



The  
University  
Of  
Sheffield.

**CARCERAL EDUCATIONS & ABOLITION PEDAGOGIES: THE BEFORE & BEYOND  
OF THE SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE FRAMEWORK**

Michael James Miller

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Sheffield

Faculty of Social Sciences

School of Education

December 16, 2020

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Lindsay, Oscar, and Beast...of course.

For everything.

May I live up to your examples of care and presence.

To Lindsay, for your softness and fun, your strength, passion, and all of your songs! For our conversations and study and laughing until it hurts and sometimes crying because it hurts. For showing me myself. Walking my process in this life and beyond with you is the greatest commitment I could ever make.

For being my mirror, for helping me shine.

...and for designing this project!

Deep thanks to the different laptops used to write this thesis, to the mugs that held coffee and tea, and to the chairs and tables that held me. To the many plants I have been blessed to grow with over these few years, and the plant medicine, skateboards, songs, sounds, and cerebellum that kept me balanced even when crowded by a slow-growing tumor. To leap musick for allowing me more ways to express, commune, and study. To the cards and the stars for your insights into and beyond myself.

To my family, thanks for sending all the good thoughts, and especially Mom and Albert – Ma, I am so grateful to be your sun. Thanks to you both for your care and encouragement. To the Cravers, Ron and Roxanne, your support through this all – in so many ways – has been amazing. So much gratitude for you all.

I acknowledge and am grateful to the land and American Indian territories upon which I received institutional schooling on Turtle Island: Kizh, Gabrieleño/Tongva, Payómkawichum (Luiseño), Kumeyaay, Shoshone-Bannock, Atfalati, Cowlitz, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Kalapuya, Clackamas. Thanks also to <https://native-land.ca/> for being a resource for beginning, continuing, and strengthening awareness and connection to the Earth.

Gratitude to Cheryl Green for your early encouragement and ongoing friendship. To Dennis Swiercinsky, thank you for your early support and belief in us. To Ansgar Allen and Darren Webb for your friendship. We have missed you.

To my supervisors Dan Goodley, Darren Webb, and China Mills. Big thanks for your commitment to my project, and for reading my jumbled drafts as I figured this thing out. May we all contribute to dismantling, changing, and building a new world with our words and actions.

For all those still in prisons, in places of confinement, finding ways to study despite seemingly insurmountable, inescapable conditions - may this thesis be a contribution to your, and thus all of our liberation.

Best for all, or not at all.

## ABSTRACT

This is a study with and for radical attempts, fugitive expressions and communal abolitionist imaginings resisting and refusing mandates of institutional schooling in the United States. Starting from and experimenting with themes in and around Harney & Moten's (2013) *The Undercommons*, this thesis attends to insurgent movement(s) that cannot and/or will not conform to prechoreographed, policed, carceral educations. This thesis attends to and imagines beyond institutions of education and understandings of violence therein, from which the School-to-Prison Pipeline (STPP) framework emerges. I assert that even critical/radical attempts to understand and subvert the STPP framework tend to reform rather than unsettle institutionalized forms of violence that emerge in and as a function of schooling.

Chapter 1, Planning, introduces this thesis as an abolitionist text, and considers education within the Prison Industrial Complex. Chapter 2, School-to-Prison Pipeline Framework, discusses policies and practices that contribute to the restriction/punishment of particular (expressions from) students deemed disturbing. Chapter 3, Genealogy, articulates a need to decenter and disorient the mundane in conceptions, imaginings, and reforms within and around the STPP framework. In chapter 4, Fugitivity, blackness and crip more fully emerge as refusals/expressions of anoriginal lawlessness, representing foundational threats to illusions of ontological security. Study, chapter 5, considers abolitionist and communal expressions of black study in schools, and impositions that attempt to prevent these excessive movements and moments. Chapter 6, Policy, attends to students who symbolize risk, as well as attempts and tensions in, among, and between reformist, radical, and abolitionist efforts at changing the conditions of these student's lives. Chapter 7 experiments with policy's regulating gesture, the Call to Order, through naturalized components of education and everyday living. Chapter 8 conjures Abolition Pedagogies as imaginaries with and for and contributing to the end of education, and ultimately the world as we know it.

**Keywords:** School-to-Prison Pipeline framework, Abolition, Schooling, Policing, Reform, The Undercommons, Abolition Pedagogies, Refusal, Genealogy

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .....	2
Abstract .....	4
List of Figures .....	7
Declaration.....	8
1 Planning .....	9
2 School-to-Prison Pipeline Framework .....	23
3 Genealogy .....	74
4 Fugitivity .....	102
5 Study .....	155
6 Policy .....	187
7 Call to Order .....	229
8 Abolition Pedagogies .....	262
References .....	278

## LIST OF FIGURES

With each figure there is an image description to increase accessibility.

Figure 1, p. 42: Aerial view of a street in front of the Madison School District Doyle Administration Building in Madison, WI. Students and community members painted in large yellow letters "POLICE FREE SCHOOLS" as part of a wider movement to remove police officers from schools (Freedom, Inc., 2020). [Image description: An aerial view of a street with the words "POLICE FREE SCHOOLS" painted in yellow, partially covered by trees. Above the letters is a large building with numerous people in front. Below the letters are smaller buildings, and various parked cars.]

Figure 2, p. 98: Photograph by Washington D.C. high school student Angel L. for the Critical Exposure project documenting student experiences with the School-to-Prison Pipeline. [Image description: The right side of the picture shows light blue numbered lockers. The left side shows a person seated at a desk with their back to the camera and a red jacket on the chair. To their left stands a student facing the seated person, whose features are difficult to discern. Beyond them is an exit sign and a set of doors that lead to another set of doors.]

Figure 3, p. 119: "The Box" is a photograph taken by Samera, a Washington D.C. student for the program Critical Exposure. The caption for the photo reads: "Every morning for the past three months after walking through the metal detectors, 17 year old Skinny has to explain to the security guards before being wanded why the machine went off. Skinny has an ankle monitor on, or 'the box.' With a curfew of 8pm every night, he feels trapped and isolated from the world. Skinny is on probation and was told he would get the monitor off a month ago. When that did not occur he became disappointed. At times he refused to go to school due to his frustrations. D.C. public schools allow up to three unexcused absences until truancy reports are sent out. I am very concerned about

his education and the consequences from the days he has missed.” This is within a series of images asking students to consider how the School to Prison Pipeline affects their lives (Critical Exposure, 2014 n.p.).

## **DECLARATION**

*I, Michael James Miller, confirm that the Thesis is my own work. I am aware of the University's Guidance on the Use of Unfair Means. This work has not been previously presented for an award at this, or any other, university.*



**1****PLANNING**

“No good cops in a racist system!” blasted out of a bullhorn. “No good cops in a racist system!” responded the crowd, shouting and chanting back.

“The USA is the racist system!” corrected a Black woman leaning out from a second story window in West Philadelphia, PA as hundreds of people walked past, coming together in protest, in solidarity, in mourning and anger and grief and struggle, as family, friends, neighbors, accomplices, and spectators. This night was for Walter Wallace Jr. And there have been too many nights like this.

The woman from the window’s clarification of the chant to the people marching down her street made clear that what they were protesting was not a singular event. Nor was it one of a long history of like events. Nor was it just about the murderous police, or the systemic racism identified in police departments around the country, or underfunded social welfare organizations, or any of the scripted reactions to the extreme moments that emerge from everyday conditions of duress. This horror was not exceptional but constituent.

Her words were beauty and horror yoked to the experiences of the underprivileged<sup>1</sup> in the USA, the racist system. Yes, beauty too. Because as Fred Moten makes clear, there is no understanding “how terrible the terror has been without understanding how beautiful the beauty has been against the grain of that terror” (2016, n.p.).

This thesis starts with the School-to-Prison Pipeline (STPP) framework, which describes particular policies and policings that push young people out of educational institutions and into institutions and systems of criminal justice. But as with the chant “no good cops in a racist system,” this is far

---

<sup>1</sup> Underprivileged is a term from Fred Moten and will be discussed all throughout this thesis.

from enough. The before and beyond of the STPP framework are attempts and experiments to get at/gesture toward/stay with the terror (carceral educations) and the beauty (abolition pedagogies).

So much has happened since I started this process in Fall 2016, some of which is discussed and some of which is the before and beyond of this thesis. A global pandemic and with it the scramble and uncertainty in restructuring of schooling. Popular uprisings in the wake of more police murdering more Black people, demanding that police departments get defunded and that money be reallocated to desired programs and positions (e.g. #CounselorsNotCops). Struggles to change the world and struggles to end the world as we know it (da Silva, 2019). Struggles to articulate the so-much that has and is happening.

The beauty and the terror...words don't go there (Moten, 2004).

At times, this thesis is plainly antagonistic to police and policing, to the state and to the world. I try to be mostly unapologetic about this, as it can be difficult not to find enemies when there are present such persistent demonstrations of hatred, violence, and disregard of life. Mostly though, my writing is geared toward those movements that do not center the violence that is so readily and profusely imposed upon life in inconsistent and disproportionate ways.

With this thesis I am engaging in schooling, which includes but is not limited to educational institutions; carcerality, which includes but is not limited to state-sanctioned practices and places of criminal justice (such as prisons); behaviors, interactions, and imaginings of policing which include and are beyond those with a gun and a badge. It is the world as we know it that abolitionist world-making are refusing and imagining otherwise. Therefore, these engagements are not to emphasize, critique, or make further spectacles of violent forces. Rather, the processes that uphold the world as we know it, which have been positioned as fixed and fixing forces of which schooling is constituent, are constantly showing up throughout this thesis. These fixing forces and their enforcers are in pursuit of (as in chasing, hunting, surveilling for) abolitionist practices and/as fugitive communing.

These expressions pose risks to ontological security<sup>2</sup> in fugitive, an original lawlessness (Moten, 2007). This thesis is a project refusing the attempted policy reforms that emerge from within carceral educations, as well as those reforms and reformers that react from places understood to be outside of carceral educations – those places of well-meaning and good-intentions with assertions of knowing better or what is needed. These reformist reactions risk preserving or recuperating patterns, systems, and naturalized ways of thinking that are attempting to be abolished (this thesis is, at best, a contribution to these abolitionist imaginaries). With resistances and refusals throughout this thesis, the concluding chapter is specifically conjuring Abolition Pedagogies as imaginaries with and for and contributing to the end of the world as we know it.

#### THE PROPHETIC ORGANIZATION OF THE UNDERCOMMONS

This thesis is structured (and embedded) with themes from *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study* (Harney & Moten, 2013). Five chapters are named after and imagine with particular concepts in the text (Planning, Fugitivity, Study, Policy, and Call to Order), and more than chapter titles, concepts within, such as blackness and refusal, are pivotal to this project. My initial engagement with *The Undercommons* was disorienting in many ways, and it remains so. It has been a text that I've had to come back to again and again, when I didn't get it in my misguided attempts to get whatever it is, as well as a text that I've turned to again and again, for support and assurance, which is why it (dis)organizes this thesis so well.

---

<sup>2</sup> Discussed further in the Policy chapter, Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti (2017) write of modernity's fantasies of ontological security, of which "exploitation, expropriation, displacement, dispossession, ecological destruction" (n.p.) are general requirements. Moving with the work of Denise Ferreira da Silva, the authors suggest that "the house that modernity built sits on a foundation of separability, which enables the production of categories and modes of valuation and measurement that divide, separate, and create the world as we know it inside the house, thereby foreclosing other possibilities" (ibid. n.p.).

The book has been taken up by many, and from what I have recognized, a good amount of it has been in the context of the university/higher education. That is no coincidence, as Harney & Moten were writing from where they were and what they knew, the university, and there are many examples and a chapter (“The University and The Undercommons”) that have the university as a prominent discussion point. But *The Undercommons* is not about the university, and the undercommons has no necessary connection to the university. As the undercommons is “a kind of way of being with others, it’s almost impossible that it could be matched up with particular forms of institutional life” (ibid. p. 112). Harney & Moten write about study and planning and communing, and these are things that are associated (and happen) at universities and in institutions of education, just not exclusively or even as a primary function.

The context of this thesis is the STPP framework, which centers US public education from pre-kindergarten through high school (though in pushing the framework so too must these foci be pushed). And so, on one level it might make sense for these concepts (e.g. Study; Call to Order) to organize this thesis, but more importantly these concepts are not attached (solely) to educational institutions, as I am arguing in regard to the conditions described in/of the STPP. It is from this context that I engage Harney & Moten’s work – making a plan to stay, to write, to imagine, and to question what can happen when the undercommons and the STPP framework converge (or more precisely, what can happen when attending to this convergence), when these radical potentials are realized, in fleeting moments and long lives, in unexpected places and unsuspecting motions, in words and efforts and even students that fail in the conventional sense, in conventional senses.

“if somebody’s reading our stuff, and they think they can get something out of the term ‘planning’ or ‘undercommons’ or ‘logisticality,’ that’s great, but what matters is what they do with it; it’s where they take it in their own relations (ibid. p. 106).

This is an undercommon study, a study with and for the undercommons. It is not a thesis about *The Undercommons* (2013), a text that has been discussed, debated, considered, and experimented with by many since its publication; a text that opened so many doors for me. The text is an open door, and that is how it is in the undercommons, it is an open-door policy with no criteria on who can and how to engage – it is “no questions asked” even and perhaps especially under duress and destruction (ibid. p. 38). My intention and hope is that the impact *The Undercommons* has had on me is less read in words describing the impact, and more felt throughout this study. On the book’s back cover, Denise Ferreira da Silva (2013a) describes Harney & Moten’s text as an “intimate and intense example of affected writing”. My having been and continuing to be affected is in this thesis - that this thesis is here at all because of being affected. Whether it comes across in my writing, it is in every sentence as well as every breath between the lines. It is in all of my struggles to be clear and my struggles with the ethics of clarity, delineation, and definition. It is in concerns raised and provocations posed. It is steeped in my hesitations and my frustrations and all the excess.

