow her two children, and six others, to attend the school of their choice. The NAACP established a three person legal team that consisted of Earl Johnson, Thurgood Marshall, and Constance Baker Motley.

Initially the African-American community was divided on the issue of school desegregation.32 However, most African Americans soon realized that it would be impossible to gain equality within a segregated system. As Jimmy John-

---

29 Interview, Lloyd Pearson, March 9, 1998, Jacksonville, Florida.
30 Interview, Lloyd Pearson. A surprising example was Dempsey Barron who represented a highly conservative North Florida legislative district. He openly supported school integration.
31 *Plan of Action*, NAACP Crisis Press, January 1959; Interview, Lloyd Pearson.
son, a veteran school board employee put it: “blacks felt that they would get a better education and system from desegregation. They were convinced that the better schools were in the white neighborhoods.” African Americans wanted to receive an education that was as good as that of the white students. If segregation was abolished, school officials could no longer use race as a determinant in allocating resources.³³

On December 6, 1960, the Braxton case went to federal court. Johnson charged that Duval County had a totally segregated school system: white teachers, principals, and personnel staffed white schools, and blacks staffed African-American schools. Furthermore, the superintendent’s office was structured along racial lines.³⁴ Johnson emphasized the inequalities between systems and showed the reluctance of the school board to correct these inequities. He argued that only through educational consolidation could blacks make meaningful improvements in their education and that the Duval County school board could not be trusted to correct the problems; he thus asked the court to take jurisdiction over the system until it resolved the issue.³⁵

The Duval County Board of Public Instruction lawyers admitted they had a dual school system, but insisted they were following state law. School board lawyers argued that the state constitution had to be changed before they could alter their mode of operation.³⁶ The court disagreed and ordered the Duval County school board to come up with a workable integration plan. The school board delayed by appealing the decision.

Judge Bryan Simpson ruled that Duval County had not attempted to make any changes in its structure or policies in the eight years since the Brown decision, and that, according to the dictates of the Fourteenth Amendment, the defendants had a right to attend a school system operated on a non-racial basis. The judge ordered the school district to halt its policy of maintaining schools based solely on race, a decision that partially eliminated the dual

³³ Interview, Jimmie Johnson, December 29, 1989, Jacksonville, Florida
³⁵ Braxton, etc., 1970; Mims etc., 1971; Florida Times Union, September 16, 1989.
system of education in Duval County.\textsuperscript{37}

In 1962, the Federal Court ruled that Jacksonville still had a “dual” school system and ordered a “plan” for the operating of schools on a “non-racial,” unitary system basis. On October 30, 1962, the school board submitted a desegregation plan to the court, but implementation was delayed while the school district again appealed the court’s decision. This appeal failed in 1964.\textsuperscript{38}

On May 8, 1963, Judge Simpson ordered implementation of the school board’s desegregation plan. It called for a gradual approach: integration of grades one and two in 1964, followed by desegregation of one additional grade each year until the whole system was integrated by 1974. The school board argued that it wanted to proceed slowly to prepare the students for integration.\textsuperscript{39}

In 1964, the Federal Courts again ordered the Duval County school board to implement its plan. Despite the ruling, few schools were desegregated. Fewer than sixty African-American children attended integrated schools and no white children attended African-American schools.\textsuperscript{40} Despite these low numbers, some whites decided to resist. On February 16, 1964, four Klansmen bombed the house of Iona Godfrey, an African-American mother who lived near the school where her six-year-old son had been the first black to integrate into the formerly all-white facility. The Klansmen failed to intimidate Godfrey into withdrawing her son. In other areas, there were reports of harassment of African-American students, but none of these efforts succeeded.\textsuperscript{41}

In August 1964, the Superintendent announced that an additional sixty-two African-American students had been tentatively accepted into all-white schools. However, the board organized the school system using principles of racial geography.\textsuperscript{42} Ten years had passed since the Supreme Court had ordered public school districts to desegregate, yet little had been accom-
plished. Throughout the country, school districts delayed implementing integration in defiance of the High Court’s mandate to make a prompt and reasonable start towards compliance. In the South as a whole, only 1.06 percent of African-American students went to integrated schools. In ten states of the Deep South, less than one percent of African-American students attended integrated schools (Silberman, 1964: 289). The situation in the Duval County school system had deteriorated. The NAACP became increasingly frustrated with the school board’s delaying tactics and with the inadequacies in African-American schools. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools conducted an in-depth investigation of Duval County’s school system. The study recommended revoking the accreditation of the Duval County school district. Rutledge Pearson, a Jacksonville high school teacher and President of the Florida and Jacksonville chapters of the NAACP, said of the recommendation: “crisis [sic] is perhaps the only motivating factor which would prompt steps for a first-class education in its totality for Negroes in this county.”

In December 1964, Pearson and Wendall Holmes, Chairman of the Joint Committee for Better Education in Duval County, organized a boycott of the school system. According to Pearson, this was aimed “at calling official notice to some nine listed inequities in the school setup, but also as a protest against official apathy concerning Negro problems generally.” The boycott became a controversial issue in the African-American community, with some activists arguing that the boycott was “an evil against the children” because of the loss of school money from what was “a poor budget already.” Many supporters meanwhile considered it “a silent protest.”

The school board pressured Pearson and others to end the boycott. Herman Fricke, Chairman of the Southern Association’s Florida Committee, blasted boycott leaders for what he saw as exploitation of students. He estimated that each $5,000 lost would cost one teacher’s job. Although his organization reportedly found no evidence to support the African-American community leaders’ claims of funding discrimination, he still recommended

---

that the Duval County school system lose its accreditation.\textsuperscript{48}

Holmes responded by asserting that segregation itself produced inequalities; he seemed shocked that Fricke’s committee found no inequities in the system. “We would welcome the opportunity to meet with any officials or professional groups to discuss these matters,” declared Holmes, “for we know that we can responsibly substantiate these claims.” Pearson said the boycott was fair play because Jacksonville’s African-American high schools had met accreditation standards. In speaking to whites about the loss of accreditation, Pearson said, “Now you know how it feels.” On December 10, the boycott ended. Since the Florida Minimum Foundation Program paid $2.11 a day for each child, the three day boycott cost Duval County at least $75,000.\textsuperscript{49}

Despite the protest, only sixty of the 30,000 African-American students in Duval County attended desegregated schools and no white students attended African-American schools. NAACP leaders and other prominent African Americans pointed out that the school board’s plan had failed to produce integration. Johnson argued that using the school board’s plan, only a paltry 0.0045 percent of the students enrolled were in integrated schools. The plaintiffs asked the court to create a plan that would accelerate integration.\textsuperscript{50}

In 1965, the Duval County school system lost its accreditation and, consequently, federal funds. Local leaders acted quickly and passed the highest property and \textit{ad valorem} tax in its history to fund the schools. Integration came with a high price tag for the cost of the reorganization of staff, transfer of personnel, and the implementation of administrative changes.\textsuperscript{51}

The Duval County school board voluntarily consented to accelerate the desegregation process. The board made some minor changes in the original draft and resubmitted the plan. Under the revised scheme, African-American students still had to travel long distances to white schools, and nothing was done to increase white students attending African-American schools.\textsuperscript{52} Understandably, African-American leaders were not satisfied. In May 1965, the

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Jacksonville Journal}, December 10, 1964.
\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Mims v. Duval County School Board}.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Mims v. Duval County School Board}.
\textsuperscript{52} Interview, Lloyd Pearson, March 9, 1998, Jacksonville, Florida.
Citizen’s Committee for Better Education produced a report titled *Still Separate Still Unequal*, which graphically displayed the problems in Duval County.

From 1965 until 1967, Johnson pressured the courts to step in and save the process. He argued that the school board intended to continue stalling. The board pointed out that it had instituted the court-ordered plan and insisted that the court had not given the plan enough time to prove itself. In 1967, Johnson asked the courts to discard the school board’s plan and to adopt one that would move the county toward a unitary school system. Despite arguments from school board attorneys, in mid-1967, the federal court found that the school board’s plan had failed to produce a unitary system and ordered the removal of the “freedom of choice” provision. The judges added that the freedom of choice rule, whether knowingly or unknowingly, contributed to the maintenance of a dual system.

However, the board refused to comply with the court’s order. It continued to operate under the original plan, which it claimed remained valid because the courts and plaintiffs had previously approved the approach. The court disagreed, ordering the school board to consult with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the University of Miami’s Desegregation Center to develop a satisfactory plan. The Desegregation Center was a bi-racial consulting center run by Charles Stolee, a young Associate Professor of education at the University of Miami. The center had successfully written desegregation plans for other counties, including Dade. Again, the school board ignored the court’s decision, insisting that a unitary system could be established by modifying the existing plan.

Braxton’s attorneys disagreed and refused to accept any plan not written by a neutral party. During the fall of 1968, while the school board and the NAACP haggled, a statewide teacher’s strike closed the Duval County schools. The strike disrupted the school year and caused much resentment in the community. Eventually the legislature relented and allocated funds that resulted in a tripling of the Duval County school budget. The strike

53 *Mims v. Duval County School Board.*
54 *Mims v. Duval; Still Separate Still Unequal: A Study Specifically Related to Discrimination and Inequities in the Duval County Public School System by the Citizens Committee for Better Education,* May 1965, Wendall Holmes Jr., Chairman, and Sally Mathis, Secretary.
further radicalized youthful African Americans who were still reeling from the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in April. African-American teachers who had participated in the strike demanded reform and increased funding for black schools.\textsuperscript{56}

In January 1968, Cecil Hardesty became the first appointed superintendent of Duval County schools. Hardesty came to Jacksonville from San Diego, California where he had won a reputation as an innovative leader who could carry out the court’s desegregation orders. The NAACP had to name the new board and superintendent as defendants in the desegregation cases. Hardesty wisely decided to follow the court’s guidelines for establishing a unitary system. He asked the University of Miami’s Desegregation Center to write a plan for desegregating Jacksonville’s schools and made the courts aware of his willingness to cooperate in whatever way they deemed necessary. Next, he assured the African-American community that there would be an equitable distribution of school board funds.\textsuperscript{57}

On July 31, 1968, following an extensive study of the Duval County school system, the Desegregation Center submitted a desegregation plan. It suggested that Jacksonville educators attempt to develop a unitary system before it sought integration. Once the system became unified, planning and integration could be done much more efficiently. The Desegregation Center’s team members warned the board that race had to be considered when decisions were made so that schools could be integrated. To reach the desired targets, the center recommended clustering and pairing some existing schools. The plan also called for the integration of the designated “one race” schools (Stolee, 1968: 196).

Further, the Desegregation Center called for a change in the procedures governing the assignment of positions. School principals at white schools would need to have a set percentage of African-American faculty; and principals at black schools would also have a target for white teachers. The plan further asserted that the proportion of African-American teachers should correspond with the percentage of African-American students (1968: 197-98). The principals and superintendent responsible for implementing
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these changes were to use teacher transfers to accomplish this objective (199). The superintendent was to implement desired racial ratios for non-teaching positions by the 1970-1971 school year.

School officials could not consider color in personnel decisions including dismissal, demotion, retention, promotion, rehiring, or appointment of any teacher or staff member (Stolee, 1968: 201). The Center advanced several proposals to deal with integrating the student population. African-American students were to be placed in white schools by redrawing school boundaries. The “freedom of choice” rule would be rescinded and students prohibited from transferring without a legitimate reason. School board members would assign white students, who were accustomed to better conditions, to schools with adequate facilities. The school board would also close inadequate African-American schools and transfer their students (1968: 202-3).

In 1968, the Desegregation Center submitted its plan to the federal court and gave copies to Johnson and Hardesty. Eight months later, the federal court ordered the school board to submit a comprehensive desegregation plan, using either the Desegregation Center’s plan or their own, by December 1, 1969 and directed the conversion to start in February 1970. After carefully reviewing the Desegregation Center’s plan, both the NAACP and the school board rejected it. Johnson urged his clients to appeal the court’s decision because he believed that the plan did not adequately repair historical damage and did not move fast enough. The Center’s plan gave the school board until 1974 to integrate the school system. Johnson wanted the system integrated by 1971.58

With no plan agreed, the federal court ordered cross-town busing. The inner city African-American children bore the brunt of the busing plan.59 African Americans accepted the inconvenience of busing because they believed that they would receive a better education. The busing program, however, shattered myths about education. People commonly hoped that, after busing, the scores for African Americans on standard tests would improve, but that did not occur. African-American students and white

58 Interview, Lloyd Pearson, by phone, March 26, 1998.
students maintained essentially the same test scores after busing as they had before.\textsuperscript{60}

With many black and white students entering integrated schools to study under teachers with cultural backgrounds different from their own, both groups feared that the teachers would be prejudiced and children would suffer. By the time the Duval County school board implemented its first comprehensive plan for school integration in 1969, some whites supported integration and helped prepare the community. Wendall C. Parker, principal at the all-white Forrest High, took his teachers to African-American schools and introduced them to the students who would be attending their school the next year. White teachers usually attempted to ease the transition for African-American students by having orientation programs for them and held sensitivity activities for the white students.\textsuperscript{61}

On December 1, 1969, the US Supreme Court, in \textit{Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education}, ordered the immediate merging of all school districts into unitary systems. The courts ordered the nation’s school systems to speed integration. On December 30, 1969, Johnson and the plaintiffs in the Braxton case returned to federal court and called for immediate desegregation of the school system. The court agreed with the plaintiffs.\textsuperscript{62} On March 15, 1970, the Desegregation Center submitted a revised plan for desegregation which called for the immediate integration of all faculty, staff, and students in Duval County. They also recommended redrawing boundaries, pairing, and clustering of schools to end the last vestiges of segregation and assigned one African-American administrator to each junior and senior high school. Additionally, there were efforts to increase the number of minorities assigned to the school board’s central office (Stolee, 1970: 4).

Federal Judge William A. McRae ordered that the faculties, staffs, transportation systems, services, and other extracurricular functions be merged into a unitary system by February 1, 1970. He mandated racial integration for staff and teachers at each school with faculty representation based on
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a seventy/thirty percentage ratio of whites to African Americans. In order to do this, the board had to re-assign teachers using objective and reasonable non-discriminatory standards and not race when hiring, firing, or demoting.\textsuperscript{63}

The court ordered that students could transfer to a school if spaces were available and their race was in the minority in the school's area; they also reorganized a program to guarantee that bus routes and student assignments to the buses were done on a non-racial, non-segregated basis. McRae mandated a new school site selection process that would prevent the return to a dual system. The federal courts ordered the school board to report on steps taken to ensure complete desegregation in compliance with the court’s orders.\textsuperscript{64}

The court’s decision affected black and white teachers because teacher assignments had to reflect the seventy/thirty percent ratio. 1,500 teachers were reassigned by February 1, 1970. Using the guidelines established, school officials paired and clustered schools. The new plan meant that many schools that previously had only token integration would be required to comply (Stolee, 1970: 4). The federal government sent marshals to serve as observers, reporting on the instructors’ teaching style. The transition from a segregated school system to an integrated one went relatively smoothly.

In August 1970, Jeremiah Bartley, a fourth grader, became the first African American to integrate into Parkwood Heights Elementary: “The thing I remember most were the federal marshals who followed me around everywhere I went. They had a pad and pencil and carefully noted what the teachers said and how they said it.” Bartley remembered most teachers treating him cordially. One white teacher made a special effort to make him welcome. He vividly remembered how much better the rooms at Parkwood were compared to those at his former school. The work at Parkwood was a little harder, but it came easily to him.\textsuperscript{65}

But the experiences were not always pleasant. Classmates mocked and tried to intimidate Bartley. Since he lived in a predominantly white neighborhood, he was used to harassment. One neighbor left his dog unchained each morning so that as Bartley walked by, the dog could menace him. People
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drove by and shouted obscenities at him and there were others who wrote him objectionable notes. Most African-American children who experienced integration shared similar experiences. The NAACP and family members instructed African-American students to be on their best behavior during the early stages of integration.⁶⁶

Over the next seventeen years, additional cases were presented in court and new plans for desegregation proposed. Only on September 6, 1988 did the US District Court finally declare the school district to be a “unitary” system.⁶⁷ However, this ruling was immediately appealed by the NAACP and the decision reversed in September 1989. Although the school district had integrated, it still essentially maintained a dual system of majority and minority schools. The school district was again placed under federal restrictions. The school district unsuccessfully appealed the decision.⁶⁸ The school board formed a committee to develop a new plan and actively sought community involvement.⁶⁹

By the early 1990s, extensive new school construction threatened to slow the process of desegregation again. The NAACP challenged the sites chosen for the schools as they were to be built in predominantly white neighborhoods—these areas needed new schools to accommodate a growing population, but board members ignored equally deserving African-American areas when selecting new school facilities.⁷⁰ The Duval County School Superintendent also had to convince the NAACP that the school system had changed its practices and no longer assigned positions based on race, but on merit. He faced tough decisions concerning teacher transfers. Only after successful resolution of these issues could the struggle for a unitary and desegregated school system end.

The example of the Duval County school district demonstrates the huge obstacles faced by African Americans in the effort to achieve civil rights. The
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fight with the school board was not only for equal education but for greater equality within society as a whole, and the brave men and women who played a role in the desegregation of schools should be remembered for their wider contribution to the Civil Rights Movement.
PURALISM AND IDENTITY

Of Equality—As if it harm’d me, giving others the same chances and rights as myself—As if it were not indispensnable to my own rights that others possess the same

Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*
Disability Rights: On the Boards of the Freak Show

John Woolf, Independent Researcher

On December 13, 2006, history was made at the UN. The General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). It was the first international human rights treaty drafted specifically to protect the rights of people with disabilities under international law. On May 3, 2008, it was formally ratified by 100 countries, thus becoming the first human rights treaty of the twenty-first century; the most rapidly negotiated human rights treaty in the history of the UN; a treaty that received more signatories on its opening day than any other treaty in the history of the UN; and a treaty drafted with the help of the subjects it was seeking to protect—disabled people—again, for the first time in the history of the UN (Arlene, 2015: 1-20).

Aside from these series of firsts (the CRPD was also the first international treaty to include the right to reasonable accommodation), the CRPD additionally moved beyond the traditional address in human rights which either focused on civil and political rights or social, economic, and cultural rights. Instead, the CRPD stressed the interdependency between these elements: the right to equality and non-discrimination of disability dependent on the right to accommodation in the workplace and public sphere. Article 14, for example, upheld the right of disabled people to liberty and security (rights long entrenched in international human rights) but demanded that State Parties affirmatively provide these on an equal basis and, specifically, that “disability shall in no case justify the deprivation of liberty” (Arlene, 2015: 2).

Although the struggle for equality is far from over, the CRPD was a monumental milestone. But what was the road to this international human rights treaty? Rewind over one hundred years, to April 1903, and the “revolt of the freaks.” The New York World published a letter signed by representatives of
the Barnum and Bailey Sideshow complaining against the “objectionable word ‘Freak.’” P. T. Barnum, the American showman, had died in 1891 so his partner, James A. Bailey, bore the brunt of this “uprising.” It was an expression, the press claimed, of “Bitter Grief” against the word “freak”: a term both ugly and stigmatizing and in need of urgent “remedy.” Ostensibly, this “revolt” was a moment of community assertion, a struggle to overcome a linguistic burden that underpinned years of exploitation and social marginalization. The struggle, however, was a “humbug”—a deception—masterminded by Bailey’s PR expert, Tody Hamilton (Bogdan, 1988: 270-272).

Linking the CRPD with the “revolt of the freaks” thus appears to be inappropriate: the former never dealt with “freaks,” the latter was never driven by freaks, and while the CRPD was concerned with international human rights, the “revolt” was all about increasing punters at the door of the freak show. Indeed, to draw a comparison between disability and freaks could almost be insulting. Following the highly successful Paralympic Games and the reverence reserved for these athletes, it seems regressive to provoke the specter of freak shows. Moreover, a disabled person is not a freak; a term which, from 1847, became synonymous with human anomalies and is usually placed within the context of the freak show: a form of entertainment institutionalized from the 1840s (Durbach, 2010: 1). Furthermore, unlike disability, the freak was not necessarily affected by physiological impairments: the freak could be a total fabrication, a “giant” made by a person surreptitiously standing on stilts, for example. On the other hand, according to the CRPD, disability is an “evolving concept” that results from the interaction between physical impairment and environmental factors (Arlene, 2015: 8).

However, in this paper I want to suggest that the road to the CRPD requires traveling into and through the world of the freak show in Britain and America; that disability and freakery are interconnected and, moreover, that the history of the freak show provides a novel insight into the development of disability rights from the 1980s. Indeed, the disability rights movement developed from a paradoxical history of concealment and spectatorship. On the one hand, activists were fighting the continual legacy of the nineteenth-century “great confinement.” The “chief centres of confinement” in Britain were the hospitals, prisons, and workhouses: institutional frameworks that isolated deviance and imposed the bourgeois ideology of work and self-discipline
In the nineteenth century, the professionalization of psychiatry was practiced in the increasing number of asylums, whereas the professionalization of medicine was practiced in the increasing number of hospitals. By 1916, hospital wards were swelling as the shell-shocked, blind, paralyzed, and deaf returned from the Great War (Shephard, 2000: 73-75, 157-159). By 1938, there were 696 voluntary hospitals in England and Wales alone (Borsay, 2005: 44). By 1954, there were 148,000 patients in mental asylums (Slorach, 2014: 161).

But while these institutions were increasingly confining the “abnormal” body, the freak show was reaching an apogee. Its *modus operandi* was spectatorship, revelation, theatricality—a far cry from concealment within institutional walls. In the nineteenth century (and well into the twentieth century), men, women, and children of the Western world could pay to see “freaks of nature”—from Bearded Ladies to Fat Men—in circuses, music halls, theaters, seaside resorts, zoos, pleasure gardens, and popular museums. By the mid-nineteenth century, spurred by new railways and steamships, the freak show was truly international with acts from around the world, and increasingly from colonized areas, traversing the Atlantic. Some continued into Russia and Constantinople following what became an established freak show route (Durbach, 2010: 2-3). Freak performers and showmen were making a living from physical difference: they were active economic agents in the world of work.

By the 1960s, the freak show had declined as a form of popular entertainment, but it had bequeathed a complicated legacy. For many disability rights activists, the freak show was a form of pornography of disability: a space that promoted voyeurism and ridicule on the basis of difference. It was a site of exploitation, a manifestation of social marginalization, and one that came loaded with a derogatory term. Indeed, the disability activist Eli Clare struggled with the term “freak,” feeling it more harmful, hurtful, and unsettling than words such as “queer” and “cripple” (Claire, 1999: 70, 93). Leslie Fiedler, first writing in the late 1970s, declared that “we live at a moment when the name ‘Freaks’ is being rejected by the kinds of physiologically deviant humans to whom it has traditionally been applied” (Fiedler, 1981: 13).

Yet, for some disability activists, the term “freak” became a badge of pride. For example, *Geek Love*, a novel by Katherine Dunn, was first published in the 1980s as the disability rights movement got underway. It celebrated human
difference and rejected the vulgarity of normality (Chemers, 2008: 1-10); as one of the protagonists, Arturo the Aqua Boy, asserted: “I get glimpses of the horror of normalcy. Each of these innocents on the street is engulfed by a terror of their own ordinariness. They would do anything to be unique” (Dunn, 2004: 251). Arturo’s sister, Lil the geek, concurs: “I win out by nature, because a true freak cannot be made. A true freak must be born.” (Dunn, 2004: 23). This was a moment of appropriation: the term freak, so often used as an insult, was being reclaimed.

But while the disability rights movement remained ambivalent about the freak show, the celebration of the “freak” was appropriated by the counter-cultural movements of the 1960s. During the “Cultural Revolution” of this decade, the term “freaking out” encapsulated an individual’s nonconformity against dominant modes of thinking and behaving (Fiedler, 1981: 300-319). The freak, then, became an expression for alternatives to conformity (Adams, 2001: 139). Indeed, “freakishness” emerged in the 1960s as an American form of dissent: identification turned the freak into an act of self-will (Russo, 1999: 75-76). In the twentieth century, according to Robin Blyn, a “Freak-Garde” associated with the avant-garde appropriated the legacy of the freak show in order to critique liberal capitalism. This is seen, for example, in the photography of Diane Arbus (Blyn, 2013: 149-183). Thus, the freak became a mode of resistance; part of the countercultural movement at the height of post-war dissent.

This, in turn, led to its own problems: the term freak became appropriated by groups with little or no comprehension of the specific problems of disability. The “freak” almost became a label of self-indulgence, divorced from the particular historical problems of embodiment it previously signaled. It became a term of celebration when, for many disability activists, it was a term of oppression. However, regardless of which perspective one takes, the point for this paper is the interdependency between the legacy of the freak show, the history of protest, and the disability rights movement of the 1960s. The birth of the latter, coinciding with cultural upheaval, was imbricated with the question of freak show legacies.

These debates also found an outlet inside the academy. Indeed, the disability rights movement was not just street protest: it was developed inside
universities, informed by theoretical insights. In 1975, the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) claimed that “in our view, it is society which disables physically impaired people”: society creates the barriers of exclusion for people with impairments (Slorach, 2014: 162). In the 1980s, Michael Oliver gave greater theoretical weight to this distinction via the “social theory of disability,” as distinct to the “medical model,” in which the former related to outcomes of social relations that restricted people with “impairment” (Oliver, 2009: 41-57). This distinction was evident in the CRPD’s definition of disability: the interrelationship between impairments and the environment. Moreover, the “social theory of disability” offered a theoretical basis that underpinned a new discipline—Disability Studies—which, in the UK, was increasingly used in training social workers and professionals (Slorach, 2014).

Particularly in America, Disability Studies developed as an academic discipline that focused on the concept of disability, hitherto relegated to a “freak show” in academia, as a crucial discourse of identity formation (Davis, 1995: 158). The freak show was soon singled out for scrutiny and, in turn, a new subdiscipline came into being. “Freak Studies” largely challenged the notion that the freak show was a site of exploitation and humiliation. Influenced in part by theoretical developments within Disability Studies, Freak Studies asserted the social construction of the “freak,” focusing upon the agency of the freak performer as an actor involved in highly-stylized theatricality and performativity (see, for example, Bogdan, 1988; Thomson, 1996; Chemers, 2005; Tromp, 2008). The freak body and the freak show became sites of celebration and politicized minority affirmation, a “peculiarity as eminence,” that had the power to disrupt oppressive social systems (Thomson, 1997: 17). The freak was no longer pitied, marginalized, or perceived as a simple victim of exploitative practices, but rather an active agent, even an artist. The freak show even provided a template for a future “freaktopia” in which physical disability could eventually be celebrated (Chemers, 2008: 135-139). Freak Studies, like Disability Studies, was imbued with a political program connected to the disability rights movement.

Engagement with Freak Studies also provides an insight into the early demands for social inclusion amongst the “freak” community. Freak Studies provides, in other words, a context for the twentieth-century disability strug-
gles. Take, for instance, the phenomenon of “freak autobiographies”: pamphlets allegedly written by freak performers and usually sold at freak shows to increase the proceeds at the door. One of the defining features of these texts is the author’s demand for normativity alongside an assertion of exceptionality (Duff, 2005). The eighteenth-century court “dwarf,” Count Joseph Boruwlaski, expressed in his memoirs his desire “to be upon a level with other men” (Greskowiak-Krwawicz, 2012: 107). The late nineteenth-century American freak show performer, R. A. Steere, presented a picture of independent manhood in the field of work and stated, on behalf of little people: “we are quite capable of taking care of ourselves” (Duff, 2005). Joseph Merrick, The Elephant Man and the archetypal Victorian freak, concluded his alleged autobiography by reminding his readers that “The mind’s the standard of the man”; or, in other words, that his masculinity derived from his elevated mind rather than his abnormal body (Merrick[?], 1880[?]: n.p.). Indeed, over half of Merrick’s autobiography detailed his employment history—a nod to his nineteenth-century readers that he was worthy of respect.

These autobiographies were not political, neither did they explicitly or even consciously tap into an emerging disability discourse, but they were part of a broader trend. For example, by the latter part of the nineteenth century, members and advocates of the blind community were demanding schemes to enable the blind to work (Turner and Harris, 1871: vii-xi). There were calls from the charitable to enlarge educational and industrial training for “epileptic and crippled children and adults” (Family Welfare Association, 1893: 99-100). Ben Purse, who led the National League of the Blind and Disabled when it was first established in 1899, specifically drew on Samuel Smiles’ self-help philosophy to promote employment within the blind community (Purse, 1925: 95-101). During and after World War I, the stress on curing patients and returning them to the front line, or into productive work, remained the ultimate goal (Anderson, 2011: 1-41). For many in the disability rights movement today, equal access to work remains the cornerstone of their struggle.

The disability rights movement, and the history of the freak show, remains on the margins of critical discourse, while simultaneously remaining central to the experience of disability today. For Jennifer Miller, the founder of New York’s queer performance group Circus Amok and the occasional performer of The Bearded Lady at Coney Island, engaging with the freak show is not a
choice but a cultural imperative because the freak show is still a lens through which physical difference is perceived (Stephens, 2012: 190). For the disabled activist and theorist Terri Thrower, there is still the “everyday freak show”: people continue to stare and unfavorably react to the disabled person in the street (Thrower, 2013: 212). Richard Butchins’ documentary, *The Last American Freak Show*, was excluded from the London International Disability Film Festival in 2008 because BAFTA’s Head of Events was “uncomfortable” about the film. Mat Fraser, the disabled actor and activist who has used the legacy of freak shows in his work, lamented at the time: “Heaven forbid that anyone should be made to feel uncomfortable by a film about disability made by a disabled person” (Fraser, 2008).

That was the same year that the CRPD was ratified. In 2008, the legacy of the freak show remained intertwined with the disability rights movement while, at the same time, the UN was making history. This paper has attempted to illuminate some of these connections, arguing that the disability rights movement had to grapple with the history and legacy of the freak show: the stage that set the UN’s Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
A Matter of Choice? The Rites and Rights of Subcultures


In 2007, twenty-year-old Sophie Lancaster, a member of the Goth subculture, was murdered as she walked through a public park in Rossendale, near Manchester. At first the gang of boys attacked her boyfriend, Robert Maltby, but when Lancaster intervened, they turned on her and beat her into a coma from which she never recovered. Maltby survived. Five teenage boys were put in prison after this attack, two for murder and three for grievous bodily harm. The trial was important in the history of subcultures in Britain because the judge, Anthony Russell QC, recognized that the couple had been attacked because they were Goths: “This was a hate crime against completely harmless people who were targeted because their appearance was different.” In 2013, Manchester police added an extra category to those protected under hate crime laws: those from “Alternative Sub-Cultures.” This paper will explore the rights and rites of subcultures and discuss the idea that some subcultures appear to be more deserving of rights than others.

The Criminal Justice Act of 2003 states that hate crimes, against a person or property, are those that relate to someone’s disability, transgender identity, sexual orientation, religion or belief, and race or ethnicity. Those found guilty of carrying out a hate crime will possibly receive a longer prison sentence or a heavier fine. But perhaps more importantly, the crime will be recorded as a hate crime and police forces can now determine how many people are attacked because of their race, or disability, for instance. Since 2013, other police forces have added subcultural membership to their groups of people who are targeted in hate crimes, while in 2016, the Nottinghamshire police force began recording incidents that take place against women which are misogynist in nature, such as wolf-whistling, and unwanted verbal and physical attention. This latest move has caused consternation in some quarters.
of Britain, best exemplified by the nation’s favorite actress Joanna Lumley suggesting “How can wolf whistling be offensive to women? It’s a compliment” (Oppenheim).

