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FROM THE EDITOR

Studying the Past to Build a Better Future

A decade after she announced the release of a groundbreaking report on Brown University’s historical connections to slavery, president emerita Ruth Simmons returned to Brown to address attendees at the “Slavery and Global Public History: New Challenges” conference.

“‘You can’t go back and redo history,’” Simmons said. “‘But you can be responsible for what you do today. . . . The ongoing process of confronting the past . . . enables us to imagine how successive generations may judge us’” (Brown University 2016).

With awareness of the past and hope for the future, the colleges and universities that tell their stories within these pages are promoting equity, integrity, empathy, civic responsibility, and human dignity.

This issue of Diversity & Democracy examines how colleges and universities are studying the histories of their institutions and local communities, connecting history to present-day issues, and working to create a better future. This issue begins with an essay that traces the history of higher education and how it has evolved to more fully execute its democratic mission and serve increasingly diverse groups of students. Later in the issue, contributors confront the sometimes painful histories of their own institutions and neighboring communities and also tell the stories of the leaders, thinkers, activists, and social reformers of the past who worked to transform their communities and society.

With an understanding of history, colleges and universities are building new legacies, programs, and practices to help their students and communities heal from the ongoing effects of injustices such as slavery, colonialism, unethical medical research, discrimination, and displacement. They are enabling students to conduct historical research, produce art and media based on events of the past, and immerse themselves in the history of local communities. They are also empowering individuals and communities to tell their own stories. Our contributors describe the many ways they are connecting people and nurturing relationships—among stu-
scholar and with her incredible warmth and kindness as a human being. As I look back at our correspondence from my first few months at AAC&U, I can feel her positivity, enthusiasm, and encouragement pouring forth from the many exclamation points that dot her emails. Lee inspired so many people with her dedication to fostering more welcoming and effective learning environments. This issue of Diversity & Democracy reflects her passion for creating a more caring and inclusive future.

With awareness of the past and hope for the future, the colleges and universities that tell their stories within these pages are promoting equity, integrity, empathy, civic responsibility, and human dignity. Inherent in this work is a commitment to honoring voices and stories that have been silenced in the past. As Lynn Pasquerella, president of AAC&U, writes, “Redressing past and present injustices mandates aligning our expertise as teachers, scholars, researchers, and artists in order to rewrite the dominant narrative that consigns to the lower shelves of history the contributions of marginalized groups that have shaped American society and culture in profound, albeit often unacknowledged, ways” (2016, 20). Remembering this history is crucial as we strive for a more equitable future.

—Emily Schuster, Editor, Diversity & Democracy
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Higher Education and a Living, Diverse Democracy: An Overview

WILLIAM C. PURDY, Adjunct Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University—Northridge

In the face of threats to our democracy, colleges and universities are perhaps the American institutions with the strongest commitment to our democratic values. Yet the history of higher education in the United States predates the nation and its democracy; colonial-era colleges created not for revolutionary or even for democratic purposes helped provide the leaders who would create the new country.

Colleges historically have not always promoted democratic missions and have often replicated existing power structures. Colonial colleges, missionary schools, and vocational boarding schools all failed to provide high-quality, culturally relevant education to American Indian students. Tribal colleges created and led by American Indians in the twentieth century emerged to remedy this failure. Colleges certainly failed to promote a higher set of democratic values in the antebellum South, but even after the Civil War, racial segregation by law or in fact was mostly the rule in both the North and South. Following the beginning of the US women’s rights movement, many colleges and universities authorized coeducation in the late 1800s, only to simultaneously restrict it with paternalistic rules. Land-grant colleges and universities struggled to gain footing in the mid-1800s: the public felt these institutions were unnecessary when many jobs were available without need of an advanced education.

This essay focuses on the various types of institutions that have emerged over time to meet the needs of our living, diverse democracy. Americans historically have demanded higher education that is practical and available, so one national university (an idea cherished by George Washington and other leaders) or a chain of colleges on the Eastern seaboard (later termed the Ivy League) would never satisfy a continent-spanning country. Accordingly, state colleges and universities, and later junior and community colleges, popped up across the nation. Also, the competition for souls among religious congregations, both Protestant and Catholic, led to the creation of private denominational colleges in the nineteenth century, dotting the Midwest especially. When segregation and legalized discrimination prevented freedmen and women from enrolling in Southern colleges after the Civil War, many historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were founded, joining a few that existed before the Civil War.

These institutional adaptations have allowed American higher education to grow. Moreover, institutional responses to democratic demands have allowed the system of American higher education—if we can conceive of it as a cohesive system—to survive. This article aims to provide an overview of how American colleges and universities have come to take their democratic missions more seriously, so that today these institutions are key bulwarks in the defense of our democracy.

Colonial Colleges

Since the Massachusetts General Court established Harvard College in 1636 as the first institution of higher education in the British colonies of North America, colleges and universities have conflicted and compromised with the public regarding curricular offerings, missions, and admissions policies. From the start, the public financially supported Harvard, not for some dreamy ideals, but because the colony needed educated clergymen and leaders (Rudolph 1962).

In areas of student life, curriculum, administration, and organization, Harvard followed the great English universities in Oxford and Cambridge, and other colonial colleges followed Harvard. This was problematic for their future democratic missions. England, while a progressive monarchy for its time, was ready to fight a war to prevent a democracy from emerging. The colonial colleges were institutions of elites, with few people able to afford tuition. Less than one colonist in a thousand attended college prior to the Revolution, and fewer graduated (Lucas 1994). Benjamin Franklin, who never attended college, spoke for many colonists when he described Harvard as a place “where students learn little more than to carry themselves handsomely, and enter a room genteelly” (Rudolph 1962, 20). Franklin instead proposed schools focusing on the needs of Pennsylvania, including a public academy that opened in 1751 and merged into the University of Pennsylvania in 1791. This college was created not to train clergymen (the Quaker leaders of Philadelphia would not presumably have supported such a mission) but to develop leaders in business and public life (Geiger 2015).

The colonial colleges, only narrowly open to White men, were closed entirely to Black slaves and freedmen and all women. Further, while the colleges marketed their missions to educate American Indians, they only made faltering efforts. In its 1636 charter, Harvard’s leader cited as ideal practices “the Education of the English and Indian youth of this country in knowledge and Goodness” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of
Teaching 1989, 8). In 1654, Harvard established an official college for Native Americans, but it petered out by 1665 due to low enrollments and because its tutor was “idle and drunken” (Morison 1964, 39).

Other colonial colleges either were created to educate Native Americans or had major sections in their charters on the importance of these efforts. For example, Eleazer Wheelock founded Moor’s Charity School in Connecticut in 1755 with the intention of schooling Native American students. Female students were boarded in colonists’ homes, where they learned housekeeping and sewing, and attended school once a week for reading and writing lessons. Male students lived at school and learned reading, writing, arithmetic, English, Greek, and Latin. Wheelock founded Dartmouth College in 1769, hoping to enroll students from tribes closer to Canada, but between 1769 and 1893, only fifty-eight American Indian students received instruction there. There were not many American Indians remaining in New Hampshire and there was little incentive for them to enroll, as Dartmouth made no effort to provide a curriculum relevant to their needs, and the institutional mission was to Christianize these students and assimilate them into white society (Adams 1971).

Regardless of their poor records of achievements, the colonial colleges’ programs established ideas that were retained in church and federal Native American educational institutions in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One of these ideas, that Native Americans should be assimilated into white culture, is the “dominant and consistent theme in federal (Native American) educational policy throughout U.S. history” (Champagne 1994, 992). Notions subordinate to this theme were that the tribes must be converted to Christianity; that the education at Indian schools should be appropriate to each gender’s assumed role in tribal society (as viewed by White cultural expectations); and that Native American children must be removed from the “corrupting” influences of tribal life into schools administered by Whites (Coleman 2008, 63). When American Indian tribes established their own colleges in the 1960s, they used a very different model from this racialized, culturally colonizing approach, with a central mission of preserving American Indian customs, languages, and identities.

It is a daunting challenge for the historian of higher education to look back over two hundred years and gauge the shortcomings and successes of the colleges and universities that have been in operation since the colonial period. None of the colonial colleges were founded with the idea that they would be training students to be the spearhead of a revolution. Yet when the Revolution came, a rising democratic tide overtook the colleges (Rudolph 1962). It has been a remarkable challenge for colleges designed to educate a colonial elite to adapt to the needs of a democratic society. Yet the colleges formed in the colonial period have for the most part thrived and have trained many leaders of our democracy for generations.

Private Denominational Colleges
As the United States expanded its geographic territory in the nineteenth century, always at the cost of American Indians, many small, private colleges were created in the Midwest, often serving members of Protestant denominations. The colleges’ missions were not only to educate students in academic subjects but also to train ministers for communities farther West, similar to the original missions of many colonial colleges.

An interesting case can be found in Ohio’s Oberlin College, founded by Presbyterian ministers in 1833. Oberlin stood out from its peer institutions by opening admissions to Black and White, male and female students from its inception (Morris 2014). By the end of the Civil War, one hundred African American men and women had studied at Oberlin, and thirty-two had graduated (Lawson and Merrill 1983). Very few other colleges admitted African American students, and nearly all HBCUs were created after the Civil War. A third of Oberlin’s African American students during this
pre-war period came from Cincinnati. Many had graduated from Gilmore High School, a private school for African Americans that was created in 1844 because Ohio law disallowed the use of public funds for the education of African Americans (Lawson and Merrill 1983; Morris 2014). With its founders closely tied to the abolitionist movement in Cincinnati, Oberlin forged a close bond with Gilmore (Morris 2014).

In the small denominational colleges of the Midwest, democratic ideals and religious aims usually fit comfortably together. Even beyond Oberlin, the leadership of denominational colleges provided much of the intellectual force and moral heft of the abolitionist movement.

These colleges have a powerful historical legacy. Many are still in operation, and many encouraged the growth of small colleges farther west (Rudolph 1962). These institutions ensured the survival of the small liberal arts college and its extension beyond the northeastern United States. Through their liberal arts curricula, they have espoused democratic values since their creation.

Public Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

Before the Civil War, there was little demand for public higher education. Senator Justin Morrill failed in 1857 to pass his bill providing federal support for higher education, coming up against Southern and Western opposition. It was not until the Southern states seceded that Senator Morrill could get his Land Grant Act passed in 1862. This was the birth of what later came to be called “democracy’s colleges”—public land-grant colleges and universities that benefited from the sale of federal lands by the states (Ross 1942).

Often, states and territories accepted Morrill Act funds long before their citizens were interested in a state college. In 1885, the Arizona State Legislature met in a session popularly known as “The Thieving Thirteenth Session” for its clear corruption. Its priorities were, in order, locating a state capital, picking a site for the state insane asylum, and choosing a location to host the state university and teachers college (Martin 1960). To the legislature, “a university and a teachers college were of secondary interest because no community really wanted them.” The favorite quip was “Who ever heard of a professor buying a drink?” This was why (supposedly) saloonkeepers did not want a university in Tucson (Martin 1960, 21–22). Of course, the Arizona state system of higher education would later become an engine of social progress committed to democracy and social justice.

When land-grant schools were established, the people sometimes argued for a practical course of study that would bring immediate local benefits, and the faculty resisted in some cases. The Reverend William Maxwell Blackburn, one of the first presidents of the University of North Dakota, argued in 1885 against the traditional liberal arts curriculum in favor of a vocational course preferred by the local people—and the faculty forced him from office. The editor of the North Dakota Herald leapt to the president’s defense, asking, “Is the university to be built as an American institution or shall it be run as a cramming, dry-as-dust, stilted, 50-years-behind-the-times, dead-and-gone style? It is a fight of plain, practical, common sense education adapted to the wants of a new population against the setting of a standard, a stilted curriculum so high that before you could enter the walls of the institution you would have to be trained at Oxford. Our university must walk before it can run” (Geiger 1958, 43).