Along with abolition and *The Undercommons* (2013), genealogies are wielded throughout this study as a means to persist and insist on shaking the habitual<sup>3</sup> in education; to experiment in engaging with violent subtleties of educational institutions that are often largely unnoticed or perceived as beneficent; to stay with the (and ultimately contribute to the world-ending work of) unsettling; and to recognize refusals and flights of fugitivity in examples and expressions that are otherwise understood as deviant, delinquent, at-risk and/or posing a risk. Genealogies as part of this abolitionist study provide support with neither reaching for nor suggesting strategic alternatives to identified/identifiable institutional issues which uphold the often-unintentional recuperation of challenged ideologies or the inadvertent preservation of contested logics within institutional alternatives and resistances. Instead, radical potentials of efforts at sounding, creating and inhabiting alternatives and expressions of resistance are attended to as extensions and instances

---

<sup>3</sup> h/t to The Knife

which are excessive to historical, traceable, knowable registers that make up and are contained within the STPP framework and efforts at lessening its recognized consequences. In finding the STPP framework limited and limiting, I am not throwing it out, but instead experimenting with what excesses and radical potentials the framework itself might hold when approached and engaged with through abolitionist practices and imaginaries.

### BEFORE & BEYOND

Nominally the School-to-Prison Pipeline framework portrays a fairly easy to understand path which starts at school and ends in prison via a pipeline of criminalizing policies and procedures. More specifically the framework often cites race, class, and disability as primary factors of student exposure and vulnerability to the im/material apparatuses which regulate, surveil, police and eventually push certain students out of classrooms and into overt systems of carcerality. Part of the inherent failure of the framework is its inability or the unwillingness of the framers<sup>4</sup> to perceive problems and violence outside of a normative gaze, in part because of an investment and faith in policy-based solutions. This faith in turn or perhaps simultaneously frames particular, and as I propose in this thesis, particularly limited and limiting understandings of the extent of problems attempting to be solved/reduced. Without recognizing and confronting issues that are systemic and structural to institutions of education and their myriad constituents, the understandings of problems and solutions (and this very problem/solution formula) and all attempts to improve conditions in schools/students and prisons/incarcerated people will remain limited. Worse than limited, these often well-meaning attempts that focus on condemning instances of direct violence actually

---

<sup>4</sup> Those opposing the procedures allowing and contributing to overt violence in schools and/or student exclusion from school be it through suspension, expulsion, being transferred to alternative classrooms/schools, removal to sites and systems of juvenile/criminal justice, or self-exclusion by students dropping out. This is a primary concern of many and, as discussed in the Fugitivity chapter, is a limited, individualizing understanding of the role schools/school officials have in some students lives and is thus an issue that can open alternative approaches and engagements rather than recycle reactions..

perpetuate other conditions of oppression, justifying more insidious, taken for granted violences that constitute the (material, emotional, spiritual) foundations for the conditions from which more obvious violences occur. As will unfold throughout this thesis, these make up the primary focus for those framing and working to reform conditions of the STPP.

Part of the study with and for the before and beyond include considerations with carceral educations, as that which restricts, prohibits, and polices, as well as abolition pedagogies as that which exceeds normative imaginings of resistance to state-sanctioned violence centered but never contained within institutions of education. The before and beyond alludes to many concepts and ways to engage, which include but are not contained in (nor entirely concerned with) the STPP framework.

An expansive way the before and beyond is taken up in this thesis is geographical, specifically engaging with Ruth Wilson Gilmore and considerations of carceral geographies as the expansive terrain (materially and imaginatively) of abolitionist struggles (Gilmore, 2017b). These struggles are part of an abolitionist project to imagine and create a world not just free from prisons, but to abolish a world that could have prisons (Harney & Moten, 2013) “and therefore not abolition as the elimination of anything but abolition as the founding of a new society” (ibid. p. 42). These abolitionist struggles should not imply only resistances as reactions with/in carceral geographies. To be sure, there is an amazing history which continues with all sorts of opposition to the evolving technologies and techniques of carcerality (overt and insidious) that constitute much of the daily duress experienced by those whose bodies, minds<sup>5</sup>, actions, inactions, histories, etc. have and continue to be targets of criminalization, imprisonment, surveillance, genocide, and more by carceral

---

<sup>5</sup> The term bodymind is increasingly used by many, particularly disabled/crip/mad people and scholars (widely defined). Bodymind as the “imbrication (not just the combination),” challenges the taken for granted separation between “the entities usually called ‘body’ and ‘mind’” (Price, 2015 p. 270).

institutions, constitutive logics, and their attempted legitimation/continuation. As a starting point for abolitionist struggle, Rodriguez (2008) suggests that

“It might be useful to begin by thinking of ourselves as existing in a relationship of deep historical obligation to the long and recent, faraway and nearby historical legacies of radical, revolutionary, and liberationist struggles that have made the abolition of oppressive violence their most immediate and fundamental political desire” (p. 101).

This thesis is filled with people, moments, movement, and movements of planning. Planning for the worlds which are to come, which are here and now in the before and beyond. The planning that was already underway before being deemed to be in error, to be an error. The planning that leads to and is enacted through hunger strikes from incarcerated people; school walk-outs protesting police violence; male students wearing female school uniforms in solidarity with their trans and gender nonconforming classmates – some of which are included in discussion in this thesis, and some are these discussions’ excesses. This thesis is perhaps one big experiment in expressing and contributing to these already underway, undercommon plans. And as the potency of planning is with its potential, so too is this thesis an unfinished contribution to an incomplete project. Getting to the before and beyond that is abolition, Gilmore writes:

“If unfinished liberation is the still-to-be-achieved work of abolition, then at bottom what is to be abolished isn’t the past or its present ghost, but rather the processes of hierarchy, dispossession, and exclusion that congeal in and as group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death” (2017b n.p.).

At the same time, this thesis also reads and expresses abolitionist struggles as coming before the systems and structures that abolitionists are dismantling. Carceral geographies are prevalent (as an understatement), but abolition geographies chart the surround of which the fort/the settlement brutally imposes itself. “The fort really was surrounded,” write Harney & Moten, “is besieged by



what still surrounds it, the common beyond and beneath – before and before – enclosure” (2013 p. 17). Carceral geographies, which include the site of the school, are the persistent antagonism to what might be thought of as a primary purpose of the school, which is study. Not study as in studying for a standardized test, but study as in that thing you do with other people toward and as acts of undifferentiated communing.

These different geographies articulate a huge shift in this thesis, from an initial focus on carceral educations and mundane violences in and as education, to abolition pedagogies which centers planning, black study, fugitivity, and refusal, which is a decentering of the persistent impositions of carcerality. The former is still prevalent, as the conditions of mundane violence are recognizable even in radical spaces of alternative education. However, shifting my concern to the latter of abolition pedagogies (described, imagined, and variously named throughout this thesis) allowed and required a more robust engagement with educational refusals, resistances that often go unnoticed, and to read differently the carcerality of the STPP framework, legacies of violence in institutions of education, and the long trajectory of reform.

#### PRISON INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

With the school-to-prison pipeline, this thesis leans more toward the school side of the equation, finding the carcerality generally thought to be reserved for prisons (and jails, detention centers, police stations, etc.) in schools as well. In an up-front way, certain schools do more readily demonstrate prison-like conditions and appearances. These are the schools for at-risk youth who have been pushed out of standard public schooling. These are the alternative classrooms and separate schools within schools – classrooms and programs that are meant to handle in-school suspensions. These are the schools with the bad kids, the ones who disrupt the good kids, the ones who disturb the learning process, who cannot and/or will not fit in. The schools that look like prisons

with their metal detectors, security cameras, chain-length barbed wire fences and armed police. But the logic which too-readily dismisses the overt violences is that these schools are necessary for some students, and more precisely that the students attending these schools each must have done something deserving to be there. These dismissive notions accept the in-place approaches to school safety measures and discipline policies, which as identified in the STPP framework (limited as it is), disproportionately punish, push out, and otherwise criminalize Black, Brown, American Indian, disabled/crip, mad/neurodivergent, poor and/or queer<sup>6</sup> students. In the article “Imprisoning ‘Those’ Kids,” Selman writes that “the rules, regulations, and subsequent punishments commonly found in the alternative school are attempting to ‘correct’ behaviors associated with ‘failure’ in the mainstream school” (2017 p. 7).

However, this thesis engages less with the upfront and more with excesses and the taken for granted. This is true for the direct violence that occupies much of the focus within the loosely conceived STPP framework (there is no single source, no STPP manual), and also true of resistances to conditions of duress brought about, in part, by the mandates of and everyday expectations in institutions of education. These conditions are only partially from and in the school because the school is not an isolated site, nor are the institution’s interests separate (though they may be different) from other seemingly dissimilar institutions. Part of the failure of the STPP framework is that it does not adequately or even remotely approach the violent conditions that are constituent of education as we know it. Further, the framework will not address nor will it be a platform for substantial change if it continues to perceive/promote student (mis)behavior as needing to be corrected, just in different, less carceral and brutal ways. When reform efforts are toward changing the language of particular policies, for instance, what is being fought for, as Erica Meiners writes, are “[b]etter school suspension and expulsion policies that just remove the ‘right’ bad kids for schools”

---

<sup>6</sup> In this thesis I use queer rather than LGBTQ. It needs to be noted that this is not a term that all who might be considered queer would want to hear or for them to be referred to as. The same can be mentioned for the use of crip in place of/alongside disabled. I use these terms in reverence and respect, and strive to express myself in the same spirit I read in other queer crips.

(2011 p. 551). School reforms within limited framings of some problems with schooling (promoting in turn some limited solutions) are neither addressing nor changing the systems that prioritize the surveillance, identifying, and punishing out of those bad kids.

As will be discussed throughout this study, the school works with the prison and the prison works with the school. This is not to say that schools are prisons, necessarily, but it is to clear away the illusion of separation (or connection via the pipeline metaphor). The STPP connects the school to the prison, but just as the school is not a distinct institution, neither should the prisons be relegated to “forgotten places” (Gilmore, 2008) where deserving bad people are sent. This thesis takes up the work of Prison Industrial Complex (PIC) abolitionists who recognize and fight against “the belief that caging and controlling people makes us safe” (Critical Resistance, 2004 n.p.). As Angela Davis elaborates, “the prison industrial complex is much more than the sum of all the jails and prisons in this country. It is a set of symbiotic relationships among correctional communities, transnational corporations, media conglomerates, guards’ unions, and legislative and court agendas” (2003 p. 107). Prisons are a primary aspect and central point of attack, but the PIC is a term that recognizes the expansive carceral geographies beyond the guarded walls of the prison. This thesis considers the school among the symbiotic institutions and, in finding the school within the PIC, new arrangements are made possible, if not required because of it. The STPP is part of the PIC beyond its end result being prison.

In 1998 a conference titled “Critical Resistance: Beyond the Prison Industrial Complex” was held, attended by approximately 3,500 people from around the world, gathered to “examine a newly framed concept [the PIC]...and to explore the practical potentials of abolishing it (Critical Resistance, 2008 p. xi). There are other ways to describe what the PIC conveys - Erica Meiners (2011) uses the term carceral state, Rodriguez (2010) writes of the prison regime, and Ruth Wilson Gilmore (2017b) has elaborated with carceral geographies, and the imprisoned Black revolutionary George Jackson (1972) writing in the 1970’s describes (the necessity to attack) “the fascist industrial state” and “the

corporate-military-police complex” (p. 47). So too are there different industrial complexes, the most connected to the STPP would be the academic industrial complex. As the PIC is centered on the prison, so too does the academic industrial complex center on institutions of education (usually higher education). However, I have decided to stay with the PIC (and its abolition) as a way to make clear the symbiosis of the school as itself a place of carcerality. The school is a different place, and schooling is a different practice, they are not so easily swapped or confused despite their similarities and communication. But neither are they so easily perceived as distinct. As I am already directing my focus primarily toward (but not on or merely contained within) schools and schooling, it has been important in this study to consider institutions of education within the PIC. This is an abolitionist study toward the abolition of the PIC, which is another way to say the world as we know it.

In continuing with this study, I call on and find support in those who came before me, whose examples I can draw from and whose influence propels this impossible, necessary, ongoing work.

“serious antiprison activists must be willing to look much further in their analyses and organizing strategies than the actual institution of the prison” (Davis, 2003 p. 100).

“Abolishing the prison industrial complex (PIC) is not just about ending prisons but also about creating an alternative system of governance that is not based on domination, hierarchy, and control. In that respect, abolitionism and anarchism are positive rather than negative projects. They do not signal the absence of prisons or governments but the creation of different forms of sociality, governance, and accountability that are not statist and carceral” (Kaba, 2018 n.p.).