When discussing hate crime legislation in the classroom, most students agree with the original five categories that the law seeks to protect, but a few are confused as to whether subcultural membership deserves to be protected in the same way. It is a matter of choice to be a Goth, they put forward, while the other categories are predetermined. It is not a matter of choice to be disabled or to be gay, they argue, and even though we are free to choose our beliefs, we often remain in the religion we are born into: once a Catholic always a…. There is the sense that trans people who transition from one gender to another are correcting a biological mishap and that they are becoming who they were always meant to be; it may be a choice to change gender but the desire to change is compulsive not capricious. The desire comes from within like an instinct. Should this need be compared to the wish to wear ripped fishnets, dye one’s hair black, and listen to The Cure?

As Dick Hebdige has asserted, to provide a definition of subculture is a slippery task as its meaning is “always in dispute,” especially at that point when a subculture is appropriated into the mainstream (Hebdige, 1988: 3). After the punk subculture, some theorists such as Sarah Thornton question whether subcultures after 1979 should actually be labelled subcultures as they do not focus on male working-class youth in the same way as those that appeared after World War II. Because of the inclusive way that Rave welcomed all classes and ethnicities, and because it favored hedonism rather than a resistance to the dominant culture, Thornton proposes the term “neo-tribe” or “taste culture.” Other new titles have been “scene” or “lifestyle.” However, for the sake of this paper, I will bring together the more traditional subcultures like Mods and Rockers (as first explored by Birmingham University’s Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS)) and the more recent phenomena of Chavs and Hipsters. Despite Hebdige’s warning, and Thornton’s reassessment, there is a list of criteria that links these groups, though of course, there are differences too. Members of a subculture should all share a uniform (the Goth’s black clothes or the Mod’s smart Italian suits), and a common argot (the Mod’s lexicon of words such as “face,” “ticket” and “bird,”) both reinforcing subcultural membership. Many subcultures have
their own musical style, from the noise and feedback of Punk bands to the folk inspired songs of the Hippies. Moreover, often in tandem with the music is the subculture’s drug of choice: the speed the Mods used to keep them awake and focused while dancing to Motown or the MDMA of ecstasy which altered the Ravers’ consciousness to the tune of techno and trance. The clubs and dives of these groups become the subcultures’ territory, another shared aspect of subcultures, where they can engage in these activities. One of the most common territories is the street, favored by the Teds and the Punks, but more recently this space is now digital, like the social media platforms that allow ultra-loyal fanbases such as the Directioners to thrive. Older subcultures negotiated a prickly relationship with the mainstream in that they were anti-capitalist or anti-consumerist in some way, though this is difficult to apply to the Hipsters and their love of all things Apple.

Goth is one of the longest surviving subcultures, its look never totally succumbing to commercialization, and Goths have existed alongside the mainstream or, as the prefix “sub” suggests, underneath it, since the early 80s. The Goths’ easily-read symbols have their origins in the period of the late 70s as Punk collapsed, and its look was inspired by the lead singer of Siouxsie and the Banshees; Paul Hodkinson describes this imitated style: “black back-combed hair and distinctively styled heavy dark make-up accentuating the eyes, the cheekbones and lips...a dark twisted form of androgyny” (Hodkinson, 2002: 36). While this look was mostly taken up by the female members of the subculture, some boys also adopted this style or looked to male members of bands rocking a similar style such as Peter Murphy from Bauhaus or Robert Smith from The Cure. The band Joy Division were also a part of this scene though their Gothic roots are often overlooked as now they are seen as a precursor to electronica, especially as a later iteration of the group was New Order, most famous for the synth epic “Blue Monday.”

While researchers are sometimes interested in the fashion and the music of this scene, most studies are focused on the gender roles of its participants. Dunja Brill and Hodkinson examine how the feminine appears to be valued more highly than the masculine, with men wearing make-up, jewelry and, in some cases, skirts and stockings. Such gender slippage or fluidity is not unique to the Goth subculture; in the 1960s there was a concern that male Mods were taking an unhealthy and un-masculine interest in fashion, and in
the 1980s, the New Romantics, another postpunk subculture, allowed its male members to wear make-up and satin blouses. However, in these cases it could be argued that by borrowing the accoutrements of femininity, these men became more desirable to the female participants; that, in effect, the lipstick and the eye shadow supplemented the men’s masculinity. For example, the members of the New Romantic band, Duran Duran, were viewed as sex symbols because of their eyeliner, jumpsuits, and frilly shirts, not in spite of them. However, within the Goth subculture, the feminine is pursued in other ways rather than just make-up and fashion. Some male Goths embrace other feminine qualities like gentleness, passiveness, and open-heartedness that could be said to resist traditional hegemonic gender roles. It is not known if these male participants are predisposed to the feminine before they join the scene or whether these men only become interested in adopting these feminine qualities once they start to participate in the scene.

Another feature of the Goth’s personality is their emotional state: it could be said to be sad, depressed, and moribund. While I would not want to say that melancholia is purely a feminine emotion, and indeed, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it was considered a masculine disposition, a male Goth’s brazen display of this emotion does seem to be in conflict with the way that men in the present age are expected to deal with emotions. I must also be clear that I am not suggesting that every Goth, or even a large majority, have psychological issues. For many Goths, the melancholic stance is an act that complements the anguish of the music that first was played in the scene. As Michael du Plessis comments, the Goth’s “relish for melancholia’s worn prestige should be understood less as a ‘real’ psychological condition than as an opportunistic deployment of privileged affect” (du Plessis, 2007: 160). This act could be compared to the swagger of the Mods and their moody measured attitudes on the side of the dance floor. These are shared performances which encourage a social identity amongst the groups and indeed create hierarchies within them. Indeed, as du Plessis continues, “such fixated melancholia is not only Goth’s affective signature, it is also crucial to the subculture’s cohesiveness”; melancholia acts as a “subcultural glue” (du Plessis, 2007: 161).

Despite Hodkinson’s assertion that in his interviews of Goths attending the Whitby Gothic Weekend in 1998 “most played down the importance of neg-
ative and miserable outlooks on life,” a stereotypical Goth persists in the minds of the public and the media: not only is this Goth melancholic, but also he/she has suicidal thoughts or engages in self-harm (Hodkinson, 2002: 47). Goth’s connection with suicide has a long history—as Ian Curtis, the lead singer of Joy Division, hanged himself at the age of twenty-three in 1980 right at the start of the subculture’s appearance. In addition to his death, Curtis’ tortured voice and forebodingly grief-stricken eyes ensured that Joy Division were an early influence on the Goth subculture. Thirty-seven years after his suicide, this stereotypical image of a Goth still persists although recent studies demonstrate that this stereotype may have some basis in truth; in 2006 Glasgow researchers found that in a study of 1,258 teenagers, those in the Goth subculture were more likely to self-harm or attempt suicide. Out of the twenty-five who identified as Goths, fifty-three percent practiced self-harm, while forty-seven percent had attempted suicide (Young, 2006). In 2015, a further study brought similar results suggesting that Goth teenagers were three times more likely to suffer from depression and five times more likely to self-harm (Bowes, 2015). Emo, short for “emotional,” a subculture similar to Goth and which has its origins online, also has links to self-harm and suicide. Carla Zdanow and Bianca Wright (amongst others) have demonstrated that social networking sites such as MySpace, Facebook, Bebo as well as chat rooms and message boards are used by some Emos to discuss and even encourage the act of self-harming. Looking at two Emo Facebook pages in South Africa in 2009, Zdanow and Wright found many posts like these:

[Cutting] counters emotional pain with physical pain to me it relieves stress people smoke, do drugs I choose to cut

if you cut that’s fine it releases your deep sad or angry emotions ...I cut...then after I feel not so angry (Zdanow and Wright, 2012: 89)

The study also looks at suicide to see if posts discussing taking one’s life encourage others to take their own lives in what is known as contagion. However, while there is inconclusive evidence to say that the use of social media spreads suicidal thought among Emos, Zdanow and Wright suggest that these sites “have the potential to open the doors for the promotion of a variety of risky and even dangerous behaviours” (Zdanow and Wright, 2012: 98).
In the Goth subculture, researchers still do not know how many participants are drawn to depression and self-harm by the actions of their peers in what is called “peer contagion,” but it could be that teenagers are drawn to the Goth subculture because of their pre-existing emotional states. In this case, we could view the use of message boards and chat rooms by Goths and Emos as support mechanisms to combat depression or suicide rather than spaces that only encourage them. The most useful study is one from 2015 carried out by Lucy Bowes et al. as it examines the childhoods of some 5,357 participants in the Avon area in the UK. The findings intimate that young people who identified as Goths “more than somewhat” or “very much” are more likely to share other characteristics in addition to depression:

Those who identified with the goth subculture were more likely to be girls. They were also more likely to have mothers with a history of depression, report being bullied at the age of eight and ten years, and have a history of emotional and behavioural difficulties...including symptoms of depression and anxiety, hyperactivity, and peer relationship difficulties. Young people who identified with the Goth subculture also reported more symptoms of depression at ten, twelve and thirteen years old (Bowes, 2015: 797)

The authors of the report say that their findings “suggest a degree of self-selection, with young people more susceptible to depression and self-harm being more likely to be attracted to the Goth subculture” (Bowes, 2015: 798). While this does not rule out peer contagion, it would seem that some young people with a pre-existing history of depression and self-harm are drawn to the Goth subculture. As they feel “isolated, ostracised or stigmatised by society” they are attracted to a subculture that is known to provide harbor for other young alternative people who do not fit with society’s norms (Bowes, 2015: 799). The subculture is more likely to offer solace than encourage further self-harming or suicidal thoughts.

Perhaps the term “self-selection” sounds too much as if these young people have a choice of other subcultures to join, or indeed the choice not to join any subculture at all. The Bowes study identified seven other subcultures which were present in the Avon area: “‘sporty,’ ‘populars,’ ‘skaters,’ ‘chavs,’ ‘loners,’ ‘keeners’ [and] ‘bimbos’”—it found that depression rates were also
high within the skater and loner subcultures while the rates were low within the sporty subculture (Bowes, 2015: 794). The choice for these young people could be to either hide their depression, suicidal thoughts, and self-harming or join a subculture where these issues are understood and discussed. In teenage years when consciousness is heightened, a decision to join a subculture may seem like a necessity rather than a matter of choice; for some troubled teenagers, it is not a matter of choice but survival. Returning to hate crime legislation, we can see that the decision to join a subculture like Goth may be, to some of its participants, a pre-determined or necessary decision, that to them they have no choice but to be a Goth.

Aside from medical issues, other pre-existing factors can govern which, if any, subculture a teenager may join. Within the Mod subculture of the 1960s, social class played a crucial part as most of its members came from the working class. Looking at the life of a young Mod called Jimmy, the 1979 film *Quadrophenia*, based on The Who's album of 1973, explores the choices of the newly-created teenager of the early 60s. Jimmy and his friends are all working-class, but for his friends, the life of a Mod is only a part-time occupation, something to do when they are not working. Jimmy and his friends hang out together after work, mess about on their scooters, go to basement clubs and travel down to Brighton in 1964 to get involved in the fights against the Rockers. For his erstwhile girlfriend Steph, the battle in Brighton “was a laugh, that’s why we went down there,” while for Peter, work is more important than the Mod lifestyle, “no work, no money, and I like money.” Even Ace, the Brighton Mod all the others want to meet, is able to separate the Mod lifestyle from his everyday life working as a bellhop in a swanky seafront hotel. Jimmy, however, wants to be a Mod full-time and this leads to him giving up his office job as a post-room boy and leaving home. While it is clear that Jimmy has problems maintaining the work/life balance, the focus of this paper is to explore his choices. Did Jimmy choose to join the Mods or did the subculture choose him?

He has the choice to choose his parents’ life, but in the film, this life is burdened with boredom and inertia. His parents sit at home falling asleep while watching TV and his father is depicted as impotent, pushing away the advances of his wife in the background of a early scene. Jimmy’s other choices are to stay at work which is unfulfilling and infantilizing, or to join
the army like his friend where “they treat you like shit.” He does not want to become a Rocker as their look is too homogenous, “all that greasy hair, and clobber. It’s diabolical.” For Jimmy, to be a Mod is a way to claim his own identity, “I don’t want to be the same as everyone else. That’s why I’m a Mod, see?” His father understands to a point, saying “you’ve got to be part of a gang, got to be a Mod,” though he still questions whether his son has a mind of his own. Stanley Cohen, in his important book of 1972, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, proposes that to join the Mod subculture was almost the only viable choice available for 60s working class teenagers who wanted to resist the passive consumer culture that was being sold to them. Even the city’s entertainments offered few options to the adolescent:

These scenes provided few opportunities for excitement, autonomy and sense of action. Either nothing at all was provided or it was dull and mediocre. He did not have enough money to participate nor the talent, luck or personal contacts to really make it. So, faced by leisure goals he could not reach, with little commitment or attachment to others, his situation contained an edge of desperation. He saw himself as effect rather than cause, he was pushed around by “them.” Rather than accept all this, rather than do nothing at all, he manufactured his own excitement, he made things happen out of nothing (Cohen, 2002 [1972]: 153)

Social class is also integral to the identity of the much-maligned Chav of the first decade of the twenty-first century. While no one has seriously suggested that these proudly working-class, disruptive, lager-drinking, Burberry-capped teenagers should be protected under hate crime legislation, writers such as Owen Jones have called for an end to “Chav-baiting” either by the tabloid media who branded every member of the working-class a Chav, or by those who uploaded photographs of Chavs to the website *Chav Scum*. These white working class teenagers and adults have been, in Jones’ words, demonized in the struggle by politicians to make middle-class values the norm. Those who do not aspire to these values are often called Chavs, even by members of the working class themselves. Instead of the new laws that the Government brought in, such as ASBOs (Anti-Social Behavior Orders) to deal with the supposed and increased “Chav-y” behavior, perhaps Chavs themselves need protecting from the rest of society. For most British people, the social
class you are born into is the class you remain in: it is as unchangeable as your ethnicity or sexuality. At one point in British history, you were able to be proud of being working-class, but this is no longer the case. For many Chavs, their economic situation is not their fault. Rather, as Jones points out, it is the fault of the Thatcher and Blair Governments which made being working-class something to be ashamed of:

Poverty and unemployment were no longer to be seen as social problems, but more to do with individual moral failings. Anyone could make it if they tried hard enough, or so the myth went. If people were poor, it was because they were lazy, spendthrift or lacked aspiration (Jones, 2012: xii)

For many working-class youths, the Chav subculture was not something they chose but a label foisted upon them because they did not fit the middle-class mold. Their love of Burberry and cheap, branded sportswear led many to believe that they were aspirational after all and they were demonized for this too. In columnist Julie Burchill’s polemic:

The very things that Chavs stand accused of—aspiration, love of material goods, lack of communal values—are the very things that have...been fetishised by institutions such as the main political parties and the Daily Mail (Burchill, 2005)

Not only does the tabloid media propose to us that we should be wary of Chavs (and in earlier years, Teddy Boys, Mods, Rockers, Ravers, Punks, and New Romantics were all taken to task by the tabloids), but that we should also be wary of the new legislation that protects them. When Greater Manchester Police (GMP) added alternative subcultural identity to their list of who was protected under hate crime laws, the Daily Mail headline was “And Now It’s a Crime to Hate the Sex Pistols.” Right-wing journalist Richard Littlejohn continued the article by condemning the “Metallers” that Manchester police now protect:

If you’ve ever been to a heavy metal concert, the audience won’t have struck you as all that “vulnerable.” Upset one of them and you’ll probably end up with a motorcycle chain wrapped round your head. And that’s just the women (Littlejohn, 2013)
While he goes on to offer his sympathy to the family of the murdered Goth, Sophie Lancaster, he remarks that the law does not need to change “because the laws to prosecute her killers were already on the statute books” (Littlejohn, 2013). He does not take into account that before this law, GMP had no way of collating such crimes, nor how the law brings awareness to the abuse, both physical and verbal, that subcultures endure.

The change in law came as a result of the campaigning of the charity, The Sophie Lancaster Foundation, or S.O.P.H.I.E. (Stamp out Prejudice, Hate and Intolerance Everywhere), that was established by Lancaster’s mother, Sylvia. The Foundation, which is supported by music legends Gary Numan and Courtney Love, visits both primary and secondary schools with interactive training materials to bring awareness to subcultures and the abuse that they can suffer. The Foundation also commissioned an animated film, *Dark Angel*, which can be viewed on YouTube, depicting the murder in shocking and heartbreaking detail; at the end of the film, words appear saying “So this film is a tribute to [Sophie]...But is also a stark reminder of the reason why Sophie was killed. Simply, because of the way she looked.” (Teyssier, 2009). So successful was the campaigning and the sympathetic reporting of the murder in the first place that Catherine Spooner suggests that the British no longer see Goths as a threat but “as possibly eccentric but creative and ultimately harmless individuals” (Spooner, 2017:74).

After watching *Dark Angel* and discussing the new research that suggests that some individuals are drawn to the Goth subculture because of pre-existing psychological conditions, most students I teach appear to be in favor of subcultures being protected under hate crime legislation, especially as English law appears to give some minorities greater rights than those rights given by American law. But then I ask should Hipsters be protected, and amidst laughs and scoffs, my argument that subcultures be protected falls quickly apart. The Hipster phenomenon attracts those from the middle class who can afford all the trappings that come along with the subculture: the organic food, the fair trade coffee, the micro-brewery beer, the fixie bikes, and so on. These affluent and educated teenagers and young adults have choices that the Mods and Chavs did not. The Hipsters’ desire to be different, original, and to have heard of bands that no one else has ever heard of is not, as far as we are aware, caused by a medical condition. The usual verdict is that
Hipsters bring it upon themselves, and that they court abuse in such a way that Hipster-baiting is not seen as a problem. Although, if anti-gentrification protests continue to intensify in the UK and the USA, perhaps Hipsters will become targets as they were in Shoreditch in 2015 when the Hipster food outlet, Cereal Killer Café, was attacked.

But for now we can laugh at the Hipsters, and I can show the ironic “Being a Dickhead’s Cool” video, which mocks the subculture (Dangoor and Riley, 2010). It would seem that even youth subcultures have a hierarchy and that some subcultures are worth protecting more than others. Will Hipsters only be offered the same protection as Goths once a Hipster dies in an attack that is motivated purely by a hatred for Hipsters?
Africa in the American Mind: The Invention of Space in Study Abroad

Michael Woolf, CAPA The Global Education Network

So in the dark we hide the heart that bleeds,
And wait, and tend our agonizing seeds

Countee Cullen, “From the Dark Tower”

Performing a Paradox

On October 24, 1974, at the Twentieth of May Stadium in Kinshasa, Zaire, Muhammad Ali fought George Foreman for the undisputed heavyweight championship of the world in a fight that became known as “The Rumble in the Jungle.” The President of Zaire, Mobutu Sese Seko, anxious to raise the profile of his country, had paid $10 million to secure the fight in an attempt to legitimize a brutal regime. The billboards proclaimed:

A fight between two blacks, in a black nation, organized by blacks and seen by the whole world; that is a victory for Mobutism

The outcome of this titanic confrontation is etched in boxing history.

71 Given that this essay explores issues of identity in the concept of “African American,” I have used blacks as a neutral term (though I am aware that it is not neutral)! When employing the term African American, I am consciously drawing upon the idea of dual identification.

72 This is variously confirmed in Norman Mailer’s The Fight (1999: 20) and in many contemporaneous reports: see, for example, Dave Anderson in The New York Times, October 27, 1974.

73 At the end of an epic encounter, Ali knocked out George Foreman in the eighth round to regain the heavyweight title: “Like a drunk hoping to get out of bed to go to work, Foreman rolled over, Foreman started the slow head-agonizing lift of all that foundered bulk God somehow gave him and whether he heard the count or no, was on his feet a fraction after the count of ten… he walked in docile steps to his corner and did not resist” (Mailer, 1999: 208).
The profound importance of Ali to the history of civil rights in America is a matter of uncontested record. The power of his personal bravery and charismatic personality created an iconic presence in the history of those days and resonates with the struggle for civil rights in many contexts, both within and beyond the USA. Ali had a unique ability to communicate through a combination of conviction and humor:

> Where are the colored angels? They must be in the kitchen preparing the milk and honey. … Even Tarzan, the king of the jungle in black Africa, he’s white!\(^{74}\)

Cassius Clay (Ali’s birth name) consciously disconnected with the white America of Jim Crow, segregation, racial prejudice. The assumption of the name Muhammad Ali in 1964 at the age of twenty-two accompanied his conversion to Islam and expressed a symbolic rejection of the values of that America. Ali was almost certainly inspired by Malcom X who rejected his surname Little in 1950 because, he argued, it represented a designation derived from slavery. Later, Malcolm was to take the name el-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz. The question of individual and community naming signifies the degree to which identities were conflicted and contested.\(^{75}\) Ali’s refusal to fight in Vietnam translated that stance into high-profile political action.

The statement he made in 1967 explicitly signals rejection of American policy and historical identity:

> I’m not going 10,000 miles from home to help murder and burn another poor nation simply to continue the domination of white slave masters of the darker people the world over. This is the day when such evils must come to an end… I will not disgrace my religion, my people or myself by becoming a tool to enslave those who are fighting for their own justice, freedom and equality… I have nothing to lose by standing up for my beliefs. So I’ll go to jail, so what? We’ve been in jail for 400 years (quoted by Marqusee, 1999: 214-215)

\(^{74}\) Address to students at Howard University, April 22, Washington, DC.

His alliance with the Nation of Islam (which he later renounced) demonstrates rejection of the national values and Christian norms of the USA. It parallels the redefinition of black communities expressed through the transition of naming: “Negro” was essentially a racial designation; “Black” is a definition based on color, a subcategory of the more inclusive term “people of color”; “African American” implies a dual identity built around a synthesis that modifies the relationship with mainstream America. The transition from “Negro” to “Black” reflected a political shift in rhetoric and a growing militancy most powerfully represented by Stokley Carmichael (who later became Kwame Ture). In the context of the Black Power Movement, the designation created an identity intentionally opposite to, and distinctive from, the white—a dichotomy framed by opposites in conflict:

There is a psychological war going on in this country and it’s whether or not black people are going to be able to use the terms they want about their movement without white people’s blessing. We have to tell them we are going to use the term “Black Power” and we are going to define it because Black Power speaks to us.

The fluidity of naming is an example of the process in which identity is not so much a matter of inheritance but rather of invention: a statement of political intent. This act of naming at a personal and community level becomes, as Ralph Ellison noted, a matter of a choice through which you define identity: “Some people are your relatives but others are your ancestors, and you choose the ones you want to have as ancestors. You create yourself out of those values.”

The Rumble in the Jungle offers an event full of paradoxes and contradictions that, in microcosm, resonate with the idea of Africa in the American mind. The name that Don King gave to this fight perpetuated a stereotypical notion of Africa. Kinshasa in 1974 was the capital of Zaire (now the Democratic

---

77 In an interview, Time Magazine, “Teaching: Desegregated History,” Friday, March 27, 1964
78 Don King was the promoter of this fight and many others. The origin of the term “Rumble in the Jungle” is disputed, however. It may have originated with Ali and been taken up by King. Ali was certainly capable of what would now be seen as politically incorrect remarks as well as enforcing negative stereotypes. He was reported to have said to the press before the fight: “All you who think George Foreman is gonna whup me; when you get to Africa, Mobutu’s people are gonna put you in a pot, cook you, and eat you” (quoted by Marqusee, 1999: 268)
Republic of the Congo) with an estimated population of almost two million people—far from the jungle of popular imagination.

Ironically, few countries had a worse record of civil rights than Zaire. Mobuto’s disregard for the rights of citizens was notorious. The motives for moving the fight to Zaire were nakedly financial. The event was named in a manner that enforced stereotype. It took place in a stadium that had witnessed State murder, in a country with a record of civil rights immeasurably worse than that of the USA, in which the victims were exclusively black. The leader of this country was a corrupt, tyrannical figure without any claim to moral or political validity. Despite all the ironies inherent in the location of this fight, there was a symbolic statement embedded in the African location. The relocation of a key event in American sporting history implicitly suggested that this was a more appropriate location for black fighters than hostile America. It represents a version of Africa that had little to do with Zaire, Mobutu, or the moral and political corruption in that country. This Africa is a concept, a dreamed landscape.

The Ali-Foreman fight exemplifies the kinds of complexities that accumulate around the idea of Africa in the history of civil rights and in the collocation of African with American. As a political model, Africa rarely offers a model of enforcement of civil rights: an affinity with many countries in Africa is problematic in that the record of treatment of citizens is significantly worse than is the norm within the USA.79

The version of Africa that is represented in African-American identity is not drawn from the Africa of nations where independence and self-determination were often followed by leadership that became corrupt and totalitarian.80 Instead, the association is with symbolic and mythical meaning.

79 By way of example, LGBT rights are only comparable to those of the USA in South Africa. As Peter Tatchell notes elsewhere in this volume, in many countries homosexuality is criminalized with punishments that include imprisonment and, in the most extreme cases, the possibility of capital punishment. Gender and religious discrimination is widespread. It would take a highly-selective view to see anywhere in Africa as an exemplary model of civil rights in action.

80 Mobutu is one example. Sadly, the list of African leaders who adapted totalitarian practices (with a varying disregard for the civil rights of citizens) includes Ahmed Sekou Toure (Guinea), Milton Obote and Idi Amin (Uganda), Kenneth Kaunda (Zambia), Robert Mugabe (Zimbabwe).
Africa in the Mind

I am a Londoner raised in an environment in which Africa was a place almost beyond our urchin imaginations. If we envisioned it at all, it was through the lens of that most colonial of figures: Tarzan, a noble savage with an English sensibility.

We were dimly aware that Africa was a real place; we had seen it in dog-eared atlases. Now and again bits of Africa would be in the news as places inexplicably (so we thought) seeking independence from the British Empire. For most of us, though, Africa was a blank space that we filled with fantasy. When we imagined it, it was never as a collection of countries or cities with economies, borders, political systems. It was as an idea.

It was only as I limped towards the illusion of adulthood that Africa entered my consciousness in any kind of concrete shape. I became aware of the struggles for self-determination, learned of Nkrumah, Kenyatta, Nyerere, Senghor (who was both a poet and a politician), Mandela. I acquired some kind of political consciousness and protested against the moral quagmire of Apartheid in South Africa. In particular, I studied the tragic intimacy between Africa and America based upon the hideous history of slavery.

Africa became most real to me when I entered the field of international education. I became involved in projects in Tunisia, Morocco, and Egypt, and managed programs for American students in South Africa, created study abroad opportunities in Kenya, and fell in love with Ghana.

I became a fairly frequent visitor and, as a consequence, learned that Africa was actually a set of separate nations with borders, politics, languages, identities, and histories.

I also learned that Africa was not just this huge collection of diverse nations, mostly artificially invented by colonial powers. I rediscovered that there was indeed another “Africa” manifest in the ways in which we represent that space in the rhetoric of study abroad. In the streets of East London when we pretended to be Tarzan, we were inadvertently inventing the space we called Africa. It was, of course, a simplistic distortion of reality forged in
the adolescent imagination. In study abroad we draw upon another, more complex and challenging set of assumptions to recreate Africa into an alternative but similarly constructed vision.

This Africa resonates with a wound that is unhealed, a history that is unresolved, and an atrocity that still divides America just beneath the surface of national consciousness. No truth and reconciliation process has liberated America from the legacy of slavery.

**Africa and Europe: Dreamed Spaces**

Africa is, of course, a set of distinctive locations offering widely different educational possibilities. It is simultaneously a single potent space. The promotion of “non-traditional” locations in study abroad rarely focuses on individual nations. Instead, we prioritize “Africa” as a location. This is curiously similar to that manner in which a version of Europe is represented. Both Africa and Europe exist in two dimensions: as distinctive continents and beyond geography as concepts shaped by historical and mythical associations; they exist as constructions of the mind.

Europe is a collection of frequently fragile nations; where is Yugoslavia? What is United about the United Kingdom? Does Italy make sense? It is also an uneasy alliance constructed after World War II to minimize the danger of yet another cataclysmic conflict in the region. However, in study abroad, Europe is frequently represented as a synthesis of high art, complex social structures, historical depth, and so on. It is not only a set of nations, but a concept that runs deep in American consciousness: the space envisaged by writers as diverse as Washington Irving, Henry James, Mark Twain, and Henry Miller. It represents a site for a secular pilgrimage.

Africa also exists at many levels: a concept invented largely by colonial authorities (not unlike the way in which the “Orient” is an invention of the western consciousness); it is also a profoundly symbolic space for all Americans, what James Baldwin characterized as “the fearful conundrum of Africa” (Baldwin, 1969a [1961]: 185).
For African-American students, the idea of Africa clearly has a very particular significance. It is embedded in a dual identity. When we speak of Africa as a destination (rather than as separate countries), we are going beyond political and national rationale to enlist a myth of origin. Myth is not used in this context to suggest an illusion but rather to suggest the opposite: a profound and embedded notion of connection.

Barack Obama contemplates precisely this Africa as he prepares to visit Kenya, his father’s homeland:

I had been forced to look inside myself and had found only a great emptiness there...Would this trip to Kenya finally fill that emptiness? The folks back in Chicago thought so. It’ll be just like Roots, Will had said at my going-away party. A pilgrimage, Asante had called it. For them, as for me, Africa had become an idea more than an actual place, a new promised land, full of ancient traditions and sweeping vistas, noble struggles and talking drums. With the benefit of distance, we engaged Africa in a selective embrace... (Obama, 2004 [1995]: 302)

The Africa envisaged by Obama represents a cluster of concepts that are pervasive. It promises a reconnection with a notion of home that transcends geography by resonating with biblical significance: a pilgrimage to a promised land. The combination of myths of nobility, natural beauty, and rich history offers a seductive synthesis: a route back towards a dream of origin that compensates for a sense of problematic selfhood.

Clearly, Europe and Africa have a significance that goes beyond geography. Europe represents a perceived absence in American social and creative life; Africa raises profound questions of identity and history that reaches into the heart of the American psyche. For African-American students, it connects with the idea of a lost home: a heritage that asserts continuity and pride of origin.

Africa and Zion: Dreamed Spaces

America's relationship with the idea of Africa is paradoxical, complex, and painful; it occupies a special place in African-American identity: a collective
memory of violent expulsion. It is a dreamed landscape, elusive in the real worlds we inhabit. This perception permeates Maya Angelou’s memoir of her return to Ghana, *All God’s Children Need Traveling Shoes*:

> We had come home, and if home was not what we had expected, never mind, our need for belonging allowed us to ignore the obvious and to create real places or even illusory places, befitting our imagination (2008 [1987]: 19)

In this respect, it resonates with the notion of Zion for diaspora Jews: a metaphor for a lost home in which persecuted minorities belong without the need to justify, defend, or hide identity for fear of hostility from the world outside. This is not to suggest that the relationship between blacks and Jews was unproblematic in the context of civil rights or in America in general. Jews had pivotal roles in the founding and development of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In the civil rights struggle many Jews were committed activists. However, there are also profound complexities and divisions between the two minorities. This is a massive subject that extends beyond the reach of this discussion. In this context, the parallel between images of Zion and Africa are manifest in the myths and metaphors of separation rather than in the politics of community relations.