The Federal Department of Agriculture was founded in 1862, the same year the Morrill Act was passed, and both measures were dedicated to the needs of a vital voting bloc: farmers. Indeed, the Morrill Act stated that land-grant schools should provide agricultural education. Yet, for many years, these schools did not possess sufficient means for agricultural programs. The Hatch Act of 1887 subsidized the establishment of agricultural extension stations, helping cement the popularity of the land-grant colleges. At the University of Nebraska, for example, funds from the Hatch Act encouraged agricultural research such as developing a new variety of spring wheat, new weather forecasting techniques, and more efficient irrigation plans (Manley 1969). Within decades, experimental stations such as those in Davis and Riverside were converted to full campuses of the University of California. The original agricultural missions of these campuses have since been absorbed into the curricula of a research university.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

While many HBCUs were created in the years following the Civil War, federal funding did not flow equitably to these new institutions. The Second Morrill Act of 1890 forbade racial discrimination in the distribution of funds (Neyland and Fahm 1990), and the South of the Jim Crow Era responded by creating institutions of higher education intended solely for African American students, often with a mainly agricultural mission. These institutions were separate but clearly not equal; funding was always terribly low for HBCUs relative to the colleges and universities reserved for White students. Nevertheless, HBCUs, public or private, shared the “unique mission of providing their students with a culturally, socially, economically, and politically relevant education” (Brown and Freeman 2004, 8). HBCUs emerged with a small but committed group of graduates who carried forward these vital missions.
Many HBCUs are still operating today with great success. As of 2016, there were 102 HBCUs spread across nineteen states, with non-Black students now composing 23 percent of enrollments. Yet HBCUs are still vital to educational outcomes for African American students. For example, recent data show that 30 percent of African American students who earned science and engineering doctoral degrees also held a baccalaureate degree from an HBCU (NCSES 2017).

It is a deep irony that in an era of austerity, these institutions that adapted to surviving on paltry public support are now held up as cost-effective choices for all students, not just African Americans. More importantly, HBCUs “have been at the center of the Black struggle for equality and dignity,” and therefore—perhaps more than any other institutional type discussed here—epitomize the central role colleges and universities have played in the cultivation and defense of democratic values (Allen et al. 2007, 263).

Women’s Colleges

Women’s colleges became a significant new institutional type in the nineteenth century, and it is useful to consider an early successful model, Mount Holyoke College. Mary Lyon, who in 1837 founded Mount Holyoke Seminary, did not intend her school’s graduates to compete on equal terms with men but rather to be intellectually stimulating partners for their husbands. Mount Holyoke women were to stay near the hearth, a soup ladle in one hand, a book of Sophocles in the other. Teachers were paid a pittance, and students did chores and cooked their own meals. Religion was a focus of student life, with Lyon herself presenting a daily scripture lecture. Upon graduating, students were expected to help convert nonbelievers to evangelical Christianity. While 83 percent of Mount Holyoke graduates taught school after graduation, half of the graduates taught for five years or less (Butchart 2002).

Women’s colleges have since become tremendously influential, producing leaders in education, law, government, science, business, and many other fields. Five of the original “Seven Sisters” women’s colleges—Barnard College in New York; Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania; and Smith College, Mount Holyoke College, and Wellesley College in Massachusetts—still operate as women’s colleges, while Radcliffe College merged with Harvard, and Vassar College in New York became coeducational in 1969. These institutions inspired the creation of other women’s colleges, such as Mills College in California. In 1990, Mills became the only women’s college to reverse a decision to become coeducational, following a student strike that was supported by Mills faculty, staff, and alumnae, as well as by students at women’s colleges around the nation (Tidball et al. 1999).

While major universities adopted coeducation starting in the late 1800s, women’s colleges retained, and still retain today, a reputation for providing a superior liberal arts education. Today, there are forty-six women’s colleges in the United States (Women’s College Coalition 2014). These institutions are producing many graduates in STEM fields, considered by many as crucial to the future: at Smith, for example, 40 percent of students major in a STEM field (Smith College 2016). Women’s colleges also remain relevant for their defense of democratic values and commitment to inclusiveness. Women’s colleges are leading the way as constructions of gender change, with Mount Holyoke, for example, admitting transgender applicants beginning in 2014 (Misner 2014). Even though just 1 to 2 percent of full-time women students attend women’s colleges (Jaschik 2017), the history of these institutions shows their flexibility and strong leadership, and they will doubtless continue to thrive.

Normal Schools

Normal schools, which became known later as teachers colleges, were designed to further efforts toward mass basic education. First implemented in Massachusetts in the 1830s, normal schools were eventually created in every state, training thousands of schoolteachers, mainly women. In 1870, the University of Missouri allowed women students to apply to its new Normal Department due to the need for schoolteachers in public schools, yet for at least the first year, female students were kept apart on campus from male students and were even walked to their classes by teachers.

By 1894, one hundred thousand US students—86 percent of them women—were attending normal schools (Parente 1998). Normal schools encouraged the gradual integration of women students into public higher education. When these institutions merged into state teachers colleges, which later became state universities, women continued to attend them, but not necessarily in teacher training programs.

Junior and Community Colleges

In the late 1800s and early 1900s, the demand for higher education was increasing as masses of students graduated from public high schools. In 1900, there were only 650,000 US high school graduates, yet by 1930 there were more than five million (US Census Bureau 2003). The junior (later community) college model emerged to relieve the pressure on four-year schools.

Junior and community colleges have been referred to—accurately—as democracy’s colleges. More than any other institution of American higher education, they evolved in response to the needs of the people. The federal government made
clear in President Harry S. Truman’s Commission on Higher Education report of 1947 that placing a community college within commuting distance of every American should be a top priority. This had clear political importance. Thanks to the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, popularly known as the GI Bill, 40 percent of junior college students in 1946 were veterans. Enrollments at junior colleges more than doubled to five hundred thousand between 1944 and 1947 (Meier 2018).

Community colleges have continued to gain popularity, especially among students of color. In 1976, just under 20 percent of community college students were students of color. In 2016, that proportion had increased to 49 percent nationwide, 59 percent in Texas, and 65 percent in California. Furthermore, 37 percent of community college students are first-generation college students and 46 percent are adult learners, compared with 23 percent and 24 percent, respectively, of students at four-year, private nonprofit and public institutions.

The greatest challenges for community colleges are providing equitable outcomes and keeping college accessible and affordable. African American, Latinx, and American Indian students are less likely than White students to complete terminal degrees or certificates or to transfer successfully to a four-year college or university (Malcom-Piqueux 2018). Yet today, community colleges deliver on the democratic mission of higher education by serving communities that previously lacked access to college.

**Tribal colleges**

Tribal colleges started in the late 1960s as two-year institutions adapted from the community college model, focusing on vocational and agricultural education. In 1963, the Haskell Institute of Kansas (now Haskell Indian Nations University) began to offer college preparatory classes, and in 1970, Haskell became the first federally sponsored Native American junior college (Champagne 1994).

In 1968, only 181 American Indians received four-year degrees. In response, American Indians wrested promises of new policy directions from the federal government. President Lyndon B. Johnson declared in 1968 that the federal government must adhere to “a policy expressed in programs of self-help, self-development, self-determination” (Prucha 2000, 249).

The Navajos took the lead in demanding reform of the federal government’s Indian policies. This tribe was the best able to put political pressure on Washington: the Navajos maintain the largest reservation in the United States; Navajos were communications and code specialists during World War II; and tribal elections had produced chairmen committed to taking control of education (Stein 1992). After Navajo Community College (now Diné College) was founded in Arizona in 1968, new institutions—created and controlled by Native Americans and located on reservations—followed its example. Ten years of growth and success concluded with the passage of the Tribally Controlled Community College Act in 1978 (Stein 1992). Since Diné College’s founding, twenty-seven other tribally controlled colleges have commenced operations (Boyer 1997).

That the community college is the model Native Americans used in forging their own institutions of higher education deserves attention. The community colleges’ institutional missions of “open admission, job training, and community development” best suited the goals of the Navajos and other tribes (Boyer 1997, 25).

Local programs reflected local needs: Salish Kootenai College in Montana began its curriculum with forestry classes; Dull Knife College on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation offered mining training; and aquaculture classes were part of the curriculum at Northwest Indian College on Puget Sound (Boyer 1997). When asked what distinguished Navajo Community College from other colleges, president Ned Hatathli said, “Well, we don’t teach that Columbus discovered America” (Stein 1992, 105).

Tribal colleges have made significant contributions to US higher education, but perhaps their most vital contribution is helping make American Indian students, faculty, educational programs, and institutions visible, helping to defeat the invisibility to which American Indians have historically been subjected, especially in elite colleges and universities (Brayboy 2004). Tribal colleges allow American Indian students and their communities to benefit from relevant higher education without having to travel far from home or go through the often alienating experiences of attending a predominantly White institution (PWI), with the historical legacy of forced assimilation practices.

**Hispanic-Serving Institutions**

Democratic institutions must adapt to serve the people, or they fail their democratic missions. Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs) are authorized by the federal government and defined as “accredited, degree-granting, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education with 25 percent or more total undergraduate Hispanic full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment” (Santiago, Taylor, and Calderón Galdeano 2016, 5). Most HSIs were historically PWIs but their student bodies changed over time to reflect shifting demographics (Valdez 2015). Indeed, only two universities in the continental United States were created expressly to serve Hispanic students: Boricua College (1968) in New York and the National Hispanic University (1981) in California (Santiago, Taylor, and Calderón Galdeano 2016). As of the 2016–17
academic year, there were 492 HSIs scattered across twenty-one states and Puerto Rico; 215 were public two-year colleges. Today, 63 percent of Hispanic students attend HSIs (HACU 2018).

In 2025, 32 percent of all US college students will be Latinx (Hussar and Bailey 2017). HSIs are acting as leaders for all colleges and universities in focusing on these vital students and their varied needs (Garcia and Taylor 2017).

Conclusion
American colleges and universities have not always been in step with the democratic needs of the larger society. However, these institutions have been expected to meet Americans’ growing demand for higher education and have responded with a variety of institutional types to support their democratic missions and ideals. We may expect this evolution to continue so long as we maintain a living, diverse democracy.
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Launched by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and supported by several foundations, the Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation (TRHT) effort is an adaptation of the globally recognized Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) concept. However, the TRHT effort has been designed to better address the multidimensional and protracted history of racial division and hierarchy that is a hallmark of the United States. Because of this history, TRHT focuses more on healing and transformation than on reconciliation, which implies a return to good relations after a conflict.

TRHT aims to jettison the false belief in a hierarchy of human value and replace that archaic notion with a reverence and appreciation for the equal and interconnected nature of the human family. The five components of the TRHT framework are Narrative Change, Racial Healing and Relationship Building, Separation, Law, and Economy. A full explanation of each component of the framework can be found in the Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation Implementation Guidebook (W.K. Kellogg Foundation 2016).

The TRHT effort places racial healing as a centerpiece of its framework. I have designed an approach entitled Rx Racial Healing, which brings together a diverse group of people in the safe, respectful environment of a racial healing circle. Racial healing practitioners encourage (but do not force) participants to share stories in pairs, using tailored prompts and questions that elicit stories of empowerment and agency.