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Each chapter contains, is guided by, and expands from the work of Harney & Moten, specifically their communally written book *The Undercommons* (2013). This thesis engages in and is itself an expression of study, primarily attending to and imagining beyond systems of education in the US from which the STPP framework emerges. This introductory chapter, Planning, introduced the thesis as an abolitionist text, discussed education when understood to be within the Prison Industrial Complex, and began to consider the concept of Planning. Chapter 2, School-to-Prison Pipeline Framework, discusses certain policies and practices that contribute to the restriction and punishment of particular (expressions from) students deemed unruly and disturbing, and rather than contributing to another critique, instead seeks to experiment with the radical potential of the STPP framework itself (as a framework, as a conceptualization from which to mobilize action, etc.). Chapter 3, Genealogy, attends to the approaches of this study and why the effort is being extended to decenter and disorient the mundane in conceptions of the broad and nuanced institutions, explanations, imaginings and reforms within and around the STPP framework, and furthers the importance of an abolitionist endeavor. Next is Fugitivity, chapter 4, in which blackness and Crip more fully emerge as refusals/expressions of an original lawlessness which pose risk to reactionary rule(s) and represent foundational threats to illusions of ontological security - what follows these emergences are the great violences enacted upon students representing these risks. Study, chapter 5, considers the abolitionist actions of communal expressions as black study in schools, and the persistent impositions of institutional study (e.g. formal and informal examination, standardization, and metrics) that attempt to prevent and punish these excessive movements and moments. Chapter 6 is Policy which, through specific educational policies, attends to (national, ontological) risk, those who symbolize risk, as well as some attempts and tensions in, among, and between reformist, radical, and abolitionist efforts at changing the conditions of their lives, communities, and the world. In Chapter 7, Call to Order, my intention is to write with instances of naturalized components of institutional education which permeates into perhaps unsuspecting aspects of everyday living,

moving with this intention in experimental ways that might offer imaginings different than (though not separate from) policy's regulating gesture.

This thesis, in starting from the understanding that institutions of education are in/constituent of the PIC, ends with considerations of resistances to these institutions through/by way of/as attempts and fulfillments of Abolition Pedagogies (a concept that is and continues to be a collaborative, entangled practice and experimental study with Lindsay Miller, "including and exceeding our PhDs and so-called academic collaborations" [Miller & Miller, 2020 p 384]). This is not a chapter attempting to coin a phrase, define/confine its meaning, or fold particular actions into it. Instead, abolition pedagogies is a term to indicate the multiple radical potentials and redefining's of pedagogy (and its place firmly in educational settings) when met with abolition (which is not generally associated with educational institutions). It is a reconfiguring lens with which to perceive things anew (or renewed), to read texts and gestures differently, to find alternatives where none seem possible, to make a way out of no way. Abolition pedagogies is a concept contributing to the impossible demands of abolition, to the already-present presence of otherwise worlds, and, as will be discussed variously throughout this thesis, to the end of the world as we know it.

## 2

**SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE FRAMEWORK**

“In the US schools in poor communities of color are thoroughly entangled with the security state, so much so that sometimes we have a hard time distinguishing between schools and jails. Schools look like jails; schools use the same technologies of detection as jails and they sometimes use the same law enforcement officials” (Davis, 2016 p. 56).

“...for people who are involved in forms of organization, like a teacher, for instance...you are much more immediately confronted, because of policy and governance and their ubiquity, with either being almost immediately the police or finding some other way to be with others (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 123).

The School-to-Prison Pipeline (STPP) framework typically describes two separate entities which are understood to be distinct in form and function. The particular ways school and prisons (or more generally, ways institutional education and the criminal justice system) are connected via the pipeline metaphor refers to various educational policies and practices that resemble policing, that increase the likelihood of a student being captured within the juvenile/criminal justice system, and/or that disproportionately push crip/disabled, neurodivergent/mad, queer, Black, Brown and/or American Indian students out of standard classrooms and schools and into sites of incarceration. These sites include juvenile detention centers, jails, prisons and US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detention centers, but also what Adams and Erevelles (2017) term unexpected spaces of confinement where aversive technologies wielded by agents of the State such as enacting “physical and mental abuse and even death” occur in “rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, and even schools” (p. 349).

As I intend to express below, the physical and conceptual site of the school should not be considered an unexpected space of confinement but instead an institution with ever-expanding reach and with a history of carceral technologies emerging from (rather than only being integrated into) it. The STPP framework importantly addresses many violent mobilizations of policy through policing practices in schools, and at its best gestures toward systemic failures of institutional education becoming increasingly hostile to expressions and behaviors that deviate from normative, conditional expectations, especially for students deemed at-risk (see Policy chapter). Yet, the fights against adverse conditions contained within the STPP framework almost always propose solutions, which makes sense until grappling with the notion that solutions based on limited understandings of problems will always produce limited alleviations (if not the ramping up of overt and the further spreading of more covert harms). This is not to suggest that there is a total understanding that needs to be discovered, or that no efforts should be made that are limited. On the contrary, a proliferation of attempts and experiments are needed. But it is in service to what that must be deeply considered.

This thesis contains attempts to imagine differently, to stay with violences that have no isolated cause, no isolated remedy, and thus offers none. Instead this thesis and specifically this chapter experiments with writing the mundane oppressive conditions of the world, focused on schooling and policing (and the blurriness between), that, in either routine teaching acts or within instances of extreme direct violence remain often unaccounted for or entirely unrecognized. More than that and always underlying the conditions and justifications of these violences are the unrecognized or misnamed resistances, variously perceived, to them. These resistances comprise the primary attendings of this chapter and thesis as a whole. It is the mundane and extreme violences that impose themselves and create the occasion of amazing, against all odds resistances. But those resisting the brutalities of policing and/as teaching are less opposing particular institutions or institutional practices (though that is there), and more expressing unregulated desires for another life on Earth.



\* \* \*

“I love my friends Abby and Faith. Lex was here 2/1/10” (Gonzalez, 2010 n.p.).

Handcuffed, arrested, sent to court, and suspended from school. These are the common and immediate results of a student’s unauthorized expression being perceived as a deviant, defiant and ultimately a criminal act, and these are the results of the above quote. 12-year-old Alexa Gonzalez, a 7th grade student in New York City, doodled on her desk with an erasable marker. This act was recognized by her teacher as something serious enough that the principle needed to be involved, who then called in the school’s safety officers (also known as school resource officers, similar but distinct from security, who are police officers officially stationed in schools). The decision to involve the police, an increasingly viable and mandated move, turned what might constitute a school policy violation into a violation of state law. This move, along with the increasing rates and measures of disciplining perceived student (mis)behavior, and the increasingly permanent presence of law enforcement, is a general orientation of US schooling that is key to understanding the official and unofficial policies and practices shaping/inhibiting the realities of disproportionately disabled, neurodivergent, queer, Black, Brown, and/or American Indian students conceptualized as the School-to-Prison Pipeline (STPP) framework.

Handcuffed, arrested, sent to court, and suspended from school. Alexa Gonzalez was ordered to remove her jacket, sweater, and shoes before being physically searched, including having a male officer putting his hands into her jean pockets, all without consent or a parent present. Officially arrested for the damage of school property caused by the impermanent doodle, Alexa Gonzalez was placed in metal handcuffs and then made to walk through the hallways of her school “in full view of teachers and other students and across the street to the 112th Precinct building” (Bruno v City of New York, 2013 p. 57), a public spectacle known as being ‘perp-walked.’ Later, Alexa was quoted saying “I didn’t want them to see me being handcuffed, thinking I’m a bad person” (Chen, 2010 n.p.).

There are milestones of policy, law, and societal events which can be cited as most overtly justifying and contributing to the naturalization of policing in schools from official police officers. Some of these will be discussed in this thesis as they relate to and influence the conditions of the STPP, but the overt shifts in US educational policy that led to the NYPD officer being stationed in the school and the arrest of Alexa Gonzalez are often only the sanctifying, making official and/or reformations of (pedagogical, disciplinary) practices already taking place. These carceral educations are recognizable, for example, in the first and ongoing attempts at capture and control of mandatory public schooling in the settler colonial project of what is now known as the United States of America, with the violent forms and justifications of forced integration/assimilation (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014) and attempted extinction (Adams, 1995) of American Indian's with off-reservation boarding schools (elaborated in Policy).

Handcuffed, arrested, sent to court, and suspended from school. These actions have major impacts, immediate and long-lasting, and it is important to know the details that more and more students have come to be subjected to. After being photographed in the police precinct Alexa Gonzalez was placed in an enclosed room and handcuffed to a pole for more than 2 hours, all the while the 12-year-old's mother was told her daughter was arrested for graffiti and was denied the ability to be with her (abc7NY, 2010). Upon being released from police custody Alexa was made to appear in court days later and was given the sentence of "eight hours of community service, a book report, and an essay on what she had learned from the experience" (NYCLU p. 57.). Quoted later Alexa Gonzalez said, "I definitely learned not to ever draw on a desk" (NY Daily News). In addition, Alexa was also suspended from school for 5 days, but after the media picked up this story her suspension was terminated 2 days early. Many students' stories are far too similar but do not receive the media attention this did.

But this event extends beyond being handcuffed, arrested, sent to court, and suspended from school. In the days following her arrest, Alexa vomited multiple times because of everything that had

happened, was happening, and the uncertainties of what would happen. Upon returning to school she was faced with the challenges so many students are met with in catching up with her classwork because of missing desk-time. Out of school suspensions are identified as a primary trapping of the STPP, literally requiring students to be out of school for a time, and then not structuring supportive transitions for reintegration and catch up upon reentry. This is a deterrent to students which results too often in what appears as the students' individual decision to permanently drop out of school (with little to no accountability for the role of the school system in bringing on feelings of resentment and not being cared for from the students). In New York City alone, where Alexa Gonzalez was attending 7th grade during the 2009-2010 school year, there were 61,541 recorded suspensions for middle and high school students (Chauhan, et. al., 2019). General statistics were collected such as Race and Ethnicity (with White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian as the available choices), and whether a student has a Disability Status with the school. But even as these categories show the disproportionate rates that Black, Hispanic and students with a Disability Status are suspended (there are no indications of potential for overlapping categories) these figures are deeply insufficient, not least because they cannot account for the immediate and lasting consequences for each student's suspension. Contributing to the disproportionate criminalization of certain students, there were 40,342 individual students suspended in NYC for this one school year (2009-2010), which means there were over 20,000 instances of a student being suspended multiple times. What is known is that the disproportionate criminalization (including and extending beyond suspensions) is similar in every US state, and that school suspensions are part of the mandates within the Prison Industrial Complex (PIC) (Willett & Thompson, 2015), and that suspensions increase the likelihood of later encounters with the criminal justice system (Vitale, 2017).

For her doodle about loving her best friends, Alexa Gonzalez experienced multiple forms of overt policing, including the school safety officers, the police officers in the 112th Precinct building, the judge, officials and agents of the court, but also policing from her teacher and principle who, with their trainings, qualifications and professional competence, decided it was necessary to amplify the

stakes by calling on higher authorities to dole out punishment for this perceived misbehavior. As with Alexa's experience, "many schools are further expediting the flow of children out of the schools and into the criminal justice system by doling out a double dose of punishment for students who misbehave" (NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 2005 n.p.). The double punishment here is being temporarily suspended or permanently expelled from a school, and also being arrested or otherwise encountering law enforcement and the juvenile/family court systems.

The most detailed account and final record publicly available of Alexa Gonzalez was her and her mother's role in a class action lawsuit along with 5 other students of NYC public schools, suing the city and directly challenging what they called the "unconstitutional policies and practices of the School Safety Division of the New York City Police Department" (Bruno v City of New York, 2013 p. 2). The other 5 students experienced similar violations as Alexa, describing their experiences of criminalization via encounters with school safety officers (SSO), such as being removed from class for "talking too much" and ending up being shoved, thrown against a wall, jumped on after falling down, handcuffed and charged with assault, resisting arrest, and harassment. This student had to be hospitalized and receive stitches to his head, and eventually settled out of court for \$39,000. Alexa settled out of court for an undisclosed amount, meaning that legally there was no official wrongdoing found with any of the officers or school officials involved in what the lawsuit indicates as an unlawful arrest, nor was any policy or practice of the School Safety Division found to be unconstitutional.

However, determining whether or not an action from a law enforcer is unlawful is not a focus in this thesis. Neither is the US Constitution considered something valuable (let alone the gold-standard) from which to determine what actions are and are not permissible, desirable, honorable, necessary, etc. That the SSO of Alexa's school was found to have done nothing unlawful is simultaneously disgusting and irrelevant. A better outcome would not have been the court finding the officer guilty of unlawful conduct. This would have allowed confidence in the criminal justice system, as if it is

designed/works for the good of all without prejudice. Further, that no one was punished for this incident other than Alexa does not indicate that the system is 'broken' or that an injustice took place. The Constitution was never made to 'protect' everyone and in that way the law was upheld throughout Alexa's trials.

In the lawsuit it is indicated that the school officials involved in Alexa's arrest, her teacher and principle, had no control over what happened to her once the school safety officers of the New York Police Department (NYPD) became involved. This highlights an unclear part of an already fraught process framed within the STPP, the escalation of school issues into criminal issues and who has (or should have) authority in situations of student behaviors understood to be inappropriate. The statements of Alexa's teacher and principle on what happened, as well as how they felt about it are not recorded, but her arrest was made without contestation or interference and there were no known repercussions for anyone involved other than Alexa. But this is not always the case.

There have been numerous recorded incidents where teachers, school officials and/or principles attempted to intervene in the direct policing/arrest of their students. One such incident found a school aide and the school's principle being arrested and going to jail, along with their student, after attempting to intervene in the student's arrest (Gootman, 2005) – an odd group to find themselves victims of criminalization in schools. The school officials found the officer making the arrest to be out of line after entering a classroom unannounced and seizing the student. The offense was allegedly shouting an obscenity at the officer earlier in the hallway, a school policy violation but it was and is unclear what law was broken. Both school officials were also removed from their positions at the school, also in New York City, emphasizing the tensions that can occur when there is "a fundamental lack of coordination and communication between school leadership, school safety agents, and school-assigned police officers" (NYCLU, 2005 n.p.).