What most unites Jewish and black identity is a legacy of suffering and humiliation that demands transformation and validation, that has to be invested with meaning. The connection is noted by Barack Obama, by James Baldwin, and Maya Angelou, and is manifest in the lyrics of traditional Negro spirituals. Baldwin, for example, identifies a synergy between biblical sources and the suffering of slaves:

> The languages of the suffering Christ and the suffering Jew are wedded with the image of the suffering slave, and they are one; the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light (Baldwin, 1969b [1955]: 56)

Explicit connections are found in lyrics of spirituals as exemplified by “Go Down Moses”: 
Go down Moses
Way down in Egypt land
Tell old Pharaoh to
Let my people go (Traditional)

Maya Angelou, with greater skepticism, summarizes the relationship between biblical origins and the desire for location that contains an implicit recognition of aspiration beyond possibility:

Our people had always longed for home. For centuries we had sung about a place not built with hands, where the streets were paved with gold, and were washed with honey and milk. There the saints would march around wearing white robes and jeweled crowns. There at last, we would study war no more and, more important, no one would wage war against us again.

The old black deacons, ushers, mothers of the church, and junior choirs only partially meant heaven as that desired destination. In the yearning, heaven and Africa were inextricably combined (Angelou, 2008 [1987]: 20)

Africa is an alternative space to the troubled histories of the USA: Billie Holiday’s “Strange Fruit,” Jim Crow, inequality, persecution. Africa is history, myth, poetry, origin, and community consciousness. Like Auschwitz-Birkenau in the psyche of the Jews, these histories and iconic spaces permeate the consciousness: an ache that does not end; a pain that will not be cured. There is, however, a fracture between dreamed landscape and realities of place. Israel is not Zion. The American dream of Africa may be based upon unreal expectations.

Maya Angelou suggests that the notion of return is a futile aspiration:

I doubted if I, or any black from the diaspora, could really return to Africa. We wore skeletons of old despair like necklaces (2008 [1987]: 84)

Angelou’s images signal the degree to which the legacy of the past is a burden carried into the present. The dead bones of the past are worn like
the iron collars of slavery. In Billie Holiday’s version of “Strange Fruit,” the skeletons of old despair are victims of lynching rendered more perversely shocking through the metaphor: fruit, which we associate with growth and nourishment, is transformed into the shape of nightmare. The relative understatement in the adjective “strange” creates probably the most profound expression of historical anguish that has ever been voiced:

Southern trees bear a strange fruit,
Blood on the leaves and blood at the root,
Black bodies swinging in the southern breeze,
Strange fruit hanging from the poplar trees.
...Here is a strange and bitter crop81

Billie Holiday reaches into the core of a discussion that is difficult in both the heart and the mind. However far from conditions of persecution and enslavement, inherited memory, Angelou’s old skeletons, return to infect the present: “You can be up to your boobies in white satin, with gardenias in your hair and no sugar cane for miles, but you can still be working on a plantation” (Holiday, 1992 [1956]: 97).

However, the history of slavery does not unite African Americans with Africans. The return to Africa as home is likely to be frustrated by political and social realities. Exploration of home is, in this context, more likely to be achieved by imagination rather than through travel: a journey into the creative self rather than into space. Duke Ellington’s suite “Black, Brown, and Beige” recreates in music early African-American experience. Alex Hayley’s Roots uses imaginative recreation as a mode of return. There are many other powerful examples of creative artists, most notably in jazz, creating a sense of reconnection through acts of imagination; excursions into the soul rather than into contemporary Africa.

81 “Strange Fruit” was written by Abel Meeropol and first performed by Billie Holiday in 1939. Its persistent power is reflected in the fact that it has been consistently part of the repertoire of many singers ever since. Nina Simone’s version was as intense and powerful as Billie Holiday’s.
The Ache for Home: African-American Students in Africa

*He never had the sense of home so much as when he felt that he was going there. It was only when he got there that his homelessness began.*

Thomas Wolfe, *You Can’t Go Home Again*

The idea of Africa as a mythic homeland offers powerful learning opportunities for African-American students precisely because of the gap between expectation and reality. In that context, Maya Angelou’s ambiguous experiences in Ghana ought to be required reading for all students before they study in Africa.

Ghana is a learning laboratory in which to analyze and explore the building of national identity, the challenges that arise from a nation-state facing issues that beset the Global South, the coexistence of aspiration towards modernity, the retention of traditions, and so on. It is also a rich environment in which to contrast the myths and realities of slavery.\(^{82}\)

However, the experience of studying in Africa renders the duality of identity problematic. African-American students may well not be treated as distinct from the American peer group. They are also probably separated by relative prosperity and behavioral patterns from their African peers. An expectation of exceptional empathy is likely to lead to disappointment as is the assumption that there is a common consciousness of shared history.

This leads to the critical question of the significance of the collocation of African and American and the consequent implications for transnational history and identity. A shared sense of common origin cannot be assumed. The degree to which African-American students identify with Africa will inform expectations and can be employed to encourage challenging introspection and reflection.

We also need to be aware of what Africa we are promoting in the rhetoric of study abroad. There is a case for focusing on both versions: the mythic

\(^{82}\) This is the subject of CAPA’s Summer Seminar in Accra. For general information, go to: [www.capa.org](http://www.capa.org)
construct and the particularities of nationhood. In any case, we need to be explicit about the distinction. The degree to which Africa is romanticized or idealized needs to be a conscious part of the educational agenda as should those negative images that conversely shape perceptions of Africa. These questions focus on our own embedded assumptions as well as on external representations that may reflect political and popular prejudices. Demystifying Africa is a core academic responsibility.

Finally, Maya Angelou raises an issue that relates to African-American experience in Africa but that also speaks to a universal element in the human condition. The idea of Africa embodies what she calls “the ache for home.” The idea of home is a critical aspect of how we define ourselves. We all share the pain of separation. We have all lost our home, whether we call that place childhood, Eden, Zion, or, indeed, Africa:

The story of the black Americans trying to return home is the central story. It is central in that all human beings look for home. It is given to us (Harris, 1986)
Evolution of Identity Through Study Abroad: Moroccan Influences and My Practice of Islam

Carrie Campbell, Undergraduate Student (Class of 2017), Beloit College

Editors’ Notes

It is a difficult and anxious time to be a Muslim in America. Islamophobia is on the rise and has been stoked further by Donald Trump’s election campaign rhetoric and policy-making to date, including remarks that Muslims “hate” Americans, a proposed “Muslim registry,” and the implementation of the so-called Muslim travel ban. Still more extreme voices have called Islamophobia “rational,” (Michael Flynn) or described American Muslims as “termites” hollowing out civil society (Frank Gaffney). In such a climate of fear and suspicion, it is perhaps little wonder that there has been a reported spike in hate crimes and harassment since the election, even in formerly Muslim-friendly places such as Michigan or New York City (de Bellaigue, 2017; Malik, 2017).

Carrie Campbell is an undergraduate student at Beloit College (class of 2017), majoring in Religious Studies and Anthropology. Her presentation at Beloit College’s International Symposium, which focused on her identity, diverse family background, and experience abroad, was the inspiration for this paper on the impact of her religious practice on her everyday life in the United States and the role of her experiences studying abroad in shaping her beliefs. Her personal story reminds us that America’s Muslim communities are hugely diverse in identity, ethnicity, and geographical location and defy lazy generalization. Overall numbers are uncertain since the Census does not ask direct questions about faith; estimates vary from between three to eight million people. Roughly a quarter of these are African American; some are recent immigrants from Arab countries; a further fifth, like Carrie, are converts (Holpuch, Pilkington and Goyette, 2016).
Despite being a significantly under-represented group in political life and influence (there are currently two Muslim members of Congress), election night saw the arrival of Ilhan Omar, the first Somali American legislator in the US and the first Muslim woman to hold office in Minnesota, a harbinger, it is to be hoped, of a more inclusive future (Holpuch, Pilkington and Goyette, 2016). Likewise, Carrie’s story is an uplifting one and speaks of great integrity and strength of character in the face of ignorance and hatred.

When I think about myself before I studied abroad, I feel that I did understand who I was and the identities that I hold, but what I struggled with was appreciating what it all meant or why it mattered. Before I get into my experience in Morocco and the answers that I found there, it is important that I give you some background information so you can understand where I am coming from and the things that have influenced my life.

The first part of who I am is that I identify as bi-racial. What that means is that my mother is white and my father is black. Yet that is not something that you would realize just by looking at me—or at least most people do not. The response that I get when people find out that I am from a mixed family is always surprise—and almost shock at times—because it does not show in my outward appearance. I may be “tan” year-round, but I have light skin, blonde hair, and bright blue eyes which are not common characteristics for someone of African descent. I have an older sister with the same parents as me, but her skin shows something different than mine. If you look at her she looks black. She has darker skin, dark hair, and brown eyes. When most people look at us together, they assume that we are just friends, rather than being full-blooded sisters.

When I am with my sister and my dad and we go out places, you can see the confusion on some people’s faces as we walk by. It is as if they are thinking, “Why is this white girl walking around with these black people? She doesn’t fit in.” You would think that at this point in history we would be in a place where it would not be such a shock that there are interracial couples and that they have children. So, something that I take with me all the time is an awareness about who I am and the different backgrounds from which I come. I understand that when people look at me that is not something that they see. There is just an assumption that I am some “random” white girl.
I am not denying my privilege, but I have to be honest, it is painful to have a whole half of you ripped away because people outside do not believe that you look like what they think you should look like if you were actually part of that identity. Even though I personally feel like I should have a voice and have legitimacy in movements such as the Black Lives Matter movement or other social organizations, I feel that the way I physically present implies to other people that I should not have any kind of authority with the issues they address, even though half of my family goes through these struggles every day—and I also go through them, just on a different level.

An experience that has really stuck with me was one that I had on the Beloit College campus during my sophomore year. I was going to donate my blood for the first time, so I had to fill out a card with my personal information on it. One of the sections that had to be filled out was about ethnicity. But there was only an option to check one box. So, here I am in 2014 looking at this card and having to decide which half of myself I should present to them since I only have one option for race or ethnicity. However, there was a box that I could check that was labeled “other.” So, I decided to check that box. I gave the card to the woman working at the table and she went through my information. She stopped at the section with which I had been struggling, looked at it confusedly, and then she said to me, “So, what are you?” I cannot tell you how many times I have gotten this question throughout my life... So, I told her, “Well, I’m bi-racial—I’m half black and half white, but there is no option for me to put that—so I checked ‘other.’” When I told her that, she acted like she had no idea that bi-racial people even existed. She was practically shocked. I tell you this to give you an understanding of the identity that I hold, even if it may not be what you think it is when you look at me.

In fall of 2014, I decided that I wanted to convert to Islam. It is important to know that before then, I would say that I was not really at all religious. I was, and to some extent still am, the type of person who had a hard time believing in religion; something that was, in my mind, impossible to prove physically. I have always been of the mindset that if there is no evidence for the existence of these things, or for this higher power, then how can they possibly be real? However, I did not want to be in that situation: I wanted to believe, and I wanted to have faith. But it was hard for me. I grew up with a Christian family although my family is not “super” religious. When I was
younger, we would always do things that showed Christianity present in our lives, like praying before every meal, and before bed. I went to church a few times, but it was never a regular thing for me. However, for as long as I can remember, I never felt like Christianity was what was right for me. I do not really know why that is.

Everyone is always curious about why I chose to become a Muslim. I was introduced to the religion for the first time just a few months before I came to Beloit, and something about it made me want to keep learning more. I took it upon myself to find avenues that would help me gain a greater understanding of the religion. I ended up taking a couple of classes during my freshman year that were being offered by a visiting professor. One of them was an Arabic language class, and another was about gendered bodies in Islam. They certainly helped me to understand the nature of Islam more clearly, but I would say that the things that I did in my personal life outside of classes had a still greater impact on me. For example, I was in contact with Muslim people from around the world, from whom I learned a great deal. I think that a major reason why I wanted to join the religion was because these people, who were representatives of Islamic values, made me feel so comfortable and welcome. I wanted that sense of community, which seemed so strong among the Muslims that I encountered.

When I converted to Islam, the biggest influences were other Muslims from around the world in places like Egypt, Sudan, and Saudi Arabia, whom I had met online. These people became great friends of mine and were very encouraging and excited for me to take the journey that I had decided to take. Most of my friends from these places were men, so the advice that I was being given about things that I should do as a Muslim were coming from them. I did not know any Muslim Americans at all. A huge part of Islam that was really emphasized to me by them was modesty. They would give me advice about how to dress, and one of those aspects was wearing a headscarf. The thing about wearing a headscarf—which is often referred to as the hijab—is that it clearly marks you visually as being part of this group of people. When I converted to Islam, I did not find aspects of Islamic practice such as not eating pork or drinking alcohol difficult, but I did struggle with covering my hair. It was something that I found particularly difficult because for nineteen years I had not covered my hair. I had been perceived a certain way by all the
people in my life and within the groups of which I had been a part. Suddenly changing this caused a shift in our relationship. In the United States, the idea of the headscarf causes all kinds of uproar because it clearly defines a Muslim woman. Moreover, the media has portrayed Islam in an extremely negative light here, and continues to do so. It was a very difficult decision to make, and a difficult process to go through, to put myself willingly into a situation which, even before I had tried it, I knew would be uncomfortable in public spaces. However, at the time, my understanding of the religion was based a lot on the advice that these Muslims from other places had given me, so I thought, “Okay, to be a good Muslim, I should do these specific things.” One of these things was to cover my hair.

I first started to experiment with scarves just in front of the mirror, seeing what it would look like, and how I could make it work with the clothes that I owned. I did not tell my family though because it invoked a kind of fear in me. Although for the most part my family respects the choices that I make, to change my appearance in that way would not only affect me but would also affect them. The first time that I covered my hair in public, I went to the mall by myself and I walked around wearing it, and it felt incredibly uncomfortable. I would get these terrible stares from people walking by me, as if this piece of fabric on my head had completely changed their view of my character. There were also looks of hate that I would get from people which were nothing like I had ever experienced before. It was a different kind of look than the one you get when you walk with your interracial family down the street, one less about confusion and non-acceptance and more about anger and hate. I knew that it was going to be hard, but I still did it anyway. It was actually a couple of months before I started to wear the headscarf in public with my family because that was another hurdle that had to be jumped. At one point, I was in the car going home with my mom and my siblings and my mom said to me, “Do you see the way people stare at you?” Although I did notice people looking at me at that point, maybe I did not notice this so much—but my mom noticed every little thing.

When I had the opportunity to study abroad in Morocco, it affected my life in lots of different ways, but the most impactful moment for me was an extremely short one. I was eating lunch with friends; one of their roommates came to sit with us. Her name was Sophia, and she was a Moroccan univer-
sity student. That day, I had chosen not to cover my hair, and I was feeling somewhat insecure about this because until then for the entire time I had been on campus, I had been covering my hair. Sophia sat down next to me and started a conversation about the rights that you have as a Muslim woman, particularly the right to choose the way you want to present yourself, and that no one way of presenting yourself is better than another. It was only a moment in my life, but that small moment gave me confidence in knowing that I could choose. I can choose to be whoever I want to be, and follow whatever religion I want to follow, and no one has the right to tell me that I do not “belong” because I am not doing something in a particular way, or because I do not look a certain way.

While covering your hair often does mark you out as being Muslim, it is not the be all and end all. I would say that about half of the girls on campus at the University in Morocco cover their hair and the other half do not, but the overwhelming majority of the girls there are Muslim. However, for these women, being in a country in which Islam is dominant means that everyone is likely to assume that they are Muslim. There, the headscarf does not act as the same kind of marker that it does in other countries with Muslim minorities, such as the United States. While I stopped wearing the hijab about halfway through my study abroad experience, and I did not wear it when I returned to the United States, I do still sometimes have the feeling that I should wear it again. I think that mostly this comes from the fact that this does mark me out as being Muslim, and this is something of which I am proud. I want people to know that I carry this identity because this is an identity that is often looked down upon in this country and has a perceived reputation of its followers being terrorists. If I can be a representative for the religion and show people that Islam is not, in fact, all the terrible things that people say it is, that seems like an important thing to do. I feel it is important not only for the religion itself, but also for the safety of the people who follow it in this country and around the world. Muslims are targeted because of the misconceptions that surround them. Because Islam tends to be perceived as affiliated with a certain group of people who look a certain way, if I do not cover my hair there is not necessarily anything about me physically that says I am Muslim. Nobody would know unless I told them. This leaves me in a dilemma as to whether I should or should not wear the hijab, and questioning the legitimacy of my own reasons for wanting to wear it.
There were no Muslims in the predominantly white, conservative community in which we grew up, so none of us knew anything about Islam aside from what we saw in the media. I could not have asked for better siblings to support me on my personal journey: they gave me so much love and support. I also take pride in my siblings’ desire to learn more about Islam. Due to my experiences, I have been able to put my younger siblings on a path towards acceptance of others as well as a deeper understanding of this religion. For example, often my little brother would tell me the bad things that people in school had said about Muslims and how he defended Islam. He would tell them, I have a Muslim sister and this is the way things are—not that way. Once, he spoke up in class when the teacher was saying bad things or incorrect information: he was not afraid. Just a few weeks ago, he told me that he had chosen me as the subject for his class project about his personal hero because I had taught him how to be brave. Despite everything that I have gone through on my journey, that moment was when I actually realized why it matters so much. My brother understands that you cannot sit back and let people discriminate and say terrible things about a group of people when you know it is wrong. If I can be a role model, even if only for my brother and sister—even if they are the only two that I could influence—all the struggles are worthwhile because now there are two more people in the world that will be willing and able to fight for what is right. I have the right—and everyone else in the world has the right—to be the person that I want to be without others putting restrictions on me.

If the 2016 Presidential Election has done anything for us, for some people it has brought the divides and the issues in this country closer to the surface. No matter how you feel about the outcome, and no matter how much it may have an impact on your life, now is the time for us to stand up and demand the rights that we deserve as human beings. We are all equal and no one deserves to have to live every moment of their life in fear. Now is when we come together, with love and support, and fight for what is right.
The future we are entering…will be shaped not only by technology and power but also by the dispossessed. The past shows us that history has also been made by the excluded.

Saskia Sassen
What happens in our cities, simply put, matters more than what happens anywhere else. Cities are the world’s experimental laboratories and thus a metaphor for an uncertain age (Parag Khanna, 2010)

The self-proclaimed “global strategist” Parag Khanna has boldly claimed that the crucible of the global future is an urban one, that the “age of nations” is over (2010). Yet this future is perhaps more uncertain and contested than ever before. If Khanna focuses on the possibilities offered by the digital technology and physical infrastructure of what he calls “connectography” as the foundation of future global “civilization” (2016), a more complex vision is provided by Darran Anderson’s investigations into the urban imagination. Here, the cityscape itself is offered up as a kind of psychic screen onto which we project the “flickering shadow play” of our collective hopes and fears, the “urban unconscious” delicately suspended somewhere between utopia and dystopia (Anderson, 2015: 15). The city becomes the arena for these competing visions, its surfaces and spaces a battleground of contested values. Anderson observes how, among the various graffiti that appeared around the Sorbonne during the Paris Spring of May 1968, one example speaks ambiguously to us today: “the future will only contain what we put into it now” (Anderson, 2016).

It has become a commonplace to argue that we live in uncertain times, an era in which human and civil rights have moved to the forefront of political and ethical debate. Since the 2008 global financial crisis, there has been a proliferation of new research exploring—and critiquing—the relationship between contemporary capitalism and questions of social justice. Thomas Piketty’s Capital in the Twenty-First Century (2014), Richard Wilkinson and
Kate Pickett’s *Spirit Level* (2009), and Saskia Sassen’s *Expulsions* (2014) have perhaps been amongst the most high-profile and provocative interventions in this field. Nevertheless, dominant discourses have continued to focus on concepts of individual rights such as those associated with identity politics, private property rights, or the profit motive, rather than on collective rights, and have thus done little to challenge the global supremacy of neoliberal ideas (Harvey, 2012: 3).

Cities have increasingly become the primary battlegrounds of these competing values. This is not surprising, given that the majority of the world’s population now lives in urban areas (fifty-four percent) with recent projections suggesting that this proportion will rise to two thirds by 2050 (UN, 2014). Moreover, cities, as Lewis Mumford reminds us in his classic work, *The Culture of Cities*, have long reflected the changing power relations of the state along with its patterns of inequality (1938: 3-6). More recently, the sociologist and urban theorist Saskia Sassen has argued that, in a global era, cities have emerged as strategic sites for understanding some of the major new trends reconfiguring the social order (Sassen, 2011: 575) as well as the primary arena where its contradictions and effects materialize and are concentrated, generating a whole range of new types of social and political conflicts (576).

Shortly before the events of the Paris Spring, the French Marxist philosopher and sociologist Henri Lefebvre had coined the phrase “Right to the City” to describe the emergence of a diverse range of civil rights movements in the rapidly urbanizing Global South. What these movements all had in common was a central demand that people, not capital or the state, must have control over how cities are designed, shaped, and run (Lefebvre, 1968). Here, the city becomes a potentially revolutionary space for collective action. For the geographer David Harvey, the “Right to the City” is a struggle over far more than individual liberties to access different urban resources:

...it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city. It is, moreover, a common rather than an individual right since this transformation inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization. The freedom to make and remake our cities and ourselves is, I want to argue, one of the most precious yet most neglected of our human rights (Harvey, 2008: 23)
Over the last decade, Right to the City movements have undergone something of a revival and are now reportedly active in dozens of cities around the world (Brenner et al., 2011). One notable recent example is that of the formation of a national Right to the City Alliance by a variety of urban social movements at the US Social Forum in Atlanta in June 2007, which brought together groups struggling against diverse issues such as homelessness, gentrification, and the criminalization of the poor across the United States. Yet, more often the agents of revolutionary change—urban inhabitants—are fragmented and divided, “multiple in...aims and needs...itinerant, disorganized and fluid” (Harvey, 2012: xii-xiii). The saturation of the neoliberal urban environment by techniques of niche marketing, the wholesale commodification of urban life, and the creeping privatization of public space have all contributed to “intense possessive individualism” becoming the dominant “template for human socialization,” driving “political withdrawal from collective forms of action” (Harvey, 2008: 32). The marginalization of organized labor and the proliferation of insecure, part-time work associated with the emergent urban precariat working in the so-called “gig economy” have made questions of urban citizenship even more problematic.

Global cities, which are both the showcase and incubator for neoliberal globalization, have thus become laboratories where established notions of citizenship, democracy, and civil society have increasingly been brought into question. In his study of contemporary politics in the global city, Raymond Rocco argues that the kind of cosmopolitan spaces created by multidimensional processes of globalization operate as strategic sites for the formation of new transnational identities and communities, and therefore, have become the crucible for forging new “associational” networks of civic engagement demanding increased rights to the city and social justice (Rocco, 2000: 218-240). London has become one such laboratory: in her case study of London as a global city entitled World City (2007), one of the most significant theorists of cities and globalization, the geographer Doreen Massey,
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83 The sociological term precariat describes the new social class of people whose lives are difficult—precarious—because they lack job security and few employment rights, providing them with very little or no financial stability. It is often associated with the proliferation of part-time, temporary, or casual forms of employment that have accompanied post-credit crunch public spending cuts and changes to the labor market in the UK, such as agency work and so-called “zero-hours” contracts, as well as low-paid retail and service jobs. For further details, see Guy Standing’s analysis, The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class (2011).
asks a critical question about this specific city and, by implication, cities in general—what does this place stand for? For Massey, the global city is a precursor of the global future. Moreover, the scope of global cities’ power and the impact which they have on the rest of the world mean that they also have global responsibilities as agents, as well as products, of neoliberal globalization. London’s identity as a global city is, therefore, fundamentally conflicted. It represents itself as the world within a city, a site of diverse forms of self-expression, ethnic “super-diversity,” and individual freedoms—a place for all—yet at the same time its nature as a site of drastic inequalities and agent of their global diffusion threatens all of this, and must be challenged. Successful multiculturalism, she argues, depends ultimately on actively combating inequality on the urban stage (Massey, 2007: 1-26).

As the outcome of the EU referendum reminded us all with stark clarity, Britain is an unequal country, much more so than most other industrialized countries, and social inequalities have widened considerably across the country in recent decades. Recent findings of the Equality Trust place the UK seventh out of thirty OECD countries for income inequality and fourth most unequal in Europe. According to the same report, wealth in the UK in 2012-14 was even more unevenly divided than income, with the richest ten percent of households holding forty-five percent of all wealth and the poorest fifty percent, by contrast, just 8.7 percent (Equality Trust, 2017). Cosmopolitan, super-diverse London, as the showcase of Britain’s open economy, has concentrated and exacerbated those tendencies while also gathering together the inequalities of the wider world. London is a city riddled with the social contradictions of its success: a formidable and highly successful money-making machine that nevertheless faces a daunting mix of problems. Today, London is one of the richest cities in the world, but arguably amongst the most unequal in the Global North, a situation which has become further entrenched in recent years as the long-term global implications of the credit crunch have played out at local level across its neighborhoods and communities.

Behind the famous skylines and historic buildings lies a picture of widespread deprivation. The cost of living is among the very highest in the world. A recent survey by The Economist placed London as sixth among the world’s most expensive cities for everyday living costs. Basic utilities costs—water, electricity, gas—have risen many times the rate of inflation; average grocery
bills are higher here than anywhere else in the world (except Tokyo), while public transport costs are some of the highest in Europe, with relatively poor reliability (The Economist, 2016). The 2009 London Poverty Profile, produced by the charitable organization Trust for London, demonstrated the highest rates of poverty and inequality of any region in the UK, with more people to be found in the city with an income in either the top ten percent or the bottom ten percent nationally than anywhere else in the country (Trust for London, 2009). A year later, the National Equality Panel on economic inequality in the UK reported that the richest tenth of Londoners possessed 273 times the wealth of the poorest tenth of the city’s inhabitants (Hills, Brewer et al, 2010: 247-8), a situation not seen since the days of a slave-owning elite (Dorling, 2011: 91-92; Ramesh, 2010). The 2015 London Poverty Profile notes that twenty-seven percent of Londoners live in poverty (by the agreed international definition) with a majority of them living in working families. The cost of housing is identified as a major factor. It is no surprise therefore that homelessness should be an acute issue: the number of rough sleepers reached 7,500 in 2014-15, the highest figure since data started to be collected. The “hidden homeless” of those living in overcrowded or temporary accommodation is three times higher than in the rest of England put together (Trust for London, 2015: 1-3).

Social displacement is an increasingly dominant part of the creation of the unequal city as the intrinsically mixed character of London’s neighborhoods has come under threat from an accelerated form of gentrification, now very much the cutting edge of neoliberal urban transformation. The term “gentrification” was originally coined by the urban planner and sociologist Ruth Glass in 1964, who observed the revival of Notting Hill and Islington streets by young London bohemians who had the resources to fix up attractive old houses which had become run down. For Glass, the displacement of long-standing working-class communities is intrinsic to the process (Glass, 1964). Decades later, the geographer Neil Smith is even more explicit in foregrounding the symbolic and social violence of gentrification in late twentieth-century New York as urban “pioneers” reclaim the “savage wilderness” to create what he terms the “revanchist” city (Smith, 1996: xiii-xiv).84
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84 The term “revanchist” is derived from the French revanche (revenge), associated in particular with a political imperative to reverse territorial losses which have been incurred in warfare or social conflict.
In London today, gentrification has gone global as transnational elites and footloose capital re-shape the city. Since 2008, the London property market has become an increasingly desirable target for international investment, driving an accelerated “super-gentrification” by the global super-rich in central districts such as Chelsea and Kensington as well as the displacement of previous middle-class gentrifiers from their strongholds of Hampstead and Islington (Butler and Lees, 2006; Cowell, 2015). In his vivid account of the cosmopolitan city’s social dynamics, *This is London*, Ben Judah reminds us that super-gentrification and super-diversity in London are intimately connected: Russian, Chinese, and Qatari elites drive the worst excesses of the city’s conspicuous consumption while also requiring extensive and specialized domestic services. Such services are themselves primarily undertaken by other, often poorly-paid migrants—thus sharpening social polarization as the city’s suburbs become progressively more deprived while the center becomes richer (Judah, 2016). The signifiers of such inequality have included an Iraqi kickboxing champion’s gold Ferrari convertible spotted driving in Knightsbridge (*Metro*, 2014) which proved the trailblazer for a later fleet of golden supercars owned by a Saudi billionaire, hit (to no avail) with hundreds of pounds of parking fines (*Evening Standard*, 2016). The noise and vibration being caused by the excavation of “iceberg homes,” so-called because so much of their development is hidden underground, in the form of private gyms, swimming pools, cinemas or car-parking, are now one of the most contentious planning issues in West London (Grierson, 2016).

As it burrows downward, super-gentrification simultaneously thrusts upwards. On the Thames riverbank at St. George Wharf in Vauxhall, it was recently revealed that “The Tower,” the UK’s tallest residential skyscraper at fifty stories which opened in 2013, had been sold to more than 130 foreign buyers including a Russian billionaire, the former chairman of a defunct Nigerian bank, and a Kyrgyz vodka tycoon (Booth and Bengtsson, 2016). The building has become a symbol of London’s current housing crisis along with the nearby development of 20,000 luxury apartments at Nine Elms dubbed “Dubai-on-Thames” and the exclusive complex of One Hyde Park near Harrods, where a penthouse was sold in May 2014 for £140 million (Prynn and Lynch, 2014). In each case, the primary function of the property is an investment vehicle rather than actual residence by super-rich purchasers enjoying “non-domiciled” tax status through the creation of offshore “shell” compa-
nies registered in tax havens such as the Channel or British Virgin Islands. In the aftermath of the Panama Papers revelations, it has been suggested for example that almost ten percent of the property purchased in Kensington and Chelsea is currently owned through such “secrecy jurisdictions,” and that these mechanisms are widely used for laundering the proceeds of organized crime and authoritarian régimes around the world (Evans, 2016).

The most visible symbol of this process, and a perfect microcosm of the ways in which the British capital is being transformed, is The Shard. Completed in March 2012, at seventy-two stories and 1,017 feet tall, it is still the highest building in Western Europe (although it has now been surpassed in height by three newer skyscrapers in Moscow). Designed by the Italian celebrity “starchitect,” Renzo Piano, and funded by a consortium of Qatari investors, the building embodies the literal globalization of the physical fabric of London and the ways in which the city is becoming ever more dependent on footloose, foreign capital. The Shard is ninety-five percent owned by the government of Qatar; its developer described it as a “virtual town,” one which includes a five-star hotel, the Shangri-la, as well as the headquarters of Al Jazeera UK and several Michelin-starred restaurants. Ten of its luxury apartments were quickly sold for between £30 and £50 million apiece (Chakrabortty, 2012). The sharply-tapering building is topped by a viewing gallery and observation deck, from whose lofty vantage point the city below is laid out like a map or printed circuit board. The social theorist Michel de Certeau noted that such an experience—in his case, seeing Manhattan from atop the World Trade Center—was one which “lifted [him] out of the city’s grasp.” Struck by the panoptical “gaze of power” which it provided, he went on: “One’s body is no longer clasped by the streets that turn and return it according to an anonymous law; nor is it possessed...by the rumble of so many differences” (de Certeau, 1984: 92).