“Because of the hurt and shame and the viral nature of unhealed oppression, people don’t talk about it and may even perpetuate it,” says Liz Medicine Crow, president and chief executive officer of the First Alaskans Institute, which engages in racial healing work. Storytelling, she explains, “allows us to go deeper with our hearts and minds, which creates space to transform and to be transformed” (AAC&U 2016, 34).

Jettisoning the belief in a human hierarchy is a process of “unlearning” as much as learning. Racial healing workshops and experiences can be helpful in this unlearning process. They have been successfully used with thousands of people over several decades. Most approaches to racial healing affirm the common humanity of all people and encourage participants to recognize the absurdity of believing in a racial hierarchy.

Racial Healing and Liberal Education
As a valued TRHT organizational partner, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is leading the creation of TRHT Campus Centers in colleges and universities across the United States, with support from Newman’s Own Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. AAC&U selected the first ten TRHT Campus Centers in 2017. (See the box on page 12.) The centers have developed and are implementing action plans to facilitate racial healing on their campuses and in their communities. (Visit https://www.aacu.org/trht to learn more.) Recent increases in public racist rhetoric, child bullying, racial hatred, violence, and scapegoating of immigrant and minority groups, coupled with increasing numbers of white supremacy groups that target college campuses for recruitment and protests, make the work of TRHT Campus Centers prescient and urgent (Levin and Reitzel 2018).

As AAC&U president Lynn Pasquerella writes, “A liberal education invites a diversity of perspectives and provides students with the skills necessary to examine their own assumptions and those of others; to propose, construct, and evaluate arguments; to anticipate and respond to objections; and to articulate with precision, coherence, and clarity a defense of their views, orally and in writing, to those who need convincing” (2016, 18).

I believe the capacity for empathy and for perspective taking are requisite skills for achieving the goals of a liberal education. Faculty and student participation in effective racial healing circles can support liberal education outcomes in the following ways:

- Racial healing circles provide opportunities to engage with perceived others in ways that enable self-reflection and nonthreatening acknowledgment of one’s own previously unquestioned assumptions and biases.
- Faculty and student participants gain direct experience sharing authentic personal narratives among diverse peers, which enhances their perceptions of human interconnectedness while increasing their capacity for empathy and understanding.
- Participants become more willing to explore the historic and contemporary consequences of adhering to the fallacy of a racial hierarchy.
- Finally, participants gain a heightened sense of responsibility for taking actions to reduce needless human
suffering and promote fairness and equity for the greater good.

**What Effective Racial Healing Circles Are and Are Not**

While there are many approaches to the racial healing process, it is important to clarify what racial healing circles are not. They are not anti-racism trainings or workshops on dismantling structural racism. They also are not the old twentieth-century race relations work, designed to promote “tolerance” of the other. Perhaps most importantly, racial healing circles are not “conversations about race.” To say that the work is about race is to reinforce the belief system based on the false idea of multiple human races. Through racial healing circles, we intend to embrace the true reality of the human family, and the myth of racism is a barrier to that intention. Rx Racial Healing helps participants move beyond that myth and immerse themselves in the commonalities of our shared human journey, while acknowledging the very real consequences of exposure to racism and honoring diverse cultures and experiences.

Circle processes, including racial healing circle processes, are rooted in the spiritual and community-sustaining models of many Indigenous cultures. During the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, Europeans and Americans appropriated and popularized the idea of using circles to gather groups together for healing and growth (Baldwin 1998). Self-help circles, addiction recovery circles, restorative justice circles, conflict resolution circles, peacemaking circles, and disease support group circles are just a few examples.

People have used circles for healing engagement over sustained periods of time because of a few inherent qualities:

- Circles temporarily suspend real and perceived hierarchies. Everyone is equal in the circle.
- Circles meet basic human needs for connection through eye contact, proximity to others, and the experience of belonging.
- Circles support focus and attention away from distractions.

In addition, the racial healing circle process emphasizes empathy. Empathy and tolerance are very different outcomes. Rather than simply tolerating another person’s existence, empathy involves the art of perspective taking and requires awareness and understanding of the experience of another. Sharing authentic stories in a deftly facilitated circle of engagement helps increase empathy for individuals and collectively among all circle participants. The Rx Racial Healing approach makes story an action. The focus, attention, and deep listening generate powerful changes in perception that help break down biases. Neither TRHT work nor a liberal education can be limited to cognitive work alone. Both must also engage the heart. Making story a verb, an action, is a way of engaging the heart.

I have been incorporating the circle process into social program design since the 1980s, including in the educator support and training program Appreciative Learning and the national multicultural education program Americans All (Brown McCracken, Christopher, and Sreb 1991; Christopher 1991). Beginning in 2008, I adapted this healing circle model and approach for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s America Healing annual convenings and for the TRHT national convening in 2016. Approximately seventy-five racial healing practitioners from diverse backgrounds were engaged to support these convenings.

In addition, I recently worked with AAC&U, the American Library Association, and racial healing practitioners to conduct a two-day Preparation Process to begin to cultivate a new cohort of racial healing practitioners. Representatives from the ten TRHT Campus Centers, five additional campuses, and five libraries participated in the process, which was held at Duke University. Participants reviewed the core elements of racial healing circles and had the opportunity to design and cofacilitate a practice circle. The Preparation Process was aimed at building capacity for TRHT partners to sustain their own localized efforts.

**Imagining Transformation**

The broad goals of a liberal education—to increase students’ analytical and critical thinking skills—are necessary to understanding truth. TRHT’s transformational goal involves racial healing and requires the imagination. We must envision a future United States that no longer believes in the fallacy of a racial hierarchy, a nation that truly celebrates our equal and connected humanity. As John Paul Lederach of Humanity United says, this work requires us to “nourish
and foster the creative imagination that permits [us] to bring into the world something that does not now exist” (Ferrera, Lederach, and Tippett 2018).

In response to increasing gun violence and police violence, student and youth protesters are using “die-ins.” So many Black, Latino, Native American, Asian American, immigrant, LGBTQ, and White young people are dying needlessly that protesters are lying down in the streets to simulate death in solidarity. It is a variation on the “sit-ins” at segregated lunch counters and elsewhere. There is one striking symbolic difference, however. Sit-ins portrayed the “desired state” of the right to be treated equally. The die-ins do not. Instead, they dramatically illustrate the crisis and, in some ways, align with the truth-telling aspect of social change. I applaud the courage and creativity of these protesters. Social change always requires multiple interventions. However, as a holistic health care provider turned social change agent, I feel compelled to share four relevant lessons that I have learned over the decades about change-making, which I have incorporated into the Rx Racial Healing methodology:

1. There is power in first imagining the desired change. We must see and be the change and find ways to practice the desired state or "just future." Effective racial healing circles emphasize diversity among participants, modeling the desired state of coming together as one community.

2. Human beings are wired for connection. I believe the deepest and most enduring wounds come when people thwart this biological and psychological imperative by "othering" through discrimination, exclusion, minimization, and oppression. The resulting stress—and sometimes trauma—increases vulnerability to disease. Chronic stress can impede the creative and cognitive capabilities that people need for resilience (McEwen and Gianaros 2011). Spending time in racial healing circles can interrupt negative exposures (temporarily, at least) and model a space of welcome and belonging. This experience helps to generate countervailing physiological responses through feelings of relaxation and healing.

3. To be human is to "story"—to create and express an authentic personal narrative that our brains are wired to embed, understand, and share. Effective racial healing circle design invites story sharing between two people in a safe and affirming manner.

4. Thanks to advances in neuroscience and imaging and scanning technologies, scientists have gathered data that indicate how experience, attention, and focus can generate measurable increases and changes in neural cell connections (Schwartz and Begley 2002). Scientific research now supports what masters in music, dance, art, athletics, and literature have espoused for centuries; practice makes perfect. Or, certainly, practice increases human capacity for specific behaviors. Translating this idea to racial healing work, we see that when we learn counterstereotypes in an attentive, focused effort, we can individually and collectively reduce bias and avoid automatically acting upon our stereotypical perceptions.

A wise mentor of mine used to say, “Child, if they knew better, they’d do better.” But life has taught me not to equate simply knowing with doing. Unlearning is more complex. Ultimately, our feelings motivate us and our fears can inhibit us. I would alter her wise saying to, “Child, if they both knew and felt better—if they believed better—they’d do better.”

Looking Back, Moving Forward
The United States’ foundational economic, governmental, religious, educational, health, social, civic, and philanthropic institutions practiced acceptance of a hierarchy and taxonomy of our diverse human family. The system of assigned value and assumed character traits was based on superficial physical features (such as skin color and facial features) and on continents of origin. American University scholar Ibram X. Kendi (2016) has compiled the most thorough history of these ideas in Stamped from the Beginning, which won the 2016 National Book Award for Nonfiction.

There have been episodic movements and significant progress toward equity in the United States since the end of the Civil War, but that progress has been subject to dramatic reversals when political leadership has changed. When we examine the reversal of gains made during Reconstruction and the Civil Rights era and the shifts in racialized immigration policies over the decades, we come face to face with the reality of a persistent insistence, by some, on the idea of a racial hierarchy.

In a 2013 New York Times book review of Craig Steven Wilder’s Ebony and Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America’s Universities, reviewer Jennifer Schuessler praises Wilder for taking a
broad look at the role of slavery in the development of US universities. She quotes James Wright, former president of Dartmouth College: “Slavery was deeply embedded in all our institutions, which found ways to explain and to rationalize slavery even after the formation of the American republic” (2013). The deeply held belief in a hierarchy of human value fueled those explanations and rationalizations.

It should come as no surprise that this country’s system of higher education was intimately immersed in the ethos of the times of its formation. Enslavement of and discrimination against people of color was the norm in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The United States was conceived not in liberty but in slavery and dominated by the belief in a hierarchy of human value. In his award-winning 2014 book, The Counter-Revolution of 1776, author Gerald Horne argues convincingly that the Revolutionary War was fought primarily to preserve slavery as abolitionist sentiments grew in Britain.

The false biological and philosophical construct of a taxonomy of humanity has long since been debunked by anthropology, genomic science, and social science. Yet its legacy and destructive consequences remain, as do the remnants of the belief itself. It is expressed primarily through unconsciously motivated behaviors, but sometimes through overt, conscious, and even hateful actions.

What is surprising and unacceptable is our ongoing state of denial and subsequent failure to thoroughly grapple intellectually and morally with the facts, consequences, implications, and feelings generated by this shameful aspect of American identity.

June 6, 2018, marked the fiftieth anniversary of the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. In a television interview about her 2018 book, Robert F. Kennedy: Ripples of Hope, Kerry Kennedy describes her father’s message for the country: “You have to think of your enemies as your brothers and sisters” (2018). This belief helped him during the Cuban missile crisis and in working with diverse communities.

I believe that the ability to take the perspective of the other and to empathize is the cornerstone of a stable democracy. Empathy is as foundational to democracies as free and fair elections. While the United States has some systems in place to foster free and fair elections, we have no systems to foster the individual and collective capacity for empathy. Effective racial healing circle experiences are designed to help participants increase their capacity for empathy.

I applaud the colleges and universities that have begun to examine their past relationships to slavery and to the decimation and colonization of Indigenous people and the confiscation of their lands. The process of looking back and moving forward requires that all people hone their abilities to both understand and begin to see themselves in the experiences of the perceived other. Racial healing circles, when effectively implemented, can enable this capacity.

As Robert F. Kennedy said, “What we need in the United States is not hatred . . . but love and wisdom and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country” (1968).