Perhaps more concerning is when there is a well-functioning line of communication and coordinated efforts between school and law enforcement officials, as was the case with Alexa. It was only after

the media covered the arrest, highlighting the extreme measures taken for what could have been an easily remedied offense, a narrative easy to be outraged about, did Alexa's suspension end early.

Beyond this easy-to-be-outraged-about narrative, there is more going on than just an overreacting teacher or principle incapable of mediating a tense situation; more than just a police officer not using enough discretion when assessing a situation or uncaring officers at the NYPD 112th Precinct; more than a cruel judge who didn't dismiss the case but instead sentenced further punishment for the 7th grader; more than a chain of people who were just doing their jobs, adhering to policy and law. These narratives make it easy to find fault in individuals, and in specific policies and laws, and for people (policy makers, school officials, police departments, parents, etc.) to push for reform.

The adherence to dominant understandings of what and who constitutes a risk to school and social order, backed up and variously enforced with state power, is what criminalizes students like Alexa Gonzalez. It is the disciplining and criminalizing of uncontained expression, even when joyous, in attempts to regulate movement and teach discernment of the proper and improper. This is a necessary carceral function of what it is to teach, a form of carceral education which is discussed throughout this thesis. The punishment of this deviant expression is itself an act of teaching.

Both school policy and state/federal law find threatening what are skewed interpretations of expressions that cannot or will not conform to the highly regulated and hyper-surveilled educational institutions of order and ordering. These threats, minor as they may be, are to be extinguished, with examples being made of those whose mere presence breaks or threatens to break with predetermined standards and expectations through overt demonstrations of force as well as more mundane acts of violence (e.g. 'perp-walk'). These predetermined punishments are enacted based on strict definitions of how an event such as doodling on a desk is to be handled. Discussed in detail below, these understandings and parameters are largely because of and secured within policies and procedures that are known as zero tolerance.

It must also be noted that the presence of the police in schools and the increasing justifications of criminalizing student (mis)behavior has and continues to be fought. More radical demands for police to be removed from schools entirely, beyond reformist calls to clarify officer roles or require more specified training, have been made as long as police have been in schools. As I write this in the wake of George Floyd's murder by police which, along with Breonna Taylor, Tony McDade, Walter Wallace Jr. and so many other Black, Brown, American Indian, disabled/crip, mad/neurodivergent and/or queer people (which highlights the racist, anti-Black, misogynistic, ableist, queer and transphobic qualities and foundations of institutionalized policing), the demands to defund police departments and ultimately abolish the police and other carceral systems have, according to many longtime abolitionists, perhaps never been made as widely and vehemently as they are in this moment. The removal of police from schools is one immediate demand from activists, organizers, and organizations in cities all across the US (and world), including demands that those allocated funds for police be redistributed in order to provide schools/students with more counselors, nurses, social workers as well as art and after-school programs and safer, more accessible learning environments.

\* \* \*

The intention of this thesis is to be a contribution to the long history and ongoing study of abolition. The abolition of all carceral institutions, expressions, and logics (e.g. the overt and insidious ways the PIC manifests). From this perspective, campaigns such #CounselorsNotCops (Dignity in Schools, 2017) offer imaginaries full of potential. One way to recognize the investment institutions have in maintaining and extending the status quo, and the potentials of these alternative movements is that these abolitionist plans are almost entirely rejected, or if anything concessions are made such as more police training for being in schools, which only increases annual police budgets and makes no actual change or movement toward abolitionist imaginings. Taking police funding decreases the resources of an inherently violent institution and has the potential to not only reduce the contact

students have with police but also challenge the notion that police both increase safety and are at all necessary (Critical Resistance, n.d.).

Yet movements for #CounselorsNotCops brings about a less obvious point, and a primary argument in this thesis: that schools themselves are inherently violent institutions. From here, bringing in more counselors will likely shift the tactics and approaches to policing in more covert ways, effectively rerouting the pipeline between schools and prisons, but the policing of expression, behavior, movement, and desire will continue. Thus, the potential contains various radical as well as reformist approaches and goals. It is the radical potentials of non-reformist attempts and alternative movements and moments that this thesis attends to and invokes as acts of abolition pedagogies.

My assertion is that the STPP framework is limited in how it's framers and those taking on described aspects of it understand and express the histories, functions and purposes of schools and schooling, of prisons and carcerality, as well as how the sites and functions are related and in what ways they overlap. From these foundational limitations, the understood problems and the approaches to change and proposed solutions to these problems are not just insufficient, but more deeply they do the work of furthering limited understandings and uphold notions that working for some change in some ways through predetermined channels (e.g. appealing to policy makers; petitioning for reform) is the best if not only path. With this chapter and overall project, I am engaging in schooling, which includes but is not limited to educational institutions, carcerality, which includes but is not limited to state-sanctioned practices and places of criminal justice such as prisons, and behaviors/interactions/imaginings of policing which includes and is beyond the police. This is a project refusing the reforms of carceral educations, weaving throughout a thinking and imagining toward abolition pedagogies.

\* \* \*



The STPP is a framework used to describe the relationship between and trajectory of students from school to prison. The STPP is described generally as a complex network of policies and practices that, through too harsh punishments and the increased criminalization of (often taken-for-granted identifications of) ‘misbehavior’, push students out of standard public schooling and either into alternative classrooms/schools (Selman, 2017), dropping out (Heitzeg, 2009), and/or juvenile and adult criminal justice systems (Annamma, 2018<sup>7</sup>). With this, critiques of the STPP tend to cite the (increased) criminalization of perceived and often accepted definitions of student (mis)behavior (i.e. arguing that school policies outlaw generally expected or normal behaviors of students acting their age [Ripley, 2016]). Critics often call for the handling of what gets framed as the recent criminalization of this (mis)behavior to be done in-schools rather than through law enforcement agencies (i.e. police specifically assigned to a school often called School Resource Officers [Addington, 2009]; the Department of Education’s Special Weapons and Tactics Team aka S.W.A.T. [Gilmore, 2017a]; Immigration and Customs Enforcement aka I.C.E. [Dillard, 2018]).

From these general understandings there are many points of departure – scholarly, activist, political and institutional work on and to address the STPP, of which are not necessarily separate but offer different articulations to approaches. These approaches are almost entirely based on accepting the STPP framework as legible (e.g. understanding various and complex mechanisms that send students from school to juvenile/criminal justice systems and/or to prison) and legitimate (e.g. confirming complex yet identifiable problems and variously working toward practical ends or alleviations). For instance, what is referred to as the criminalization of child/adolescent/student conduct is not an

---

<sup>7</sup> Though it should be noted that Annamma makes explicit effort to not use the term justice when referring to juvenile and criminal justice systems. This is to reflect that the systems have not and do not produce anything resembling standard notions of justice, especially for the majority of people in the US including the global implications of this, and that these tactics and systems actually institutionalize, perpetuate and naturalize violence and injustice. In *Genealogy I* will explicitly bring in Denise Ferreira da Silva’s work of knowing at the limits of justice (2013b) in considering juvenile and adult criminal justice systems which include racialized judgements of the very categories differentiating who can be considered a juvenile and therefore be afforded the contingently lesser punishments that would be legally available and justified when tried as an adult. For now, knowing at the limits of justice can be considered alongside and existing within the radical potentials being discussed that are always available but seldom considered/attempted.

aberration of schooling (Howell, 2018) – it is a new expression/form of an ongoing historical and foundational violence of US education. It is not a recent development or even a misguided manifestation for schools to recognize and (mis)name particular expressions of students as disturbing, delinquent, at-risk, or criminal. And while the naming of and recourse for deemed (mis)behavior has not been fixed throughout the relatively recent history of the US – a history that is neither past nor can be made distinct from pedagogical, curricular, structural approaches to education - there are foundational and steadfast, if not underlying, carceral logics that shape schooling. Though carceral educations are being discussed in this chapter more explicitly within the context of the STPP framework, these foundational violences will be brought up in conversation with other concepts before and beyond the framework throughout this thesis.

What underlies and shapes schooling are, in-part, the “historical-racial schematizations that have produced a visual field riven with anxieties about ungovernable, errant forms of bodily movement” (Hilton, 2017 p. 230). It is in-part because errant forms of movement exceed and need not be contained to a physical movement. Hilton (2017) is writing on the surveillance of blackness and disability, stating that “...the policing and violent regulation of black life takes place at the level of bodily movement” (p. 226). This thesis takes up Hilton’s work with crip movements, and in study with Harney & Moten’s *The Undercommons* (2013), offers an expansive imagining of bodily movement not needing to be expressed as a particular physical motion at all. A study engaging with and offering provocations excessive of any fixed definition of the body as connected yet separate from a mind (bodymind being an excess here), as well as questioning the legitimacy and understandings of singular bodies that, although interdependent, are necessarily and unquestionably individuated from anything else (individuation is considered throughout). Through adaptations and even progressive reforms, these foundational logics make almost unquestionable the varied attempts to regulate not just what is valuable for students to learn and how they should best be taught (a basic premise of schooling), but attempt to regulate what is imaginable. Planning

with and for the anarchic capacities of unregulated movement are some beginning contributions to what is being conceptualized in this thesis as abolition pedagogies.

\* \* \*

There are many angles regarding just what contributes to the STPP, and many in-points to addressing the stated issues. The use of the STPP framework has increased significantly since its first formal appearances in the early 2000's (e.g. Skiba, et. al., 2003; Wald & Losen, 2003a which were attached to the conference "Reconstructing the School to Prison Pipeline: Charting Intervention Strategies of Prevention and Support for Minority Children"<sup>8</sup>; Skiba, Rausch & Ritter, 2004).

Examples of this increased use come in part not just from standalone academic articles (of which there are countless in title and/or content) but also from special issues in journals (e.g. *Race Ethnicity and Education* in 2010, *Rethinking Schools* and *Teacher Education and Special Education* both in 2012, *Journal of Educational Controversy* in 2013, *Equity & Excellence in Education* in 2014, and *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education* in 2018<sup>9</sup>). A particularly significant example is from a special "Kids Incarcerated" series from the mainstream magazine *Teen Vogue* (2017), which featured a month-long series of articles on and around the STPP (Kaba, 2017) with articles in relation to black students (Knefel, 2017), police in schools particularly as it concerns undocumented students (Reichard, 2017), LGBTQ youth and mental health (McNamara, 2017), and disabled youth (Anspach, 2017), amongst others. The series is significant both in the scale of reach the magazine has, as well as the depth of engagement from the authors (e.g. Mariame Kaba [2017] is a prominent organizer and PIC abolitionist) and the magazine in featuring the articles, particularly with contributions from previously imprisoned/currently on probation (e.g. Topeka K. Sam's [2017] article "I'm on Probation

---

<sup>8</sup> A 2-day conference organized by the Institute on Race and Justice at Northeastern University in collaboration with the Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

<sup>9</sup> Meiners & Winn, 2010; Au, et. al., 2012; Houchins & Shippen, 2012; Kasprisin, 2013; Fasching-Varner, Martin, Mitchell & Bennett-Haron, 2014; Washington & Henfield, 2018.

and It's Like Another Form of Incarceration"; Tina Curiel-Allen's [2017] article "I Was Locked Up at 18 – This Is My Advice to Help Others Survive the System"). The importance of the "Kids Incarcerated" series demonstrated the need for going to unexpected or 'less credible' sources (as will be elaborated in the Genealogy chapter). There were 25 articles published in the *Teen Vogue* series (2017), but as far as quantity, however, journal articles, books, conferences, and special issues are lesser when compared to platforms such as television news stories, radio reports, newspaper articles, online magazines and entertainment sites, social media posts and threads, opinion pieces, and the internet wasteland of online comment sections.

With the increased focus on the terminology and generalities of the framework has come a predictable focus on reforming a broken (yet salvageable) school system (e.g. Advancement Project, 2010; Kim, Losen & Hewitt, 2010; etc.). This response is predictable in that the STPP framework, while perhaps offering new or newly acknowledged examples, is of the same logic that framed and addressed violences before the language and framework of the STPP. This is far from the only approach (e.g. Martinot, 2014; Stovall, 2018) as will be discussed below, but reform is the most prevalent, from which the questions revolve around what is broken and how best to fix it (e.g. particular policies or policy enforcement practices, and/or individual learners/teachers/administrators). For instance, the immediate and all too easily understood cues of 'school-to-prison' boost public awareness/concern of some direct problems in institutional education. Increasingly available information on the numbers of recognizable and reported school incidents resulting in punishment, violence and/or police/School Resource Officer<sup>10</sup> (SRO) involvement itself has led to many different approaches for finding problems and taking action.

---

<sup>10</sup> Necessarily elaborated below and further in the Call to Order chapter, a School Resource Officer (SRO) here might briefly be described as an official, uniformed, and armed law enforcement officer assigned to a school (involving daily interactions with students as early as pre-kindergarten through high school and institutions of higher education), as was the case with Alexa Gonzalez though in NYC the officers assigned to schools are known as School Safety Officers (SSO). Not all schools have an SRO/SSO, and schools outside the US also employ these roles. The contested responsibilities include enforcing law and school policy, as well as serving as educators, counselors, and informal mentors (Vitale, 2017; National Association of School Resource Officers, n.d).