Despite its visual dominance across the skyline and its role as catalyst for local urban regeneration, The Shard is still markedly disconnected from its immediate surroundings, which include the historic London Bridge and one of the capital’s busiest transport interchanges. The larger borough in which it sits, Southwark, continues to be among London’s most deprived (eighth on the Index of Multiple Deprivation in 2015), with an average life expectancy for men of seventy-eight years, placing Southwark twenty-seventh out of the
thirty-two London boroughs for this statistic (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2015).  

In 2016, Ben Wheatley’s long-awaited film adaptation of *High Rise*, J. G. Ballard’s dystopian novella (1975), arrived in British cinemas. The original novella is set in a future London—interestingly enough, although its location is not specified, Ballard leaves us numerous clues that it occupies the site of Canary Wharf, which only five years later would form the iconic centerpiece for Margaret Thatcher’s ruthless laboratory of 1980s neoliberal socio-economic experimentation, the London Docklands. Indeed, the eponymous tower block which is the backdrop for Ballard’s weirdly prescient vision of social disintegration offers a disconcerting mirror of the real No. 1 Canada Square, itself once Europe’s tallest building and the flagship of what was quickly dubbed “London’s Manhattan.” The setting is therefore both strikingly “retro” and futuristic at the same time, an ambiguity on which the film capitalizes, setting the action retrospectively in the 1970s. Indeed, the main protagonist, Robert Laing, notes at one point in a voiceover that he feels he is “living in a future that had already taken place” (Wheatley, 2016).

As the novella did in its day, the film has woven its dystopian horrors around contemporary concerns about social polarization and urban inequality. Ballard’s novella is a forensic, satirical critique of the social implications of modernist brutalism. Wheatley’s cinematic version of the story re-imagines the viciously stratified high-rise (with its super-elite penthouse and declining social gradient as one moves groundwards), as both microcosm and signifier for the urban alienation, rampant status anxiety, and decaying community cohesion which have become the touchstones of current debates about London’s future. At one point, Laing asks another character’s young son, Toby,
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85 In a response to recent data from the London Health Observatory, the director of the Institute of Health Equity at University College London, Sir Michael Marmot, noted that “the best life expectancy in London is better than the average in Japan, which has the highest in the world, and the worst compares to Guatemala,” a disparity at its widest of twenty-five years. The data itself showed the lowest male life expectancy in London in Nunhead, Southwark, at seventy-one years, compared with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, where in Bayswater and Hans Town it averaged nearly ninety-six years (*The Evening Standard*, 2014). For an accessible and hard-hitting account of health inequalities in London, see Danny Dorling’s *The 32 Stops*, a fictionalized account of a journey along the Central Line of London’s underground: “like the trace of a heartbeat on a cardiac monitor,” along which life expectancy rises and falls by up to two months a minute as one moves eastwards across the city above (Dorling, 2013: 1).
what he can see as he peers into a toy kaleidoscope. The boy replies: “the future”; as with all Ballard’s visions, this future is a dark and disorienting one. In the aftermath of the crescendo of mayhem, violence, and feral tribalism that is unleashed across the tower block, Wheatley’s *High Rise* ends with Toby listening to a radio broadcast from a newly-elected Margaret Thatcher proclaiming the virtues of political and individual freedom. For Laing, the inhabitants of the high-rise are the first to blaze a trail in this brave new world of privatized neoliberal anarchy.

What alternative visions of urban—and global—futures might we discern in the present-day global city as a counterbalance to such pessimism? The sociologist Saskia Sassen, arguably the leading scholar of globalization today, makes us focus on the complexities of the historical processes unfolding around us. For Sassen, the shape of future history is shaped primarily by the formation of new assemblages of bits and pieces of territories, political authorities, and rights, some “real,” some “virtual,” some public, some private, which are all globalized to varying degrees. Pre-Trump and Brexit, she had already prophesized that this uncertain future history would be shaped not only by technology and power, but also by the dispossessed. History, she reminds us, has also always been made by the excluded, and politics shaped even by those who lack power (Sassen, 2014: 10-11).

One example of the kind of assemblage she identifies as critical to the shaping of future history is an emergent form of collective, public space she terms the “global street,” a space of political action and protest which is categorically different from the classical European model of ritualized and formal spaces of public activity such as the piazza, square, or boulevard. By contrast, the global street (which nevertheless may include public squares and other types of open spaces) is, she argues, a distinctive social space where new forms of the political and social can be made (Sassen, 2011: 574). This social space is global because the forces which are being resisted or protested there are themselves transnational aspects of globalization. Crucially, these include deepening inequalities (or, as Sassen terms them, *exclusions*) from places and livelihoods, as well as issues of political corruption or oppression. The movements which appropriate the global street as the theater for action are also themselves transnational. For example, the agendas and practices of the *indignados* movement in Athens, Madrid, and Barcelona, protesting for jobs
and social services, as well as the various uprisings of the Arab Spring, were all overlapping. Here, the material and virtual cityscape interacted together to create the potential for socio-political transformation in the so-called “movement of the piazzas” across many Mediterranean cities. The global street is also virtual because it extends into cyberspace, as social media enable local activists in each place to organize themselves, as well as to communicate globally. Thus, global—and globalizing—cities become critical spaces where “the powerless can make history” (2011: 574), although such empowerment may in practice be partial or short-lived. Nevertheless, such movements claim new rights to the city and the city itself is re-constituted through those dynamics. The contested city is where the civic future is re-made.

London’s own status as a global city hangs in the balance, but its future is already being re-shaped as the contours of the post-Brexit city begin to emerge (Campbell, 2017). What kind of global future does this urban “assemblage” (to use Sassen’s terminology), a quintessential “factory of globalization,” stand for now? London’s new mayor, Sadiq Khan—the city’s first Muslim mayor—described by the British periodical New Statesman as the “anti-Trump,” embodies the notion of London as a diverse city of freedom and opportunity for all (Eaton, 2016). His initiatives in bilateral cooperation with Paris, proposals for a city-specific “London visa” for EU workers, and calls for greater autonomy for the city all respond directly to post-Brexit realities, but also reflect the growing influence of urban mayors and global cities as political players in their own right on the world stage. The mayor’s post-referendum campaign with its accompanying hashtag, #LondonIsOpen, has also reinforced the branding of London as global city perhaps more urgently than ever before. The new mayor’s first policies have been focused on issues such as housing, the role of transnational capital, transport, and environmental quality. Their impacts will be judged by future history. Yet, it is already clear that as the son of Pakistani immigrants, and as an ex-London bus driver, Sadiq Khan himself also offers a pluralist, and altogether more hopeful and inclusive, vision of the city’s future.
Civil rights are premised on the idea that citizens should be able to participate equally in civil and political life. Equality and democracy are therefore central to civil rights. The 17.4 million people who voted for Brexit on June 23, 2017 represent the largest number of people to have voted for anything in the history of the UK. The 16.1 million who voted to Remain represent the second largest vote in UK history. This demonstrates both the importance of the issue and the seriousness with which citizens took their role in making a decision about how we are ruled. Sadly, despite decades of concern about the increasing “apathy” of the electorate, the response to the vote from large sections of the political class, cultural elite, and academia was one of disgust with majority rule. As Mick Hume writes in *Revolting!: How the Establishment are Undermining Democracy and What They’re Afraid Of*:

> It became possible to hear it seriously proposed by some that some members of the electorate are “stupid and shouldn’t have a vote.” Or as Orwell’s oligarchical pigs might have put it, “All Voters Are Equal, But Some Voters Are More Equal Than Others” (Hume, 2017)

A YouGov survey in November 2016 found that twenty-four percent of the electorate believed the government should ignore the results of the referendum or seek to overturn it in a second referendum. Sixty-eight percent

---

86 Editors’ Note: the electorate for the EU referendum totaled 46,500,001 across the UK and Gibraltar. Members of the Commonwealth and Eire who were resident in the UK or Gibraltar were eligible to vote. Other members of the EU resident in the UK or Gibraltar (some 2.9 million) were not able to vote. Leave won 17,410,742 votes, and Remain 16,141,241. The difference between Leave and Remain was 3.8 percent or 1.3 million in favor of Leave. 12.9 million people who were eligible to do so did not vote, making a national turn-out of 72.2 percent. Leave won the majority of votes in England and Wales, while every council in Scotland saw Remain majorities, as did Gibraltar (The Electoral Commission, 2016).
of voters said the government had a duty to carry out the wishes of the electorate (YouGov, 2016). Millions of Remain voters clearly respected the democratic mandate. However, influential sections of society attempted to discredit the results by writing off large sections of the electorate as “ignorant, stupid and racist.” For example, *The Guardian* newspaper produced a post-referendum T-shirt stating “Never underestimate the power of stupid people in large numbers.”

Greg Scorzo, philosopher and editor of *Culture on the Offensive*, eloquently exposed the anti-democratic nature of some people’s reaction to the Brexit vote: “Discourse became drenched in a distinctly middle-class kind of sneering at the lower orders, a sneer covered in faux-progressive shades of sanctimonious outrage.” He continued:

Democracy requires you to collaborate with your fellow citizens in deciding the direction of your country. If your fellow citizens are so thick that they aren’t worth talking to, democracy winds up sounding irrelevant and possibly dangerous; something civilized and enlightened people need to protect their country from (Scorzo, 2016)

In *Prospect* magazine, scientist Richard Dawkins sneered at “the dilettantish frivolity with which many voters relished the flattery of being asked to decide the country’s future—the many who googled ‘What is the EU?’ the day after voting to leave it” (Dawkins, 2016). It is “unfair to thrust on to unqualified simpletons the responsibility to take historic decisions of great complexity and sophistication,” Dawkins argued. As an aside, the claim that “What is the EU?” had been extensively googled the day after the vote has probably been repeated more often than the question was googled on June 24, 2016. The spike in the search for “What is the EU?” represented little more than 1,000 people, or 0.00003 percent of those who voted (McGoogan, 2016).

The descriptions of large sections of the electorate as incapable of engaging with complex issues mirrors anti-democratic arguments made in the past. In response to battles for universal suffrage in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century, eugenicists and Fabians used similar arguments to dismiss the views of the majority. Fabian writer H. G. Wells wrote: “We cannot make the social life and the world peace we are determined to make, with
the ill-bred, ill-trained swarms of inferior citizens that you inflict upon us” (Wells, 1922: 5). The eugenicist Francis Galton argued that “a democracy cannot endure unless it be composed of able citizens; therefore, it must in self-defence withstand the free introduction of degenerate stock” (Galton, 1908: 311).

A prominent argument put forward for overturning the results was that the vote was a result of ignorance and misinformation. Yet, the Electoral Reform Society’s report, It’s Good to Talk, shows that rather than unquestioningly swallowing the official campaign propaganda, voters on both sides of the debate were skeptical about campaign claims (Brett, 2016). In fact, the figures were remarkably similar for Leave and Remain voters: forty-six percent of Leave and forty-seven percent of Remain voters felt politicians on both sides were mostly lying. As Lee Jones, Senior Lecturer in the School of Politics and International Relations at Queen Mary, University of London, wrote in the blog The Current Moment:

> there is simply no evidence that people were particularly ill-informed, still less that “stupid” voters were “brainwashed,” as many Remainers suggest. Most people displayed normal or above average levels of information; drew liberally from many sources; and assessed those sources skeptically. In other words, most people took their duty as citizens very seriously (Jones, 2016a)

This is also the impression I got from speaking to voters in the West Midlands—an ethnically diverse region in which almost 1.8 million people voted to leave the EU compared to 1.2 million who voted to remain. I interviewed Brexit supporters from Birmingham, Coventry, and the Black Country. I discovered that the caricature of the Leave voter as ignorant and bigoted was far from the truth. The Leavers I spoke to were reasoned, sensible, and motivated primarily by a desire for more control over their lives and more of a say on political issues.

Tanveer Khan, a taxi driver in Birmingham, told me: “I voted Leave to maintain sovereignty. It is about the dignity of the nation.” Politicians do not care about “common people,” he said, adding that “politics has become so stagnant that it stinks.” Hugh McDowell, a pensioner, echoed Khan, saying he wanted
“control, simple as that. The British parliament should make decisions, and we can kick MPs out if they don’t do what they said they would do.” Accountability and democracy were also the main issues for Terry Biddulph, managing director of an IT company in Birmingham: “I voted out because the EU is undemocratic. This is my principal reason. But in the media this issue is hardly mentioned.” Sue Shrimpton, a foster carer in West Bromwich, is similarly concerned about a lack of control: “I voted out as I feel it’s about time we started to make our own decisions as a nation.” Phil Harris, a crossing guard in Birmingham, told me, “I want us to take power back to our own country, and make our own decisions, not do what Brussels wants us to do.”

A key motivation for voting Leave among those I spoke to was an aversion to bureaucratic rule undermining sovereignty and democracy. This was reflected in national surveys. In a ComRes poll the week after the referendum, fifty-three percent of Leave voters cited “the ability of Britain to make its own laws” as the most important issue when deciding which way to vote (ComRes, 2016). Many would argue that the EU, since its inception, has removed power and control from the people it is meant to represent. In his fascinating book, *Ruling the Void*, published posthumously, political scientist Peter Mair describes “the widespread drift towards forms of decision-making that eschew electoral accountability and popular democratic control.” It is this, he argues, that “furnishes us with a context in which the European Union’s ‘democratic deficit’ may best be understood.” He sees the EU as one manifestation of the way in which national political leaders create protected spheres “in which policy-making can evade the constraints imposed by representative democracy” (Mair, 2013). Politics lecturer at Queens’ College, University of Cambridge, Chris Bickerton, similarly explains how national politicians use the EU to evade democratic control:

Over eighty percent of EU law is currently made through a “trilogue” system, where agreements on legislation are struck in private meetings between representatives from the Commission, the member states and the Parliament. Once a decision has been made through this opaque process, ministers return from Brussels and represent the decision as one made by the European Union. If necessary, they complain of European diktat. The European Union is a collaboration
between the governments of its member states that permits them to evade political accountability to their electorates for the policies they pursue by passing the buck to “Europe” (Bickerton et al., 2016)

Leaving the EU will not reinvigorate democracy in and of itself, but it is an important prerequisite to creating more democratic control and engagement. Another issue that came up frequently in my interviews was “loss of identity,” connoting a yearning for a stronger sense of togetherness, belonging, and a sense of common destiny. “I want us to look after our nation first and foremost,” said Khan. “It’s just like our relationships with our family and friends: I will always help my family first, but that doesn’t mean I don’t want to help my friends.” When he states that we should “look after British people first and foremost,” he is not suggesting that we should be hostile to foreigners. Biddulph argues instead that it is the EU that has caused hostility: “The EU has created divisions because we are losing our identity. People who lose their identity look for someone to blame, and often they blame immigrants.” Biddulph touches on something important here: it can be argued that only a society with common values can truly welcome newcomers. If we have a strong sense of who we are, what we believe in, and what we value, then we will be more open and tolerant of different norms, values, and habits.

In the post-referendum ComRes poll, immigration was the second most important issue (thirty-four percent) when deciding which way to vote (Comres, 2016). Yet, this should not necessarily be interpreted as an anti-immigrant sentiment. A July 2016 ICM poll found eighty-four percent of all voters wanted EU migrants living and working in the UK to be allowed to stay (ICM, 2016). Interestingly, this was highest for the over seventy-five age group (ninety-three percent) and lowest for the eighteen to twenty-four age group (eighty-two percent), challenging claims about the “bigotry” of the older generations.

I did not encounter any hostility to immigrants among the Leave voters to whom I spoke. However, there were concerns about the effect of migrant flows, including the free movement of labor on jobs, wage levels, and public services. Terry Biddulph’s wife, Sue, who works as a cleaner in her own domestic cleaning company in Birmingham, told me: “As long as people play fair I am happy for them to come over here. But they need to be able to support themselves. I know some people have escaped from terrible situations and
war-torn countries, and they need our help. That’s fine—as long as we make things better for us first.” McDowell said: “I do think we need to deal with the immigration factor; we are under pressure in schools, hospitals and other health services.”

It is particularly galling for some Leave-voters that some Remainers accuse them of being anti-immigration, given that in the first nine months of 2016 more than 3,000 migrants drowned in the Mediterranean—deaths that are arguably primarily caused by discriminatory EU migration policies (Keating, 2016). Birmingham-based Richard Marks, who is currently out of work, asserted that: “Brussels tells us how many and which people we should let in. That’s wrong. I think whether immigrants come from Australia, Europe, Africa, or anywhere else in the world, there should be the same rules for whether or not they get in.”

All the Leavers were disgusted at how they have been portrayed in the media and by politicians. Roy Starkey, a train operator in Coventry, said he has lost respect for those who have “called us a bunch of racist Chavs.” “The only people being attacked are those who voted Leave,” he tells me: “I have been to forty different countries. When I go there I abide by their rules and respect them. I am no racist.” Marks also dismissed the idea that Brexit voters are all racists and bigots: “Far from it. I’m a big black man with dreadlocks and my partner’s French. There is no more racism today than in the past. It’s rubbish—all propaganda.” Khan, who has lived in the UK for twenty years, similarly believes Leave voters are misrepresented. He says he did experience racism in the past. He believes that some Eastern Europeans face some hostility today, “which is wrong: they are hard-working people.” However, he does not think we have seen a significant upturn in racism since the vote: “As a taxi-driver I am on the front-line. I have hands-on experience. I do not think there is any more racism after the vote.” Phil Harris agrees: “There are one or two racist idiots who voted Leave, but for each one of them there are thousands who voted Leave for good reasons.” Shrimpton is not impressed with the way she feels that Brexit voters have been sneered at by the Establishment: “I don’t understand why they brand people who voted Leave as uneducated, racist idiots who only voted out so that they could get all the foreigners out… I am an educated woman who has chosen to foster babies, children, and young adults of any race or color. I find it really offensive that
people who do not know me think it is okay to judge and criticize me for my vote, just because it differs from their own view.”

Khan also noted the “distasteful way” in which some individuals were publicly shamed and mocked on social media in order to demonstrate the rise in racism after the vote. One video that did the rounds showed a seemingly drunk woman in Salford going on a racist rant. Another showed some youths on a Manchester tram behaving obnoxiously and making racist comments. Their behavior should not be excused, but that does not make public shaming acceptable—a spiteful and nasty way of dealing with behavior we do not like. “We should remember that tolerance goes both ways,” Khan told me. He explains: “Some of those lashing out [against immigrants] may have all kinds of issues, including mental health issues. Forgiveness is key: we should treat fellow human beings with kindness. I think the media plays a part in creating divisions the way they report [racist incidents]. To me, common people are kind.”

It is possible that the referendum result will have emboldened racists—particularly because of the way a vote for Brexit was presented as the racist vote in the run-up to the referendum.\(^{87}\) However, media reports of “waves of xenophobia” should be critically interrogated. In *The Current Moment*, Lee Jones evaluates some of the reports that hit the headlines in Britain that purportedly demonstrated a sharp increase in post-referendum racism. Jones concludes: “The data boil down to a statistical uptick in an underlying current of low-level racist activity… a tiny, hard-core minority of racist individuals, who existed prior to the referendum, apparently felt emboldened to be more abusive following the result. Alarmist reports that made it appear that their attitudes were widely shared may even have emboldened them further” (Jones, 2016b).

\(^{87}\) Editors’ Note: There was a sharp increase in the number of racially or religiously aggravated crimes including assaults, arson, and non-violent acts recorded by police in England and Wales immediately following the EU referendum. According to the Home Office and National Police Chiefs Council, in July 2016, police recorded a forty-one percent increase compared to the same month the year before, with figures rising further in subsequent weeks. These figures were widely reported in the media—see, for example, Forster (2016), Travis (2016)—but their precise nature and significance is open to interpretation, as the skeptical response of the right-wing think-tank Civitas (2016) demonstrates.
Some of those Remain voters who called for the referendum to be ignored—or re-run—did so on the basis that those who voted Leave were “duped” by the official Leave campaign’s lies. Many of those I spoke to were not even fans of those who supposedly duped them, including Nigel Farage and Boris Johnson. “To me, Farage is not appealing at all,” says Khan, “and Boris Johnson played a dirty game to try to become leader of the Conservative Party.” McDowell says: “I did not vote Leave because of Farage or Boris or anybody else. I hear Boris is now out of the picture [for the leadership race]. Next time there is a circus in town he could get himself a job there—as a clown.” Most of those I spoke to had nothing but contempt for the entire political class, especially its behavior after the referendum. For example, Harris singles out the Prime Minister at the time of the Referendum, David Cameron, as worthy of contempt: “Cameron took a gamble. He lost. And what did he do? He threw his dummy out like a baby and ran off. All the politicians at the moment are behaving like children squabbling among themselves. They are meant to be our leaders!”

The Leave voters I interviewed seem fully aware of the potential negative economic effect of Brexit and argued that this would have a short to medium-term impact on the country. As Shrimpton put it, “We know that some aspects of leaving the EU will affect us all for a while, but in time we will be better off as a nation. To be honest, it can’t get much worse than it is already.” Sue is “absolutely disgusted” that her father-in-law (who sadly passed away days after I interviewed her), was not getting the palliative care “necessary to make him as comfortable as possible.” “He has worked and paid taxes all his life. Things really do need to change for the future of our children and their children.” Khan also pointed out that “there will be a financial impact—just like when two partners divorce and you end up with lawyers’ fees and so on.” However, he believes the UK will benefit in the long-run: “We are funding the EU more than the EU is funding us.” Similarly, Sue Biddulph recognizes that it may be difficult as a small-business owner in the short-term: “I do think there will be problems initially, but I think it will come together.” Her husband, Terry, is also confident that being out of the EU will eventually benefit small businesses: “It is the European elites that run the EU and they want to stay in the EU. Bankers and the corporates don’t want it to change. The EU stifles innovation. Small entrepreneurs struggle. My company—with fourteen staff—is strangled by red tape. There is so much
we cannot do because we haven’t got the resources to deal with all these EU directives.”

What I found most inspiring from the many discussions I had with Leave voters was their sense of optimism and appetite for change. As Harris told me: “Politicians haven’t been listening to us. But now things could change. If politicians think they can continue in their old ways, we will make them listen. We will demand it.” “It is scary but exciting at the same time,” said Shrimpton: “It’s sometimes good to embrace the unknown.” Starkey agrees: “I believe change is good. Change is opportunity and change is what the UK needs.” Terry Biddulph says that the UK leaving the EU could prove an inspiration to our fellow Europeans: “They might just do the same.”

Those who cherish civil rights need to defend democratic principles against those who want to undermine them in the name of “some being more equal than others.” Civil rights are meaningless if we do not recognize that every citizen should have an equal right to participate in democratic decision-making. We should take inspiration from the Leveller Thomas Rainsborough (quoted in Key and Bucholz, 2009: 188), who argued during the Putney debates of 1647 that “the poorest man in England is not at all bound in a strict sense to that government that he hath not had a voice to put himself under.”

88 The Putney Debates were a series of discussions during the English Civil War (1642-1651) which took place between factions of Cromwell’s New Model Army and the Levellers concerning a new constitution for England. Thomas Rainsborough was a leader of the Levellers, a political movement that emphasized popular sovereignty, extended suffrage, equality before the law, and religious tolerance.
Disintegration: When the UK Voted to Leave the European Union

Michael Woolf, CAPA The Global Education Network

A Complex Fate

To be English in the field of international education is a complex fate. I have lost count of the times hosts in many parts of the world have taken me to sites “you will find interesting.” These are almost always locations in which the English had acted very badly indeed. You are forced to react in one of a number of excruciating ways. You may try to demonstrate historical empathy (“My ex-wife was Irish you know.”) You may choose to say nothing under the delusion that silence will be interpreted as eloquence. I once, under stress, said “the bastards!” on being told of what my ancestors had inflicted upon the indigenous people, flora, fauna, and wild life of a place that was comprised mostly of dust.

There is something that requires you (an arthritic John Bull) to play the part of a red-faced, ridiculous apologist for stupidities that had absolutely nothing to do with you. Which brings me, inexorably and sadly, to the decision of the UK (England really) to leave the European Union.

I have repeatedly been asked this question by friends in other parts of the world: “Why did you vote to leave?” Let me be clear: the “you” does not mean “me.” It refers to that tortured soul who carries the Burden of Being English. I will, however, assume the weight of that responsibility and try to offer some form of bewildered explanation for what “we” did.

What Happened?

On the morning of June 24, 2016, my immediate reaction was disbelief (some mistake surely) followed by anger at the political leaders who, motivated
by opportunism, escorted the country to the edge of peril with the voters, lemming-like, jumping off. Furthermore, they had lifted a rock and all sorts of unpleasant things crawled out; voices of xenophobia, racism, and ignorance were heard around the land.

So, I moved between anger, disbelief, and disdain.

My reasons for voting to remain were relatively simple. The primary protagonists of World War I were, on one side, Britain and France, and on the other, Germany. Just over two decades after that slaughter, the same protagonists engaged again in hostile confrontation. My grandfather and father fought in European wars. I did not and it is almost inconceivable that my children, or their children, will have to do so. One of the reasons for the fifty and more years of peace between these long-standing rivals is the European Union. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the European Union in 2012 was a recognition of a profound alteration in regional geopolitics.

Another reason for remaining is the protection afforded to citizens by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union:

Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice...it seeks to promote balanced and sustainable development and ensures free movement of persons, services, goods and capital, and the freedom of establishment (European Commission, 2000: n.p.)

The Charter, legally established under the Treaty of Lisbon (2009), is a unique example of human and civil rights written into law and made binding across transnational borders. It was barely mentioned in the cauldron of impassioned lies and alliterative spittle that littered the rhetoric of the referendum campaign.

However, in retrospect, I realize that my rationale for voting to remain was driven predominantly by instinct rather than argument (which does not make
it wrong of course). The referendum was contested in conflicting zones of emotion in a manner that was unique in my experience of British politics. It was metaphorically a kind of (mostly bloodless) civil war in which the nation was torn into rival camps owing allegiance to views that were embedded in their histories, ideologies, and prejudices.

On the morning of June 24, I believed that over half of the country were idiots and bigots. It is necessary, though, to revisit my visceral disdain. That view was arrogant and dismissive of people who could not, or should not, on reflection, be so characterized. It is a view based on despair. If over half of the country are fools, what future is there for these islands? I also know enough about the regions of the UK to understand that there are valleys of pain in which good people have been derided and ignored because they spoke about their fears. There are also towns of deprivation where industries have disappeared and where the remaining population exists marginal and invisible to those of us in London.

I believe that those who voted to leave were profoundly wrong. Nevertheless, as educators we bear an intellectual obligation to seek some kind of explanation. As citizens, we have a moral obligation to avoid demonizing those who disagree with us.

An Accidental Outcome?

Students studying in the UK in June 2016 must have been somewhat bewildered by the fact that a majority of the population voted against the advice of the leaders of the major political parties. How do we explain or, at least, intelligently speculate on the reasons for that result? What might students learn about Britain and Europe from this unique event?

CAPA’s learning objectives are demonstrably relevant: globalization and
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SECTION THREE

89 Globalization: CAPA students will recognize, describe, and interpret examples of the impact globalization has on the urban environment.

Urban Environments: CAPA students will explore and analyze the urban spaces in which their programs are located and reflect on the differences and similarities between these global locations and their home countries.

Social Dynamics: CAPA students will understand and be able to articulate the concepts of power, privilege, and inequality in urban environments.

Diversity: CAPA students will be able to describe, interpret, and respect the differences they discover within their program’s student community and between their home and host country.
diversity have been simultaneously constructed as positive influences and, conversely, symptoms of lost potency and undermined identity. In the UK, globalization has certainly not led to greater equality: an urban elite is disconnected from regional fears and economic unease. Some populations feel that they are victims of social dynamics and diversity: alien forces that have, in some way, diminished individuals and destroyed community values.

The result was unexpected, I suspect, both by those who voted to leave and those who wanted to remain. At one level, the exit vote was a protest intended to shock a complacent elite. The national mood after the result suggests that intention was to rock the boat rather than capsize it.

So, how did the shipwreck happen?

**A Disunited Queendom**

One of the more obvious implications is that there is widespread alienation from mainstream politics. Most leading figures, “the Establishment,” in business, creative arts, education, and politics were unequivocally in support of remaining, as were liberal cosmopolitans, urban internationalists, like you and me. The views of these groups were rejected decisively by swathes of populations who, literally and metaphorically, are excluded from corridors of influence and the “by invitation only” airport lounges of international travelers.

The UK is profoundly fractured in many ways. These disaffected populations include the traditional white working class who have over years suffered the loss of an industrial and manufacturing base upon which a sense of solidarity was built. There was also support for the leave campaign from the leafy and prosperous suburbs.

Britain’s post-imperial decline from a star to an extra in the global cinema repeatedly raises the question of identity and definition, both of the individual and the nation. Nostalgic hearts expressed, perhaps, a yearning for an idealized myth of Great Britain and voted for those “traditional values” that had been sullied by the influx of foreign peoples and ideas. That lost world is expressed in many ways and many forms, in votes to leave Europe, in the oft-heard Brexit slogan “we want our country back,” and lyrically by Rupert Brooke. The England that Brooke recalled in 1912 from a café in Berlin had already
disappeared, even if it had ever existed anywhere but in the idealized memory:

God! I will pack, and take a train,
And get me to England once again!
For England’s the one land, I know,
Where men with Splendid Hearts may go...
Say, is there Beauty yet to find?
And Certainty? and Quiet kind?
. . . oh! yet
Stands the Church clock at ten to three?
And is there honey still for tea?

(Brooke, 1916)

There is a common thread that binds this unholy alliance. A sense of community and identity is eroded: the angry and bewildered “I” seeks reconnection with the collective “we”—now an illusion, lost.

Individualism and Collectivism

The root of this alienation resides in a struggle between social and political ideologies. A key conflict in the twentieth century was between collectivism (let us call this “state socialism”) and what we might call “ideological individualism.” In the UK, working-class collectivist values were eroded by the decline of those industries which had traditionally enforced community cohesion. Collectivist ideologies were also an anathema to Margaret Thatcher (and Ronald Reagan) during the years 1979 to 1990 in which she was a determined and ideologically-driven Prime Minister.

Regional cohesion and heavy industry had stimulated powerful working-class associations, particularly Trades Unions. These were founded to counterbalance unequal power relationships between individual employee and employer. The existence of Trade Unions was legalized in 1871 and they subsequently grew in members and influence, particularly in the first decades of the twentieth century. The Union was more than a workers’ association; it was also a social hub, a welfare resource, an advice center, and an agency for the development of local cohesion.
The industrial power of the Trades Unions in the UK was undermined by the historical decline of traditional industries, hastened and encouraged by Thatcher’s government. The government had determined, for a combination of economic and political reasons, progressively to withdraw government subsidies from many of those industries, particularly mining. The National Union of Mineworkers, probably inadvisably, chose to confront the government in a protracted strike from January 1984 to March 1985. This bitter, long, and divisive struggle was essentially an ideological confrontation that involved up to 142,000 mineworkers and many more thousands of supporters and opponents. It was arguably a struggle for the soul of the nation, but it was an unequal conflict. A probably inevitable process of industrial reform was made an occasion for a battle that the miners were, ultimately, certain to lose.

In microcosm, the Miners’ Strike enacted a global confrontation between the principles of state socialism and ideological individualism. It prefigured the ultimate eradication of traditional industries and the emasculation of working class associations. The consequence was a bitter legacy of distrust of the political establishment. Centralized authority in London (or Brussels), was not likely to be viewed as benign.