**Gail C. Christopher is an award-winning social change agent. This article is adapted from her upcoming book, Rx Racial Healing: A Handbook: Your Questions Answered.**
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Freedom University was founded in 2011 as a modern-day freedom school for undocumented students, after the Georgia Board of Regents enacted Policy 4.1.6. and Policy 4.3.4, preventing undocumented students from attending Georgia’s top public universities and receiving in-state tuition (University System of Georgia 2018). Based in an undisclosed location in Atlanta, Freedom University provides free college-level classes, college application and scholarship assistance, and movement leadership training.

We posed questions to Freedom University’s executive director Laura Emiko Soltis (below) and professor Fernando Esquivel-Suárez (on page 15). A reflection from former student Rafael Aragón can be found on page 16.

Soltis joined Freedom University as a volunteer faculty member in 2013 and has served as executive director since 2014. Soltis introduced a human rights framework and a horizontal leadership structure and expanded the curriculum to include courses chosen by students. As a social movement strategist, Soltis works to build bridges between undocumented and documented student groups, advocate for fair admissions and sanctuary policies in higher education, and cultivate relationships between undocumented students and veterans of the Black Freedom Movement. Soltis teaches classes at Freedom University in international human rights, social movement theory, and immigration history.

What makes Freedom University different from other institutions of higher education?

Freedom University is unique in that every one of our students is undocumented. We are the one true sanctuary campus in the world. Our students arrived in the United States as young children from Mexico, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Uruguay, South Korea, Romania, Jamaica, Ghana, Mali, and Haiti. We are also different in our purpose, structure, and content.

The purpose of education at Freedom University is to empower students to overcome fear and reclaim their dignity and rights as human beings. We employ liberatory pedagogy, which aims to deepen our students’ consciousness and empower them to be leaders in their own freedom struggle (Freire 1970). One of my students, Jonathan, said it best when he described Freedom University as “the place where you walk in undocumented and leave unafraid.”

Our structure is unorthodox. We have no tuition, grades, degrees, mascots, or tenure. Students come because they want to learn. Teachers come because they want to teach. All Freedom University professors are volunteers. When you take away the clutter of educational institutions, you are left with something revolutionary: education. In this space of shared learning and growth, the boundaries of teacher and student are blurred, and everyone is free to teach and learn.

This concept is central to liberatory pedagogy. Most of our professors are first-generation college graduates, people of color, or formerly undocumented immigrants. Students often note in their written reflections that this has a significant impact on their ability to imagine themselves succeeding in a certain career or life path.

Our content is driven by the students, who have a dialogue every semester about what subjects they want to learn. Students shape the university, unlike traditional universities that require students to shape themselves into the mold of the institution in order to succeed. Our courses and faculty mentorship programs prepare students to continue their college education after they graduate from Freedom University. We also conduct movement campaigns to change admissions policies at private universities across the country to increase access for undocumented students. As a result, one in three of our students at Freedom University this past year left with a full scholarship to college.

Our curriculum includes the social sciences and humanities, fine arts, biological and life sciences, and SAT and college preparation. Each semester, we also offer College Level Examination Program (CLEP) courses that allow students to earn credits that can transfer to a future university. In the social sciences and humanities, we explore the diversity and complexity of the human experience and the structures that shape our social world, with a critical lens of power to strengthen our students’ political consciousness.

In our arts courses, students have chosen to study creative writing, music, dance, and drawing and painting. The arts provide a space where students can express their full selves—not just as
CIVIC LEARNING FOR SHARED FUTURES

A Legacy of Education for Liberation

FERNANDO ESQUIVEL-SUÁREZ, Professor of Spanish Literature at Freedom University and Senior Instructor in the Department of World Languages and Literature at Spelman College

Fernando Esquivel-Suárez joined Freedom University as a volunteer instructor in 2017. His main research interests focus on African American/Latinx relations, overlapping oppression, and solidarity.

Why did you decide to teach at Freedom University?
To me, serving at Freedom University represents learning from historically Black colleges and universities and Freedom Schools and carrying on their legacy of education for liberation. As many scholars point out, racist and xenophobic narratives legitimize segregationist policies and violence against migrants and people of color. Freedom University allows students and faculty to contextualize our personal stories in history and resist the criminalization of our bodies and identities.

I believe in the strength of multiracial political solidarity. Freedom University is a great example of diverse oppressed communities working together. We are not only inspired but also guided by leaders and institutions that formed the Civil Rights Movement. As a documented immigrant from Colombia who has lived in Atlanta for more than a decade, teaching at Freedom University inserts me into the history of the struggle for human rights historically led by activists from this city.

What are some of your most memorable teaching moments at Freedom University?
Beyond training students in the academic uses of Spanish, our course Introducción a las Literaturas en Español (Introduction to Spanish Literature) became a space for both native speakers and heritage speakers (those who grew up in homes where Spanish was spoken) to reflect on the role of the language in our lives. I find this exercise crucial during this latest resurgence of nativism, as we experience shaming for speaking Spanish in public.

I particularly treasure two moments from this course. The first occurred as students read their own poetry, exhibiting great artistic control and the ability to powerfully convey their experiences as they fluctuated between Spanish and other languages. In the second instance, one student described how, for her, Spanish was contained in family and religious spheres, and how our class helped her tap into another dimension of the language and reflect on the multiplicity of her identity.

What have you learned most from your students?
Working with students at Freedom University has given me a glimpse of how education might look in the margins of capitalism. There are no financial transactions. This transforms the school into a place where people willingly meet to learn from each other, produce and interrogate knowledge, and develop academic skills. To me, Spanish-speaking students and faculty at Freedom University have become an invaluable intellectual community in my first language.

What are your hopes for your students for the future?
The goal of segregationist policies in education—like the policies passed by the Georgia Board of Regents—is to constrain oppressed populations’ access to social mobility through professionalization and force them to be a reservoir of cheap labor. I hope for a future in which our students can determine their own destinies without the burden of laws designed to curtail their freedom. They are already actively building that future.

Fernando Esquivel-Suárez
(Photo © Laura Emiko Soltis 2018)
movements in the South, I befriended Charles Black, Lonnie King, and Roslyn Pope, who were youth leaders of the Atlanta Student Movement, an affiliate of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in the 1960s. When I started teaching at Freedom University, I invited them to speak with and mentor students in my human rights classes. It was Charles who suggested I attend the Freedom Summer 50th Anniversary Conference in Jackson, Mississippi, in summer 2014 with my students. During that conference, ten Freedom University students learned directly from movement giants like Marian Wright Edelman, Rita Schwerner Bender, and the late Julian Bond. These relationships no doubt changed the students forever, and as a teacher, I was inspired to weave this legacy into the content of my courses and into the soul of Freedom University.

As a professor of human rights and social movements, I aim not only to teach social movement theory and concepts like cognitive liberation (McAdam 1982) but also to bring about that liberation in students’ minds by teaching them to recognize inequality as injustice, to assert their human rights regardless of their citizenship status, and to believe that collective action can bring change. There is no better way to teach this than to put students in direct dialogue with the veterans who led the Black Freedom Movement as young people. And when you teach the history of race, immigration, incarceration, and labor in the United States to undocumented students, they catch on quickly that it is not a coincidence that the same public universities in Georgia that ban undocumented students today banned Black students in 1960. They realize that if Georgia’s public universities could be desegregated by student insurgency in the 1960s, they can be desegregated again.

The Strength of Our Solidarity: A Student Reflection

RAFAEL ARAGÓN, Freedom University Student Committee Member, Former Freedom University Student, and Eastern Connecticut State University Student

Rafael Aragón was born in Mexico and arrived in the United States at the age of six. Since joining Freedom University in January 2017, Aragón has been an active student leader, participating in direct actions and speaking on panels across the country. He received a full scholarship to Eastern Connecticut State University and plans to study cognitive behavioral psychology beginning in fall 2018.

“Movements are multidimensional: they [comprise] a lot of different people, doing many different things, over a long period of time, all working toward one common goal.” When I first heard these words from veteran civil rights leader and Freedom University board member Charles Black, I realized the power we hold when we fight together.

Of the many lessons I’ve learned at Freedom University, the importance of building a strong community is the most significant. The success of everything we seek to accomplish at Freedom University depends on the strength of our solidarity with one another. We changed the admissions policy at Emory because we built a coalition with Emory students through the Freedom at Emory initiative. In 2015, as a result of our advocacy, Emory announced it would accept academically qualified DACA students without discrimination and provide them need-based financial aid. Because of our work with the Emory Sanctuary Coalition, Emory decided in 2017 to expand its admissions policy to accept undocumented students without DACA. We also lifted two public universities off the list of schools that ban undocumented students in Georgia under Policy 4.1.6 because we stood together in an act of civil disobedience at a Georgia Board of Regents meeting. As individual students, we learn, grow, and achieve because we have a supportive community to turn to when things get too difficult for us on our own. The hopelessness we might have felt before finding Freedom University dissipates when we learn from teachers who look like us or share a similar experience, and when alumni visit our classes to advise and encourage us.

In my journey, I have found encouragement in meeting Freedom University’s mental health coordinator, Carissa Balderas, someone who understands me and is even from the same part of Mexico where my father was born. Watching Carissa work as a therapist to improve the mental well-being of immigrant youth—a career path I hope to follow—has solidified my resolve to keep striving toward my goals. After years of trying to tackle the world alone, with its walls, borders, and obstacles, I now understand that working collectively is the most effective way to transform the world for the better. Because of my experience at Freedom University, I know that whenever I encounter injustice, I have the tools to mobilize people around me to fight for our human rights.
What is the greatest challenge facing your students today?
The greatest challenge facing our students is fear. This fear has often been building in their daily lives for as long as they can remember. Fear of keeping secrets and being different from their friends. Fear of police. Fear of deportation. Fear of not getting into college. For many, fear is the defining force of growing up undocumented. Many students describe Freedom University as crucial to their growth because it is the only space outside of their homes where they can say they are undocumented and where they can explore the history and politics of “illegal immigration.”

With the Trump administration’s repeal of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) on September 5, 2017, a wave of fear hit our students. Some students responded by being more fearless in their activism. Others retreated into isolation. Others promoted separatist politics based on race and immigration status and lashed out against allies, teachers, and even each other. As in many grassroots social justice organizations, the virulence and uncertainty of the political climate seeped into our organization, and we had to fight to keep our community together. But in doing so, we rediscovered that our strength truly lies in our differences, our inclusivity, and our practice of loving one another as a revolutionary act.

We are constantly working to address the challenge of fear in our community. Our Mental Health Program—which matches interested students with trained mental health counselors for one hour of free counseling each week—and our commitment to dialogue with one another are the best antidotes to fear. As both a social movement scholar and practitioner, I strongly believe it is harmful to paint rosy pictures of social justice organizations in social movement history because, in reality, they are often messy, heartbreaking, and prone to self-destruction. After all, they are collective experiments in love and justice in a cruel and unjust world. I remind students about a story of a viejito (an elder) in South Texas who ended a community meeting filled with angry disagreements by saying, “Of course we are going to step on each other’s toes. We are trying to walk arm in arm.”

Why did you decide to teach at Freedom University?
I started teaching at Freedom University when I was just twenty-nine years old. Fresh out of my fieldwork with farmworkers in South Florida, I think I decided to teach at Freedom University because I genuinely wanted to keep learning, and I recognized that I learned the most when I was working alongside grassroots intellectuals and the oppressed. I also wanted to bring my whole self into the classroom. To my surprise, my strange set of skills as a scholar, artist, and activist came in handy at Freedom University: I was qualified to teach college-level classes. I had studied and participated in immigrant rights and farmworker rights movements. I was a self-taught photographer, painter, and singer who had learned to use art, music, and humor in direct actions. Most importantly, as my considerable arrest record proved, I was not afraid of getting in “good trouble” (Lewis 2018).