These approaches are also highlighted in the various alternatives and renditions of the School-to-Prison Pipeline, including the School-prison Nexus (Annamma, 2018), Schoolhouse to Jailhouse Track (Advancement Project, 2005; n.d.), Cradle to Prison Pipeline (Children's Defense Fund, 2007), school playground-to-prison pipeline (Bryan, 2018), school-to-court pipeline (Ferriss, 2015a), school-to-sweatshop pipeline (Cahill, Gutierrez, Cerecer, 2016), School-to-Deportation Pipeline (Dillard, 2018), School-to-Coffin Pipeline (Wozolek, Wooton, Demlow, 2016) and, attempting to flip the wording and outcome, Prison-to-College Pipeline (Halkovic, 2014).

The various ways critiques and efforts to change institutional education and institutional justice have been and are being mobilized (materially, discursively) attest to the importance given by so many for so long to figuring out better ways to live on the Earth. Indeed, as long as there have been prisons there have been resistance to prisons (Shirley & Stafford, 2015). Yet the push for change is too often either based immediately in narrow reformist perspectives (e.g. more training for police in schools rather than removing the permanent place police have relatively recently occupied in certain students' lives [Dix, 2015]) or defanged to accommodate efforts for measurable and achievable solutions (e.g. radical activist/community work to #DefundThePolice as a step toward ultimately abolishing the police being manipulated into reforms which make the police/politicians seem somewhat accommodating to community demands yet unwilling to consider a police-free world [8toAbolition, 2020]) which are shaped by the same (educational, carceral) systems and logics that shape and frame the immediately identifiable and addressable problems. When this cyclical formulation is recognized as remotely legitimate, any analyses, investigations, concerns, critiques, and attempted changes will continue to be fundamentally flawed so that they will ultimately serve only to extend, naturalize, and strengthen the underlying mechanisms within the institutions of education and justice that almost entirely go unnoticed, accepted, or excused away. Here an abolitionist perspective serves to break with the repetition.

“The etymological meaning of radical is root. So, abolition allows us to get to the root of the problem. That is why it is the radical alternative. Abolition enables us to escape being trapped by the same framework, the same footprint over and over again. So we don’t look at policing and incarceration as discreet institutions that must perpetually remain at the core of our efforts to make human community. We look at abolition as a revolutionary perspective. It asks us to understand and resist not only the single institution, but all of the conditions and forces that enable the continued existence of the institution” (Davis, 2020 n.p.).

As abolitionists like Angela Davis and many others have been variously working toward (and more to the point collectively attempting to live) for decades, and abolitionists imagining a better world before them, the dismantling of current systems and power relations, changing of destructive habits and confined imaginations, and building of a better world that is simultaneously already here and unrecognizable under current conditions of duress, must encompass all institutions and institutionalized thinking/feeling. There are no isolated institutions so therefore it is inconceivable that the attempted abolition of the police, for instance, would be successful unless similarly focused efforts were oriented to the specificities of other carceral institutions, and perhaps the carcerality of institutions themselves. Some of the more obvious examples of abolitionist work include jails and prisons<sup>11</sup>, and I.C.E. agents and detention centers<sup>12</sup>, but go further to borders, nations, and citizenship (Walia, 2013) of which I.C.E. works to enforce and uphold. Abolitionist work includes and extends beyond the many unexpected spaces of confinement which are “cloaked in discourses of care” (Adams & Erevelles, 2017 p. 350) such as schools (Stovall, 2018) including and especially special education programs, classrooms and/or alternative schools (Erevelles, 2014) which are overrepresented by Black, Brown, and American Indian students.

---

<sup>11</sup> “Prison abolition extends beyond the erasure of physical manifestations of the carceral state, but does not overlook them” (Castaldi, et. al., 2015 p. 1).

<sup>12</sup> “Demands for the abolition of ICE are not, cannot be, radical demands – they must be the baseline for a total shift in U.S. immigration policy” (Uhlmann, 2018 n.p.).

Any attempts at abolition that do not hold space for other, alternative, and not-so-obvious carceral manifestations both fail to undertake the impossible demands of abolition and risk ultimately reforming the police (to continue with the example) to appear as a kinder, gentler oppressive force. “Indeed, ‘the prison,’ or the material buildings that comprise prisons and jails are only one component of the PIC” (Stanley, 2011 p. 6). The PIC emphasizes these institutional connections and symbiotic relationship (Critical Resistance, 2008). As Harney and Moten (2013) write, “The hospital talks to the prison which talks to the university which talks to the NGO which talks to the corporation through governance, and not just to each other but about each other” (2013 p. 57).

An increasingly popular abolitionist project being pushed in cities across the US and internationally, especially in the wake of the police murder of George Floyd, is the movement for #PoliceFreeSchools which seeks to rid police presence from schools entirely. As with any abolitionist demand the calls are not only negative (i.e. removing police). The demands for #PoliceFreeSchools are also creative, imaginative and additive (Advancement Project, 2020) by pressuring school, city, state, and federal officials to reallocate the funds budgeted for SROs, surveillance and other technologies rooted in handling (mis)behavior through punishment and criminalization to instead, for instance, hire more teachers to decrease class sizes, hire more counselors and invest in restorative justice programs in efforts to stop the detrimental effects of the STPP. The #PoliceFreeSchools is part of/contributes to wider abolitionist campaigns such as #DefundThePolice (which is itself a moderate demand<sup>13</sup>) and the decriminalization of laws such as the targeting of people experiencing homelessness (8toAbolition, 2020), which directly affects the 1,508,265 reported US public school students in the 2017-18 school year experiencing homelessness (National Center for Homeless Education, 2020). These demands cannot be made regarding nor contained within seemingly isolated institutions nor within confined imaginations, and certainly not within schools. Imagining and experimenting before

---

<sup>13</sup> As the prolific abolitionist, organizer, educator, and self-described Hallmark Channel devotee Mariame Kaba tweeted about defunding the police: “It’s a call to divest from policing and to fund the commons. That’s a common sense and moderate demand” (2020, n.p.).

and beyond the STPP framework toward its abolition is focused on but is never solely about schools and prisons and the policies connecting the two institutions. A major driving factor for this imagining is considering what the many obligations of an abolitionist are (Rodriguez, 2017a). Discussed in more detail in the Genealogy chapter, and imagined further in the concluding Abolition Pedagogies chapter, the obligations of an abolitionist have no end because what needs abolishing for life to thrive is without end. Ultimately it is the world as we know it must be abolished (da Silva, 2014; Miller & Miller, 2020).

“all of our theories and analyses of violence have gotta be abolitionist, otherwise they get co-opted by state and academic violence or violence of the state and academia” (Gossett, 2017 n.p.).

Abolition requires the impossible. Abolitionist efforts require

“getting rid of white supremacist hetero-patriarchal capitalism, taking a shot right at the heart of what that means and how that is undergirding every institution in the United States. Defunding the police is one step toward that...It gets people to understand that they prioritize the police in ways that are unhealthy for so many of us, that are dangerous, that threaten our lives” (Smith, 2020).

In this way, defunding the police and the STPP are similar in that they both tend to get people thinking and questioning. But at the same time these phrases get people stopping at reform. Not everyone, though, and the proliferation of #DefundThePolice and the STPP creates opportunity for new and more people to come to/embrace/be embraced by the radical potentials therein.

One of the complex and problem-laden components that contributes to the STPP are Zero Tolerance policies (1994). Elaborated in a later section of this chapter, these policies and approaches to discipline both define and deal out strict punishment for subjective, open interpretations of student deviance. The subjectivity is evident in how Alexa Gonzalez ended up handcuffed and ‘perp-walked’



through her school after her principal called the SSOs, and the strictness can be perceived with Alexa's teacher feeling the need to call the school's principal to enact discipline at all. This might seem to counter stated intentions of Zero Tolerance, often attributed to officially being introduced through The Gun Free Schools Act of 1994 (*ibid.*), which was to make repercussions of student misconduct or rule-breaking sweeping and not subject to the determinations of officials. Highlighting the subjective and overdetermined meting out/attributing what is recognized as breaking the rules/law, critics of Zero Tolerance emphasize the disproportionate numbers of Black, Brown, American Indian, queer, poor, disabled/crip and/or neurodivergent/mad students being disciplined, as well as the escalated methods of discipline (Erevelles, 2014; Meiners, 2007).

Regulations/policies/attitudes that would come to be known as zero tolerance served to both address and introduce concerns of school safety (and the particular, evolving policing measures enforced to ensure this). Zero Tolerance had been an unofficial title for policing practices as well, otherwise known as tough-on-crime policing (elaborated in the Broken Windows section below), for decades prior to being federally introduced to schooling, of which both opponents and proponents use to evidence their position on the matter.

The violences described within the STPP framework, while not insignificant, are in most cases limited and largely put in a recognizable register (one that identifies elements of the institution of education that could be improved, with achievable targets and measurable outcomes). The movement for #PoliceFreeSchools provide an example of the gradations within and around the demands. At the time of this writing more and more school districts across the country are voting to remove the police from their schools (e.g. Minneapolis, MN; Denver, CO; Portland, OR; Rochester, NY). While there is an unprecedented surge happening in this moment, the abolitionist agendas to remove security and armed law enforcement agents from schools have been taking place for as long as there have been (even the threat of stationing) police in schools<sup>14</sup> (e.g. Schermele, 2020), in no small part

---

<sup>14</sup> In November 2019 I attended a School to Prison Pipeline Town Hall in Rochester, NY which featured local students, parents, teachers, activists and organizers discussing experiences, perspectives and strategies to

because incidents of SROs committing overt violence to students have been occurring and recorded through cellphone video since being in schools. And as long as there have been efforts to abolish institutions, there have been attempts to ratchet down and degrade radical actions for change. Rodriguez (2020) aptly describes this as the counterinsurgency of reform. As with Gossett (2017) above, the co-opting of analyses that are critical of the seemingly unquestionable existence of police occurs so readily because of the power and resources government agencies, private corporations, politicians, and non-profit organizations have in the world and share amongst each other as understood through the PIC (INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, 2007).

Because of historically unequal power dynamics, and the straight up difficulties in not just emotionally/intellectually grappling with but promoting and working with and for abolitionist agendas like #PoliceFreeSchools tend to shift toward integrationist, reformist and so-called practical/actionable agendas. This is so often the case in efforts to reframe and change conditions of the STPP which, plainly is a framework, in attempts to identify problems and solutions, that actually structures, allows, and necessitates violence. This is a main argument of this study, and these singled-out problems, proposed solutions, and naturalized violence are so pervasive they will come up throughout this thesis.

---

combat the negative impacts policing has on students in the school district (NYCLU, 2019). There were also two speakers from Toronto, Canada sharing their insights and expertise from being a part of a successful campaign to remove police from the Toronto school district that was fought for almost 10 years (Black Lives Matter – Toronto, 2017; Gordon, 2017).



*Figure 1: Aerial view of a street in front of the Madison School District Doyle Administration Building in Madison, WI.*

*Students and community members painted in large yellow letters "POLICE FREE SCHOOLS" as part of a wider movement to remove police officers from schools (Freedom, Inc., 2020).*

*[Image description: An aerial view of a street with the words "POLICE FREE SCHOOLS" painted in yellow, partially covered by trees. Above the letters is a large building with numerous people in front. Below the letters are smaller buildings, and various parked cars.]*

\* \* \*

This chapter is intended to provide somewhat of an overview of what is/how the STPP is commonly described and understood in the US (and increasingly beyond), including the more clear and not as obvious origins and precursors of this framework and how it has been/is being taken up by people and organizations across a spectrum of imaginaries such as mainstream reforms, more radical alternatives, and abolitionist pedagogies. The more overt origins might be traced back to the first official instances and utterances of the STPP framework and its alternatives (e.g. school to jailhouse

pipeline) to the early 2000's (Skiba, et al., 2003; Wald & Losen, 2003a). The research conference "Reconstructing the School to Prison Pipeline: Charting Intervention Strategies of Prevention and Support for Minority Children" in 2003 was the first to use the specific School-to-Prison Pipeline wording, which was followed by a special journal issue that year in the *New Directions for Student Leadership* journal titled "Deconstructing the School-to-Prison Pipeline" (Wald & Losen, 2003b). From there the STPP framework was taken up nominally by policy makers, education researchers, community action groups, journalists and other parties variously invested in education to signify particular problems and particular solutions. As discussed throughout this chapter, the take-up of the STPP has mostly been as a framework to structure one institution or system being connected to another seemingly separate entity (e.g. neglecting the carceral logics foundational in the system of education and connecting these to other interconnected, symbiotic systems within the PIC, and accepting a straightforward narrative of schools as places learners go, and prisons as places where criminals go). But being dispersed and mobilized for many purposes, the STPP framework is also (less often) used to blur what are usually thought of as clear distinctions between education and police/prison (e.g. to emphasize the many facets of school collusion with law enforcement through the STPP [Dillard, 2018]). As there has been a widening knowledge and discourse of the STPP, so too have the understandings widened.

The early and overt conference and article titles with themes suggesting comprehensible origins (zero tolerance; criminalization; over-regulation), aims (deconstructing; redirecting; diverting), and outcomes (reform; training; more research/better measurements), and the corresponding and subsequent papers and projects strategizing toward best practices for change within the recognizable and restricted registers they inevitably frame, have a place in this thesis only inasmuch as they offer flashes and traces of consequences from and within always already violent processes and systems of schooling. The not-as-clear before and beyond the "analytical construction of the STPP [which] provides an easy and accessible narrative pertaining to prisons and public education" (Sojoyner, 2013 p. 243), is the naturalized discourse which frames the problem, the debate, and the

pathways for solutions. It is what guides the available reactions/responses to what does and does not garner reaction/response at all. My engagement rather than avoidance or adherence of what seems so obvious and natural to many is not a disavowal of a gut reaction to a horrific act of violence caught on cellphone video, for example, but a refusal to believe that the event is an isolated incident and that the situation was particular. Discussed, questioned, and embedded throughout this thesis is what and how the natural to many becomes so, and the necessity to imagine and create worlds otherwise.