The triumph of ideological individualism may, in some circumstances, have led to benefits, but those were not felt in the alienated regions. Community values and collectivist ethics were replaced by the greed of bankers, the excesses of stockbrokers, the ethics of Enron.

**Globalization and Inequality**

Globalization also had a perceptible impact upon the referendum result. This is not a single or simple concept but relates to forces that exist beyond the local. The beneficiaries of globalization, liberal cosmopolitans, are those for whom community is disconnected from traditional notions of geography. The worlds in which they (we) function benefit from the free movement of people and goods. The financial markets, creative arts, scientific education, international education etc. all benefit from the removal of constricting frontiers. On a philosophical level, this translates into an endorsement of internationalism, belief in transnational alliances, and ideas that extend beyond parochial or national contexts. Globalization is, however, perceived quite differently by
those who are experiencing, or who have already experienced, an erosion of their community identity, who feel abandoned and ignored by a privileged elite. They feel like victims rather than beneficiaries. Globalization is a process imposed from elsewhere that brings foreign ideas and populations into the towns, that threatens local identity and security, that is believed to undermine employment opportunities for residents and their children and impose unmanageable demands on limited resources, that disrupts national tradition and myth. Whether logical or not, residents feel a lack of control over their own destinies. Change is seen to be imposed by forces that are neither benign nor identifiable.

Globalization cannot be put back in its box in a post-Brexit Britain; its effects, including the loss of jobs in traditional industries which no longer fit into today’s globally interconnected, technology-driven world, are real; inequalities within the country are growing. A vote for Brexit represented in many cases a cry for recognition. Brexit is most unlikely to result in the solutions that these voters seek, but the impacts of globalization need to be addressed. Governments must learn to listen to the voices of the dispossessed.

**Immigration and the Alien**

The immigration debate, which was critical in the referendum, is not only or crucially about facts or politics; it is an emotional issue—shaped by prejudice (certainly) but also by experience and fear. While many of the common concerns about immigration may not be supported by data (see, for example, Dearden (2016)), an uncomfortable truth is that, for the most part, the Establishment and the internationally-inclined cosmopolitan elite are disconnected and unsympathetic to the issues impacting others outside the cities in which they reside. London has always been different: a center for mobility in which immigration is crucial to the success of the economy; the scale of the city absorbs, embraces and integrates difference; multiculturalism is perceived by many (not all) to enhance the lives of those living there.

The employed elite do not share the issues faced by those in the provinces, such as unemployment and declining industries, strains on the NHS, and fewer school places. Whatever the real impact may be, some populations feel themselves to be disadvantaged, even threatened, by immigration. This unease and those fears have not been taken seriously but have been ignored
or dismissed as parochial, prejudiced, and reactionary. The views of a significant population have been marginalized.

**Taking Back Control**

Supporters of the leave position repeatedly claimed the restoration of national sovereignty as a primary motive. Leaving the EU, the argument goes, will restore national sovereignty; control will devolve to communities and individuals. They will regain the power to define and defend their national or social boundaries, admit or exclude those they choose, and become, again, masters of their own fate. This is a seductive image of a dreamed landscape and a delusion. The unrestrained authority of nation-states belongs to an idealized history. Within or without the EU, the UK, like all other states, is subject to any number of restraints and limitations of power. One impact of globalization is increased interdependence; the UK may well find that its field of influence, as a country alone, is reduced rather than expanded. Instead of having more power, the subjects of the United Kingdom may likely have less civil rights protection than the citizens of Europe. Those realities did not matter. Emotion overruled reason.

**Now What?**

We are very far from entirely understanding either the beginning or the end. The referendum was an act of rebellion: a refusal to accept the opinions of a traditional leadership and a rupture in the psyche of the nation. In that respect, it was a peculiarly un-British event. The choice of uncertainty over the status quo and the rejection of traditional authority signals a major alteration in the conservative soul of the nation.

The predominance of emotion over reason in the motivations of voters on both sides of the divide demonstrated that political reality is not based on objectivity or rational analysis. Reality is constructed. The beliefs we hold and the actions we take are driven by emotional imperatives.

Most obviously, there are large groups of people who feel diminished, abandoned, and alienated. That signals a dangerous disintegration of anything approaching a national consensus. Simultaneously, nationalist sentiments
are resurgent. If that is a significant reason for concern (and it is), there are also historical parallels in which anxiety becomes nightmare.

In 1815, the Congress of Vienna, following the defeat of Napoleon, led to almost 100 years of relative peace in Europe. By 1912, that accord was fractured by the rise of rampant nationalisms. By 1914, Europe had embarked upon a cataclysmic war. The uneasy outcome of that terrible confrontation created the conditions for the rise of madmen and the slaughter of the innocent.

We are not, of course, forced to re-enact history. We might learn from it but, in too many parts of the world, we have created disturbing scenarios; menacing and inexplicable shadows populate our worst nightmares. There are ominous figures lurking just out of the light. The choice before us is between an open or closed ideology. We may choose the light or enter into the darkness.
Over the last century, several US politicians and presidents have taken up the mantle of affording access to higher education. Lyndon B. Johnson established the federal student aid system; George W. Bush doubled Pell Grants in his two terms; and Barack Obama has been dubbed the “Higher Education President” for his ambitious and expansive higher education strategy (Lederman and Fain, 2017). A late senator who perhaps may not come immediately to mind as a proponent of access to higher education is Edward Kennedy, who led the charge on several bills that increased funding for higher education in the twentieth century. Harvard University President, Drew Faust, said of Kennedy’s efforts: “No US Senator has committed more of his time and his wisdom to the advancement of American higher education. Thanks to him, students across the spectrum have the opportunity to pursue their ambitions” (Walsh, 2008).

Indeed, Senator Kennedy believed that education could lead to economic mobility and took up initiatives such as access to higher education aimed at improving the lives of the underserved and underprivileged. His pursuit of these ideals was evident in his first ever speech in front of the Senate in 1964, when he spoke in support of the Civil Rights Act. His fight for equity continued throughout his political career; for example, he supported the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Voting Rights Act (Khan and Taylor, 2009).

In the spirit of Senator Kennedy, this paper addresses the ways in which the field of international education engages with these same issues of equity in the twenty-first century, namely through opportunities for students to

---
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participate in internships abroad. There is no denying that internships, co-ops, and other such immersive work experiences offer students the skills and social capital that can lead to future social and economic mobility. Universities and internship organizations structure courses and processes to ensure that students undertake meaningful and productive work. However, are these opportunities truly attainable to all students? Do international internships create equity, thereby closing the growing gap of economic inequality in the US, or do they widen this gap?

International Internships and Equity

Between the academic years 2004/5 and 2014/15, study abroad participation grew by more than fifty percent. Non-credit experiential learning opportunities such as internships and service-learning have also seen significant growth (IIE, 2015). Yet, a closer look at participation reveals that international internships are not reaching all types of students equally. For example, black/African-American students comprise just 5.6 percent of study abroad students; Hispanic or Latino/a 8.8 percent; and Asian students 8.1 percent: this is far less than their representation within the US college student population (IIE, 2015). This under-representation of students of color, a group that continues to experience the effects of past and present structural barriers to higher education, is one indicator of unequal access to international internships.

Regarding participation in internships, a study by the National Association of Colleges and Employers found that about sixty-five percent of 2015 graduates participated in an internship or co-op, the highest percentage ever recorded. Of the remaining thirty-five percent of graduates who did not undertake an internship, a large percentage were from minority groups. Overall, African-American and Latino/a students are about ten percent less likely to participate in an internship (NACE, 2015); perhaps as a result, after graduation, young people of color are nearly twice as likely to be unemployed as their white peers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017).

Barriers to access to international internships are particularly troubling when we consider the impact of international internships on students from under-represented groups. For example, research by George Kuh (2008) found that underserved students were more likely to benefit from high impact experiences such as international internships than their more privileged peers;
Increasing access to international internships for minority students can potentially work to close the gap of inequities that exist among US students. By providing access to these opportunities, educators level the playing field for students’ personal and professional development, social and cultural capital, and future economic equality. Yet, solutions to the problem of access must take into account the barriers to international internships. In particular, international internships are often unpaid positions due to visa restrictions, thus limiting participation to those students who can afford it. Furthermore, for-credit placements often require payment of tuition credits. Additional barriers to participation in international internships reflect similar obstacles that students face to participation in study abroad generally: students from under-represented groups must often navigate the support or lack thereof from family, faculty, and other members of the university community, and fear of the unknown or discrimination abroad (Willis, 2015). Given the benefits of international experiences for under-represented students, educators have a responsibility to address the barriers to participation. Otherwise, international internships will continue to serve the needs of the fortunate few and perpetuate inequality on our campuses and in our education system.

**A Solution**

So, if unequal access to international internships has the potential to exacerbate inequity, how can we work toward creating greater access to internships for all students at our institutions and organizations?

In his speech on the floor of the Senate in 1964 in support of the Civil Rights Act, Kennedy said

> Federal programs, especially in the fields of health and education, and training for jobs have an enormous influence on the social fabric
of our communities. They can set a pattern in keeping with the moral commitment of the Nation, or they can set a pattern opposed to it (Kennedy, 1964)

A discussion of the public versus private good of higher education is outside the scope of this paper; however, Kennedy, in his defense of the Civil Rights Act, evokes the moral commitment of the nation, in which all citizens have equal opportunities to succeed, regardless of their background. That some groups were intentionally and structurally excluded from these opportunities must be resolved by federal government programs aimed at access and inclusion. Otherwise they perpetuate inequality, which runs counter to national values. For Kennedy, higher education is one such opportunity that can predict greater future economic and social equality for individuals and society at large; thus, the federal government’s support of these initiatives is in keeping with the “moral commitment of the Nation.”

If we follow Senator Kennedy’s advice, the answer to promoting equal access and opportunity to educational opportunities for the global workforce is clear: a federal initiative aimed at providing greater access and comprehensive support for students to participate in international internships. Already students can utilize most federal financial aid to pay for a for-credit internship experience abroad; however, Federal Work-Study Program grants are limited to US-based jobs on- and off-campus. An expansion of the Program to include overseas internships would offer students additional funding, thereby making these experiences, and the benefits they provide to students, more accessible. Established in 1964, and supported by Senator Kennedy, the Federal Work-Study Program is one of the oldest and smallest forms of federal financial assistance to college students. Students work for at least minimum wage at placements that are arranged by their colleges (Kenefick, 2015). Several problems exist with the current structure, including the size of the grants, the lack of flexibility in applying these grants to international experiences, and the ability for under-resourced college administrators to find placements that are relevant to students’ career goals. An overhaul of the program could have a positive impact on students’ access to overseas internship opportunities.

First, the Program needs more funding. It currently serves about 700,000 college students each year at a cost of $1 billion. In comparison, there are
nine million Pell Grants awarded each year worth over $30 billion (Kenefick, 2015). As discussed earlier, financing is a key barrier to interning abroad. Students are reluctant to give up paying jobs at home for unpaid internships abroad, where they generally cannot work legally or do not have the connections to find work easily. Increasing the amounts of the stipends would offer greater incentives to students to pursue an internship abroad (Kenefick, 2015). In its current form, the Federal Work-Study Program requires the university or the employer to pay up to fifty percent of the student’s wages, though this can increase to 100 percent for certain jobs such as tutoring (US Department of Education, 2014). To cover their half, universities could engage in creative fundraising or develop partnerships with overseas businesses and organizations to provide additional grants for their students. Otherwise, as most universities would not be able to cover this cost and because internships abroad are unpaid, full funding by the US government for overseas internships would be required.

Second, like other forms of financial aid, the grants must be transferrable to overseas internship programs. In a globalized world, investment in education and job training takes on a broader task of preparing citizens for a workforce beyond national borders. In order to succeed, students must demonstrate that they are proficient in a foreign language, have communication skills, can demonstrate cultural sensitivity, and work with diverse groups (British Council, 2013). Students who participate in international internships have the opportunity to develop these critical skills for the global workforce. For this reason, access to international internships is particularly important. The ability for students to transfer work study grants to international internships will create greater access to these opportunities, thereby allowing them to develop these critical personal and professional skills. Government programs must provide support that fosters student success in a globalized world, such as international internships.

The Federal Work-Study Program also requires universities to use at least seven percent of their allocation to

...support students working in community service jobs, including: reading tutors for preschool age or elementary school children; mathematics tutors for students enrolled in elementary school through ninth grade; literacy tutors in a family literacy project performing family
literacy activities; or emergency preparedness and response (US Department of Education, 2014)

Many education and social service organizations abroad could use the help and expertise of US university students who may be interested in giving back to the community in which they work and live. Thus, the Federal Work-Study Program should be expanded to include service-learning placements abroad as well.

Third, there needs to be an expansion of the types of placements to align better with students’ career goals. Too many work study grants are for clerical or office work that students feel is irrelevant to their professional development; more than sixty percent of students said their work study was not related to their career goals (Kenefick, 2015). In its current structure, the Federal Work-Study Program represents a missed opportunity and an equity issue. Some students are actively seeking a relevant work experience but are being paid for jobs they find to be irrelevant, while others, who can afford to participate in unpaid internships abroad, are gaining valuable work experience for their future careers. If the Federal Work-Study Program included personalized internship opportunities abroad, more students would be empowered to build skills for the future to set them on more equal footing.

As a form of financial aid, these programs tend to be administered by the financial aid office which typically has limited resources and expertise to develop a network of placements and match students appropriately; more collaboration between on-campus offices of career services, study abroad, and alumni networks can expand the types of placements available to students which connect to their career goals. Financial aid offices could still retain control of the distribution of the funds; however, students could rely on career services, study abroad, and alumni offices to find quality meaningful placements abroad (Kenefick, 2015).

In his 1964 speech in support of civil rights, Kennedy noted, “we should use our powers not to create conditions of oppression that lead to violence, but conditions of freedom that lead to peace.” With proper federal funding and support, our education system can and should improve, not exacerbate, economic inequality. An overhaul of the Federal Work-Study Program is one
way to ensure that students with financial need can afford to participate in international internship opportunities and gain the desirable intercultural and technical skills in their field that they need to succeed post-graduation, thereby closing the gap between the privileged and the less fortunate in our society. The myriad opportunities that higher education institutions offer including international internships must be available to all students who are qualified and motivated enough to have enrolled in the first place. It is the responsibility of higher education to eliminate not perpetuate the systems of inequality. Enhanced funding and structure can allow it to become an institution that makes America more equal and more just, as Senator Kennedy intended.
THE LIMITS OF FREEDOM

I disapprove of what you say, but I’ll defend to the death your right to say it

Evelyn Beatrice Hall, *The Friends of Voltaire*

Liberty is meaningless where the right to utter one’s thoughts and opinions has ceased to exist. That, of all rights, is the dread of tyrants. It is the right which they first of all strike down

Frederick Douglass
My parents are liberal. My father is an academic; my mother an artist. Both were hippies back when being a hippie was still connected to being part of a counterculture movement. They are both pro-diversity and anti-discrimination. My mother’s first marriage was to an African-American man; her son from that marriage, my half-brother, inherited his father’s skin color. They have had gay friends for as long as I can remember. When they took a road trip through North Carolina one year, as far south as they had ever been on the East Coast, they were conscious of, and unnerved by, the dynamic of largely black servers waiting on largely white customers. Of course, they passed these values on to me, teaching me not to judge others, to be aware of power and privilege, to believe in social justice. Thus, it was with some surprise that several times in the last couple of years I have found myself engaged in discussions with my parents who were defending people in positions of privilege and expressing frustration about the behavior of people traditionally seen as in the minority or disadvantaged.

Let me explain: my father teaches at a small college and like at many, many institutions in the past few years, the subject of diversity has become a hot topic, one that has caused significant tension and upset across the campus community. Two incidents have been particularly distressing for my parents. In one, a white, male faculty member made a comment on a personal social media page about Hamas. The comment took a strong ethical stance against Hamas and used language that could definitely be construed as lacking sensitivity. In the second incident, a white, male faculty member responded with bewilderment and again, perhaps some lack of sensitivity, to minority students critical of his handling of content in a Latin-American history course.
In both cases, students who were initially offended and upset garnered support from sympathetic faculty and staff and lambasted the faculty members publicly. Whether the careers of these faculty members will survive remains to be seen.

Discussing these incidents and the ensuing fallout with my parents, I experienced significant confusion and doubt. My instincts were to defend the offended students, to agree that you cannot generalize about members of Hamas, and certainly not on a public site, to agree that the time when a white male could teach Latin-American history has passed. And yet, everything I know about my parents suggests that they would not defend a position that had no ethical validity. So I listened, but I was uncharacteristically silent. I did not know what to say.

Flash forward to an event on my campus for the staff in Student Affairs. I work at Rollins College, a small, private, majority-white institution. Diversity is a concern, and it was the topic of this particular Student Affairs event. To begin the day, a Professor of History and African-American Studies presented us with archival research he had done about the history of African Americans at Rollins. As you might imagine, the numbers of both students and faculty through the decades have been small, and at various points since the 1960s, African-American students and faculty have made requests or demands of the institution related to diversity. These requests are the same as those being made by minority students on college and university campuses across the United States. Although there have been some changes, most of the core demands have remained remarkably consistent since the 1960s and 70s because they remain unmet: US higher education is still marked by systemic inequalities and injustices.

Later that same day, after learning how little had truly changed at Rollins in regards to civil rights and diversity, and about the actual demands being made by students, staff, and faculty across the US in regards to these issues, we had a reflection session during which we were invited to share how the morning’s discussions had made us feel. As the reflection session unfolded, it became obvious that the only people contributing were the few voices of racial minority in the room. One of my colleagues, a gay, white man, tried to point this out, since it seemed worth noting. If what we are striving for is a valuing of all perspectives, a silencing of no voices, then the space
we were in did not seem to encourage that at all. In fact, my colleague was replied to in a manner that made him feel distinctly silenced; it was not a dialogue. Once again, I sat there quiet...and I am someone who always speaks. I am the person who colleagues come up to after meetings and thank for speaking up when they felt too cowed or uncertain. For one of the first times in my professional career, I felt afraid to speak. I felt my confusion and doubt were not valid, or even if they were, they would not be heard as valid.

I am aware of my own position of privilege as a white, straight, middle-class woman in the United States. I know that equality can feel like oppression to those who have been sitting in positions of power. When you have been residing in a privileged center, at the apex of the hierarchy, shifting to make room for an expanded community, the flattening of the pyramid, can feel like being pushed aside or downgraded. Some of my confusion comes from this very place—a sense that maybe my voice really does not matter here; that it is time to let Others have the floor.

Let me be clear, I do not believe that white men are being oppressed. I do not believe that we need an “all lives matter” movement. I do not believe that a liberal, atheist conspiracy in higher education is eliminating conservative and religious perspectives. What I do believe is that something strange is happening in higher education in response to the real civil rights issues we still face in our culture and in our campus communities.

Instead of working towards substantive change, which would involve confronting our own unconscious biases and disrupting and re-creating many of the structures within academia, we seem to have resorted to gymnastic responses to slights and insults that can be easily identified and corrected. Challenged by the tensions and difficult questions that arise when individuals with different power and privilege, and different levels of awareness and self-awareness, come into contact with one another in the microcosms of classrooms, campuses, and residence halls, we have resorted to trying to protect our students from offense and harm. We have invented the concept of “trigger warnings,” concerned that depictions of a wide variety of topics will disturb or traumatize our students. This includes, famously, depictions of rape in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, but also a wide range of texts and topics, including, on my own campus, racial and sexual slurs used in Junot Diaz’ The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao. We have also focused on microaggressions, the “brief, everyday exchanges that send denigrating messages” to certain
individuals because of their group membership (Sue et al., 2007: 273). Microaggressions are symptomatic of the structural inequalities that pervade our societies and are deeply damaging. However, to respond to incidents of microaggression as if the aggressor is exactly that, a perpetrator, a violent actor infringing on the right of a victim, holds an individual responsible for a societal problem. We also tend to privilege emotion in these cases and allow one person’s “truth” to become dominant while forgetting that all of us are trapped within these systems of bias and inequality. While emotions have too often been disregarded in our culture, denied in favor of logic and reason, negating reason is equally problematic. As Paulo Freire so clearly described half a century ago:

> When a word is deprived of its dimension of action...the word is changed into idle chatter, into verbalism, into an alienated and alienating “blah.” It becomes an empty word, one which cannot denounce the world, for denunciation is impossible without a commitment to transform, and there is no transformation without action.... On the other hand, if action is emphasized exclusively, to the detriment of reflection, the word is converted into activism. The latter—action for action’s sake—negates the true praxis and makes dialogue impossible (Freire, 1981: 75-76)

So privileging the emotional response is akin to Freire’s “activism.” The emotional word becomes the stopping point. We go no further. We fail to reflect critically on the emotion, on the invisible structures that make that emotion possible or even likely. Without this necessary stage of reflection and dialogue, the emotional response, and only the emotional response, drives our actions. This focus on emotion is complicated further by the commercialization of higher education, which views the student as a consumer, and by the high value placed on the individual within American culture. A passive consumer is not expected to engage critically with his or her reactions. Rather, the focus is on alleviating discomfort and mitigating any distress. A happy consumer is an unchallenged consumer. The student as consumer then reinforces the pre-eminence of the “Self” over any sense of community. A consumer is not viewed as part of a community of actors, whose crossing paths and interactions have the potential to reify or disrupt accepted norms
and structures. Instead, a consumer is viewed primarily as an individual, and thus any concerns are treated as the concerns of an individual, rather than indicative of a larger problem. Yet, any movement towards diversity and equality depends deeply on the concepts of solidarity and empathy. Each individual must be able to engage openly with the Other, to move beyond the limits of the Self. When we protect our students, and focus on their needs as individuals, we are doing them a disservice. As Jacques Derrida argues, “the One does violence to itself, and guards itself against the Other” (Derrida, 2005: ix). By encouraging this focus on the emotional, consuming Self, we are encouraging an insular perspective. We are discouraging our students from engaging directly, for better or worse, with the world.

Although there are likely many individuals in higher education seeking to engage in dialogue around these and similar issues, the mainstream narratives seem to offer only two options: you are either with the students and faculty protesting at campuses across the country, or against them. You either believe that higher education needs a civil rights revolution, or you believe our students are so coddled that they are offended by everything. This false dichotomy discourages honest dialogue and generates fear, anger, and misunderstanding. If there is no place for confusion and doubt, no spaces where we can debate, for example, the gray area between acts of actual discrimination and violence, and acts of ignorance and immaturity, or the challenges associated with validating someone’s emotions without creating a hierarchy of emotional stances, how can we expect to deal with these issues? And let us be honest, the stakes are very high, for everyone involved. There are psychological and physical repercussions for those involved on all sides—loss of friends, loss of job, fractured identity, failure to complete a degree, etc.

We need to create an alternative narrative that seeks substantive change to systemic inequalities while also encouraging campus communities to challenge, rather than protect, our students and ourselves. Rather than operating reactively, we should be engaging in academic debate around civil rights and other issues of concern on our campuses. We should take each incident of aggression or microaggression as an opportunity for dialogue, an opportunity for each side to engage in critical reflection. So rather than just shutting down an offensive costume party, we should be engaging in a discussion about appropriation of culture, a discussion that acknowledges the possibili-

SEEKING A THIRD SPACE
ty of respectful appropriation and explores the gray areas between respectful and offensive appropriation. Instead of taking punitive action against a faculty member opposed to Hamas, we should engage in a dialogue about the limits of tolerance and the tensions between ethics and cultural relativity. This sounds easier than it is, since it requires us to be willing to question and provoke, as well as be questioned and provoked. It requires us to work in a space of humility and community and to seek a balance between emotion, critical reflection, and action.

In this important project, international education may offer a model. International educators are familiar with the discomfort and challenge necessary for growth and learning, as well as with the structures and facilitation needed to support students through these moments of difficulty. Nevitt Sanford’s theory of challenge and support tells us that we learn best when the levels of challenge and support are balanced and appropriate to the task or content (Sanford, 1966). The tasks and content in study abroad are extremely challenging: they require students to understand that their versions of “truth,” their way of life, their values, are not the only realities, and to accept that we all participate, in myriad commonplace and miniscule ways, in the damaging structures of social and cultural inequity. These realizations are well aligned with frameworks of learning used in international education. For example, David Kolb’s theory of experiential learning emphasizes the need for experience, reflection, and abstract conceptualization for the process of learning. In fact, Kolb claims that transformation cannot occur if one does not move from reflection and observation to abstract conceptualization (Kolb, 1984). In the terms I used earlier, this is the movement from emotional response to critical reflection. The Intercultural Development Inventory describes the path from a monocultural to an intercultural mindset: from a place where, as Milton Bennett states, “one’s own culture is central to reality” (Bennett, 1993: 33) to a space where there is no center at all. William Perry’s model of intellectual development follows this trajectory as well, from a dualistic perspective to an understanding of relativity (Perry, 1968). Perry, however, takes us one step further to the development of ethical commitments beyond relativity. This additional step is important since it points to the need for an active choice, a deliberate positioning, once the decentering process is complete. This final step of ethical action is extremely difficult to differentiate from an ethics of duality or monoculture (one worldview imposing itself on another), yet it is crucial for any movement in support of civil rights. Ultimately,
by supporting civil rights, we are arguing for the dominance of a particular worldview. Only through dialogue with one another will we be able to make this argument from a space of relativity and intercultural understanding, rather than imperialism.

Within the field of international education, we have also been struggling with how to use these frameworks effectively in our programs and with our students, to develop practices that help our students move along these continuums. We have succeeded in developing course content that engages with these frameworks and concepts (I am referring to the courses on cultural learning and reflection offered by many institutions and organizations including CIEE, University of Minnesota, Bellarmine University, University of the Pacific, etc.) and have proved that such coursework does impact student learning. However, we have struggled to meet our students where they are—to adapt our support to accommodate each student’s level of readiness. We have also struggled to train instructors for these courses which depend heavily on effective facilitation, a skill related to but different than teaching.

All of these lessons learned should be applied back on the home campus. Just as international educators worked with colleagues in a variety of disciplines, including education, anthropology, and communication, to develop course content focused on intercultural development, we should now partner again with colleagues to adapt that content to on-campus curriculum and experiences, to focus the content on civil rights and social justice. We should also share the trainings we have developed for instructors of these courses and subsequently train on-campus staff and faculty to facilitate this type of learning. We should focus on-campus discussions and training on our own levels of intercultural and intellectual development since research done by Tara Harvey and others in our field suggests that individuals in a monocultural mindset have difficulties facilitating intercultural learning (Harvey, 2013). How can we expect to move the dialogue on our campuses forward when many members of our community do not yet have an entirely intercultural or relativistic perspective?

None of this is easy. What students demand and deserve is truly an upending of limiting structures, a destabilizing and ultimately a dismantling of hierarchies, a disturbance of power. In order to achieve these aims, or even to move towards them, we must demand of ourselves the courage to speak
openly and respectfully about these challenges, about the truths in each and every perspective. International educators could offer possibilities for this dialogue, frameworks of learning and development, lessons learned about how to balance challenge and support, and to help individuals move towards multiplicity, and beyond to ethical commitments.

Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt argue that in order to free ourselves from hierarchical and damaging concepts of identity and difference, we must ultimately abolish identity entirely. Yet we cannot dissolve identity without also and simultaneously making hierarchies and power structures visible and seeking freedom from them. These three tasks must be inseparable. Thus far, the conversation about identity politics and civil rights in US higher education has centered largely on trying to alleviate the discrimination and disadvantages experienced by our students, often without seeking to disrupt the larger structures causing the discrimination. It is time to engage in an alternate narrative, to create a third space. This will require us to think differently about civil rights and about identity. It will require us to be provocative, literally to provoke our communities into spaces of challenge, dialogue, and critical reflection. As Negri and Hardt observe: “Revolution is not for the faint of heart. It is for monsters. You have to lose who you are to discover what you can become” (Negri and Hardt, 2009: 340).
Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Era of Police Militarization

Thomas Nolan, Merrimack College

The Police and the Constitution

On July 5, 2016, Alton Sterling, a thirty-seven-year-old African-American man known for selling CDs outside of a convenience store, was shot and killed by police in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The following day, on July 6, police in Falcon Heights, Minnesota, shot and killed Philando Castile, a thirty-two-year-old African-American motorist who had been stopped by police while driving with his girlfriend and her four-year-old daughter. In the aftermath of these shootings on July 7, a gunman in Dallas, Texas, Micah Johnson, shot and killed five Dallas police officers and wounded nine others. Ten days later, a gunman in Baton Rouge, Gavin Long, opened fire on Baton Rouge police officers, killing three officers and wounding three others. Many law enforcement officers decried a so-called “war on cops.” Calls for the escalation of the militarization of the police re-emerged in the public discourse.\textsuperscript{91}

Earlier events that began in 2014 in Ferguson, Missouri; Staten Island, New York; North Charleston, South Carolina; Baltimore, Maryland; Washington, DC; Cleveland and Cincinnati, Ohio; and Waller County, Texas have brought the perilous disconnect between domestic law enforcement practitioners and the communities that they police into a worrisome and troubling focus. That grand juries hearing evidence in both Staten Island and St. Louis County have failed to bring indictments against police officers who killed unarmed

\textsuperscript{91} The events connected to Alton Sterling, Philando Castile, Micah Johnson, and Gavin Long, and the subsequent national debates were widely discussed throughout the US media and internationally. These examples represent a small sample of the various reports and signify the divisive nature of responses to police violence and the subsequent violence inflicted upon the police (see, for example, Associated Press, 2016a; King, 2016; Jan, 2017; Rice, 2017).
African-American men, Eric Garner and Michael Brown—both suspected of committing only minor crimes—is cause for grave concern regarding the ability of our criminal justice system to ensure equal protection under the law as well as compliance with the provisions of the Constitution that guarantee civil rights and civil liberties to all. Grand juries that fail to return indictments against police accused of wrongdoing, which too often results in the deaths of men, women, and children of color, convey unspoken yet unequivocal support for police practices that are routinely violative of the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution.

Tacit messages conveyed to me during my twenty-seven years as a Boston police officer and lieutenant were these: the provisions of the Constitution pertaining to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, search and seizure, probable cause, due process, and equal protection (among other provisions) could be disregarded and dispensed with as obstacles to “street justice.” Criminal justice system failures and injustices, such as the arguable failure of the grand jury process in both Missouri and New York, do little to counter the widespread perception, held most closely by the police themselves, that law enforcement officers are held to a much different standard of legal culpability than ordinary citizens. Grand juries are typically populated with people who have had little if any exposure to the vagaries of the experiential world of the police or the police subculture and may glean what understanding they have from the popular culture and the mainstream media. They may believe that the day-to-day experiences of law enforcement officers are fraught with ever-present danger, peril, and violence. That the police themselves do little if anything to dispel this commonly understood yet wholly inaccurate myth may contribute to the emergence of this criminal justice double standard. The double standard exists when an unarmed African-American teenager can be shot and killed with impunity by police for the crime of jaywalking, or when the police can choke an African-American man to death for the crime of selling untaxed cigarettes.

The due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution are unequivocal in requiring that no state shall “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 law.” Yet those engaged in domestic law enforcement operations, particularly in com-
munities of color, too often believe that the “process” that plays out in the streets of our communities supersedes the mandates of the Constitution. The exoneration and vindication that prosecutors and juries unfailingly grant to the police when they kill unarmed African-American men confirms the dichotomy between the Constitution and the criminal justice system: the police may occasionally make costly mistakes, but if the cost is the life of a black man at the hands of a white police officer, the cost is one that the criminal justice system is prepared to bear. In the eyes of many, that is exactly what has caused the justice system to become criminal.