I am a first-generation college student on my father’s side and a first-generation American on my mother’s. My parents weren’t exactly thrilled that my first job out of graduate school involved working for free at an underground freedom school. But over time, they realized that working alongside low-income, immigrant youth fighting for their right to education was my way of honoring the sacrifices my parents had made for me. Growing up, I watched my father struggle as a road construction worker with a first-grade reading level. I watched my mother face racism as an immigrant woman of color. I felt an obligation to share my knowledge in a way that would most effectively challenge injustices against immigrants and disrupt the status quo in Georgia.

Freedom University is a space where I can practice liberatory pedagogy, where individuals generate collective genius by serving as both teachers and students. Putting this into practice is difficult. Sometimes faculty divert back to lecture-style instruction and away from a dialogue-based model. Other times students think they have nothing to learn from their teachers. Students have asked me, “As a citizen, what could you possibly teach me about being undocumented?” I have explained, “I am not going to teach you about being undocumented. You are experts in that field, and you will always be my teachers in that experience. But I am going to teach you how powerful people use borders, legal systems, cultural norms, and divide-and-conquer strategies to maintain their power, and how these strategies change over time. I am also going to teach you how powerless people have organized across borders, challenged unjust laws, transformed cultural norms, and formed diverse coalitions of solidarity to reclaim their power. And one day you will teach these things to others, just as I myself have been taught.”

These are the reasons I joined Freedom University. Five years later, I’m still making good trouble.
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I teach history at Georgetown University, a school where history matters. It’s the oldest Catholic university in the United States, and we celebrate that legacy through rituals such as reading the college’s charter at every graduation (Georgetown University 1815). But history is more complicated than the funhouse mirror version of it we encounter in the carnivals of historical memory. Despite its origins as a beacon of religious tolerance and republican liberty, Georgetown was built on the backs of enslaved people. Along with many other schools, Georgetown is beginning to reckon with that history, a microcosm of the paradox of America (Georgetown University, n.d.). On April 18, 2017, the descendants of 272 enslaved people—whom Jesuit leaders sold from Maryland to Louisiana in 1838, using part of the proceeds to rescue Georgetown College from debt (Maryland Province Archives 1838)—gathered on stage and in the audience of Georgetown’s Gaston Hall. These descendants of the Georgetown University 272 (GU272) shared the stage with Georgetown president John J. DeGioia and Father Tim Kesicki, Society of Jesus (SJ), president of the Jesuit Conference of Canada and the United States, who delivered historic apologies for their organizations’ histories of slavery. “We pray with you today because we have greatly sinned, and because we are profoundly sorry,” Father Kesicki said (Georgetown University 2017). It was a milestone in a long, unfinished journey of truth and reconciliation.

**Recognizing Our History**

In September 2015, President DeGioia formed a Working Group on Slavery, Memory, and Reconciliation to reflect on how the university should “acknowledge and recognize Georgetown’s historical relationship with the institution of slavery” (DeGioia 2015). I was a member of the group, which included faculty, staff, and students. The impetus was the reopening of the renovated Mulledy Hall, named after Rev. Thomas F. Mulledy, SJ, a president of Georgetown who orchestrated the sale of men, women, and children owned by the Maryland Jesuits. President DeGioia grasped that the moment was ripe for the Georgetown community to have a conversation about our history.

This history had not been a secret. Jesuit historians had written about it for a hundred years. Robert Emmett Curran’s *The Bicentennial History of Georgetown University*, published in 1993, describes the college’s connections to slavery in detail. American Studies faculty and students launched a pioneering digital history project in the 1990s to publish archival material related to Georgetown’s history of slavery. From 2014 to 2016, undergraduate history major Matthew Quallen (2016) wrote a series of articles for the student newspaper, sparking renewed interest in this history among students. Nevertheless, one surprising discovery of the Working Group was how few people knew about this history. That Georgetown and the Jesuits owned and sold slaves came as a shock to most people. Educating ourselves and others about our history became a priority.

What is our history? Georgetown was founded by a Catholic elite in Maryland whose wealth was based on slavery, which provided cheap labor for tobacco fields. The earliest records of Jesuit slave-holding in Maryland date to the 1710s, but the Maryland Jesuits had been part of a transatlantic slave economy since the 1500s. They justified their involvement on the grounds that slavery was an instrument for the Christianization of so-called heathen people.

By the 1830s, nearly three hundred enslaved people worked on Jesuit-owned plantations in Maryland, whose profits were supposed to subsidize the education of white boys. In reality, their most profitable activity was probably the selling of people whose labor they no longer needed (Maryland Province Archives 1808). After a debate spanning two decades, the Jesuits got out of the business of running plantations with slave labor. But instead of emancipating the people they owned, they sold them to two planters in Louisiana for $115,000.

The college itself was a site of slave labor from the time it opened in 1789 until emancipation in the nation’s capital in 1862. One of the first enslaved people at Georgetown was a woman named Sukey (Georgetown University Archive 1859), and the last was Aaron Edmonson (Georgetown University Archive 1859). The $12 Edmonson earned each month went to his owner, Ann Green, who received $109.50 from the federal government when Edmonson was freed. Nobody repaid former slaves for the robbery of the fruits of their labor.

In 1814, twelve out of 102 people on campus were enslaved (Georgetown University Library 1814). They were owned by the Jesuits or rented from students’ families or local owners. They worked as carpenters, valets, blacksmiths, maids, and cooks.

Faculty and students at Georgetown accepted the slave economy and even endorsed it. The college Philodemic Society held debates about slavery, usually supporting the proslavery side. Father James Ryder, SJ, a two-time president of the school, condemned...
abolitionism, declaring “God is a God of order” (Georgetown Slavery Archive 1835). A strong majority of students and alumni who fought in the Civil War did so on the Confederate side. After the war, the school adopted blue and gray as its colors to signify sectional reconciliation. Blue and gray are still our colors.

**Reckoning and Reconciliation**

During the 2015–16 academic year, the Working Group strived to deepen the Georgetown community’s knowledge of this history. We put out a pamphlet with basic facts. We organized “conversation circles” to allow the university community to express diverse perspectives. A “teach-in” examined other efforts to come to terms with past racial injustice at home and abroad. A series of public events culminated in a weeklong symposium on slavery and its consequences, featuring distinguished scholars including historian Craig Steven Wilder. These events provided guidance to the Working Group and brought the university community into our process.

The conversation that President DeGioia launched took off in unexpected directions. Inspired by Black Lives Matter, Georgetown students protested in November 2015, forcing a change in the names of two buildings that had been named after Jesuit priests who orchestrated the sale, Mulledy and Rev. William McSherry, SJ. The Georgetown Memory Project, an independent nonprofit founded by alumnus Richard Cellini, began to track down descendants of the GU272, enslaved people whom Jesuit leaders sold from Maryland to Louisiana in 1838. On April 18, 2017, Georgetown University president John J. DeGioia delivered remarks to Georgetown community members and descendants of the 272 enslaved people whom Jesuit leaders sold from Maryland to Louisiana in 1838. (Photo courtesy of Georgetown University)

As a historian of slavery at Georgetown, I direct the research on Georgetown’s history of slavery and suggested steps forward. These included an apology, new names for the two buildings, support for further research and teaching about our history, “legacy” status in admissions for the descendants of the GU272, and—perhaps most importantly—collaboration with descendants in the task of reconciliation.

The events of April 2017 showed progress. Along with the apologies came the dedication of Isaac Hawkins and Anne Marie Becraft Halls, formerly Mulledy and McSherry Halls. Hawkins was a patriarch of the GU272, and Becraft was a free woman of color who established one of the first schools for black girls in Washington, DC.

Two GU272 descendants, Melisande Short-Colomb and Shepherd Thomas, matriculated at Georgetown in fall 2017, and more are expected. At sixty-three, Short-Colomb is the oldest first-year student in Georgetown’s history, and one of the most indomitable. (See her narrative on page 20.) The Georgetown Slavery Archive (n.d.), which provides digital access to archival materials, continues to grow through student research. Many GU272 descendants have visited Georgetown’s Booth Family Center for Special Collections to see the sacramental registers and bills of sale and catch a glimpse of their ancestors.

As a historian of slavery at Georgetown, I direct the research on the Georgetown Slavery Archive, and I teach American Studies 272: Facing Georgetown’s History, open to junior American Studies majors. We read about the history and memory of slavery, speak with scholars and descendants, and trace the footprints of the GU272 from Maryland to Louisiana and from past to present. As a final project, students add to public knowledge by creating podcasts (American Studies Program 2018). I also collaborate with colleagues in film studies, art history, and theater, who are grappling with Georgetown’s history of slavery in creative ways. These projects include a student-produced video (Film and Media Studies Program 2017), a student proposal for a memorial to the GU272 (Art History Program 2016), and a commissioned play entitled The 272 (Laboratory for Global Performance and Politics, n.d.).

Georgetown is one of many schools investigating their histories of slavery and connecting the past to the present. The Universities Studying Slavery consortium, started by the University of Virginia (2018), includes more than forty member institutions.

But Georgetown’s history does not matter just for those who work, teach, and learn at our school. As I was writing this essay, I received a phone call from a man who had just discovered his connection to the GU272 and was eager to learn more about his family’s history. The excitement in his voice spoke volumes.
For Our Ancestors and Our Descendants

Mélisande Short-Colomb, Georgetown University Student

In August 2016, I got a personal message on Facebook from a genealogist working with the nonprofit Georgetown Memory Project, who inquired about my relationship with the Mahoneys of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Having grown up with grandmothers steeped in the ways of teaching a granddaughter the “begats,” as my mother called them, I was easily able to trace our family back four generations to Mary Ellen Queen and Abraham Mahoney from Maryland.

That Facebook message would bring me into a new way of learning and living, into uncovering layers of my family history and discovering new family members, some whom had been friends for years as we attended the same schools and churches growing up in New Orleans. We would come to be known as the “descendants” of the Georgetown University 272, or the GU272—enslaved people who were sold by the Society of Jesus in 1838 to support the bankrupt Georgetown College.

One year later, I arrived at Georgetown’s Front Gates to begin my first semester as a first-year student. It has been a year of growth and learning, incredible opportunities, challenges, new friendships, and academic highs and lows. The inclination early in life is to blend in with your peer group. Yet here I am, a fully actualized senior adult, facing the same emotional, physical, and academic challenges as students generations younger than myself. I am learning so much from them!

We have so much historical information available to us that could make us stronger by opening avenues to dialogues about how and why freedom matters. I believe that we all, as members of an open and free society, owe so much to the records kept from the sale of those families. It is an opportunity to do the hard work of truth and reconciliation our nation has consistently refused to do.