Immersed in the ongoing conversation which refuses to trace or seek a linear story, this thesis instead engages with various shifts in discourse and/or practice. Later, further intentions are to consider various attempts across the spectrum to plug, break, or divert the pipeline (in general or specifically identified proposals/policies/laws that are understood as contributing to the pipeline mechanisms of criminalization and push-out). I am working to neither dismiss nor outright reject these attempts, recognizing the hard work it takes for communities to try and affect more immediate changes to illegitimate systems that are palpable, tangible, felt.

However, I am also working to not accept these attempted plugs, breaks, or diversions of the STPP, as they too often can be placed in limited and easily relatable categories that I recognize as justifying, excusing, and/or contributing to violence and/as suppressions of resistances. For instance, oftentimes efforts are working to legitimate an illegitimate system, such as the belief that students are being punished for acting normally for their age (e.g. "We criminalize juvenile behavior that is considered normal by psychologists" [Ripley, 2016 n.p.]). Alternatively the efforts may be doing the legitimizing work unintentionally, as in implementing reforms to lessen punitive measures, which can be beneficial but ultimately reinforcing violence (e.g. "There are numerous models of school sanctioning that work for all but a few behaviors: old-fashioned remedies like detention halls, time out, letters of apology, contacting parents, losing school privileges; and more modern restorative justice approaches" [Ayers & Dohrn, 2000 p. 2]). Immersed and guided in undercommon study,

deliberate distinctions are made of pedagogical approaches; between those approaches that embrace what will be described, weaved, and imagined in this thesis as abolition pedagogies and the urgency to innovate and create in/as refusal and fugitivity, and those that reproduce and are inseparable from the violences of which they are intended to mitigate. The later are exhibited when (pedagogies are) embracing, excusing or tolerating notions that policing (which include and exceed the duties and actions of a police officer) is both necessary for social functions (and thus upholding said knowing of that society) and separable from an ongoing legacy of violence (of which education is simultaneously distinct and indistinguishable). I am making these distinctions influenced and guided by the work of Dylan Rodriguez, as well as other abolitionists, anarchists, artists and otherwise misfits and maroons unconvinced and unimpressed with the illusions of, in the case of this thesis, a world that can have educational systems based on values and understandings within capitalist competition and ideas of scarcity; a world which works to limit and regulate imagination; a world that can have prisons, not just the criminal justice system we have, but at all. This thesis is at best a contribution to, and study with, those who are imagining new worlds and demanding the impossible.

“What is, so to speak, the object of abolition? Not so much the abolition of prisons but the abolition of a society that could have prisons, that could have slavery, that could have the wage, and therefore not abolition as the elimination of anything but abolition as the founding of a new society” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 42).

“...what might happen to the disoriented teaching act if it were re-oriented against the assumptive necessity, integrity, and taken-for-grantedness of prisons, policing, and the normalized state violence they reproduce?” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 9).

This thesis is positioned within and against persistent, steadfast, and inadequate understandings of origins/issues/problems/solutions. This thesis is an engagement with, in, and as violences attributed to, foundational for, emerging from, contained within, refusals under, fugitive from, entangled,

mirroring, a part of, apart from education – particularly what come to be perceived as mundane, relationally inconsequential, and/or not violences at all.

\* \* \*

Herein are selections from an STPP framework archive which, in addition to scholarly works, consist of national reports, documents from international institutions and councils, evolving representations of school violence manifested in national and state-level laws and policies, presidential speeches, images and video, official school journals, teacher training texts, and various media including news reports, interviews, online article comment sections, informational worksheets/handouts, course syllabi, newspaper articles, comics, and cellphone video footage. This STPP framework archival material predates the term by over 100 years and is further inseparable from the happenings (atrocities) of US settler colonialism which has and continues in violent upheaval to try and impose/regulate/shape/manipulate what is thinkable and imaginable through continually developing technologies of coercion and control (education that includes and exceeds schooling).

Studying this archive genealogically offers opportunities to perceive conditions of possibility that contribute to the framework firstly making sense and secondly becoming popularized. This genealogical project is less a study of students deemed violent/at-risk, and more about the ways these (mis)understandings of the violent/at-risk are shaped and imparted, assigned and the consequences thereof (particularly on the routine rather than what becomes perceived as excessive and exceptional). This is less a study of the administrators/enforcers of school policy that uphold and enact (and are bound to) these understandings, or even the laws that are established and reformed to create the conditions in which a framework like the STPP can be recognized, and more about various institutional mechanisms of control, their processes of naturalization, and expressions of refusal to them. It is also about what the undercommons has to offer, what the misfits have to offer,

what abolition has to offer the already existing plan toward the end of the world as we know it (da Silva, 2014).

“The mission then for the denizens of the undercommons is to recognize that when you seek to make things better, you are not just doing it for the Other, you must also be doing it for yourself” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 10).

This is less a study of the STPP framework and how to stop/plug/divert it (as has been/is being attempted by others for others), and more about what is manifested/upheld with proposed and implemented reforms founded on dominant (as well as alternative) understandings of the issues. This is less a study of the appalling and sensational and more about how these stories overlook, distract from and even (unknowingly) work to make acceptable mundane violences – examples of which are offered explicitly and otherwise throughout this thesis. This thesis is less about challenging the categories and definitions of delinquency which push students out of standard classrooms and schools, and more about reading refusals that are misnamed as disruptive, disturbing, and at-risk. With this, suspicion is asserted as a valid starting point in researching the STPP framework and generally to this study. This is, for one, in consideration of the growing popularity and widespread attention toward certain understandings of the STPP (throughout the US but also internationally). These understandings frame school issues in ways that can be addressed by the same institutions and structures that function because of them. This assertion as a starting point serves as a basis to stay within and go beyond suspicion.

“Suspicion and accusation are a minimal disturbance to a force that spills endless violations of spirit, memory, and flesh. There is no state of exception, just a grinding normal that concedes reform in the demand, inventing and refurbishing a Civilizational imperative” (Rodriguez, 2019b p. 125).



## BROKEN WINDOWS

The different framings and conceptualizations of the array of identified workings and consequences existing in and arising out of US education and criminal justice institutions all come with varying, specific, and contested origins and implications. In the devising and developing of US schools and prisons and their multiple institutional connections/inseparability's is a type of policing attitude/approach that has been given the signifier of broken windows. Broken windows policing is a term-turned-theory that was nominally introduced in a 1982 article in cultural and literary magazine *The Atlantic* by Kelling and Wilson. The article promoted an approach to law enforcement that is said to do the work of preventing larger, more serious illegal acts from occurring by allocating more resources/officers to enforcing violations of what are classified as minor, quality-of-life offences (Kelling & Bratton, 2015). This proactive type of police work was nothing new by 1982 –

“it was the oldest and laziest [theory of policing] in the history of the profession” (Scannell, 2016 n.p.)

– but this article gave it a name which has since been widely taken up and heralded, particularly by supporters of so called tough-on-crime policies and politicians, most notably in New York City with former mayor Rudolph Giuliani and former police commissioner William Bratton (Kelling & Bratton, 2015).

The idea is that untended property (e.g. broken windows) sends a message that no one cares for or about the property, which practically invites further destruction and destitution. This untended behavior (e.g. breaking windows) is understood as leading to “the breakdown of community controls” and losing “the sense of mutual regard and the obligations of civility” (Kelling & Wilson, 1982 n.p.). The social contracts and civilizational projects which are to uphold the (assumed and imposed qualities put within the register of) goodness of one's property, one's family, one's

community, one's nation, one's self<sup>15</sup> are to be maintained and regarded with prominence in all aspects of life. And so, violations of these obligations and orders, including and especially in the most minor of ways, must be fixed.

“When those who plan together start to participate without first being fixed, this leads to crisis. Participation without fully entering the blinding light of this dim enlightenment, without fully functioning families and financial responsibility, without respect for the rule of law, without distance and irony, without submission to the rule of expertise; participation that is too loud, too fat, too loving, too full, too flowing, too dread; this leads to crisis”  
(Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 81).

The going about and justifications for fixing those expressions that come to be known as a crisis is discussed further in the Policy chapter, but here with broken windows policing (particularly under Bratton's command as police commissioner in New York City, then as chief of the Los Angeles Police Department before again returning to NYC) it meant an increased hyper-aggressive style of policing (in numbers of officers as well as extent of justified actions taken) that hugely increased arrest rates (Herzing, 2016). The increased arrests were a consequence, in part, of the call for and granting of police increases in powers already established and supported in various legal and social ways, such as to individually judge what counted as disorderly and unlawful based on subjective interpretations, as well as the type and extent of force used when dealing with what/who would be crimes/criminals (Kelling & Wilson, 1982). This trust or faith in the police as official and expert representatives/agents/employees of a wholly justified policing institution became a substitute for assumptions and attempts at holding officers accountable for abiding to “established protocols governing what was and was not within their jurisdiction” (Scannell, 2016 n.p.)<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Beyond how to conduct one's self, this gets at the ontological and epistemological unthought of individuation and possessing a self/being a self-possessed, self-determined subject, which then either does or does not fit in with societal regulations and what is accepted as a good citizen/neighbor/self.

<sup>16</sup> It needs to be noted here that following proper procedures of policing and the strict enforcement of the law is not something being argued for in this thesis.

This trust in the absolute necessity of having police is also an acquiescence of all that goes along with it, such as broad acceptance of laws and the enforcement thereof, or jails/detention centers/prisons as punitive sites of exclusion for those outside the law, as well as imposed and intentional (rather than unintended) precarities and displacement of (outlaw, unintended) people, families and communities. These mechanisms have, to different extents, officially been introduced to schools nationwide in a consistent way since the 1990's and the presence of police in schools, not-uncontested to varying degrees, is becoming just another reality of public education in the US (Heitzeg, 2009; Sojoyner, 2016; Vitale, 2017). In writing on US prisons, policing, and schooling, Rodriguez pushes the importance of making strategic distinctions between what pedagogical work adheres to and is implicated in everyday violence and suffering, and abolitionist pedagogical work that teaches against the carceral common sense recognizable in even the most critical or radical educational settings. It is in the more critical, radical educational spaces that this thesis seeks to be engaged with; in spaces that knowingly or unknowingly and despite the best efforts of those involved promote the opposite aims and/or effects but which still...

“...operate from the *a priori* notion that prisons and policing serve necessary, peace-and-safety making, and ‘good’ social functions that are somehow separable or recuperable from their historical primacy to socioeconomic/class repression, American apartheid, racial slavery, indigenous land displacement and cultural genocide, and white supremacist colonization” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 9 emphasis in original).

The social orderings which works to maintain and expand the carceral state is, according to Kelling and Wilson to be maintained by police-citizen relations, though the authors of Broken Windows assert that “the police are plainly the key to order maintenance” (1982 n.p.) - the police are the ones to best attend to those moments, neighborhoods and people at risk of contributing to and/or constituting a crisis. A proposed solution from the authors was to instill more community trust in police, specifically through the increase of regular neighborhood foot patrols. The attempts to build

long-term familiarities and relationships as a method for gaining support and trust through regular, face-to-face patrols and patrollers is the same deployed and used to justify, in part, having police officers/SROs posted in public schools (Vitale, 2017). This is a mechanism of informal control enacted to teach order, be it in neighborhoods with familiar police officers or in schools with SROs. This informal control exceeds the police department employee, however, and can be recognized in neighborhoods and schools alike. Here the habits of the law-abiding citizen and the pedagogical enactments of the well-intentioned teacher are not as easily distinguished from the work of policing.

As with the disproportionate policing of Black, Brown, and/or American Indian students in educational institutions (which are a part of the ongoing legacy of settler colonial brutality, which is to say, of the USA), the neighborhoods constituting the crisis that was and is confronted, in part, by broken windows policing are not just any neighborhoods. They are the unsafe neighborhoods of the undercommons, “where they say the state doesn’t work,” “where they say there is something wrong with that street” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 65). The “city-within-the-city” where the “collective endeavor to *live free* unfolds in the confines of the carceral landscape” (Hartman, 2019 n.p., emphasis in original). Where the risk will always be found by the law enforcers because these neighborhoods and more-to-the-point the neighborhood inhabitants are what generate law in all their anoriginary lawlessness. Harney & Moten discuss this with the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense (BPP), who “theorized revolution...with neither a subject nor a principle of decision” and thus experimented and innovated with and for a Black social life “always calling for itself, already [living] around and below the forts, the police stations, the patrolled highways and the prison towers” (2013 p. 18). Where the Panthers organized, police agencies reacted, finding only disorder to be corrected, safety to be restored, and threats to be neutralized.

Some of the self-defense of the Panthers included organizing free breakfast programs for schoolchildren, by creating free medical health clinics, and with free transportation services for the elderly. The BPP practiced and taught self-defense by creating educational programs and schools,

like the Oakland Community Learning Center where, amidst being taught in a participatory style of learning further than rote memorization from a textbook, students learned Taekwondo. Further the students themselves ran a Justice Committee where peers would discuss issues like not doing homework and would agree on a 'method of correction' (as opposed to punishment or sentencing). Here, the 'method of correction' for and by the students of the Oakland Community Learning Center pushes notions of, reasons for, and the extent of discipline generally known in institutionalized educational settings – this is getting to the limits of correction.