The Demise of Community Policing

The mid 1970s through the early 2000s saw a shift in the philosophy of domestic policing in the United States from one that embraced rapid response to 911 calls for service and an omnipresent, ubiquitous police imprint to one that endorsed principles of so-called “community policing” or “problem-oriented policing.” These policing philosophies advocated partnerships between the police and the communities that they served in a collaborative effort to identify problems and to propose solutions that both the police and the community “stakeholders” could work toward resolving. Under community policing principles, residents were seen as “co-producers” of strategies to address quality-of-life issues that required law enforcement and community intervention. Partnerships were forged between the police and community residents to solve problems and to prevent crime. Community policing was the mantra in the United States throughout the latter part of the twentieth century, and many attribute the sharp reduction in the rates of violent crime during the 1990s to the successful implementation and adoption of the philosophies of community and problem-oriented policing.

Even though most domestic law enforcement agencies nationwide still publicly embrace community-policing principles as their operational philosophy, I believe that the demise of community policing began with the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. Police in the United States quickly morphed into front line shock troops in the domestic war on terrorism. Partnerships with the community, co-producers and collaborators in shared community betterment, were all

---

92 For discussion of this term, see for example, Spelman & Eck (1987) and Goldstein (1990).
quickly superseded by what law enforcement saw as an unprecedented threat requiring all available police, and now, military resources.

**The Militarization of the Police: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at Peril**

Beginning in 1990 and 1991 with the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act, Congress authorized the Department of Defense, through the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), to transfer surplus military equipment to domestic law enforcement agencies for their use in fighting the so-called “War on Drugs” in what became known as the “1033 Program.” The belief at the time was that law enforcement agencies in the United States faced an unprecedented threat from heavily armed drug cartels and drug distributors that could only be countered by equipping police with military-grade weapons and vehicles. Since its inception, the 1033 Program has distributed over $5.1 billion worth of equipment to over 8,000 law enforcement agencies. In 2013 alone, $450 million worth of equipment was distributed to local, state, and county agencies (Else, 2014).  

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and in the years that followed, domestic law enforcement operations in the United States began a strategic shift toward tactical initiatives that endorsed and supported more militarized responses to routine police activities. Much of the militarization of domestic law enforcement has been facilitated and supported by the federal government through DLA’s 1033 Program as well as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) and the Department of Justice (DOJ) Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program. The 1033 Program provides police agencies with M-16 and M-14 rifles, bayonets, night vision goggles, military aircraft, tactical vehicles—such as Bearcats and Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles—and military watercraft. The HSGP and JAG funding allows police departments to purchase tactical weapons, military uniforms, less lethal weapons, body armor, and SWAT equipment: all contributing in large part to the militarization of civilian law enforcement in the United States.

It has become commonplace in the United States during the first and second decades of the twenty-first century to see police officers dressed in Battle

---

93 For a detailed analysis and commentary on the 1033 Program, see Rezvani, Popvac, Eads & Fisher (2014).
Dress Uniforms (BDU) or other military-type uniforms that were designed for use during actual combat operations and military engagement with an enemy during war. Modified M-16 and M-4 rifles are standard patrol long guns in many police departments across the country. Tactical military vehicles are routinely used in SWAT deployments and crowd control incidents. City police and state highway patrol agencies now frequently use unmarked black SUVs with blacked out windows, such as those used by the United States Secret Service, the FBI, and the DEA.

Dressing police as soldiers and equipping them with military weapons and body armor, having these officers perform routine patrol activities in fortified and armored vehicles, and sending these officers into our communities to engage an enemy causes them to adopt the mentality of warriors and the trope of soldiers engaged in a war on the battlefield. The battlefields have become our communities and we are the enemy. As any soldier will readily admit, on the battlefield there is no Constitution, and enemies do not have civil rights or civil liberties. These, then, are the casualties that we are taking in our communities and neighborhoods. Our new policing paradigm: The “Homeland Security Police.”

The Militarization of the Police: The Boston Marathon Bombing

On April 15, 2013, two bombs were detonated near the finish line of the Boston Marathon, killing three spectators and injuring over 260 others. The response of the law enforcement community to this attack was without precedent in contemporary United States history and included thousands of police officers, both on- and off-duty, from all over New England, as well as federal agents of the FBI, ATF, DHS, CIA, and others. Additionally, 19,000 National Guard troops moved into the city to assist in the search for the bombing suspects who were identified from surveillance photos taken on Boylston Street as Tamerlan and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev.

Governor Deval Patrick ordered residents to remain in their homes and to “shelter in place,” a term ordinarily used in reference to remaining indoors during a chemical or biological weapons attack in order to avoid contamination. Reports of the law enforcement response at the time of the bombing attack characterized it as “mayhem” and “chaos.” The police, dressed in military uniforms, equipped with military long rifles, dogs, body armor, and driving
heavily militarized vehicles, cordoned off a twenty-square block section in Watertown and parts of the city of Cambridge and conducted warrantless house-to-house searches of hundreds of homes, often ordering residents out of their homes at gunpoint. These warrantless searches of homes were conducted in clear violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, and to date there has been no public accounting for, or explanation from the police regarding, their riding roughshod over the unequivocal mandates contained in the Fourth Amendment. No law enforcement official has provided any rationale or justification for the decision to dispense with the provisions of the US Constitution in the search for the surviving bombing suspect, who was found hiding in a boat after a resident called 911 and reported seeing a hand moving the boat’s covering. Officers converging on the boat fired hundreds of rounds into the vessel and the suspect, Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, was found to be unarmed. Tsarnaev has since been convicted of crimes related to the Boston Marathon bombing and has been sentenced to death.

The analysis of the police response to the Boston Marathon bombing, released by the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency in December 2014, found that thousands of police officers from across Massachusetts, New England, and New York “self deployed” to the town of Watertown, Massachusetts, where it was believed that Dzhokhar Tsarnaev was hiding. These officers had not responded to any mutual aid request and did so without authorization. The report found “that there was no command or management structure formally assigned to manage incoming mutual aid personnel” (Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency, et al., 2014: 10). This hyper-exaggerated, highly militarized response likely exacerbated an already dangerous situation and posed a serious threat to the safety of the officers on the scene who did in fact have the legal authority to respond to the incident and subsequent search. The report also cited a lack of “weapons discipline” in officers randomly firing their weapons without identifying targets and creating dangerous and potentially deadly crossfire situations.

The police response to this horrific incident was so fearsome, menacing, frightening, and intimidating that voices objecting to the warrantless searches or questioning Fourth Amendment and other Constitutional issues fell silent, lest they be labeled unpatriotic or terrorist sympathizers. For 108 hours in Boston, chaos and mayhem were the (dis)order of the day, and the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution was shelved as the police morphed into the
military, and civil rights and civil liberties were figuratively struck down with the butt of an M-16 rifle. No one was surprised and few objected when a year later, for the running of the 2014 Boston Marathon, the police announced that they would be conducting searches—warrantless searches—of anyone carrying a backpack on the street in the vicinity of the marathon finish line (UPI, 2014).

The Militarization of the Police: Events in Ferguson, Missouri

On August 9, 2014, Ferguson, Missouri police officer Darren Wilson shot and killed an unarmed African-American teenager, Michael Brown, after an altercation following Officer Wilson’s ordering Brown to refrain from jaywalking. That Brown was unarmed and that his body lay on the ground for over four hours infuriated residents of St. Louis County, and they took to the streets in protest. The law enforcement response to the largely peaceful protests was a hyper-exaggerated, hysterical, and highly militarized juggernaut. Thousands of police officers from Ferguson and surrounding municipalities, the St. Louis County Police Department, the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, as well as troops of the Missouri National Guard, were assembled in Ferguson to meet the threat posed by several hundred largely peaceful and unarmed protesters.

The law enforcement footprint was monolithic: police dressed as soldiers stood atop gun turrets in Bearcat and Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) military vehicles pointing M-16 and M-4 rifles at unarmed protesters. Police used Long-Range Acoustic Devices (sonic sound cannons developed for military defense) and fired upon protesters using rubber bullets, tear gas (banned by the Geneva Conventions for use during war), smoke bombs and grenades, stun grenades, wood bullet projectiles, pepper pellet rounds, and beanbag rounds (New York Times, 2015). For most people in the United States, and the world, this was the first glimpse into the newly emergent and highly militarized “homeland security” police, resplendent in their military uniforms and gear, riding in their fortified MRAP vehicles, flying above in their military aircraft, while shooting, gassing, deafening, bombing, and stunning members of the community who were engaging in constitutionally protected activities. The police in Ferguson, Missouri roundly trounced the First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom to petition government for redress, as well as freedom of the press. These constitutionally protected freedoms were ignored and trampled by police forces that had adopted a highly-militarized posture and response to
a situation that was wholly the result of police misconduct: excessive force that caused the death of Michael Brown; secrecy and lies in the aftermath of the shooting; the unilateral suppression of civil rights, civil liberties, and the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Consider the report issued by the Department of Justice (DOJ) on March 4, 2015 that roundly condemned not only the Ferguson Police Department (FPD), but also the entire system of criminal justice as administered in the City of Ferguson (United States Department of Justice, 2015). The DOJ report found that the FPD regulates the activities and behavior of Ferguson’s African-American residents, workers, students, and visitors through petty stops and harassment, and enforcement strategies designed to raise revenue rather than to protect the public, and that it does so in collusion with the municipal court and the city government. These practices are wholly inimical to commonly accepted and widely supported community policing principles that are endorsed by virtually all of the almost 18,000 legitimate police agencies protecting and serving our communities in the United States. These procedures, combined with race-based and pervasive violations of the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, serve to delegitimize the Ferguson Police Department.

The FPD has a dysfunctional history of operating beyond the margins of commonly accepted twenty-first century police practices, and it is a department that has become a renegade and outlaw menace. The recommendations contained in the DOJ report somewhat optimistically presume that the FPD is a department that can be rehabilitated and reborn into one that respects the law and the Constitution and that will ensure the safety of the members of the community through respectful and just treatment.

**Militarization, Technology, and the Erosion of the Police Narrative**

Concomitant with the escalation of police strategies and policies that privilege the acquisition of military equipment, as well as military operational tactics in routine engagement with the civilian population, is the memorialization and dissemination of video and audio recordings of the police engaged in these activities by members of the public. Thus, militarization, coupled with the widespread distribution of video footage evidencing police violence and brutality via social media and other outlets, contributes to an erosion of trust
in the police and a tangible sense of dread, danger, and peril in many of our communities, particularly communities of color (communities where the legacy of police-community “relations” is already characterized by suspicion and mistrust based on a history of oppression, racism, and discrimination).

Historically, it has been the police who have maintained a firm grip and almost complete control of the law enforcement narrative in the United States. The police version of events and incidents that they were involved in was always and readily accepted as factual, truthful, and without question, at least by the white working and middle class. The police routinely hold press conferences to display the drugs and guns that they have “taken off the streets” in order to convince us that they have been effective in, and dedicated to, keeping our communities safe from criminals. When the police used deadly force and killed men, women, and children, we accepted their version of the events leading up to the deadly encounters (one inevitably fraught with danger, violence, bravery, and heroism—for the police) without question. After all, the police themselves meticulously and methodically investigated these instances of the use of deadly force and always came to the “proper” conclusion.

On April 4, 2015, Walter Scott, according to the initial police narrative, attacked North Charleston, South Carolina police officer Michael Slager and attempted to steal the officer’s Taser weapon, causing the officer to fear for his life and necessitating Officer Slager to fire eight times at Scott, killing him. That all too familiar narrative was accepted as factual and truthful, at least until the video surfaced—showing Officer Slager shooting Scott in the back as he ran away from the officer and then planting the Taser weapon on Scott’s lifeless body. Scott was a fifty-year-old African-American man; Slager, now charged with murder after the evidence contained on the eyewitness video challenged the officer’s version of the events, is white.\(^94\)

On July 19, 2015, Samuel DuBose, a forty-three-year-old African-American resident of Cincinnati, Ohio, was shot to death by white University of Cincinnati police officer Ray Tensing. Tensing initially reported that DuBose had dragged him with his car and that he feared for his life. That version of the events leading to the death of DuBose at the hands of then-Officer Tensing (he has since been fired and charged with murder) would no doubt have been

\(^{94}\) For a recent discussion of the case, see Cobb (2016).
believed without question—until video obtained from Tensing’s own body camera showed Tensing shooting DuBose in the head without provocation or any apparent precipitating actions.

Only with the emerging ubiquity of video footage depicting police actions that stand in stark contrast to familiar and long-practiced police narratives do we begin to imagine a shift in the discourse: challenges to the credibility that has long been accorded to the police by default. It would have been unimaginable even a few years ago to see police officers charged with murder for killing unarmed black men, as has occurred in North Charleston, South Carolina, and Cincinnati, Ohio.

The militarization of the police in the United States, coupled with the exposure of the police using deadly force against unarmed African-American men, women, and children without justification, has caused those concerned with issues involving social justice to interrogate the police narrative. It is fair to say that the police version of events will continue to be viewed skeptically and to be questioned and not accepted as truthful or factual without corroboration and substantiation.

The police see themselves as the victims in the emerging narrative. This “self-victimization” will prove inimical and detrimental to productive dialogue and relationship building that needs to occur between the police and communities of color before fractured and ruptured trust and confidence can be re-established (if it ever existed at all).

Those of us who remember the Chicago police riot at the 1968 Democratic National Convention or the May 4, 1970 shooting of four students at Kent State University by the Ohio National Guard may have thought that law enforcement repression of those engaged in activities protected by the Constitution was a phenomenon studied in history books: a legacy of the bad old days. The increased militarization of the almost 18,000 police forces in the United States reminds us that we must remain vigilant and that we must continue to interrogate those in law enforcement who arrogate the authority to interpret the Constitution and to impose arbitrary limitations on our civil rights and civil liberties.
Freedom of the Press as a Right of the People to Know About the Acts of Their Government: A Brief History

Bernardo H. Motta, University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers

Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

Introduction: Difficulties in Defining “Freedom of the Press”

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (US Constitution, First Amendment)

Thanks to its vagueness, interpretations of the First Amendment to the US Constitution range from a strict publishers’ protection against prior restraint, similar to freedom of speech but for the written word, to a much broader idea that journalists, as representatives of the general public, have a special right to obtain information from the government and impart that information to the public (Halstuk, 2002). The discussion of what press freedom actually means in the courtrooms has usually favored a stricter view, but exceptions, dissenting opinions, and scholarly and political arguments point to the general acceptance that the public, if not the press itself, has a right to know about the doings of the government. The press, as a representative of the public, enjoys a somewhat privileged position to obtain and deliver that information, as the US Supreme Court found in Branzburg v. Hayes (1972), for example.
Historically, the definition of the press, as an institution, has also evolved. As Samuel Freedman wrote in his *Letters to a Young Journalist* (2006), definitions about journalism have always been moving targets:

> The value system that I have in mind—that a journalist is an honest broker of information, which has been assiduously reported, verified for accuracy, and written without bias or partisanship—is a product only of the past century, as Michael Schudson made clear in his indispensable history *Discovering the News* (Freedman, 2006: 11)

In despotic societies, in which the press is highly regulated, it would probably be easier to define the press as the group of agents who either work for the government or with its permission to publicize official information. In other words, journalists in those societies are not much more than public information officers.

In open societies, trying to define who is a journalist is considerably harder (Flanagan, 2012). In the United States, for example, unlike lawyers and medical doctors, journalists do not have a self-regulating body. Courts and governmental agencies have struggled to distinguish professional reporters working in newsrooms of established news media from professional reporters working as freelancers or for not-for-profit organizations. It was only during Barack Obama’s administration that a news blogger became recognized as a journalist who could be part of the White House’s press corps. In addition, many amateur, hobbyist, and citizen journalists may stumble upon important news and may require legal protection for their work (Shepard, 2009).

The Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) recognizes the definition problem and offers the idea of defining journalism as an activity instead of defining the actor (journalist):

> How do you define a journalist? This is a difficult question. Once a “journalist” is defined then before long the government might start raising the idea of licensing journalists, which can lead to a form of censorship that is found in other countries. In general, SPJ favors a functional definition in the shield bills that defines “journalism” rather than “journalist.” In other words, a definition that provides protection...
to those who “commit acts of journalism,” rather than focusing on a job title or employment status (SPJ, n.d: n.p.)

Nonetheless, even committing “acts of journalism” may be complicated to define. Is a paparazzo running after celebrities committing an “act of journalism”? How about a lawyer or scientist writing an opinion piece to be published in a news magazine? Does a fifth grader working for the school’s news blog have the same status as a professional journalist? Information-dump sites such as Wikileaks have also been questioned about their function as journalism practitioners. Discussing who is a journalist on a case-by-case basis can be frustrating, if not futile, while trying to make broad assertions can curtail freedom of the press.

The more important and useful question may be who has the authority to decide what is or is not an “act of journalism”? The government? The courts? Professional associations? Recently, Observer Media Group’s CEO Linda Solomon Wood testified to the Canadian parliamentary Heritage Committee that certifying journalists may be the future: “But in terms of who is a journalist, what is a journalist, in the same way that lawyers have to be certified or pass a bar exam, we could have those kinds of structures for journalism.” (Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, 2016).

Wood’s testimony inspired reaction: the issue was raised by the trade magazine Editor & Publisher (February 2017) and two commentators rejected the idea that the government, or any other organization, should license or define who is a journalist or not. The discussion over defining and licensing journalists is not new; many countries adopt one form or another of licensing and/or defining journalists.

The Press and the Truth Under Attack

However, a rampant attack on the credibility of the news media in recent years, particularly during the Trump presidential campaign as well as after his inauguration, has provoked a series of articles about the ways in which the news media can fight back in the main trade news magazines and media observers’ websites (Dawes, 2016; Lewis, 2016a; 2016b; Mantzarlis, 2016; 2017b; 2017c; Uberti, 2017; Warren, 2016; 2017). The phenomenon is not
expressively American (Lewis, 2016a; Mantzarlis, 2017a; Weilandt, 2017), but the Trump campaign and administration have received special attention for the number of incidents involving open attacks and easily verifiable lies (Warren, 2016).

Expressions such as propaganda, fake news, and Lügenpresse ("lying press") (Noack, 2016) have once again been used with an intention to hurt journalistic credibility. Directly from the playbook of fascist régimes, the assault on the news media is an effective way to cause confusion and to attract audiences to alternative media offering “alternative facts,” as Kellyanne Conway, a counselor to the American president, put it during a Meet the Press interview on January 22, 2017. It also helps official sources to reinforce their ideological view with their supporters.

“The first casualty, when war comes, is truth.” Hiram Johnson, at the time a US Senator representing California, made the famous statement during World War I. Johnson died on August 6, 1945, the day the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima. War, or at least the perception of imminent danger and the need for heightened security, is a central argument used by anti-democratic governments to cement their power. National security is largely accepted as a legal exception to allow the limitation of rights, or the freedom to exercise those rights, in most democratic countries. Security issues are also often claimed by those in power to curtail or circumvent the work of a free press.

The Need for a Functioning Press

In times of presidential tweets, governmental websites, and Facebook pages, governments do not need the press to send out their messages directly to the population. Accessing public officials and public places is not as fundamental to democracy when public officials are directly engaged in propaganda and misinformation. The public interest in a free independently functioning press has become the need of the people to have an “honest broker of information, which has been assiduously reported, verified for accuracy, and written without bias or partisanship” (Freedman, 2006: 11) to ensure that the information obtained from the government is not only relevant, accurate, and complete, but also understandable in its causes, motives, impacts, and consequences.
As the general public does not usually have the knowledge, the training or, more importantly, the time to acquire that level of information on its own, a functioning press with freedom to do its work and with access to government’s documents, officials, scientists, technocrats, and ground workers is still the best way the general population can learn about the actions of its government in a meaningful way.

Many issues of freedom of expression have also muddled the discussion over freedom of the press. Looking at the journalists as not only the imparters of information, but also as the investigators and analysts of such information in the public interest, helps to focus the discussion on the ways freedom of the press distinguishes itself from freedom of speech. It also allows the discussion to go beyond censorship to include the rights and/or privileges necessary for the press to perform its public function of acquiring, verifying, and analyzing information.

For example, SPJ’s straightforward definition of certain “acts of journalism” as those that are in the public interest—knowing and evaluating the actions of government—disentangles the arguments from those related to issues of freedom of expression. This conversation could include the idea that people living in democratic societies have a human and a civil right to know what their governments do, a right to obtain that information without unreasonable constraints (reasonability here is another point of discussion), a right to be educated to understand the information about their government’s activities, and a right to form their own opinions about the activities of their government. These would be followed by a right freely to express those opinions, a right to engage in unrestrained discussions about the government’s activities in any public forum or medium, and the right to act lawfully in response to governmental action by vote, petition, public demonstrations of dissent, or any other form of communication, which would also include the freedom to assemble and the right to petition the government for redress of grievances. In other words, under this premise, the press acts as surrogate for the people’s right “to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media,” as established by Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In regards to the First Amendment, this definition would finally distinguish freedom of the press in a way that makes sense as a continuum of the other four freedoms and that links it back to a fundamental human right.
Freedom of the Press and the History of the Right to Know About and to Act on Government’s Activities

The idea that the public has a right to know about the purposes and actions of government evolved through John Milton, William Bollan, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, George Mason, John Wilson, and James Madison among others (Halstuk, 2002; Meyers, 1968; Motta, 2009; Uhm, 2008). Kiul Uhm (2008) argued that the right to know can be found in the text of the Declaration of Independence in which Jefferson accused King George III of making it virtually impossible for the American people to find out information about the British government’s actions:

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their Public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures (The Declaration of Independence para. 6, US, 1776)

It became common in the colonies for people to be fined for not following a new law that they never knew existed. Jefferson believed that, if a real democracy were to prevail in what would become the United States of America (Uhm, 2008), the people could only retain power if they were informed about the activities of government and took active part in the political process.

For Jefferson, the concept of a right to know was more than a simple right to access information: it included the right to be educated about the functions of the government so people (through the works of the press) could watch and control the actions of government. In a letter to Edward Carrington in January 1787, Jefferson explains his views:

I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army. They may be led astray for a moment,

95 Jefferson, unlike the majority of his peers, believed in a liberal democratic system which, later on, became the basis for his Jeffersonian Democrat Party (Uhm, 2008: 396). It is also important to point out that the interpretation presented here is an analysis of the writing and discourse of these individuals and their beliefs, not their actual practices. Jefferson, for example, was very emphatically against slavery in his discourse, but being a rich man, he had scores of slaves himself even after he became president.

96 Historians tend to agree that Jefferson was mostly against government secrecy as he made evident in his writing. For more on this topic, see Randall (1993); a rebuttal to that theory is provided by Levy (1963).
but will soon correct themselves. The people are the only censors of their governors: and even their errors will tend to keep these to the true principles of their institution. To punish these errors too severely would be to suppress the only safeguard of the public liberty. The way to prevent these irregular interpositions of the people is to give them full information of their affairs thro’ the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people. The basis of our governments being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean that every man should receive those papers, and be capable of reading them (Epps, 2008: 74)

The mix of education and information was, according to Jefferson, fundamental to protect the right he considered the most important of all: freedom of opinion. Jefferson believed that the right to a thoroughly informed opinion was the very basis of a fair system and the only protection people have against their governments. In an almost prophetic passage, Jefferson wrote:

Cherish therefore the spirit of our people, and keep alive their attention. Do not be too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them. If once they become inattentive to the public affairs, you and I, and Congress and Assemblies, judges and governors shall all become wolves. It seems to be the law of our general nature, in spite of individual exceptions; and experience declares that man is the only animal which devours his own kind, for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe, and to the general prey of the rich on the poor (Epps, 2008: 74)

Jefferson was not the first one to come up with such a complex notion regarding a right to knowledge and information. The idea that the decision-making process should be carried out by informed citizens can be traced back to the ancient Greeks (Motta, 2009).

Thomas Paine formulated the need of the people to be able to investigate and point out defects in legislation to correct them. In the “Applying Principle
to Practice Preface” of the second edition of The Rights of Men, he wrote:

The defects of every government and constitution both as to principle and form, must, on a parity of reasoning, be as open to discussion as the defects of a law, and it is a duty which every man owes to society to point them out. When those defects, and the means of remedying them, are generally seen by a nation, that nation will reform its government or its constitution in the one case, as the government repealed or reformed the law in the other. The operation of government is restricted to the making and the administering of laws; but it is to a nation that the right of forming or reforming, generating or regenerating constitutions and governments belong; and consequently those subjects, as subjects of investigation, are always before a country as a matter of right, and cannot, without invading the general rights of that country, be made subjects for prosecution (Paine, 1791-92)

Paine participated actively in the preparation of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens by The National Assembly of France which included a version of the right to know in one of its seventeen items: “Fifteen: Every community has a right to demand of all its agents an account of their conduct.” For Paine, likewise for Jefferson, the right to know was an instrumental right to secure all other rights. Both of them might have followed William Bollan’s (1766) idea of an instrumental right to free examination of public measures.

[T]he free examination of public measures, with a proper representation by speech or writing of the sense resulting from that examination, is the right of the members of a free state, and requisite for the preservation of their other rights (Bollan, 1766: 3)

Letters from Jefferson, Madison, Mason, and Paine are evidence that at least a few of the mainstream thinkers of the time defended the instrumental importance of a right to know. Other historians have also identified the common belief among educated Americans of the period of the American Revolution that an informed and educated citizenry was necessary to support a legitimate government (Smith, 1981).

Finally, James Madison, who was to be the major force in proposing and drafting the Bill of Rights, urged in letters exchanged with Jefferson for the inclusion
of a right to know (Conway, 1894; Jefferson, 1783a; 1783b; Larson, 2007):

A popular Government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a Farce or a Tragedy; or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance: And a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives (Hunt, 1900)

Conclusion

It is particularly important to note that Madison, as did Bollan, emphasized the importance of acquiring and examining information and not only of expressing opinions. Key documents are The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789), mostly drafted by General Lafayette, similar American iterations such as the Virginia Bill of Rights (1776), the Declaration of Independence (1776), and the Bill of Rights (1789), and much later, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). These documents do not contain any specific clarification that a free press means that people have the right to free expression of speech and publication. They also do not ensure access to knowledge of government actions. We only learn about the intentions of those who framed those documents by interpreting the historical records, behind-the-scenes discussions, letters, and other evidence. In the same way that we depend on historians, librarians, and archaeologists to unveil the truth about the past, we depend on journalists to unveil the truth about the present.

A clearer definition of a public interest based on the public’s need to know about the actions and activities of one’s government provides a better framework to define a legal right, or at least a privilege, represented by the freedom of the press. History demonstrates that a properly educated and functioning press is the expression of a properly educated and functioning citizenship. In times of turmoil and of attacks against transparency, press freedom, and even the truth, it becomes ever more important to remember that those who formulated the First Amendment had more than the right not to be censored in mind when they discussed the idea of a free press: the only defense against tyranny.
TEACHING AND PRACTICING RIGHTS

Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world

Nelson Mandela
Sarah was enrolled in a service-learning class that worked with Charity House, a drop-in center for people living on the streets. She visited once a week for a couple of hours over the course of a semester. At first, she was compelled by stories about her own city from new, unfamiliar, and startling perspectives. She spent each Wednesday afternoon talking with a man named Timothy about his military service, need for structure, addictions, violence, love of music, and life on the streets. With each conversation, Sarah grew frustrated by the interlocking social problems of poverty, homelessness, racism, and by complexity of social service, legal, and political systems. After a dozen afternoons at Charity House, Sarah had completed her service-learning commitment but was moved to do more. She raised funds to purchase and distribute personal hygiene items. But that too felt like offering a bandage when so much more was needed. Sarah was galvanized to action by a proposed city council ordinance limiting the proximity of homelessness service providers. She testified in front of the council about the need and value of these services, and when the ordinance was passed anyway, she protested outside city hall. Reflections on Timothy’s story eventually led her to a veterans’ advocacy center, lobbying the legislature to fund employment programs for homeless veterans.

One year after her service-learning course, I asked Sarah if she would speak to my class about her experience at Charity House. Her resistance surprised me. “It doesn’t do any good to volunteer when the system is set up to keep people down. Your students ought to be out there changing the system instead.” This was the opening statement in a long conversation about charity and social justice in service-learning. We discussed the dynamics of being in relationship with those who face daily injustices and with those who work
to alleviate injustices; the difficulty of understanding the assets and deficits of both individuals and communities; the efficacy and unintended consequences of social change strategies, and what it means to take action as a citizen, an organization, or a university. By the end of our conversation we had not solved great social problems, but we did explore the tensions between various approaches to social change; we considered the ethical quandaries posed by linking service and learning, and we agreed to bring that conversation into my classroom.

Service-Learning as Charity or Justice?

Sarah and I are not alone in that conversation. The deference given to charity or justice in service-learning gets at critical questions about the relationships among universities, students, social service organizations, and the subjects of service. But charity and justice need not be mutually exclusive. Choosing one approach does not necessarily mean neglecting the other. Sarah’s sense of agency grew as she understood more about the connections and tensions between serving immediate needs, challenging unjust systems, and promoting social justice. Service-learning practitioners and scholars are growing in understanding too, as we wrestle with the complex ethical, practical, and pedagogical challenges implicit in this powerful approach to education and change. How do we move beyond the choice between charity and justice to find a wider context for service-learning?

Service-learning has grown in popularity and credibility since “the early to mid-1980s saw a resurgence of interest in campus service and service-learning, with a national initiative to promote service among undergraduate students” (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, 2008). This early enthusiasm for service-learning was later tempered by critical appraisals of its shortcomings. As the field grew, concepts and terminology evolved to describe an appreciative yet critical understanding of complex dynamics between individuals served, social service organizations, students, faculty, service-learning organizations, and higher education institutions. Simple formulations of service-learning were (and sometimes still are) premised as meeting academic goals while contributing to the community, with projects like painting a house, cleaning a playground, or raising funds for a homeless shelter. Such acts of charity can be a good in and of themselves. However, charitable projects
alone are unlikely to remedy social problems, they may be used as license to maintain the status quo, and they may be undertaken without critical analysis of power and privilege. These shortcomings are indeed problematic and deserve critique by contemporary service-learning practitioners.

Some scholars decry the limitations of “service-learning-as-charity” (Artz, 2001: 240) and call for a justice-oriented approach in articles such as “From charity to justice” (Marullo and Edwards, 2000) and “Justice-learning: service-learning as justice-oriented education” (Butin, 2007). I appreciate this emphasis on justice, but contend that charity should not be disparaged uncritically, such that we focus solely on systemic change in service-learning. Other scholars make distinctions between “traditional” and “critical” service-learning (Mitchell, 2008) to differentiate uncritical charity work from critical service-learning that analyzes the dynamics of power and privilege. These authors acknowledge that charity can be essential to sustaining the lives of people caught in unjust systems, necessary to ameliorate suffering, and even ensure survival, but they must be undertaken critically. To deny the significance of charity is to allow for current social ills to worsen—or to sacrifice those currently suffering—in service of a commitment to social justice on the horizon. Charity can support individuals and groups in the immediate term while complementary efforts at systemic change bring about greater social justice over the long term.