I am here at Georgetown to be a living representative for my family and our ancestors as an act of good faith, in the spirit of the Ignatian-Jesuit philosophy of cura personalis, for the care of the whole nation and healing of national wounds. There is no better time than now and there are no better people than ourselves to create a better future so that our descendants will be proud to say our names and remember us lovingly as we acknowledge and revere those who came before us.
Transforming the Negative Legacy of the Unethical United States Public Health Service Syphilis Study

BETTY NEAL CRUTCHER, Presidential Spouse and Cross-Cultural Mentor at the University of Richmond, Visiting Scholar at Tuskegee University National Center for Bioethics in Research and Health Care (NCBRH)

JOAN R. HARRELL, Lecturer and Diversity Coordinator at the Auburn University School of Communication and Journalism, former Visiting Scholar and Associate Director of Community Engagement at NCBRH
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From 1932 to 1972, medical researchers from the United States Public Health Service (USPHS) in Washington, DC, developed and conducted an unethical clinical study in Tuskegee and other locations in Macon County, Alabama. Officially named the Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro1 Male, the study sought to discover how syphilis—the sexually transmitted disease that had spread in an epidemic affecting Black people and White people throughout the United States during the late 1920s and early 1930s—ravaged the human body. The researchers never told the men who were subjected to the study that they had syphilis, never offered them penicillin after it became the standard treatment in 1947, and never gave them the option to leave the study.

The USPHS researchers implemented the immoral public health study at the Tuskegee Institute (now Tuskegee University), a historically Black institution founded sixteen years after the Civil War by Rev. Lewis Adams and Booker T. Washington, two descendants of Black slaves. The researchers lived among the majority African American populations of several rural farming communities in Macon County. Three years after the Great Depression started, the medical investigators recruited more than six hundred Black men—descendants of slaves in the Deep South—at their churches, places of employment, and homes, and offered them the opportunity to receive free health care for themselves and their families, as well as free meals and burial insurance. Research revealed that the original study included six hundred men: 399 who had syphilis and 201 who did not, representing the control group in the study (CDC 2017). By the time the study ended, a total of 623 men had been subjected to this public health medical mistreatment.

The researchers told the men they had “bad blood.” During that time in history, African American citizens in Macon County used the term bad blood for many physical ailments, including syphilis. All men in the study were given spinal taps, ostensibly to treat their condition. A majority of the men and their families welcomed the thought of free health care and the $25 given to them each time they were subjected to the study. But the men were not offered informed consent when they technically agreed to be guinea pigs in an experiment that was never intended to medically treat them. Additionally, none of the men’s family members received access to the promised free health care (Harrell 2014).

In 1972, an Associated Press reporter, with information from a USPHS employee, blew the whistle (Heller 2017). Macon County and the world were shocked to learn about this tragedy. The federal government ended the study later that year, and the survivors received a settlement of more than $9 million in 1974.

Building a New Legacy
This infamous study continues to plague the descendants of the 623 men, as well as other members of the Black American community. In an interview with Joan R. Harrell on behalf of Tuskegee University, a granddaughter of one of the men who had syphilis revealed that her grandfather suffered from blindness as a result of not being treated. A great-grandson of another man in the study shared that his family talks about how his great-grandmother died before his great-grandfather because she contracted syphilis from her untreated husband.

According to a report from Johns Hopkins Medicine, “More than three decades after the shutdown of the notorious Tuskegee study, a team of Johns Hopkins physicians has found that Tuskegee’s legacy of Blacks’ mistrust of physicians and deep-seated fear of harm from medical research persists and is largely to blame for keeping much-needed African Americans from taking part in clinical trials” (2008).

1. Historically in the United States, people of Black African origin have been ethnically described as “negro,” which means “black” in Spanish. Spanish and Portuguese slave traders used this description during the Atlantic slave trade. “Negro” was later capitalized to denote non-White people. Throughout the Jim Crow era, the term “colored” denoted Black people of African descent in the United States. During and after the Civil Rights Movement, “Black” and “African American” became ethnic descriptors.
In response to this injustice and the need to begin holistically restoring a stigmatized community, physician and medical historian Vanessa Northington Gamble chaired the Tuskegee Syphilis Study Legacy Committee in 1996. The committee declared that the unconscionable medical study should be referred to as the United States Public Health Service Syphilis Study at Tuskegee (USPHSSS), underscoring the fact that the federal government constructed the study. This empowering move catalyzed efforts to examine the history of exclusion in medicine and education and the lived experiences of the survivors and their families, including the issues of racism, sexism, and ethics.

President William Jefferson Clinton made a public apology for the unethical study on May 16, 1997, and announced a $200,000 grant to Tuskegee University to begin plans for a National Center for Bioethics in Research and Health Care (NCBRH), based on the recommendations of the Legacy Committee members and the university. In 1999, NCBRH opened at Tuskegee University as the only bioethics center in the United States mandated by a US president. Today, NCBRH faculty and staff collaborate with the Voices for Our Fathers Legacy Foundation (VOFLF), which was founded in 2014 and comprises descendants and relatives of the men in the USPHSSS.

Partly inspired by Tuskegee University’s commitment to its bioethics center, VOFLF seeks to assist in the healing process among the descendants and their families, tell the men’s stories, and keep alive the memory of this horrific, decades-long study so that citizens may be alerted to the insidious nature of medical mistreatment. One joint project between NCBRH and VOFLF was the dedication on March 31, 2014, of a hollow open-ground space at NCBRH to create a Memorial and Inspiration Garden to honor and respect the lives of the 623 men in the study.

Joyce Tyson Christian, secretary of the VOFLF board of directors, told us, “As a daughter of one of the men, I have the opportunity to raise my voice about the USPHSSS and the unethical effects it had on humanity. I hope we can show the ripple effect created by this unjust act, which affected my generation and will affect future generations.”

NCBRH continues to work in step with the vision of the descendants through its efforts in education, research, and training. (See Betty Neal Crutcher’s reflection on page 23.)

Advancing Ethics and Equity
NCBRH focuses on increasing knowledge and awareness of moral issues underlying biomedical research and the treatment of underserved populations within the health-care system. It also addresses issues of health inequity, among other goals. Through a cooperative agreement with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), NCBRH provides ongoing education, training, and research regarding bioethics and public health ethics.

In addition, NCBRH seeks to increase the number of people from underrepresented minority backgrounds trained and working in bioethics. Through the Bioethics Honors–Bioethics Associates Program and Bioethics Minor at Tuskegee University, students are trained to identify, articulate, and analyze ethical issues in biomedical research and to hone bioethical decision-making skills. Bioethics courses and university-and community-wide seminars and conferences address contemporary and historical bioethical violations, as well as ethical issues within the biomedical sciences and public health. Students have a chance to further develop their ethical analysis skills through summer internships at the CDC and fellowship opportunities with NCBRH, working with the majority African American population within the Alabama Black Belt (including in Macon County) to address health disparities.

These programs are open to all students within the university in all majors. Several of the courses, conferences, and seminars are also open to faculty and community members. For instance, in addition to a Special Topics in Bioethics course (an online and face-to-face course that anyone in the United States can take), NCBRH offers a rigorous Public Health Ethics intensive.
Course for health-care professionals, medical residents, graduate students, faculty, and community advocates across the nation. Health-care professionals receive continuing education credit, and the course builds competency in the theory and practice of public health ethics, health-care ethics, bioethics, and research ethics. An important feature of the course is its focus on the intersection of the various domains of ethics with race, ethnicity, sex, gender, and class.

Some Tuskegee students in the Bioethics Honors Program are descendants of those subjected to the USPHSSS. For example, Kimberly Carr—a PhD candidate within the Integrative Biosciences Program at Tuskegee, whose research directly addresses health equity and social justice—is the great-great-granddaughter of John Goode. Carr stated, "Because I am a descendant of John Goode, my career in public health and basic science research is committed and dedicated to fulfilling their dreams deferred. . . . It is my ethical and moral responsibility in my career [to] involve the ethical practices that are critical for humanity" (NCBRH 2018).

Through education, training, and scholarship, NCBRH is transforming the negative legacy of the USPHSSS by equipping students, faculty, scientists, and health-care professionals with ethical sophistication that can enhance their daily work toward the health and well-being of underserved communities. In step with the vision of the descendants, NCBRH is working for justice with an aim of keeping the spirit of hope and healing alive.

A Descendant’s Personal Reflection

Betty Neal Crutcher, Presidential Spouse and Cross-Cultural Mentor at the University of Richmond, Visiting Scholar at Tuskegee University National Center for Bioethics in Research and Health Care (NCBRH)

As a Tuskegee, Alabama, native who was born in the John A. Andrew Memorial Hospital, where the United States Public Health Service Syphilis Study took place, and as a descendant with several relatives who were part of this horrific study, I have been appointed to serve as a visiting scholar at Tuskegee University’s National Center for Bioethics in Research and Health Care (NCBRH). I also serve as a board member of the Voices for Our Fathers Legacy Foundation (VOFLF) and chair of VOFLF’s scholarship committee. At NCBRH and VOFLF, we want to cast out the hurt of shame and remember with a loving heart the 623 men who were part of the deceitful and unethical study.

For the descendants, these men were our fathers, uncles, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers—and husbands to mothers, aunts, grandmothers, and great-grandmothers. They were family members, neighbors, friends, and hardworking citizens of Macon County, Alabama, and surrounding communities.

On April 9, 2018, a community day of healing in Tuskegee concluded with VOFLF’s First Annual Scholarship Banquet. To date, VOFLF has awarded ten scholarships to descendants of the men subjected to the study: six to students enrolled at Tuskegee University, two at Georgia State University, one at Indiana University, and one at Winston-Salem State University. Scholarships are available to descendants enrolled in two-year and four-year colleges as well as graduate and doctoral programs. We are rising to a new level of purpose to benefit the young generation of descendants of these men, who were so poorly treated. These descendants are students and scholars, some of whom aspire to serve in the bioethics and health sciences fields.

Our goal is to provide a portion of scholarship funds to these descendants, with the dream of lifting up 623 new voices in the fields of bioethics and health sciences, expanding the ethics of care and creating a new tapestry of hope, healing, and trust.
The Western Addition neighborhood of San Francisco has undergone many changes since 1860, when it was first added to the city’s street grid to accommodate the influx of people during the gold rush. Today, San Francisco is in the middle of a technology boom that influences everything from our skyline to the cost of housing. In May 2018, the California Association of Realtors reported that people need an income of $333,000 a year to purchase a house in San Francisco. As such, the cost of living continues to fuel the outmigration of African American residents, which began in the mid-twentieth century due to redevelopment policies. The Western Addition is one of the few neighborhoods in San Francisco with a concentrated African American population. As the oldest university in the city, and one that sits adjacent to the Western Addition, the University of San Francisco (USF) has long been connected to this neighborhood.

Formally launched in 2014, Engage San Francisco (ESF) is a place-based initiative rooted in a partnership between the USF and the Western Addition. We ground ESF in community history and knowledge, best practices in campus-community partnerships, and intellectual thought that brings the well-being of the African American community to the forefront. Our vision is to support a thriving community for Western Addition children, youth, and families through community-engaged learning, research, and teaching consistent with USF’s Jesuit principles (USF, n.d.). ESF is a university-wide initiative located in the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good. (See https://www.usfca.edu/mccarthy/engage-san-francisco.)

Through ESF programs and partnerships, USF students, faculty, and staff partner with community organizations, city agencies, and alumni to address some of San Francisco’s most pressing issues, including education, healthcare, housing, and employment. In two examples of this work, students serve as literacy tutors through partnerships with public schools and afterschool programs, and faculty and students provide health and wellness screenings and hand out school supplies at an annual community back-to-school fair.

To achieve our shared vision for the future, we pay attention to the impact of history on the Western Addition; listen to how residents and partners identify community needs, assets, and outcomes; and discuss how power, privilege, and identity affect our work systemically, institutionally, and personally. This continuously evolving work is informed by Black feminist scholars such as Patricia Hill Collins (1991), bell hooks (2000), adrienne maree brown (2017), and Alexis Pauline Gumbs (2015), as well as by Ta-Nehisi Coates (2015), Paulo Freire (1970), and the Black Lives Matter Guiding Principles (2018). We also honor the lived experiences of staff and community members as we define our efforts. Below are examples of how we have connected history, community knowledge, and the impacts of policy making to our work.