Further still, students were fed breakfast, lunch, and dinner because, as student Kelita Smith said, "sometimes your mother or father, or whoever you're living with, probably don't have enough food for you" (It's About Time, n.d. n.p.). Revolutionary self-defense was feeding and educating children, because as Safiya Bukhari-Alston, who started with the Panther's in the Free Breakfast Program said: "It's hard to think of reading and arithmetic when your stomach's growling" (2003 p. 126). Programs that gave free breakfast and free medical care met a need, and yet were understood to be survival programs to the Panthers (Jackson, 1972). They were programs of survival pending revolution. As Huey P. Newton, minister of defense and co-founder of the BPP said:

"the survival programs are not answers or solutions, but they will help us organize the community around a true analysis and understanding of their situation. When consciousness and understanding is raised to a high level, then community will seize the time and deliver themselves from the boot of their oppressors" (Huey P. Newton, quoted in Jackson, 1972 p. 71).

The many efforts of the BPP were met with immense, overt, and largely covert governmental counter-forces, with then-Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) J. Edgar Hoover calling the Panthers "the greatest threat to the internal security of the country" (The Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations, 1976 p. 2). One of the primary threats (and thus targets) identified with the FBI's now infamous Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) was the BPP's Free Breakfast

Program. The efforts taken to “frustrate every effort” of the BPP that are known are immense, from assassinations, arrests, and agent-provocateur infiltration, to FBI agents impersonating members of churches that allowed the Panthers to use their space for distributing free breakfast so as to complain about the church associating itself with ‘a black militant cause’ and threatening to stop (fictitious) financial support to the church (ibid.). This was an any-means-necessary effort to stop what actually was a real threat. The Panthers were a threat to whiteness, to policy, to the fantasies of ontological security, to the world as we know it. Marquis Bey adds to this discussion of (broken windows) policing by making clearer the risk that blackness and those closest to blackness (discussed in *Fugitivity*) poses by inhabiting any space:

“To inhabit a world on anarchic grounds is to inhabit, necessarily, an ‘unsafe neighborhood’ because safety and security are characterized by an implicit, constitutive whiteness that allows for safety and in fact serves as the obverse of abolitionist liberation” (2020 n.p.).

The enforcement of aggressive, preemptive broken windows policing in and out of schools is based on assumptive definitions and distinctions of what does and does not constitute disorder (Harcourt, 2001), which were made into official policy with the Improving America’s Schools Act (1994), and made to be inflexibly enforced and without considering context when administering predetermined punishment. This would be known as Zero Tolerance. Put another way, it was mandated to surveil for any and all minor deviation at the individual level that could lead to major aberration and crisis on a grand scale (e.g. *A Nation at Risk*, discussed in the Policy chapter), as was the rigid disciplining of behaviors widely considered unruly, that were no longer upheld in subtle and unofficial ways but were now at an official, national level. Noncompliance with these policies would be met with a similar attitude and is discussed below. As was exhibited in Bratton & Giuliani’s New York City, “No crime, no matter how insignificant, would go unnoticed and unpunished: zero tolerance” (Herzing, 2016 n.p.).

Kelling and Wilson's Broken Window's article further put forward the general idea that police were too restricted in their available resources and recourses to their duties. Bringing in their own observations and first-hand accounts, along with some direct quotes from police officers and hypothetical situations, they meant to invoke an idealized image of the police, and to give law enforcement agents unencumbered reach without the incapacitating reforms "designed to address corruption and racism in American police departments" (Scannell, 2016) that attempt to limit and/or hold these agencies accountable in often the most minor of ways.

These similarities in reason and duty demonstrate ways that policing and teaching are not and should not be too quickly thought of as distinct. It is in the practices and environments, including and exceeding obvious similarities such as metal detectors, armed police/guards, regulated and surveilled schedules, and acceptable expressions of movement, their concrete and evolving places in society/civilization that the works of schools and prisons are connected in more fundamental ways than through a conceptual pipeline. I am suggesting that these carceral logics and appeals to reason give insights into how the policing act and the teaching act might be considered almost indiscernible projects – their differences, however, are far from inconsequential, but it is the task of the (radical) educator to acknowledge, question, and change where in their practices they contribute to the STPP (e.g. enforcing disciplinary measures determined acceptable for student behavior accepted as disruptive to the learning process, discussed in the Study chapter), and in what beliefs do they uphold expressions of carceral educations (e.g. faith in the inherent goodness of preventing dropouts/staying in school in the Fugitivity chapter; fantasies of ontological security in the Policy chapter; through pedagogical processes of individuation in the Call to Order chapter).

## ZERO TOLERANCE



Figure 1: A comic depicting Alexa Gonzalez, the 7<sup>th</sup> grade student who opened this chapter, depicting the School-to-Prison Pipeline and describing ways in which Zero Tolerance policies "have done more to criminalize youth than they have to protect them" - created for the Suspension Stories Project to further their "quest to raise awareness about the destructive and pernicious impact of harsh school disciplinary policies (Dee, 2010).

The primarily identified issue contributing to the STPP framework in the US are Zero Tolerance policies, which have come to describe a national attitude in approaching discipline (Aull IV, 2012) and surveillance (not separate from discipline) in education. These policies mandate predetermined punishment for (and surveillance of) so-called misbehaving students – no matter the situational context. Zero Tolerance policies are also cited as key factors contributing to the increased types and consequences of punishment for students being disciplined (e.g. being arrested in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade for writing about the love you have for your friends on a school desk with an erasable marker). Talk of



and the acting on Zero Tolerance policies stems largely from the risk and fear of school violence. The reasoning goes that the physical site of the school can be made safer by removing elements determined to be disruptive to the learning environment. These elements being surveilled for, secluded and/or removed, however, are largely the students themselves.

With various provocations and elaborations offered throughout this thesis, the surveillance and exclusion of some, in an educational system touted as providing equal access and opportunities for all, where no child is left behind, is a necessary function of the continuation of what have become naturalized orders and understandings of what constitutes education. These include such concepts as valid knowledge and proper behavior. This is also the case with orders and understandings of what constitutes violations and violences, and consequential/preemptive restorative and retributive measures.

The Sent Down the Drain comic (Figure 2 [Dee, 2010]) serves as a good introduction to the often-represented consequences of Zero Tolerance policies as they contribute to the effects of the STPP. The comic was created by the youth-led Suspension Stories and is offered with corresponding discussion questions to help think through the brief yet complex content. It is assumed that the comic as a teaching tool is intended for a younger audience (i.e. those that are at risk of/have been pushed out of schools and into the criminal justice system), but I incorporated it into a lecture I created titled *Carceral Educations* for an MA Education course in 2018. The comic depicts a common understanding of schools no longer being safe spaces for students to gain an education (“Schools are meant to be places for learning” *ibid.*) because of strict disciplinary policies, specifically and especially Zero Tolerance (that “create school environments in which young people can easily be pushed out of schools and into prisons for minor non-violent offenses” *ibid.*).

In my lecture the comic served as a discussion prompt for students to engage with the text and imagery in relation to their own definitions, understandings, conceptions and feelings about schools and school discipline. Some students shared their faith in the fundamental goodness of schools and

teachers, and agreed with the premise of the comic that what happened to Alexa Gonzalez was wrong and the conditions that allowed it (policies) should be changed. Feelings of sadness, helplessness, anger, shock are general themes in response to stories of students caught in the STPP. These feelings are conjured in many narratives such as with the comic, done so in order to appeal to people's morality or common sense. Stories like Alexa Gonzalez's are horrible and disturbingly common, yet the way the stories are told (and deeper yet, who's stories are told) offer limited, often very normative, ahistorical depictions of schools and their function as separate from prisons and their function. The comic as a marker for many other stories and critiques of schools via the STPP framework finds blame with specifics about schools (e.g. Zero Tolerance policies) but in doing so fail to see the carceral technologies embedded in and emerging from educational institutions and the teaching act itself. By emphasizing Zero Tolerance policies as a major issue to combat, it is framing structural functions as something new with the STPP, and gives space for schools to be perceived as a fundamental good needing only particular changes in order to alleviate obvious issues.

A fairly common critique in the STPP framework is done with using examples of students being harshly punished for "minor non-violent offenses" so as to highlight how disciplinary policies and practices such as Zero Tolerance are ineffective at "creating 'safer' & more 'peaceful' schools" (ibid.). But the student in these "minor non-violent offenses" is assumed to be an innocent and an otherwise good student like Alexa Gonzalez, who was described in news stories about her arrest as never having been in trouble before. While this narrative seeks to emphasize the failings of policy, they uphold definitions that demarcate good from bad students, innocent youth that should not have had such dire consequences from guilty youth who are deserving of direct discipline and/or punishments cloaked as care (Adams & Erevelles, 20177). The absurd cases of students being punished for "bringing butter knives to school (a violation of 'weapons' rules), for sharing cough drops with fellow students (a violation of 'drug' laws) and for simply forgetting to wear a belt to school (violation of dress code)" (Dee, 2010) mentioned in the comic do the work of bringing attention and outrage to certain school policies. But attention and outrage are typical and typically

ineffective responses, and, however understandable, are especially so within the already limited framework of the STPP.

\* \* \*

Zero Tolerance policies were formally introduced through the Gun-Free Schools Act, part of the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act (Heitzeg 2009). The Improving America's Schools Act (1994) was a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (United States, 1965) and outlined that/how local educational agencies must have certain policies in place, such as involving police in school issues, to continue receiving federal funding under the Act (Nguyen, 2013). The ESEA was one of the main Acts to come out of President Johnson's War on Poverty (as part of his Great Society) and was formed for more-or-less the same reasons previous and future approaches to national education would be: "To strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools" (United States 1965, p. 27). While the Act doesn't offer much as far as the actual aims, specifics of how these improvements would be attempted did shift federal spending, as ESEA made funds conditionally available to local educational agencies with an emphasis on children of low-income families, of which reauthorizations would amend.

There have been significant/consequential/controversial amendments since 1965: Reagan's Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 made strides to deregulate federal responsibility in US education (1981); Bush Jr.'s No Child Left Behind is perhaps the most recognizable reauthorization of which high-stakes testing and yearly progress reports were increased (2001); in 1994 the Clinton administration introduced the Improving America's Schools Act and with it an increase of Zero Tolerance policies in schools (1994).

The original ESEA was vague in its protocols for states to confirm and assure that the funds allocated through the act/title were being disbursed and implemented as the grants were intended: "...the State educational agency will make to the Commissioner (A) periodic reports...evaluating the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and (B) such other reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title" (United States, 1965 p. 32). The President-elected National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children announced this in their first official report: "...it is abundantly clear that the evaluation will be difficult." (1966 p. 25). These difficulties, such as the majority of the 26,983<sup>17</sup> school districts in the US purportedly lacking qualified personnel to develop evaluations, as well as there not being dependable ways to measure the specific progress and attainment of disadvantaged students, marked a more clear delineation in the historical register of surveilling and testing academic achievement based on providing or denying federal funding in schools.

Foreshadowing later amendments and measurements, the ESEA report went on to assert: "Because of the importance of evaluation and its difficulty, a major effort will need to be made to develop instruments and procedures, and to get wide adoption of sound and helpful programs of appraisal" (ibid. p. 27). The results/consequences of these developments have evolved through the ESEA reauthorizations and have become commonplace, fundamental components in educational settings. As will be considered further in the Call to Order chapter, educational protocols are made to be commonplace and commonsense: "The presumption is that it's so absolutely necessary and indispensable so why would you do anything else?" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 127). A component that is perhaps most noticeably the case in institutional education settings is that of standardized testing. Discussed in the Study chapter, standardized testing is a highly contested issue in the US and

---

<sup>17</sup> The number of school districts after 1980-81 are not directly comparable due to expanded survey coverage. These numbers are according to the National Center for Education Statistics, available at: [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12\\_098.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_098.asp)

the emphasis given to these measurements (for students individually and demographically, for individual teachers, individual schools, school districts and across states) has been explained/justified by these tests and similar reforms as holding the various parties accountable to educational/professional standards. For example, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), a Bush-era reauthorization of ESEA, was promoted as addressing and alleviating educational inequalities experienced by marginalized students. This was to be done with federal mandates of NCLB implemented measures to hold states, districts, and schools accountable for student achievement.

NCLB was simultaneously a consequence of Zero Tolerance policies and attitudes, and a means for its expansion with its “new wave of inflexible, test-based accountability” (Advancement Project, 2010 p. 4). Though promoted as mechanisms of reform, policies ensuring accountability were approached punitively, where schools were sanctioned for not meeting high test-score increases (Yang, 2009). The emphasis on academic assessments for particular subjects (“mathematics, reading or language arts, and science that will be used as the primary means of determining the yearly performance of the State and of each local educational agency and school” [No Child Left Behind, 2001 p. 1449]) heightened the critiques of schools teaching to the test. The implementation of this ESEA reauthorization further and drastically cut down an already dwindling curriculum in electives beyond the common core. The effects of curriculum cuts - made to “stave off the possibility of losing federal funding” (Sojoyner, 2019 p. 523) - were on a national scale, but (historically underfunded) schools and (marginalized, at-risk) students were unsurprisingly disproportionately impacted by these measures. As evidenced in a report by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund:

“In addition to impacting students’ behavior, the lack of sufficient resources in our schools also creates perverse incentives for school officials to remove children from school.

Ironically, some of the hallmarks of modern education reform — including demands for greater accountability, extensive testing regimes, and harsh sanctions imposed on schools

and teachers — actually encourage schools to funnel out those students whom they believe are likely to drag down a school’s test scores” (2005, n.p.).

These perverse incentives do not stand out as particularly deviating from or unprecedented in the building, maintaining and evolving schooling systems and educational understandings of the US. Merely adopting tests and punishments will not create genuine accountability. In fact, adopting punitive sanctions increases the likelihood that the already disproportionately under duress students will be treated more severely by a system not organized to support their learning (Darling-Hammond, 2007 n.p.).