Closer to the classroom, charity may also be a first developmental step in student engagement. Service-oriented projects can play a role in “pro-social decision-making” and understanding the “multidimensionality of social problems” (Batchelder and Root, 1994). Furco et al., in researching student preferences and learning outcomes, describe two “paradigms of service” defined as “charity or social change” (2008). Morton goes a step further to explore “related but distinct community service paradigms of charity, project and social change” (1995), acknowledging the role of charity in student growth and modifying sharp distinctions between charity and justice. Cipolle (2010) articulates student stages in service-learning—from commitment to service, and commitment to social justice, to critical consciousness—while cautioning against assumptions of unidirectional development. In addition, Marullo, Lance, and Schwarz, writing about peace studies and service-learning courses at Georgetown University, describe service-learning with mul-
tiple categories: direct service, challenging or changing social structures, research or technical support that contributes to policy discussions and/or change with respect to pressing social problems (1999: 51).

These authors have identified inter-related service-learning strategies while rejecting the dichotomy or unidirectional continuum between charity and justice. I suggest we integrate and expand these categories by employing a social change wheel model to contextualize charity within a variety of inter-related justice-oriented approaches. Integrating charity with social change provides a strategic and comprehensive approach to the goals of service-learning. Whether those goals are defined as enriching the student learning experience, encouraging civic responsibility, promoting public work, minimizing harm, or maximizing systems change, a social change wheel model can contextualize service in justice-oriented strategies to transcend the dichotomy between charity and justice. In addition to conceptual utility as an instrument of reflection, a social change wheel model can be applied to service-learning education, analysis, and planning. These three applications frame the remainder of this article.

The Social Change Wheel

The earliest social change wheel model associated with service-learning seems to have been developed by Langseth and Troppe in an unpublished conference paper (1996), and then published by the same authors a year later (1997). Social change wheel adaptations may be found in geographic proximity to its origins at Minnesota Campus Compact, including: the University of Minnesota, College of St. Benedict, and the University of St. Thomas. These adaptations typically reference Langseth and Troppe, or Minnesota Campus Compact, which Langseth directed at the time. A similar model is found at the Media Research Hub of the Social Science Research Council, and Minnesota Campus Compact has since updated its own model in a more detailed form.

Because individual service-learning projects and programs will benefit from different formulations of social change wheel models, I am not promoting one model over another. Adaptations to particular contexts and circumstances seem to be the norm, albeit in a small sample group. The Langseth and
Troppe social change wheel was originally composed of six categories around an empty hub: Charitable Volunteerism, Community/Economic Development, Voting/Formal Political Activities, Confrontational Strategies, Grassroots Political Activity/Public Policy Work, and Community Building (Minnesota Campus Compact, 1997). For purposes of this article, I will illustrate my own adaptation of this model, one that adds the category education in the hub or center of the wheel (figure 1). The other strategic categories of the social change wheel rely on knowledge or skills in order to be effective. Therefore education—in the form of teaching, learning, training, or awareness—is a significant foundation for the other six categories and an important node of connection between them.

**Figure 1: Social Change Wheel**

Before proceeding with applications and case studies for service-learning education, analysis, and planning, the limitations of such a model ought to be acknowledged. First, these abstract categories may overlap conceptually or sequentially when applied to real situations. For example, public policy is sometimes formulated within the context of grassroots organizing and shaped by lawmakers within formal political activities. Second, social change wheel categories could be further defined and elaborated. For example,
confrontational strategies could be articulated by Gene Sharpe’s 198 methods of non-violent direct action (1973). Third, categories are somewhat arbitrarily ordered on the wheel. The model does not imply movement from one category to the next in ordered rotation so much as a web of relationships between categories, often (but not always) intersecting through education.

I use my adaptation of the social change wheel model in three different modes to help contextualize service-learning in strategies for social change. First, I typically explain it through story (education mode) to engage students and educators in a hypothetical and simplified scenario addressing a social problem. Second, I use the model to examine an historical campaign that addresses a social problem (analysis mode). Third, I ask students or faculty to use it as a strategic tool to contextualize and strategize effective and ethical ways to address a social problem (planning mode). In the remainder of this article, I illustrate these three applications of the social change wheel through examples that move from theory to practice: teaching and learning about the model, analyzing a past event with the model, and planning classroom and institutional initiatives through strategic application of the model.

Teaching and Learning About the Social Change Wheel

In undergraduate classrooms, faculty seminars, or teacher in-service workshops, I use a hypothetical scenario to elicit participant descriptions of social change wheel categories. The reader may recognize the following scenario describing a puppy in distress on a river. Others use a baby as the subject, perhaps to garner a more sympathetic response. However, in my experience, this tends to lead to debate on pro-life, pro-choice issues that distract from the purpose of the scenario.

My campus is located near a major river, so I ask participants to imagine walking along the river bank where they notice a shivering puppy floating on a plank of wood. This puppy is obviously in distress and a hydroelectric dam lies just downstream. I ask participants, “What would you do?” Most suggest wading into the water, or using a branch or rope to retrieve the puppy. I continue the scenario by adding that several more puppies are now visible floating toward you; more than one person can manage to retrieve. I ask participants, “What would you do?” They typically respond, “Call my friends—or
bystanders—to help.” As friends arrive to lend assistance, even more puppies are spotted upstream. “Now what would you do?” Their responses tend to vary now, including: “organize a rescue team,” “call the police,” or “go upstream to see what’s going on.” This last response typifies the movement from charity to justice by getting at the root of the problem, going upstream. This is often where service-learning practitioners will dichotomize charity and justice approaches.

However, the scenario continues: “Upstream a group of large, threatening men reach into a truck and fling puppies into the river, one after another.” Participants often laugh at the ridiculousness of this situation, and ask why such a thing would happen. Other participants respond by describing “puppy mills” that over-breed dogs, or a bad economy that leaves dog owners desperate enough to abandon animals. Impassioned animal advocates want to intervene and confront the men, which might lead to violence. Others suggest calling the police. I continue the scenario by saying, “When the police arrive, the men escape. The police remark on this event as a regular occurrence that they do not have the personnel to address.”

Participants get indignant and begin making recommendations—strategizing—about how to address this social problem. “There ought to be a law against this,” or “People need to be aware of this issue,” or “If people would spay or neuter their pets…” or “Maybe the Humane Society could match these puppies to people who want them.” As they suggest changes and search for a solution, I record their strategies on a blank social change wheel diagram (on the blackboard or flipchart). Their responses tend to describe each one of the categories on the social change wheel with few exceptions (improvisation in the scenario is sometimes necessary to tease out a missing category). I then label each category and, following this educational exercise, move to the next step, analysis.

**Analyzing a Past Event with the Social Change Wheel**

To move from a hypothetical—and somewhat ridiculous—scenario to more realistic social issues, I introduce an historical example for analysis. Although many events and social movements would make suitable subjects for the analytical dimensions of this model, I typically use the 1955 Montgomery Bus
Boycott event in the Southern US Civil Rights Movement. More specifically, I show a video, “Eyes on the Prize: Part 1, Awakenings (1954-1956)” beginning with the story of Rosa Parks and ending with the conclusion of the bus boycott (about twenty-five minutes in length). This eleven-month, multidimensional, and successful campaign employed many social change strategies. It is well-documented, yet also includes elements that are commonly misunderstood and even surprising to students and educators alike. These factors make it particularly accessible and appropriate for social change wheel analysis.

Participants are instructed to watch the video closely in order to identify and write down examples for each social change wheel category on a worksheet with a black diagram of the model. Students or faculty have no trouble filling out each category on the wheel with examples from the Montgomery Bus Boycott (see figure 2). This activity provides several opportunities for critical analysis. Most significantly for the focus of this paper, it contextualizes the role of charitable volunteerism with other methods of social change. It does not dichotomize charity and justice, but rather integrates charity as one of seven inter-related strategies for social change.

Figure 2: Social Change Wheel Worksheet with Responses from the Montgomery Bus Boycott Activity
As an analytical activity, the social change wheel also helps identify relationships between different methods of change; for example: concurrent or sequential strategies, complementary or supportive strategies, and the potential of employing several strategies rather than singular approaches to social change. Thus, charitable volunteerism can be appreciated not just for its own sake, but also for supporting other social change strategies by extending immediate support in the midst of long-term change. For example, giving rides during the bus boycott (charitable volunteerism) enabled the eventual development of an alternative transportation system (capacity building). Moreover, some acts of charitable volunteerism made other social change strategies possible, such as Joann Robinson copying 30,000 notices to enable the confrontational strategy of the boycott. Analysis of historical cases with a social change wheel model can contextualize and deepen a critical understanding of charity while relating it to other strategies for social change, moving beyond dichotomous thinking about charity and justice.

Social change wheel analysis can also suggest the limitations of any one strategy if it is not connected to other methods of social change. For example, social change wheel analysis of the Montgomery Bus Boycott can deepen understanding of Rosa Park’s iconic action of refusing to give up her seat. In the contexts of other methods of social change, her action can be understood as more than the spontaneous act of a tired seamstress, as suggested by popular accounts and perpetuated by some history sources (such as ushistory.org). By connecting her voluntary individual action to other methods of social change, it can be critically examined as a confrontational strategy, rooted in her education at Highlander Folk School and in her grassroots organizing work through the NAACP. In this light, refusing to give up her seat is profoundly more complex than an individual act of exhaustion or defiance. Gender and social norms can also be examined through the social change wheel as participants consider why Rosa Park’s strategic arrest became an efficacious spark to the movement. As a test case for the courts, her arrest prefigured the formal political activities that tested the legitimacy of the segregation ordinance. In comparison, Claudette Colvin and Mary Louise Smith had been arrested for the same action, but due to “less than sterling character,” (Olson, 2002:94) local leadership strategically declined to connect their defiant actions to other strategies for social change. In this mode, a social change wheel model can integrate charity among other social change methods for strategic analysis of historical events.
Planning Service-Learning Initiatives with the Social Change Wheel

In addition to its educational and analytical modes, a social change wheel can also serve as a planning tool for service-learning projects. By considering all the categories of social change in the model, educators might envision new projects and partnerships that transcend charitable volunteerism alone by connecting it to other strategies. For instance, the social change wheel category of Voting/Formal Political Activities might encourage service-learning projects that promote citizenship education. The first planning example below examines how service-learning can support political literacy and democratic action.

When planning a service-learning project for a one-month January term class, students expressed an interest in learning about a selected country of study from recent immigrants. However, simple projects premised on charitable volunteerism might only provide an opportunity to struggle over translation issues together. So we used the social change wheel to conceptualize the type of service-learning project that would meet the goals of the class and the needs of a potential partner organization. Through education, students wanted to find a service-learning opportunity that allowed them to grow by sharing different aspects of culture. They hoped for a capacity building project that contributed toward a tangible goal beyond limited betterment of language skills. Voting rights for new immigrants became a potential focus. Through a community organizing lens that analyzed shared interests and needs, students recognized the limitations of a one-month partnership, both for the depth of their own engagement and for the needs of a local community organization.

After clarifying our goals and articulating our needs, the search began for a partnership based on the strategic considerations of our social change wheel analysis. We found a nearly ideal partner in the Jane Addams School for Democracy. New immigrants and college students came together in evening “cultural circles” as learners and teachers, working on language skills for one hour and sharing cultural traditions over a second hour. The organization had existing relationships with other collegiate service-learning programs, but most of these regular volunteers left over January term, so our one-month course could fill that unique need. In addition, many new immigrants at the Jane Addams School for Democracy were studying for their citizenship test, addressing the tangible goal my students desired. This partnership has continued for more than ten years, due in part to the strong foundation created
by strategic partnership planning through the social change wheel.

Planning with this model can promote collaborative and sustained change outside the classroom too: for example, campaigns on college campuses. When a student club I advise wanted to bring fair trade coffee to campus, they used the social change wheel to plan a sequence of actions. During a previous effort, students had presumed that a little volunteer time spent on educational events would quickly convince the student body and decision-makers that fair trade coffee just made sense. They expected change would be made from the top down; however, that result failed to materialize. I suggested that student organizers use a social change wheel model to promote more strategic and collaborative planning, rather than quick campaigns that led to frustration or confrontation.

By planning with the social change wheel, they realized that education was appropriate as one of many strategies: a means to an end. Community building in the midst of educational events might increase the number of students interested in fair trade coffee. By utilizing economic development/capacity building, students could collect data on the costs and benefits of providing fair trade over conventional coffee, or conduct research on financial obstacles and infrastructure or equipment-related issues. Grassroots organizing might match the interests of many individuals and groups on campus so that they could engage in formal political activities to make requests of campus decision-makers, or promote voting in student government for a resolution or policy change. If these approaches failed, confrontational strategies might garner more attention and promote a return to the work of other categories on the wheel.

Having imagined several tactics in each strategic category of the social change wheel, students were able to choose realistic and complementary actions to help them achieve the goal of a coordinated and collaborative campaign. While this example is outside of traditional service-learning connected to a particular classroom, it illustrates the planning potential of the social change wheel for goal-directed campaigns and projects in a service-learning context.

**Implications**

The potential for education, analysis, and planning through a social change
wheel model goes far beyond the examples highlighted above. Individual faculty might use a social change wheel model to imagine innovative approaches to service-learning beyond charitable volunteerism, or to integrate charity with other strategies to deepen critical analysis and achieve course objectives. Faculty seminars on service-learning could make use of this model to brainstorm a wide variety of engagement strategies with local communities and imagine new partnerships with community-based organizations beyond traditional volunteer groups. On an institutional level, service-learning institutions might use the social change wheel to analyze partnerships across campus and communities in order to better coordinate sometimes haphazard relationships. Schools and colleges might also analyze programs—or better yet strategize with communities—to maximize the potential of their partnerships based on shared outcomes. Service-learning projects might be planned sequentially so that where one classroom’s charitable volunteerism strategy leaves off, another classroom’s social change wheel strategy might begin, enhancing both the depth of engagement and the web of relationships. Research on the dynamics and outcomes of social change wheel modeling will also contribute to the simple cases presented above.

Conclusion

Social change wheel models contextualize complementary service-learning strategies to avoid the unnecessary dichotomy of charity and justice. By situating charity in the scope of inter-related methods of social change, it can be viewed as one of many approaches to social problems. When critically combined with other approaches, charity can complement and enhance strategies for social change, leading to service-learning projects that are more than the sum of their parts. Conversely, social change wheel models also suggest the limitations of charity in isolation from other methods of social change. Beyond addressing the dichotomy of charity and justice, a social change wheel model can be used in service-learning education, analysis, and planning to integrate charity with other methods of social change, and attend critically to the dynamics of charity and justice.
This volume orients itself on an issue that human rights scholars have recognized as a central tension: that states have been the only historic guarantors of human rights (Donnelly, 2003). That is, while the language and central tenets of rights theory suggests universality, the structures that ensure liberties such as freedom of movement, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the experience of a quality education are national not global. The deep irony in this observation of states as rights guarantors is that states have also been the largest violators of rights through systematic persecution of minorities, undermining freedom of the press, failing to support quality schooling, and other state-institutional attacks and inadequacies. It is civil society organizations—those collections of people that have social missions that are governed neither entirely by the market desire of profit nor the state desire of power—that continuously push states to appropriately enshrine and protect human rights as civil rights.

Civil society organizations are essential components in the development of rights experiences because while states have been the only historic guarantor of rights, the presence of a state does not guarantee rights. Rights are not merely objective conditions realized through a teleological process of states existing and improving. Rather, rights are “contingent moral aspirations” (Donnelly, 2003) that are tentative and open to change (Donnelly, 2003; Ignatieff, 2003). When people choose to hold governments accountable for the existence of rights, those rights are more likely to manifest. For those who believe that the presence of human rights represents important moral progress, it is therefore essential to include rights thinking and rights pedagogy within international education and community-campus engagement. In this sense, institutions of higher education are among the civil society organizations that hold states accountable for the existence and
experience of rights.

In the brief essay that follows, I will illustrate how international and community-engaged educational experiences offer important opportunities for intellectual inquiry centered on the juxtaposition between rights thinking and rights practice. I will illustrate the discussion with examples from a set of courses that continue students’ intellectual journeys relating to rights-thinking following eight-week summer internship experiences focusing on peace and social justice. In the conclusion, I will consider the question of how rights inquiry relates to teaching, preaching, and socialization.

Ensuring Disciplined Rights-Inquiry Accompanies Summer Internships

Haverford College’s Center for Peace and Global Citizenship (CPGC) supports summer internships for students at the intersection of their academic careers, peace work, and social justice efforts. This programming is advanced with a certain self-critical wariness. That wariness leads to curriculum and programming processes that aim carefully and conscientiously to encourage the development of humble, reflective social change leaders.

Programming connected to the CPGC is rooted in deep skepticism borne of a thorough review of the literature across several related fields of practice. The literature on community-engaged teaching and learning offers a robust critique of universities positioning communities as laboratories for the advancement of student learning, documenting community members who observe paternalistic, racist, and “taking” behaviors among students (Larsen, 2015; Stoecker and Tryon, 2009). In terms of advancing intercultural learning or humility, editors of a sweeping summary of the field of international education recently concluded, “Most students do not, then, meaningfully develop either through simple exposure to the environment or through having educators take steps to increase the amount of that exposure through ‘immersing’ them” (Vande Berg, Paige and Hemming Lou, 2012: 21). Moreover, the field in which many CPGC students intern—global development—has been critiqued for its repeated failures to advance well-being meaningfully around the world (Easterly, 2006).

Yet carefully facilitated community-campus partnerships can positively impact communities (Irie, Daniel, Cheplick and Philips, 2010), achieve broad
community support for partnerships (Hartman, 2015; Larsen, 2015; Toms, 2013), grow civil society networks and advance human rights norms (Lough and Matthews, 2014; Reynolds, 2014), and have transformative effects for students (Kiely, 2004; 2005) who become more globally aware and more engaged in global civil society (Hartman, 2014). Such careful facilitation takes many forms, including the locus of community campus partnership. The discussion below focuses on only one of many important programming components: pedagogy and co-curricular programming as drivers of student learning related to rights-thinking.

Considerable research in the fields of international education (Vandeberg, Paige and Hemming Lou, 2012), community-campus engagement (Ash and Clayton, 2009), and the combination thereof (Hartman, 2014) demonstrates that students are most likely to learn when they are systematically prompted to give focused attention, and when they are academically rewarded for doing so. This quite logical—even banal—conclusion offers an important caution for courses and programs that feature conventional curricular pathways coupled with assertions that students “become global citizens” or other important, aspirational goals that do not necessarily track onto program and curricular learning design pathways.

The pre-internship retreat and post-experience coursework offered in conjunction with CPGC internships, since 2003, ensure that students consider and even address political, economic, and social structures relating to their individual internship experiences. In the pages that follow, I share specific texts, descriptions, and assignments from the retreat and related courses to illustrate the manner in which structural thinking and related rights-inquiry is continuous, connected to experiential learning, contextualized within relevant literature, and challenging in terms of moving students toward deeper and more nuanced rights-thinking (this framing borrows from the four Cs of best practice reflection as advanced by Eyler, Giles and Schmiede (1996)).

Internships may take place anywhere in the world, domestically or internationally. Haverford does not have separate offices supporting students in international and domestic civic participation. This truly global framing of intercultural and global systems learning and engagement, increasingly understood as best practice in international education and civic engagement
(AACandU, 2014; Musil, 2006; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012), supports a bridging of the distance between universalist rights theory and civil rights implementation as a matter of institutional organization. From the outset, students interested in public health implementation in urban environments in the US are in the same dialogue spaces as students considering public health in Appalachia and Argentina. The comparative opportunities continuously highlight the role of structure across diverse spaces.

These international and domestic activities are consistent with the CPGC’s global mission to advance peace and social justice through research, education, and action. Examples of internships include: working with a women’s empowerment center and cooperative in Morocco; supporting arts-based reconciliation work in Berlin; cooperating with environmental justice initiatives in Nicaragua; advancing public health initiatives specific to Philadelphia’s Latino community; and self-designing internships specific to students’ own intellectual and professional trajectories. Each year, the CPGC works with more than fifty interns in placements around the world, about half of which are self-designed, with the remaining portion occurring through standing partnerships.

The pedagogical arch of a summer internship experience couples careful student selection and preparation during the spring term with community-based experiential learning during the summer, followed by coursework on human rights and global health during the fall term. Each component of this process is further explained below.

**Pre-Internship Selection and Programming**

Preparation includes a competitive selection process in which students respond to essay prompts that are the first moment of written reflection in a learning journey that proceeds over nearly a year. Responses to these prompts are developed through the awareness and disciplinary backgrounds that students bring to the process, coupled with individual counseling provided to students by staff members in the CPGC.

Essay prompts during the selection process include:
• Please identify the issue you are examining and why it is significant historically, politically, socially, and culturally. How does this internship project relate to or examine this issue? How does this issue fit within the parameters of the CPGC's mission?
• What impact do you expect your internship project to have on the community in which it is taking place and the participants it will involve? Discuss the ethical issues necessary to consider before undertaking such a project.

A faculty and staff committee makes student selections. For many of the internships, a representative from the hosting organization oversees the final selection. Once selected, students attend a three-day retreat that includes instruction on working across social and cultural difference, brief consideration of broader social, political, and structural issues, and preparation for the logistical, health, and safety considerations that accompany the experiences. While the retreat is not associated with academic credit, students are required to read brief articles that begin the intellectual inquiry they will continue through the fall term. Such articles or chapters include, for example, selections from Amartya Sen’s (1999) *Development as Freedom*, consideration of Kwame Anthony Appiah’s (2006) “Case for Contamination” in the *New York Times Magazine*, as well as other articles and chapters that consider individual and cultural identity in the context of cultural, economic, political, social, and historical structures. Here again, facilitated discussion spans domestic and international structures of identity, belonging, and rights.

During the internship experience, students receive specific journaling prompts to encourage continuous reflective engagement with these themes. Often, students experience their internships individually, without other similarly situated students nearby, putting particular emphasis on directed journaling as an opportunity for dialogue connected to the preparation and re-entry components of the experience. While CPGC preparation works to ensure students are respectful and supportive interns, prepared to learn with and from host organizations, it is in the post-experience courses where students are challenged to consider related rights issues through sustained intellectual inquiry for academic credit.
Re-Entry Courses

Haverford has developed several courses—two are described below—that offer students opportunities to integrate their summer internship experiences with academically-grounded learning and reflection. Students may also appeal to enroll in other courses as “re-entry” courses but must have those courses approved by the CPGC Academic Director. The Academic Director role is filled by a Provost-appointed, tenured faculty member on a three-year, rotating term. Re-entry courses during the Fall Term, 2016, were:

Re-Entry Course Option 1: Development, Human Rights, and Transnational Injustices

What are the worldwide obstacles to peace and justice? How can we surmount them? This course examines theories of some of the leading obstacles to peace and justice worldwide, and of what global citizens can do about them. In doing so, it invites returning CPGC interns to interpret their experience in light of some of the most important concepts and theories driving debates over international activism and global citizenship. The three problems we will consider are colonialism and its legacies, whether we live in a global racial order, and whether the global economic order harms the poor and does them a kind of violence. The two solutions we will consider are the practice of human rights, and the project of economic and social development. The course has three main goals: (1) to give students some of the knowledge they will need to address these problems and be effective global citizens; (2) to understand some of the major forces that shape the present world order; and, (3) to hone the skills in analysis, theory-building, and arguing that are highly valued in legal and political advocacy, in public life and the professions, and in graduate school.

The course, the full syllabus for which is available online,97 includes significant theoretical investigation and as such could stand independently as a course in political science or human rights. In order better to integrate experiential learning with that strong theoretical foundation and academic inquiry, returning interns receive several prompts that specifically integrate both. For example: For returning CPGC interns: (1) By noon on September 16, submit via e-mail

---

97 For full details, see the course outline by T. J. Donahue, “Development, Human Rights, and Transnational Injustices or, Theories of Peace and Global Citizenship,” online at: https://sites.google.com/site/tidonahu/home/theories-of-peace-and-global-citizenship
a paper of not more than 350 words. The paper should describe a question about the social circumstances in which you conducted your internship, a question to which you did not feel you had a good answer. The paper should explain why that question is important, using the method for turning questions into problems in the section from Booth et al.’s Craft of Research, mentioned in the Guide to Writing Good Papers, below.

(2) At the beginning of Session 13, submit another paper of not more than 350 words. This should explain how what you have learned in this course has shaped your view of the question that first puzzled you. Do you feel you have a better answer to it? Or do you feel that you need to formulate the question differently? Why? These count as response papers for grading purposes.

In addition to these response papers, course discussion and presentation opportunities return continuously to consider summer experiences in light of broad structures.

Re-Entry Course Option 2: Bodies of Injustice: Health, Illness, and Healing in Contexts of Inequality

This course is designed for students returning from internship experiences who wish to deepen their understanding of social justice, health, and healthcare. The course integrates experiential learning with humanities and social medicine readings on witnessing and representing inequalities, cultural conceptions of health, structural determinants of health, and addressing health inequalities in the United States and other countries. Structural determinants include education, food resources, markets, medical and social services, governments, environments, transportation, cultures, languages, and more.

The syllabus indicates clearly that

All course graded activities, including reading responses, an internship presentation, an internship critical reflection essay, and a next steps project, center on integrating internship experiences with relevant critical readings in the humanities and social sciences.

Readings and dialogue within the course highlight health as a human right, as understood in the 1946 Constitution of the World Health Organization,
the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (UNHCR, 2008). Course questions and dialogue extend to the United States’ historic and continuing reluctance to engage health as a right, the relevant civil policy structures in place to support health as a right at the internship sites (in the US and abroad), and next steps in organizing and advocacy for supporters of health as a human right.

Engaging students in courses like these, at the least, provides opportunities to increase the likelihood that students will understand their summer internships in light of broader structural forces specific to the existence of rights (at the civil level) and the distance between that implementation and theorized existence (at the universal level). The courses also encourage increasingly sophisticated academic inquiry, and many of the students continue with additional research, leading to senior theses (All Haverford students must complete a substantive senior thesis for graduation). Research topics advanced beyond courses in the past year, for example, included:

- *Clashing Motives: International Aid and the Case for Strengthening Healthcare in Nigeria*
- *Addressing Access: Abortion Providers within the Reproductive Justice Framework*
- *The Changing Landscape of Healthcare in the Greater Philadelphia Region*

The research topics shared above all advance inquiry at the intersection of individual experiences of health and broader policy questions, highlighting the relationships of structures and rights. Due to the shared preparatory programming, inclusion of domestic and international experiences in common dialogue with one another, and exchange within and among re-entry courses, CPGC programming supports sustained engagement with the question of how rights structures manifest, succeed, or fail.

**Teaching, Preaching, and Socialization**

The prompt for this collection includes the question, “How do we avoid (and should we avoid) the danger of preaching rather than teaching?” The primary
purpose of this essay has been to outline a structured approach to deepening rights thinking across the curriculum, in conversation with eight-week summer internships and preceding preparatory programming. This question of “preaching rather than teaching,” however, is so important that I will comment on it at some length before closing. The CPGC, through its role at Haverford College, advances the classic goals of a liberal education. We do not believe these goals to be at odds with supporting students and the institution in not only better understanding but also advancing rights-thinking and rights-practices.

From its founding in 1833, and in part due to its historic Quaker affiliation, Haverford has worked to be an institution where the excellence of the academic program is deepened by its moral and ethical dimensions. Today, our student learning assessment plan includes offering:

...our students many opportunities to engage fundamental issues of inequality and social justice. The college encourages students to put learning into action for greater ethical purposes (Haverford College, 2016)

The role of the CPGC is to support the interaction between critical inquiry and consequential action. Though our mission and college commitments support our efforts, we see the work as entirely consistent with a long view of the appropriate role of higher education as a critical, dynamic socializing institution nurturing a collective civilizational imagination.

Twenty-first century educators, in the United States in any case, have inherited a sense of loyalty to the notion of objective scholarship and objective education. This is the case despite empirically-observed and theoretically deep understandings of the impossibility of objectivity, the historic roles of schools and universities as locations of moral formation and civilizational imagination, and the socializing role of educational institutions. As has been amply documented elsewhere (Hartley, 2011; Hartman, 2013), the American university has repeatedly been positioned as a civil society organization central to the imagination and implementation of democracy; an arrangement that is most fundamentally an agreement among citizens to recognize and reinforce one another’s civil rights. This is the case throughout US history. Historian Frederick Rudolph argues that, “a commitment to the republic
became a guiding obligation of the American college” (Hartley, 2011: 27). Many years later, University of Chicago President William Rainey Harper, who recruited John Dewey to that institution in 1894, professed, “The University, I contend is the prophet of democracy—the agency established by heaven itself to proclaim the principles of democracy” (Harkavy, 2006: 7). The 1947 Truman Report offers an even stronger connection between universities and democratic values. The report concluded that, “The first and most essential charge upon higher education is that at all levels and in all its fields of specialization, it shall be the carrier of democratic values, ideals, and process” (President’s Commission on Higher Education, 1947: 102).

As the United States has slowly, painfully come to recognize and speak openly about its historic and current human rights abuses, the university, along with its faculty and its students, has continued to be a location of withering critique and extraordinary imagination—essential elements of moving forward together. Notably, the university is often on the slow and conservative end of aligning itself with rights provocateurs, but a repeated bellwether of activist mainstreaming—in a good way—is inclusion within university structures and discourses. Faculty positions have been earned or offered to critical, theoretically robust, artistic, and creative social activists as varied as W. E. B. Du Bois, John Muir, bell hooks, Toni Morrison, Julia Alvarez, Junot Diaz, and Ta-Nehisi Coates, among many, many others.

As theorists, activists, and policy makers continue to attempt to understand the imagined and applied components of global citizenship and human rights, institutions of higher education have a central role to play in supporting critical inquiry and dialogue on these aspirational possibilities. Even offering courses on such topics as human rights as moral aspirations is a bow toward a progressive orientation; a future possibility. At Haverford College’s Center for Peace and Global Citizenship, our aim is to support critical inquiry and consequential action in accordance with achieving a more just and humane world.
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Teaching Whiteness in American Literature: To Preserve “Truth, Justice, and the American Way”

John T. Reilly, Loyola Marymount University

According to Euro-American filmmaker Whitney Dow, creator of the Whiteness Project: Inside the White Caucasian Box, which aired on PBS in 2014, “Most people take for granted that there is a ‘white’ race, but rarely is the concept of whiteness investigated. What does it mean to be white?” (Dow, 2014: 1).

In Whiteness Visible, The Meaning of Whiteness in American Literature and Culture, Professor Valerie Babb answers this question in part by contending that, “being white became synonymous with being American” (Babb, 1988: 2). In Democracy in Black: How Race Still Enslaves the American Soul, Professor Eddie S. Glaude Jr. broadens Babb’s assertions by calling this conflation of whiteness with Americanness a “value gap,” wherein

…our actual lives rested in the gap between who America said it was as a democracy and how we actually lived. Our democratic principles do not exist in a space apart from our national commitment to white supremacy. They have always been bound together, sharing bone and tissue (Glaude, 2016: 9)

He goes on to argue that the “powerful ideals of the American Revolution, which challenged the authority of monarchs and insisted on the principles of freedom and equality in the context of democratic institutions, were reconciled with” and defiled by extreme prejudices and injustices (2016: 31). Glaude also notes how “people could talk of freedom and liberty and hold black slaves,” disparage and oppress white females, people of color, the poor, homosexuals, the disabled, and worshippers of creeds other than Christianity for centuries. Furthermore, “even the first immigration and naturalization act, in 1790, allowed only ‘white persons’ to attain citizenship, and that racial understanding of citizenship persisted” (31) well into the late
twentieth century. This has also been evidenced in our recent political contests, notably the 2016 presidential campaign, which elected Donald Trump, a reputed white supremacist, President of the United States. He, in turn, appointed Steve Bannon, another reputed white supremacist, his chief White House Advisor, and Jeff Sessions, yet another reputed white supremacist, to head the Department of Justice.