1. **We educate participants about the history of the Western Addition**, including the ongoing impact of Executive Order 9066, which resulted in the incarceration of Japanese immigrants and Japanese Americans during World War II. We also discuss the influx of African American laborers who worked in shipyards and created a robust jazz scene on the Western Addition’s Fillmore District, leading to its nickname, the “Harlem of the West.” Between 1940 and 1945, the city’s Black population grew by 665.8 percent (Broussard 1993). This phase of arts and community building
was followed by redevelopment policies that displaced tens of thousands of African American families between 1950 and 1990. James Baldwin put it best during his 1963 visit to San Francisco: "Urban renewal . . . means Negro removal" (2004). Today, the Western Addition’s population is 13 percent African American, compared with 6 percent of San Francisco’s residents as a whole (San Francisco Indicator Project 2014). To help people learn about these trends, we direct them to the Western Addition research guide at https://guides.usfca.edu/westernaddition.

2. We illuminate partnerships between USF and the Western Addition community, including those that preceded ESF. As a Jesuit university, USF has a strong commitment to service. In 1969, its largest student club was the Student Western Addition Project, which worked with neighbors. Today, many USF alumni work with and lead nonprofits in the Western Addition, and they are now our partners. In addition, following the vision of community organizers Lynnette White and Altheda Carrie, more than one hundred USF students and two faculty have conducted research and interviews to capture the biographies of one hundred African American “changemakers” (leaders and community builders) with connections to San Francisco. We will publish their stories in print and on the web this spring.

3. We highlight the values and practices of ESF, including our commitment to engage in work that is informed by community-identified needs, focuses on community assets (Kretzman and McKnight 1993), and is reciprocal and authentic in partnership (Mitchell 2008). The walks include community partners and visits to community-based organizations.

We Recognize the Effects of Trauma
“The community we created for ourselves [in class] was a safe space for us to help each other heal.”
—Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction Workshop participant

ESF defines “oppression” as the weight and trauma of systemic racism, prejudice, and discrimination on people’s minds, bodies, and spirits. Actively and passively, oppression upholds constructions of social power such as patriarchy, white supremacy, and ableism.

We work to understand trauma-informed approaches (SAMHSA 2018) to community work and to build respect for community-informed approaches to healing. Our ESF literacy interns and America Reads tutors learn about trauma-informed approaches to teaching reading (Craig 2008). This requires USF students to see assets rather than only deficits. We focus on healing because an unchecked focus on trauma may lead to seeing the community as “broken” (Ginwright 2018). For example, when Rhonda Magee, USF professor of law, taught her Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction workshop to community members as part of ESF, she focused on healing and building participants’ capacity to care for themselves and incorporate mindfulness into their community work.

As a crucial aspect of recognizing the ongoing impacts of racism and valuing cultural competency, we hire staff of color who have relevant lived experiences and cultural understanding. We recognize that work doesn’t end once staff of color leave campus; it continues into their personal lives, relationships, and communities. Simultaneously, white-identified staff must have cultural humility and be in a process to understand the ways that systemic, institutional, and personal racism affect their work, the Western Addition, and their relationships. In concert with the values of the Place-Based Justice Network (2018) and the McCarthy Center’s 2019 strategic plan (forthcoming), white staff participate in staff caucuses, book groups, and ongoing trainings to unlearn racism.

We Honor Community Knowledge
“We have equipped one another with the tools and resources we need to make the world a better place.”
—Nico Bremond, 2014 USF graduate, senior lead program manager at Collective Impact, a community organization based in the Western Addition.
When community members trust us enough to talk to us honestly about their lived experiences, they are sharing knowledge that no textbook can capture. These one-on-one conversations are a gift; they allow us to document and lift up assets from the Western Addition. Preserving this wisdom is critical, as narratives from Black communities are often erased from history.

Our Community Partnership Innovation Fund (CPIF) is one example of an ESF program informed by community insight. Through CPIF, a USF faculty or staff member and a Western Addition resident or service provider work as a team to apply for funds to address a community-identified need. CPIF rewards community knowledge by paying community members and partners for their intellectual and emotional labor and recognizing partner contributions. Whenever possible, we offer stipends to community members and partners who lecture or teach at USF. Additionally, in 2017, we instituted and partners who lecture or teach at offer stipends to community members contributions. Whenever possible, we by paying community members and recognizing partner contributions for their intellectual and emotional labor. We also need to be nimble and humble enough to recognize our assumptions and evolve with our community. We also need to be willing to be vulnerable and get things wrong, which does not come easily to academe. However, examining the culture and history of our university and community can result in deeply meaningful work and connections.

Above all, this work is not possible without the trust that partners offer and the risks they take as they journey with us. We do not say it lightly when we say that ESF would not be possible without our community partners.

We Acknowledge Power Dynamics

“Move at the speed of trust. Focus on critical connections more than critical mass—build the resilience by building the relationships.”


We work at building relationships while recognizing the power dynamics between our campus and community. For example, we are a dues-paying member of Mo’MAGIC, a community coalition that includes nonprofit organizations in the Western Addition. We recognize that the coalition is led by community members, not by USF, and we are invested in its success. ESF staff members attend twice-monthly meetings and participate in subcommittee work. We also invite USF faculty and staff to provide professional development for coalition members when requested. As often as we can, we share our resources with our partners, such as access to space and infrastructure on campus for large-scale events.

In addition, we learn from, and when appropriate, contribute to reports, meetings, oral histories, and convenings that document trauma specific to the Western Addition. We recognize the history of exploitation in higher education’s “ivory tower” relationship to communities of color. As such, we have a responsibility to frame the university’s relationship as reciprocal and challenge assumptions about the university being the keeper of knowledge.

Our Work Is Ongoing

Honoring community wisdom means building intentional relationships rooted in the history of the Western Addition and grounded in active listening, self-reflection, and accountability, all values of the McCarthy Center. We need to be nimble and humble enough to recognize our assumptions and evolve with our community. We also need to be willing to be vulnerable and get things wrong, which does not come easily to academe. However, examining the culture and history of our university and community can result in deeply meaningful work and connections.

Above all, this work is not possible without the trust that partners offer and the risks they take as they journey with us. We do not say it lightly when we say that ESF would not be possible without our community partners.
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As Linda Tuhiiwai Smith points out, “When Indigenous peoples become the researchers and not merely the researched, the activity of research is transformed. Questions are framed differently, priorities are ranked differently, problems are defined differently, and people participate on different terms” (2012, 196).

Global studies, and to a lesser degree, global Indigenous studies, are growing fields in colleges and universities across the United States. How can we ensure that global and global Indigenous studies combat “othering” practices and align with postcolonial practices (Tuhiiwai Smith 2012; Battiste 2016)? In other words, do current efforts to internationalize post-secondary institutions avoid reinventing the colonial methodology that perpetuates asymmetries in the curriculum?

This is where our work can help to set standards and practices. We codirect a joint Navajo Technical University–Indiana University project entitled GALACTIC (Global Arts Language Arts Culture Tradition Indigenous Communities). Over the past few years, GALACTIC has been looking at new ways to conduct global Indigenous studies. As part of this work, we are establishing a global Indigenous studies curriculum at Navajo Tech in Crownpoint, New Mexico.

We understand and construct our effort as global Indigenous education that arises from Indigenous communities, rather than as a Eurocentric study of the “other.” A colonial approach to global studies results in an imagined “utopian” Western society that erases the endless variation of people, their languages, and their actual ways of life. This colonial approach appropriates, romanticizes, and misinterprets Indigenous ways of life and ways of knowing. A global Indigenous studies approach—emerging from traditional homes such as the Navajo (Diné) hogan or the Tuvan yurt or the Bedouin beit al-shâr—is grounded in Indigenous ways of knowing (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, n.d.). According to Marlene Castellano (2000), Indigenous knowledges are personal, orally transmitted, experiential, holistic, and narrative.

The Global Indigenous Approach

At Navajo Tech, global Indigenous studies is rooted in an Indigenous institution of higher learning. When we first began creating GALACTIC, we asked ourselves whether it was possible to globalize curriculum at Navajo Tech—or any Indigenous institution—when the local struggles and challenges are so immediate and dire. Attending to the global seemed like a goal for the distant future, yet as we dug further, we saw how deeply intertwined the local and the global are for Indigenous communities.

We saw how empowering it would be to draw connections through comparative studies of, for example, leadership, water issues, or even the ways of knowing of sheep-centered societies. Why not, for example, build a comparative course on economic, environmental, sacred, artistic, musical, and food practices among communities from Bedouin, Peruvian, Armenian, and Diné shepherd societies? Conversations between Diné and Peruvian weavers a few summers ago at a GALACTIC workshop at the Smithsonian Folklife Festival inspired this idea. In fact, the Smithsonian-based GALACTIC workshops have provided numerous opportunities to further the comparative approach as Diné scholars and cultural practitioners have met other Indigenous practitioners from around the world, including Chinese Muslim storytellers, Armenian potters, Amazonian medicine people, and Basque shepherds. Participants in these workshops have forged and fortified a global Indigenous network.

Navajo Tech currently incorporates a comparative approach in some courses as part of its Diné Studies undergraduate degree program, including courses in global Indigenous leadership and theoretical Indigenous leadership. We imagine developing additional comparative courses and eventually comparative undergraduate and graduate programs in global Indigenous studies centered at Navajo Tech.

GALACTIC invites participants to travel beyond the global and into the universal—not in the way the word “universal” is often misunderstood as erasing difference, but to see ourselves as part of a living cosmos. We posit an approach to global Indigenous studies based in arts, culture, language, and tradition, because that is the way societies really work if they are really working.

Looking to the model provided by WINHEC (World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium, http://winhec.org), we conceive of a pedagogy that combines “Western” methodologies and Indigenous ways of knowing taught by traditional practitioners who also serve as counselors and advisors rather than objects of study. GALACTIC, following the WINHEC model, believes that global Indigenous studies requires oversight by a council of elders from the community...
who can ensure that learning remains grounded in traditional ways.

We also study the Indigenous communities that have, against all odds, decolonized aspects of their own countries over time (including India, Hong Kong, and others). What can we learn from them? How do we translate this strong need for change into a global reality? We look at global Indigenous studies for current and future Indigenous generations.

Global Indigenous studies must challenge existing notions of what it means to be global. The Navajo Nation is a sovereign nation within a nation. Diné people elect government officials and governing bodies, control a school system, and fiercely ensure the survival of a national language. We imagine a day when students can travel to Crownpoint to study Diné language just as they travel to Paris to study French. We imagine a time when tribal boundary issues such as the Diné/Hopi border struggle—caused and perpetuated by earlier and continuing colonial interests and policies—are part of the geopolitical curricula of global studies.

**Reclaiming History and Heritage**

Indigenous peoples have been subjected to a long and continuing history of cultural genocide, land theft, broken treaties, appropriation of natural resources nestled within and under sacred spaces, and the loss of their children—their future itself—who were taken away from family and sent to boarding schools that stripped them of their language and their roots.

History is not made up of past relics to be romanticized; it is a way of living daily life. The idea of linear time is a Western colonial construction. The past, present, and future are not separate realms with neat borders in time or space. The Diné people, and all Indigenous peoples, carry traditions, traumas, perseverance, language, and ceremonies, and these transform the present and ensure the future. Even as we talk about a postcolonial consciousness, Indigenous peoples and the perpetrators of colonialism carry forward the legacies of devastation, colonial brutality, violence, genocide, and cultural annihilation wrought upon Indigenous peoples in the Navajo Nation and globally.