If whiteness and Americanness are synonyms, Dow’s statement and question about whiteness apply equally to American identity, meaning that we know as little about our Americanness as we do our whiteness. Despite our heartfelt pledges of allegiance to our flag and our spirited celebrations of the Fourth of July, we cannot know what it is to be American without comprehending what whiteness is, and we cannot know what whiteness is until we reify it, put flesh and blood on it, humanize it, and see it as American writers see it: paradoxically, as good and evil, true and false, pious and impious, sane and insane, liberating and oppressive, progressive and retrogressive, tolerant and bigoted, peace-loving and militant, beautiful and ugly, cultured and crude, strong and weak, generous and selfish, smart and stupid, brave and cowardly, civilized and savage, and democratic and despotic. According to Professor Richard Dyer, Euro-American author of White, “a study of the representation of white people in white Western culture” (Dyer, 1997, xiii), such an investigation of racial whiteness should not be done

...merely to fill a gap in analytical literature, but because there is something at stake in looking at, or continuing to ignore, white racial imagery. As long as race is something only applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people. There is no more powerful position than that of being “just” human. The claim to power is the claim to speak for the commonality of humanity. Raced people can’t do that—they can only speak for their race. But non-raced people can, for they do not represent the interests of a race. The point of seeing the racing of whites is to dislodge them/us from the position of power, with all inequities, oppression, privileges and sufferings in its train, dislodging them/us by undercutting the authority with which they/we speak and act in and on the world (Dyer, 1997: 1)

The first step toward dislodging this whiteness in America is discernment,
seeing it for what it is, identifying its deep-rooted characteristics. Like the proverbial elephant in the room, these stay hidden in plain sight, such as the salient traits of America’s founding fathers and ninety-five percent of America’s presidents, namely their white skin, male genitalia, Anglo-Saxon heritage, English tongue, Christian (principally Protestant) creeds, ownership of land and wealth, and alleged heterosexuality. Essentially anyone, such as former President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who lacks one or more of these mandatory traits is considered less American than a Donald Trump who appears to possess all these prerequisites, and who, incidentally, exploited the heritage/racial differences between himself and President Obama, as well as the gender differences between himself and Secretary Clinton, so successfully that he won the Republican nomination for President of the United States and earned the title “Grand Wizard of Birtherism” from the African-American journalist, Charles Blow (Blow, 2016, n.p.). Ergo, to some degree, white women, men and women of color, non-wealthy and unpropertied classes, non-Christians, non-native-born speakers of English, the disabled, and gay, lesbian, transsexual, bisexual, and transgender communities are mistreated as second-class humans and citizens; they are accorded less respect and fewer rights, privileges, protections, powers, and opportunities than standard, certified whites.

In Race Matters, Professor Cornel West underscores these points by, firstly, judging the United States as a “racist patriarchal nation where white supremacy continues to define everyday life,” and, secondly, chastising “White America for being historically weak willed in ensuring racial justice and accepting the humanity of blacks” (West, 1994: 27), and, thirdly, sharing his “ugly racial memories”:

Years ago, while driving from New York to teach at Williams College, I was stopped on fake charges of trafficking cocaine. When I told the police officer I was a professor of religion, he replied “Yeh, and I’m the Flying Nun. Let’s go, nigger!” (West, xxv)

Further evidence of this pernicious de-Americanizing of persons of color can be found in recent cases such as a March 5, 2017 USA Today report of the shooting of Deep Rai, a male, Sikh, US citizen by a white male who told him “Go back to your own country”; and a November 17, 2016 report from the Associated Press, entitled “American Jews Alarmed by Surge in Anti-Semitism”: 
During the past year, anti-Semitic imagery proliferated on social media, Jewish journalists were targeted and longstanding anti-Jewish conspiracy theories got a fresh airing. Much of the bias originated with the alt-right or alternative right, a loose group espousing a provocative and reactionary strain of conservatism. It is often associated with far right efforts to preserve “white identity,” oppose multiculturalism and defend “western values” (Associated Press, 2016b)

A third illustration of this dangerous Othering is my personal, post-2016 Presidential Election experience of exiting a Ralph’s Supermarket in Marina Del Rey, California and being attacked verbally and threatened with physical violence in the name of President-Elect Donald Trump by an irate, vulgar, white male for sporting a USA jacket and American eagle cap, which he repeatedly shouted I had “no right to wear” because I am “a f…king nigger, not American!”

Although in reality white is merely a color, or, more to the point, the absence of color, it has been, is now and ever will be a formidable ideology and political force, granting white supremacists/white nationalists the authority to determine: (1) what are truths and lies, (2) what is sacred and profane, (3) what are law, rights, and justice, (4) who can be human, civilized, accepted, enfranchised, respected, beautiful, protected, prosperous, and privileged, and, (5) most importantly, who lives and who dies. The tears and blood of untold victims of this egregious white supremacy/white nationalism stream from factual history and true life throughout the canon of American essays, plays, novels, short stories, and poetry, insisting that we teachers check it before it checks us. Not only should we critique it openly and honestly, but we should also amend its ill effects, lest, like McCarthyism, it undermines our students’, our institutions’, and our society’s capacities to be free, open-minded, honest, reasonable, tolerant, humane, inclusive, moral, egalitarian, democratic, just, intrepid, and progressive.

A case in point was the objection made by a senior academic colleague against my teaching a new course on black stereotypes entitled *Black Image in the White Mind*, after a scholarly book by the notable historian George Frederickson, which focused on the idea of the “white mind,” a concept they felt to be simultaneously annoying and threatening. It seemed to me that they disapproved of me wanting to conduct what they regarded as a...
public dissection of the “white mind,” which—as a person of authority—they wanted to remain cloaked and closed. To be fair, this administrator was not my only would-be censor. Shortly after that confrontation, I overheard an African-American male student warn an African-American coed not to enroll in African-American Studies courses, several of which I taught, because she might “pick up stuff that would piss off white students—like slavery and civil rights.” This African-American student reflexively defended the white mind from an imagined black attack. I inferred that despite the lip service academics pay to upholding truth, social justice, and freedom of thought and expression, too many demonstrate a stronger tendency to suppress queries into deep matters of race, especially racial whiteness, than show a willingness to face the reality of them.

While this revelation intensified my awareness that teaching these topics could embroil me in uphill battles, a Pyrrhic victory at best or revolutionary suicide at worst, it also clarified my mission in teaching and altered the axis of my pedagogy. Instead of focusing mainly on the images of blacks in the white mind, I scrutinized more intently the white mind itself, asking what makes white people white, of what is their whiteness made, how does their whiteness work in their lives, the lives of others, and my own life? What are the positive and negative qualities and effects of this racial whiteness? How can its positives be improved and its negatives overcome?

In order to open my students’ minds to these hidden, racial factors of American identity and spark their activism to reform pernicious aspects, such as intolerance, I tell them a brief anecdote about the mugging of an unnamed American family by a shadowy assailant while the family was sightseeing at Times Square. When I ask them to describe the characters as they imagined them, they denote various traits except race and skin color until I ask them to identify the races and colors of the family and assailant. Initially, they are taken aback by the question and become hesitant/self-conscious to admit what they truly imagined. Ultimately, they confess that they saw the American family as white and their mugger as a person of color, a black or Latino male. Unwittingly then, by conflating whiteness with Americanness, they substantiate Babb’s contention that being white equals being American. Just as importantly, they become aware of their own tendencies to stereotype Americans, and they start learning to make the invisible visible, to be discerning and candid about race, color, class, caste, and other such tribal distinctions in their study of American literature.
Knowing from experience that this lesson takes time to sink in, I deepen it by asking my students to weigh the *Declaration of Independence, Constitution, Bill of Rights, Pledge of Allegiance, Ten Commandments, Sermon on the Mount,* and *Lord’s Prayer* against historical and literary portrayals of the subtle disenfranchise-ment and disparagement of all women, African Americans, Native Americans, immigrants, LGBT people, the disabled, the poor, and those following creeds other than Christian. Soon my students begin to see a critical fault in our Founding Fathers’ vision of America, one of severe incongruity—“high-pocrisy” as a compelling song in the Broadway musical *1776* asserted resoundingly. Questions then pop into minds about the ways in which the Founding Fathers might be flawed, how their words and deeds might be inconsistent. How significant were their whiteness, maleness, economic standing, religious creed, sexual orientation, Anglo-Saxon heritage, and self-interests to their establishment of our republic? How true have human and civil rights, faith, equality and justice been in America? How much have institutions of religion, politics, commerce, culture, and even family been compromised by self-interest, bigotry, and hypocrisy? Furthermore, what could be done to change them for the better, to make them live up to our democratic standards?

To address these issues and, most importantly, the latter question,

> We have to tell stories of those who put forward a more expansive conception of American democracy. This will involve confronting the ugly side of our history, recalling the heroic and representative efforts of countless men and women who gave everything to achieve our country, and sacrificing the comfort of innocence and the willful blindness that comes with it. This will require a radical reordering of value. Changing our stories is a way of changing what matters (Glaude, 2016: 203)

So, to keep raising my students’ awareness of “truth, justice, and the American way” and making their raised awareness actionable for positive change in America’s outlooks and behaviors, I continuously enable them to think, speak, write, and act freely on dilemmas and intersections of gender, race, color, class, sexual orientation, creed, physical abilities, ethnicity, national origins, contradictions between principles and practices, and disparities in the privileges, protections, prestige, powers, prosperity, and promise afforded...
Americans by our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and democratic, Judeo-Christian, humanitarian, and judicial codes. Operating under the premise that American culture informs American literature and American literature reflects American culture, I direct them to discern Americanisms, unique American qualities, in plots, characters, and themes, and to identify personal, human, tribal, and national attributes of protagonists and antagonists as well as those of the voices and visions of narrators and authors. In order to clarify and substantiate my inference that whiteness plays a major role in shaping American identity, causing Americans to be deeply contradictory in their principles and practices, I assign divergent readings on American dilemmas of identity, internal and external conflict, cultural difference, freedom, conformity, conscience, justice, humanity, aspirations, exceptionalism, and morality, such as J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur’s *Letters from an American Farmer* and Theodore Roosevelt’s *American Ideal*, Thomas Jefferson’s *Notes on the State of Virginia* and David Walker’s *Appeal in Four Articles*, Frederick Douglass’ *What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?* and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s *I Have a Dream*, Kate Chopin’s *Story of an Hour* and Susan Glaspell’s *Trifles*, William Faulkner’s *Barn Burning* and James Baldwin’s *Going to Meet the Man*, as well as Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass* and Allen Ginsberg’s *Howl*. Finally, to vivify the characters and themes raised by these authors, I permit my students to relate to them personally, to connect them to their individual experiences in the real world, including their studies in other courses; their involvement with political, social, and civic organizations; and their relationships to family and friends.

Over a semester, the literature stimulates more candid, spirited inquiries into gender, race, color, sexual orientation, creed, class, freedom, equality, fairness, and activism; as well as providing few indisputable answers to these queries—save one, which is truth, the value of truth, in determining who and what we are and what we should be about as individuals, members of a specific group, human beings, and Americans. Happily, students’ course evaluations, such as the following from my first class on Whiteness in American Literature, remind me that although the journey to enlightenment and transformation is rough, slow and unpredictable, I must keep the faith:

Dear Professor Reilly: ...before I really understood about cultural whiteness, I thought, “Just because I call myself white, you can’t tell me that I automatically think I have power, prestige and privilege over any non-white.” I didn’t like the fact that it was said that the Bible was
a hypocrisy. I didn’t like the fact that our founding fathers were racist…I almost considered dropping the class…I look at things differently now…I try to be open minded because I don’t want to be like my family…I love them with all my heart, but my grandparents are very offensive. My grandpa will say “Why do you listen to that damn jigg-gaboo music?” My grandma calls Asians “chinks,” “slant eyes,” and things like that. Even my dad can be offensive. He works in the film industry, and he always complains about the people. “Ninety percent of the industry I work in is Jewish or homosexual.” Sometimes I have a hard time dealing with my family (Anonymous, 1999: 3)

Like Professor Thandeka, author of Learning to be White, I believe that “this social construction of a ‘white’ requires us to make a distinction between a person’s core sense of self before and after its identity is defined as white” or assimilated into racial whiteness. Contrary to white supremacist ideology, “before the white identity is established, this core sense of self is not white.” It is quintessentially like my own: human. Thandeka argues that “its personal racial identity is, in effect, nonexistent because the socialization process has not yet been undertaken by its white community of caretakers, legislators, and police force” (Thandeka, 2007: 84). By being more human than a racial construction, this core self retains a natural propensity to “hold these truths to be self-evident: that all [people] are created equal; and that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” (Jefferson, 1776). To uphold these truths is tantamount to safeguarding human and civil rights nationally and globally, saving humanity from its most atavistic and destructive tendencies, and legitimizing America as a model of democracy and refuge from tyranny—“the city upon a hill” (Matthew 5: 14).

Human and civil rights are top among America’s and the world’s most precious blessings; for this reason I find that they persist in my mind at my most practical and idealistic moments of teaching. Therefore, an integral part of my mission in teaching American literature is to help accomplish the revolution initiated by the Founding Fathers by liberating my students from false and dangerous constructions of their “core sense of self” so that: (1) they may nurture their natural proclivity for truth, goodness, liberty, equality, fairness, beauty, fulfillment, and happiness; (2) they may investigate and discuss any topic freely, comfortably, respectfully, fearlessly, and
dynamically, with open minds and hearts; (3) they may transform for the better, into enlightened, independent, compassionate, logical, progressive, contributing thinkers, which America sorely needs to thrive as a democracy and world leader; and (4) mostly importantly, they/we may save the soul of the nation:

I celebrate myself, and sing myself.  
And what I assume you shall assume, 
For every atom belonging to me as good belongs to you

(Whitman, 1855)
Editors’ Notes

One of the standards by which we recognize a civil society is the manner in which minorities are treated. The degree to which we oppose discriminatory policies and reject hate speech is a measure of civilized values. Those values appear to be under siege in many ominous ways.

The example of the Roma raises dark specters. They are defined by those who mistrust, fear, or hate them: invested with constructed identities in which irrational fears of alien values are located. Negative stereotypes reduce individuals to a simplified set of imagined behaviors. Primitive prejudices permit perverse dehumanization. The Roma are subject to current myopia and historical amnesia; they reside within our collective unconsciousness. The Roma are on the margins of memory despite the fact that an estimated half a million, something like a quarter of the entire Romani population of Europe, were victims of the Holocaust.

Romani Holocaust Memorial Day did not make the mainstream press. There is, though, a constant trickle of disturbing news; it is easy to avoid. If you manage to find it, messages will appear that seem to belong to another Europe:

“Authorities close shelter making Roma homeless” (Milan, September 30, 2016)

“Roma denied electricity...collective punishment” (Serbia, October 14, 2016)
“No arrests after Romani man beaten to death” (Czech Republic, October 21, 2016)

“No arrests after Romani man beaten to death” (Czech Republic, October 21, 2016)

“Families pushed out into the streets as winter begins to bite” (Rome, October 28, 2016).

These news stories do not derive from some distant past. They are happening, in places we know, where students go to study, but they are outside of our field of vision. We do not associate these events with what we know of contemporary Europe. The phrase “collective punishment” belongs to a barbaric past.

The Roma are paradoxically both invisible and vilified. They do not inhabit the liberal consciousness and, simultaneously, are subject to vicious demonization.

William New spoke with passion and eloquence on the plight of the Roma at CAPA’s Civil Rights Symposium in Denver, May 2016. He is an international expert on the subject and what follows is the syllabus of a course he teaches at Beloit College. It reflects his wisdom, wit, and compassion.

A Study Abroad Experience Placed on Offer by the Hon. William New, Philosophiae Doctoris, Laurence Sterne Professor of This and That, at Beloit College, Up to His Neck in the Great Prairies of the United States of America

Let us reflect how different they are from Europeans; the one is white, the other black. This cloaths himself, the other goes half naked. This shudders at the thought of eating carrion, the other prepares it as a dainty. Moreover these people are famed, and were even from their first appearance in Europe, for being plunderers, thieves and incendiaries: for that the European not only dislikes, but hates them. For the above reasons, Europeans have always driven the Gipsies away from them

Heinrich M. G. Grellmann, Dissertation on the Gypsies (1783)

Institutionalized antigypsyism might always not have the force of law to support it but may be policy nevertheless: an immigration officer’s decision to refuse entry to a Romani family while letting a non-Romani family in …, or a police officer’s apprehending and questioning a citizen just because he is Romani … They qualify … because they originate
within institutionalized society, and those who perpetrate it use their official authority as a weapon. It is personal too, since the decision to discriminate rests with those same individuals

Ian Hancock, *We are the Romani People* (2002)

**Advertisement**

Interested in civil rights (whatever they might be)? Interested in people who are not like you, like, say … Gypsies? Would you like to get out of town, even step outside of time? If you said YES to these questions, we have the perfect adventure for you. This winter and spring you have the chance to take your own Grand Tour of Europe, just like the privileged youth of yesteryear. But your Tour may well be superior to theirs, because you will not only be able to move freely in space, but you have the opportunity to get yourself unstuck in time. It could be that you will be able to get entirely outside of yourself! Did I mention that we will go to see the Roma, who most travelers are warned to avoid: but in order to learn our lessons, we must go to the worst places instead of the best places.

The “Grand Tour” was to be applied at the end of one’s formal education—a formality of which consisted both in attending school and learning one’s rightful place in the world—as a curative for the limitations, the moral straightjacket, inherent to growing up with one’s own people in the safety of one’s own community. But the Grand Tour was also meant to reinforce the values learned at home through their application to foreign subjects; an historical version, we might say, of the so-called “liberal arts in practice.” But the tourists, in this case, remained obdurately in their own “now,” lending the experience an atemporality that obstructed the vision of historical processes, such as the recognition of “others” as candidates for citizenry and the attendant civil rights. From where we stand—so habituated to our posture that we barely feel gravity or the crosswinds that never cease blowing—those “others” who are objects of our observations may not appear to be quite human.

In the pursuit of a critical and liberal education, they are not unlike pets, to whom one might show even lavish affection, but who in the end are only means to our own ends, not beings in themselves. Cruelty, neglect, and
abandonment toward our objects of study, our pet passions, are frowned upon, but not forbidden. We are free to care, or not, and free to leave and forget. Children (and, previously women) belong in the same class of objects: you can own them, beat them, perhaps even kill them, with some degree of impunity—which brings us back to the Roma, who have historically not been recognized as human, typically not even rising to the diminished state of our own children and women. Or, to be totally frank, not even to the status of our favorite hounds. We might say, and we will see in the course of our travels, that the Gypsy is experienced instead as a form of vermin—whatever can manifest as a plague. Hence, the ironically non-ironic subtitle of our field trip: A Plague of Gypsies (whispered under our communal breaths even as we pursue the liberal quest of understanding—and “doing something about”—Romani civil rights).

Packing List (For Travel Outside the Comfort Zone)

- A pair of spectacles through which you might learn to recognize the shadowy figures that waver in the margins of your visual field, between the pixels, so to speak, the unthought lurking in the midst of the thought (and believed).
- A hardbound book of blank pages that can stand up to a beating, pen and ink, pencils for drawing. You can haul along a computer, but who knows when we’ll be able to charge the battery.
- A supply of medicine to treat vertigo. If you’re particularly prone to motion sickness when confronted with ideas and realities that do not comport with your preferred vision of the world, prochlorperazine is recommended. For milder symptoms, meclizine will probably do the trick.
- Footwear suitable for walking: you don’t want to be like a former student who threw her shoes in the trash on the third day, and then had to spend her souvenir (or drinking) money on a new pair.

Learning Goals and Essential Understandings

Fellow travelers will arrive at the essential understanding (somewhere along the way, or at the end, or perhaps later on when they are enjoying some ethnic food with a potential love interest who has expressed some dubious beliefs...) that:
1. The status of persons is guaranteed through the shared recognition of “civil rights,” which encompass the rights to equal treatment and opportunity for our fellows, but also the responsibility not to abridge those rights through our own actions, intentional or unintentional.

2. The Roma are Gypsies and not-Gypsies, a migrant, minority, and indigenous people in Europe (and the rest of the world) whose civil rights have rarely been recognized.

Each fellow traveler (well, maybe not everyone, not thoroughly) will:

- Come to know
  - What they don’t want to know, what culturally and personally must count as a contradiction of their beliefs, their values, their faith;
  - Where and when and how “others” in their world, i.e. Roma in Europe, are not accorded—even by them, however silent our disavowals—the status of persons.

- Develop the ability to
  - Get out, and stay out, of their comfort zone, where the holding and granting of rights is natural and invisible, but whose application is thereby fatally flawed;
  - See through academic, disciplinary boundaries that obscure the vision of what is right before them.

- Come to feel
  - What they feel and not only what they are supposed to feel or would like to feel;
  - That the “natural” tendency to act sometimes, even often, as an imperialist, an ignoramus, a boor, an abject asshole, may be “natural” but is not necessary; but it is forgivable, and subject to change.
The Roma, who were not yet the Roma, arrived in Byzantine Europe from northern India in dribbles and drabs over the course of at least two centuries, beginning as early as 900 something CE, and continuing into the eleventh century. Probably. From there, many Roma—then known in the Greek worlds as *Tsiganoi* or *Egypcians*—moved on: to the north, east, and west, until by the seventeenth century there were significant Roma populations in every European country (which were not yet countries at all, but an odd assortment of kingdoms, territories, empires, free cities, backwaters, duchies, and principalities, etc.). Romani people, speaking their Romani language, became an integral part of European society writ large, not integrated but always present, and often persecuted for their resistance to assimilation, for their stubborn “otherness,” and as a bogeyman for all the inner terrors to which Europeans were subject in those precarious eras. Our story begins in the eighteenth century with the advent of the Enlightenment, because it is with this radical change in thinking, and eventually, in governance, that the notion of the “civil” and legal/ethical entities called “rights” arose, and were combined eventually into this doubly troublesome concept of “civil rights,” which we now blithely tend to assume we understand, though all the empirical evidence indicates that if civil-ized men and women do understand what rights are, they choose to act as if they don’t understand. There are, of course, other perspectives and explanations, which will be the gristle we will chew on for sustenance throughout the expedition.

When it comes to the Roma and civil rights, there is, as when entering Paris, just too much to see, and so little time. In this prospectus, we will offer a snapshot of three excursions that will make up this Grand Tour. Unfortunately, much will be missed, and because the historical record of the Roma is already so tattered and full of holes, much more is not even available to miss. The full tour will offer additional destinations, plus the opportunity for travelers to undertake independent study trips.

**Josef II and the Regulation of the Roma (Austria and Hungary, 1781)**

Josef II, Holy Roman Emperor and ruler of the Hapsburg lands from 1765 until 1790, first subjected the Roma to a proper “rule of law” in 1781, with the promulgation of *De Domiciliatione et Regulatione Zingarorum* (“On the
Domiciling and Regulation of the Gypsies”). The son of Empress Maria Teresa, Josef II, was a child of the Enlightenment, a student of Voltaire and Kant, whose own brand of “enlightened despotism” imposed a rational legal order, replete with rights and responsibilities, redolent of the discourses of equality, on his feudal subjects. He believed deeply in the power of the state, guided by reason, not in the irrationality of religion and superstition. The Roma were not permitted to live in the forest, to sell horses, to intermarry, to speak Romanes, and so on.

Josef’s *De domiciliatione et regulatione Zingarorum*—issued in almost the same moment as Madison’s “Bill of Rights” to the US Constitution—reminds us that equality in these early conceptualizations was a highly-restricted concept, whose breadth and application depended crucially on who counted, and for how much, as a citizen. In the US, a black man was worth three-fifths of a white man, and a woman or a Native American counted for nothing. In Josef II’s Austria and Hungary, rights and a modicum of equal treatment were enjoyed only by nobles. Peasants had only their one-sided feudal contracts with the landowning nobility, in which the right even to survive was contested. The Hungarian *cigányok*, the Gypsies—who in most cases declined to take up the low status of peasant—were the subjects of greater restriction, not rights, as a legitimate means to protect the Empire from Gypsy mischief.

We should attend closely in the edict to the preoccupation of the rulers to family matters of those non-equal, non-citizens who must, for the sake of the Empire, be ruled, a preoccupation that will reveal itself historically as a violent obsession. The proscription of intermarrying was designed to ensure that there were to be no new Gypsies. Those Romani children who did manage to get born were to be farmed out to Hungarian and Austrian families for a more appropriate education in the proper ways of living. Forbidding Roma to use their own language, which the authorities did not understand, further handicapped the passage of Romani culture—which, in the eyes of an enlightened Austrian, was no culture at all, but more like the instincts and habits of wild animals—from one generation to another. A final note: by all accounts, authorities were unable or unwilling to enforce the provisions enacted by Josef II, and Gypsy life went on much as it had before, with new generations of Roma to regulate.
The eugenics-minded Germans who peopled the Nazi party had always been more than suspicious of the *Zigeuner*, or *Sinti*, as most Roma were known in Germany. Even as they ranted and raved about the pollution of Aryan blood by admixture with the *Juden*, they found time and space to foment about the intractable problems that came of mixing good German genes with deficient Gypsy genes. Despite the fact that most German *Sinti* had been settled and integrated for longer than anyone could remember, with decent jobs and homes, and were for the most part phenotypically indistinguishable from other Germans, there were still “other” *Zigeuner* around who were less civilized, and who—through their tendencies to vagabondage and outright moral perversity—demonstrated the underlying genetic constitution of even well-behaved, Germanized *Sinti*.

In order to investigate the racial defects that produced the “Gypsy menace,” the Nazi government established two units in the Reich Security Main Office, one to police the Gypsies (and manage their incarceration and eventual destruction), and a Criminal Biological Institute: its scientific purpose was to prove that the Roma were not Aryans, and were thus properly subject to the race laws that “legitimated” the use of concentration camps to deal with genetically dangerous populations. Robert Ritter, a psychologist by training, and his assistant, Eva Justin, conducted a series of scientific studies on a group of Romani children living in a Catholic orphanage—their parents had been sent to concentration camps—to demonstrate their genetic inferiority. When the study was complete, and after Ms. Justin had time to write it up and successfully present it as her dissertation for a PhD in Anthropology, the children were assigned for transport to Auschwitz. All but two of them were gassed and burned on August 4, 1944, as part of the “cleaning” of the Gypsy Camp at Birkenau, to make room for incoming Jews from Hungary.

#RomaAreEqual (or Not)

On April 18, 2016, a Bulgarian teenager (of Romani descent), Mitko Yonkov, was attacked in the street by Mr. Kaleev, a Bulgarian man (of Bulgarian descent), who had the terrifically bad, but highly diagnostic, judgment to film the beating on his phone and post it on his Facebook page. In the video,
we cannot see Mr. Kaleev’s face, but we can see him kicking and punching Mitko, all the while haranguing him with racial insults. We also can see a number of “innocent” and passive bystanders. The crux of Mr. Kaleev’s gripe is Mitko’s claim that he, as a Roma, is equal to Mr. Kaleev, a white Bulgarian. The following morning another Bulgarian man (of Romani descent) in Berlin was checking his Facebook feed and came across the graphic and disturbing video which he, unlike most, was able to understand quite clearly. He forwarded the post to his friends around the world and in no time the video had gone viral, with a version with English subtitles available for the rest of us. Mr. Kaleev deleted the video from his account, but it was too late for him.

The video, now embedded in a rich cultural and historical context, spawned a social media movement under the hashtag #RomaAreEqual. The #RomaAreEqual movement has not caught fire outside of the small community of Romani and allies, even though the issues raised are identical to those raised in the very high profile #BlackLivesMatter movement. This is a sign of where we are in Europe. It is necessary, though, to follow the story, forward and backward, from the nausea produced in watching this two and a half minutes of brutality and humiliation, in order to grasp its full meaning as a violation of Mitko’s civil rights. Racially-inspired violence is common in Bulgaria, not only against Roma, but also against Bulgarian Turks and now, refugees.

But Mr. Kaleev’s conviction of a “racially motivated attack” marked the first such verdict by a Bulgarian court, which had previously considered such acts as hooliganism, or mischief. According to human rights activists, this is a very important legal development. Now, it must be reported that Mr. Kaleev did only receive an eleven-month jail sentence, none of which he will be asked to serve, having been offered probation and community service instead. In addition, both the medical officer and the investigating detective in the case were removed for referring to Mitko repeatedly as “Mango,” yet another derogatory term for Roma, and the term that Mr. Kaleev uses repeatedly in the video. Additionally, the European Court of Human Rights has ruled against Bulgarian police and courts on several occasions for its actions against Roma. The legal victory, the European Roma Rights Center admits, is bittersweet. So, in Europe, in the present (as the Rom who disseminated the video often says), “this is the life.”
Debriefing

These days in academia it is customary to announce the destination before the voyage begins, as a vouchsafe that learning goals have been met and measured. But we will not indulge here in this interesting form of psychological, i.e. neurotic, defense. That is not to say that in the course of this voyage a full range of neurotic defenses will not be laid out on the table, a sumptuous smörgåsbord of fears, anxieties, excuses, prevarications, denials, displacements, confabulations, and immediately regretted expressions of anger and disappointment. But to fail miserably in the goal of comprehending the terrible things we humans do to each other—as is the history of the Roma in Europe—is to satisfy, at least in part, our initial learning goals. To understand that civil rights, by their nature, history, and inner logic, are at best a (false) promise to those who haven’t come by their rights and recognitions in the “natural” way of belonging to the right tribe, but still a promise that we can bring forcibly to mind and try to keep (knowing that our efforts, if we want to “solve the problem” once and for all, will be futile); that too must count as an achievement of our learning goals.

When you all reach the end of the voyage, this course, this curriculum, this “running around,” the hope of management is that you will be in different places, having started from different places and chosen your way through the woods according to your own sense of direction. But we also hope that these different places will be connected by your memories of how you got there, together (albeit separately), and by a common conviction that going back is neither possible nor morally defensible. This will be then the place to reflect, not only on whether we can make sure everyone’s civil rights are respected (because probably we can’t), but on what one might do, in this moment, to make better that which is made worse by the withholding of the recognition and respect that was supposed to constitute the basis for the very idea of a civil right.
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You, you’re a stork
Who has landed on Earth.
Me, I’m a black bird who has taken flight.
Why does your wicked mouth spit on me?
    What harm is it to you
That my skin is dark…
And my hair Gypsy black?
From Isabelle the Catholic…
    From Hitler to Franco…
We have been the victims
    of their wars.
Some evenings, some evenings
    Like many other evenings…
Some evenings I find myself envying…
The respect that you give to your dog.
Why does your wicked mouth spit on me?
    What harm is it to you
That my skin is dark…
And my hair Gypsy black?

“El Pájaro Negro,” lyrics by Tony Gatlif
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