Indigenous peoples have to reclaim their heritages to distance themselves from the Western history of genocide, trauma, and violence. More importantly, they are the only ones who can read, address, recognize, and recover from the ongoing and continuous injustices each community is experiencing. Such confrontations with Western injustices empower Indigenous people to persevere and to build better lives for themselves and their children. In this way, global Indigenous studies provides a curriculum for understanding, healing, and empowerment.

Global Indigenous studies must be rooted not only in the study of devastation but in providing frameworks for reconciliation where those who have benefited from this travesty assume responsibility for these injustices.

There has been no time in the history of Indigenous peoples that this sort of reconciliation has occurred. Only after the European heirs of colonialism, who continue to benefit from its devastating practices, recognize this continuous colonialism will the future of global Indigenous studies—and the future itself—belong to Indigenous peoples.

The effort to unify global Indigenous communities through global Indigenous studies is a search to find themselves and to define and reclaim their ancestral homelands.
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Posey County occupies the southwestern tip of Indiana, where the Wabash River gives a delicate, curling edge to our mostly squared-off state. The green and gold fields, broken by ribbons of forest, are probably what most people envision when they think (rarely, I imagine) of Indiana.

Every year, during spring or summer break, I head for New Harmony, a small town in Posey County, with twenty-five honors students from Ivy Tech Community College’s Indianapolis, Gary, and Fort Wayne campuses. New Harmony was the home of two nineteenth-century attempts at utopia. In 1814, a German Protestant sect built the community of Harmonie. Within a decade, they returned to Pennsylvania and sold their community to Welsh industrialist Robert Owen, who was looking for a ready-made town in which to try his own utopia—New Harmony. The venture only lasted for two years, but Owen’s “Boatload of Knowledge” brought scientists and social reformers who remained after the experiment failed. My students often think the New Harmony tour guides are being dramatic when they use this phrase, but it was a literal boat, the Philanthropist, which brought a group of thinkers to the Indiana wilderness. Today, New Harmony’s preservation and restoration make it appealing for tourists interested in gardens, architecture, and history.

My interests in history, my home state, and the idea of utopia prompted me to research New Harmony as a graduate student and, later, to return there with my students. For my students, my New Harmony immersion course represents an affordable way to fulfill their travel course requirement. They participate in online discussions as an introduction, explore the town for five days, and then have two weeks to complete a research portfolio.

My students are accustomed to urban industrial and suburban commercial districts. Many are immigrants, and some young women wear hijabs. Before our trip, they worried that they might not be welcome in a town that boasts just eight hundred residents and a single flashing light at the corner of Church and Main. Parents asked to meet with me to discuss if the town would be safe. But for the most part, my students were skeptical that they could learn anything here. One was frank: “If I’m being honest, I had a bad attitude. I didn’t think I would enjoy it, I thought it was going to be boring. And I was a little ticked off that this is how I was going to be spending my spring break.” Another student reflected later that the Harmonists also must have felt “unsure” in a new land, being commanded by a leader with a not-quite-tangible vision.

Arriving in New Harmony

When my students and I arrived in New Harmony, we could see in one glance a modern visitor’s center, a trio of original log cabins, and someone’s garage sale. After a three-hour drive, my students were cranky and a little dumbfounded to realize just how small this town is. I had told them that it would be a thirty-mile drive to reach a Starbucks, but they didn’t believe such a thing was possible.

I started them off in teams of three with a scavenger hunt. They came back tired but feeling like a cohesive group. One related how his trio made slow progress but then “started working as a team. It wasn’t until we returned that night that we really started to bond. We talked about our majors, why we were here, where we were from, and what we planned to do after this.”

The next day, I scheduled an all-day tour, which my students dreaded at first. But once on the tour, they took countless pictures and asked the guides about ghosts, town scandals, and obscure historic publications. Before we struck out on our journey, I assured them there would be two days of follow-up tours to explore their favorite spots in depth in smaller groups. My jaded nineteen-and twenty-year-olds rolled their eyes, bemused that I would think they would want more time in historic houses and archives. But it turned out that they did. One admitted that it “was just as fun and interesting [as the full-day introduction tour]. We sat and talked and got a lot more questions answered.”
My history colleague, who joined the trip as a male chaperone, helped them to see the broader context: how this town had lasting influence as a center of scientific research and social reform. The two utopian communities experimented with shared property, equal housing, and shorter work days. New Harmony had the first US public school open to both boys and girls. One of my biggest student dissenters admitted that my colleague’s lecture “made me think, and I appreciated that. I wasn’t being a critical thinker like I wanted to be.”

From the Past to the Present
At first, my students wanted to know how utopias developed. But then they connected with the town’s residents and became more interested in the living populace. One of our guides was home from college on break—he was a peer in age, but his affluent, small-town background and East Coast undergraduate studies made him very different from my students. They convinced him to join them for dinner and stay and talk all night. A previously cliquish foursome met a foursome of retirees and went hot-tubbing with them three nights in a row. Through conversations with the community, the class made connections between historical and present-day concerns. One student went to the town hall to compare minutes from long-ago and last-month’s meetings. One pair spent a morning with the sheriff to talk about the opioid crisis in the region. Another student asked if he could cite Dave the Smoothie Guy on his references page.

My students became interested in the way a community reinvents itself and survives when so many small towns disappear. They heard how the closing of a two-lane toll bridge affected employment and tourism, and how a minor state legislative change shuttered the K–12 school and changed the makeup of the town. They were enchanted with the legacy of an affluent leader (and oil heiress) who married into the Owen dynasty and made the town’s restoration and revitalization her life’s work for nearly sixty years. After my students met her daughter, one wrote, “This made the whole visit more real to me because it was like seeing a living piece of history.” Another was awed that this “millionaire descendant of Robert Owen [was] riding through town on a golf cart and even with her financial status was still more than willing to stop and say hi. . . . Calling this a utopian community doesn’t do the beauty and togetherness of this town justice.”

Global Learning in Our Backyard
New Harmony is special because it isn’t just a place where something happened once—it’s a living community. People still live in some of the original houses. The Working Men’s Institute, established in 1838, is still a “disseminator of useful knowledge,” housing both an old-fashioned museum (featuring an eight-legged calf!) and the oldest continuously operating public library in Indiana.

When we think of learning from travel, we often think of foreign countries and languages. But although my students do not leave the state, this is global learning. As in any good global learning experience, my students consider other perspectives, value differences, and engage with the unexpected. New Harmony is a microcosm where they can become immersed in a community and understand how individuals can effect change and how every place’s history informs its present-day identity. They consider how communities grow and fail and how new ideas become common practice.

My students tell me that they “expect to be bored out of [their] minds.” As a teacher, my greatest joy comes when reluctant students engage with a new idea, book, or place and admit they were mistaken about its lack of appeal. My students will soon move on to four-year institutions, but they will leave our community college better prepared to be open-minded members of their future academic, social, and civic communities.
AAC&U and the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network

As part of its commitment to preparing all students for civic, ethical, and social responsibility in US and global contexts, AAC&U has formed the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network. The CLDE Action Network builds on the momentum generated by the 2012 White House release of the report *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*. Coordinated by Caryn McTighe Musil, AAC&U senior scholar and director of civic learning and democracy initiatives, the network includes twelve leading civic learning organizations that are committed to making civic inquiry and engagement expected rather than elective for all college students. *Diversity & Democracy* regularly features research and exemplary practices developed and advanced by these partner organizations and their members:

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- Anchor Institutions Task Force
- Association of American Colleges and Universities
- The Bonner Foundation
- Bringing Theory to Practice
- Campus Compact
- Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement
- Imagining America
- Institute for Democracy and Higher Education
- Interfaith Youth Core
- The Kettering Foundation
- NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education

**Resources and Opportunities**

**Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation**
AAC&U is a partner in the W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation (TRHT) effort to help communities embrace racial healing, address the historic and contemporary effects of racism, and uproot conscious and unconscious beliefs in the hierarchy of human value (http://healourcommunities.org/). AAC&U is leading the creation of TRHT Campus Centers nationwide (https://www.aacu.org/trht), with support from Newman’s Own Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. To learn more, read the *Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation Implementation Guidebook* (http://www.racialequityresourceguide.org/guides-workshops/trht-implementation-guidebook) and a special edition of *Liberal Education* (https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2016/fall).

**Facing History and Ourselves**
Facing History and Ourselves is an international organization that provides educational materials and professional development to help educators “engage students of diverse backgrounds in an examination of racism, prejudice, and antisemitism in order to promote the development of a more humane and informed citizenry.” Topic areas include democracy and civic engagement, race in US history, justice and human rights, antisemitism and religious intolerance, bullying and ostracism, global immigration, genocide and mass violence, and the Holocaust. Teaching strategies, materials, and activities, as well as information about online and face-to-face professional development opportunities, are available at https://www.facinghistory.org/.

**Universities Studying Slavery**
Universities Studying Slavery (USS) brings together more than forty higher education institutions working to examine the legacy of US slavery, as well as race and inequality in higher education in both historical and contemporary contexts. To learn more about USS, visit http://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/.

**REGISTER NOW:**

**AAC&U ANNUAL MEETING**

**Raising Our Voices: Reclaiming the Narrative on the Value of Higher Education**

*January 23–26, 2019 | Atlanta, Georgia*

Recent public opinion polls have highlighted the devaluing of higher education, but college and university leaders have not yet spoken with a unified voice to challenge the notion that the true value of higher education is in decline. AAC&U’s 2019 Annual Meeting will provide an opportunity for institutional leaders—in teaching, research, student support, and student affairs—to share their stories about how higher education at the local, regional, and national levels is preparing students not only for workforce development but also for democratic participation.
Upcoming AAC&U Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Network for Academic Renewal Conference  
Transforming STEM Higher Education:  
Confirming the Authority of Evidence | Atlanta, Georgia | November 8–10, 2018 |
| AAC&U Annual Meeting  
Raising Our Voices: Reclaiming the  
Narrative on the Value of Higher Education | Atlanta, Georgia | January 23–26, 2019 |
| Network for Academic Renewal Conference  
Creating a 21st-Century General  
Education: Responding to Seismic Shifts | San Francisco, California | February 14–16, 2019 |

About Diversity & Democracy

Diversity & Democracy supports higher education faculty and leaders as they design and implement programs that advance civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity to prepare students for socially responsible action in today’s interdependent but unequal world. According to AAC&U’s Statement on Liberal Learning, “By its nature . . . liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.” Diversity & Democracy features evidence, research, and exemplary practices to assist practitioners in creating learning opportunities that realize this vision. To access Diversity & Democracy online, visit www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy.

About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association dedicated to advancing the vitality and public standing of liberal education by making quality and equity the foundations for excellence in undergraduate education in service to democracy. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises nearly 1,400 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, research universities, and comprehensive universities of every type and size. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, faculty, and staff engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Through a broad range of activities, AAC&U reinforces the collective commitment to liberal education at the national, local, and global levels. Its high-quality programs, publications, research, meetings, institutes, public outreach efforts, and campus-based projects help individual institutions ensure that the quality of student learning is central to their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges. Information about AAC&U can be found at www.aacu.org.

AAC&U Membership 2018

- MASTERS 29%
- BACCALAUREATE 23%
- ASSOCIATES 13%
- RES & DOC 16%
- OTHER* 19%

* Tribal colleges, specialized schools, state systems and agencies, and international affiliates