What of a violent education is unattended to when understanding and emphasizing the movements captured within the STPP framework as new? as increasingly distinct and deviating from an argued earlier intent and action?

Similarly, the effects of increased policing in schools (whether officially required such as through ESEA reauthorizations like 1994’s Improving Americas Schools Act, or done as a reaction to increased school violence whether actual/evidenced, feared/preemptively confronted, or perceived/believed) have been spread across the country with increased police presence every year<sup>18</sup> with school spending being redirected away from facilities maintenance, extracurricular activities, guidance counselors, etc., to security measures such as police officers in schools (e.g. SROs) and surveillance equipment. These increases did not stop after the NCLB reauthorization was transformed into the Every Student Succeeds Act with the Obama administration, and continue during the writing of this thesis. To be sure, an increasingly collective imagination is expanding to include ideas that have historically been dismissed as naïve and/or impossible, such as efforts to abolish policing in part through #PoliceFreeSchools. With this, there is an increased awareness of the often-staggering figures demonstrating the disparate priorities and resources for policing and surveillance at the

---

<sup>18</sup> In the 10 years between 2005-06 and 2015-16, US public schools reported a 15% increase in security staff, from 42% to 57% in US schools, a 12% increase in sworn law enforcement (36% to 48%), and a 10% increase from 32% to 42% of US schools reporting having school resource officers (Musu-Gillette, et. al, 2018).

expense of what are more generally associated with education such as teachers, counselors, or educational materials. While demands to #DefundThePolice and for #PoliceFreeSchools are gaining a wider audience and have gained some impressive successes (notably, cities such as Minneapolis, MN voting to remove police from their schools), the resistances to what are ultimately abolitionist efforts like these are also increasing. These resistances and reactions come from those in staunch opposition as well as from those who support diluted, tempered versions of these demands. The latter being insidiously dangerous to the efforts being made by diluting radical demands in efforts to appease critics/make reasonable appeals/procure funding/maintain the status quo (e.g. misunderstandings and/or attempts at co-opting the demand to #DefundThePolice as a reform effort that maintains the police being needed/wanted, or what Rodriguez [2020] identifies as reformist counterinsurgency). The former being dangerous to the efforts of and very lives of people working to dismantle the world as we know it and simultaneously build a new way of being, as demonstrated by the over 500 documented civilian complaints of police misconduct in New York City alone in the 6 days following the murder of George Floyd by Minneapolis, MN police officers (e.g. the police driving through crowds of protestors; using excessive force) (Adams & Duggan, 2020)<sup>19</sup>, as well as the actions of individuals/groups who commit horrible violences toward those who represent change (e.g. driving into crowds; assaulting protesters). These violent reactions to uprising demonstrate how frail the widely accepted belief is that police protect and serve, that police keep us safe.

But these uprisings also demonstrate that people don't believe the hype, not all of us. More than a response to the resistances of a different world, abolitionists, activists, poets and dreamers of all

---

<sup>19</sup> These are incidents that were reported to the official Civilian Complaint Review Board of New York City between May 29 and the afternoon of June 3, 2020, which should be read in the context that many have deep mistrust of the police/State and will not know/will know better than to report police (mis)conduct. As a comparison, the New York Police Department directly received only 87 complaints from May 20 to June 15, 2020 (Morales, 2020).

sorts have been and are continuing efforts and experiments to imagine and live in radically different and perhaps unthinkable ways.

Heightened by zero tolerance approaches to discipline (not solely because of the policies), the actions of defunding art programs and under-staffing counselors contribute to the effects named in the STPP framework by continuously avoiding/disregarding/ignoring/justifying educational inequalities embedded in and as the US education system. Of the 1.6 million students in the 2013-2014 school year who attend a school with a police officer but not a single school counselor, Latino, Asian, and Black students were 1.4, 1.3 and 1.2 times more likely to attend these schools as white students, respectively (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2016<sup>20</sup>). While an overall point here is that these initiatives impact everyone involved (far beyond the individualized focus on the student), it can neither be stated enough nor can statistics/evidence within a logic of creating and confining measures of progress/outcomes/experiences/consequences/etc. begin to describe the disproportionate impact had on marginalized students. Even when the most marginalized are named as the intended recipients of governmental assistance (e.g. ESEA and its reauthorizations), efforts can/will only go so far.

“In lieu of providing a structural critique including the racism of US educational policies, NCLB fixates on marginalized students as problems. Even if the language of the policy is essentially to provide equal opportunities and high standards for historically neglected students, the emphasis is that these students are academically deficient...” (Wun, 2014 p. 470).

Some of the many arguments against high stakes standardized testing are that they have not been proven to be effective in increasing student achievement (Advancement Project, 2010). This is not why I am discussing NCLB with Zero Tolerance policies. Rather, an intention here is in consideration of the question: what does the emphasis on these assessments reveal (in plain sight) about

---

<sup>20</sup> Latino, Asian, and Black are the named racial demographics in this report.



education? These policies are another step in the perceived forward progression of the education system that has always been about ideals of competition, national economic advancement, national security, racist, nationalist, heteronormative, ableist standards (one argument could be that schools have progressed with inclusion of historically excluded students, another could be that schools have become worse due to heightened regulation and testing). Hence there is no recuperation. But there is chance in the radical potential of reacting to new/old educational policies and policings if it brings the reactor closer toward abolition pedagogies, which is to recognize the urgent need to engage in a praxis of communing toward and as radical, unfixed redefinitions of education for and as liberation.

\* \* \*

It was the Clinton administration's Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA) that is credited with first bringing in official Zero Tolerance approaches to rule-breaking and violating school code (though so-called tough-on-crime politicians and authorities had in practice been utilizing Zero Tolerance approaches to perceived (mis)behavior well before 1994). The zero tolerance attitudes to rule-breaking were discursively centered around keeping drugs and guns out of schools (the Gun Free Schools Act was within the IASA). But the required/reactive take-up and increased meting out of these disciplinary policies (in both means and measures) would be increasingly applied to disciplinary attitudes in general. Zero Tolerance policies were and are still applied disproportionately to poor, disabled, American Indian, Brown and/or Black students (Meiners, 2007; Watts and Erevelles, 2004). That disabled students, for instance, would be targeted for misbehavior or would be seen as disturbing schools was nothing new by the time 1994's Gun-Free Schools Act was passed. Yet these new policies often designate the start of what came to be known as the STPP framework.

Below are brief overviews of some of the primary critiques of Zero Tolerance and the STPP. The intention here is to add more context to these educational framings and frameworks, offering more explanation within the critical lens' shared by many people working against the numerous causes

and consequences of the STPP. It is also an experiment towards imaginings of abolition by questioning the basis from which particular critiques and criticisms are emerging from, as well as what and how these conceptions are made actionable, and what the desired result(s) might reveal about the entire approach. This is an uneasy effort in making distinctions between pedagogies that embrace an urgency of living and understanding life beyond sanctioned definitions, that make and work toward (seemingly) impossible demands, and those that are critical of aspects of the educational system but uphold fundamental elements in attempts to make tempered and realistic changes that have measurable results with current assessment-measuring tools. In making these often difficult distinctions I am not interested in condemning or dismissing what I consider tempered or critical reforms. Instead, my intention is to study with, not against, the various framings to consider limitations as well as potentials. Here and all throughout this study I am asking in various ways:

What are the radical potentials of the STPP framework?

How can these radical potentials make the STPP less easy and appealing to be taken up and appropriated into policy?

The point ultimately is not to distance or alienate myself from those whose efforts resemble those contributions and elaborations that are distinct from a fugitive study of abolition pedagogies. However, in wanting to “take apart, dismantle, tear down the structure that, right now, limits our ability to find each other” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 6), perhaps these distinctions make that an unavoidable consequence. The point is not to critique or add a critical analysis, but “if we are committed to emerging out of the ruins without bringing along the same patterns, systems, and naturalized ways of thinking and being, then our efforts must extend to our too-often assumed understandings and imaginings” (Miller, 2018 p. 648). To reiterate an earlier question/provocation from Dylan Rodriguez (2010), “...what might happen to the disoriented teaching act if it were *re-*

*oriented against* the assumptive necessity, integrity, and taken-for-grantedness of prisons, policing, and the normalized state violence they reproduce?” (p. 9, emphasis in original).

“To be skeptical of what one already knows is of course an absurd position.” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 35).

Guided by absurdity, I want to know what the radical potentials of the STPP framework are, what they could be, and what these potentials can contribute to its own conceptual expansion/abolition. Can the STPP framework expand so much that the site of the school and site of the prison are no longer the focal points? Can the framework expand so that these sites are not just connected but conceptually inseparable? Can the framework stretch even more to encompass other institutions and be recognized as constitutive of the PIC? stretching even more so that framework can no longer contain all the symbiotic, messy, complex, destructive, insidious, everyday occurrences that contribute to carceral educations and the world as we know it? As Yusef Omowale extends, “one of the problems of the school-to-prison pipeline is the way that it privileges the school site, and ignores the other geographies in our communities in which we experience premature death” (2013 n.p.). So too, carceral geographies are meant to expand ideas of carcerality further than the site of the prison (Gilmore, 2017b).

One critique that often places the Gun Free Schools Act of 1994 at its center is that reforms meant to prevent school violence themselves allow the enacting of violence through harsher punishments for perceived student misbehavior (Advancement Project, 2010). This critique generally continues to assert that the punitive reforms which were created to prevent violences like school shootings disproportionately impact poor, disabled, and/or students of color (Ayers & Dohrn, 2000; Erevelles, 2014; Heitzeg, 2009).

Being generous, even if Zero Tolerance policies began as an effort to address harmful acts perpetuated by any student, these policies effectively became another way of policing students of color and forcing them out of school and into neighborhoods where over-policing, lack of job

opportunities, and family and community violence may contribute to their eventual imprisonment. (Willett & Thompson, 2015 p. 4). In many cases, school officials and SROs preempt this eventual imprisonment and do so on-site.

Similarly, a critique of Zero Tolerance and the STPP is that these Black, Brown, American Indian, disabled, poor and/or labeled at-risk students<sup>21</sup> are being punished for non-violent offences, and that policies meant for major crime prevention are used for minor infractions (Heitzeg, 2014).

However valid, this criticism gives space if not boasts the belief that the initial intervention of the Gun Free Schools Act of 1994 was based on and meant to prevent direct and overt violence in schools. This is evident when fights against the STPP claim that laws and policies are not being used for what they were intended. But the language of zero tolerance in schools was taken directly from the US Drug Enforcement Administration (Alexander, 2013) and so were not written and enforced with the specifics of school safety/discipline as the driving force behind Zero Tolerance policies.

Detailed in the Fugitivity chapter, Disturbing Schools is a policy that has received a lot of attention within this critique because the policies are essentially overly broad catch-all's that allow for the disciplining of students who are demonstrating any behavior that school officials deem disturbing to the general educational process. The notion of misuse and abuses of power, as well as unintended consequences surround this point.

Further, the notion of innocence is invoked within this critique, in that undeserving students are negatively impacted by Zero Tolerance policies – this is similar but distinct from the overrepresentation of and impact on marginalized students. Here innocence is attached to the individualized student who can be mobilized in critiques that highlight the absurdity and overly consequential punishments for non-violent, minor offenses (Tebo, 2000). This assertion of innocence is based on and accepts recognizable registers of guilt, which calls attention to and is only capable of

---

<sup>21</sup> In some instances I am leaving out cripp, mad, and/or queer students because the critiques being described do not account for/cannot hold the beautiful complexities that these bring – though, neither can the descriptions account for/hold the excessive beauty of those the labels are attempting to describe.

understanding and framing structural oppressions from a perspective of individualized and directly recognizable examples of violence. In the article “Against Innocence” Jackie Wang writes: “Framing oppression in terms of individual actors is a liberal tactic that dismantles collective responses to oppression and diverts attention from the larger picture” (2012 p. 147). Examples that critique the educational and legal systems from a narrow, individualized framing actually legitimize the violences being called-out by thinking they are in any way exceptional.

A final critique here is that the increased police presence in schools, and punitive enforcement of school policies, are preventing students from forming trusting relationships with adults/role models/officials in positions of power. Instead of using discipline as a means of control, discipline should be used to guide students in the development of self-control (Advancement Project, 2000). In *The End of Policing* (2018), Alex Vitale states that a primary goal of having a police presence in schools is to assert to students that it is safe and valuable to treat law enforcement agents as mentors they can confide in, implicitly establishing to students the need and legitimacy of the police. An alternative to law enforcement agents mentoring students is offered, suggesting that trained counselors, as well as teachers and coaches are better suited for the role (e.g. #CounselorsNotCops). However, when the role is understood as disciplining and guiding students to discipline themselves within predetermined knowledges and expectations about children/students/education/behavior, how much does it matter if the array of authorities undertaking this project are functionally agents of the state?

Perhaps a primary difference between police and teachers is to be found in the expression and extent of discipline, between overt and covert approaches to policing/teaching and in enforcement/demonstration of what are demanded and expected forms of self-control in particular contexts. These modes of instruction have different immediate and long-lasting effects and are important to consider and ask, collectively, what kinds of situations and experiences are in the best interests of all within (and without) institutions of education.

It is important to lessen the likelihood of students encountering more blatantly harmful, intrusive and negatively impactful systems and system enforcers that are maintained and promoted as fundamental and fundamentally beneficent (e.g. police; policy). This harm-reduction approach is mobilized in example after example as the seemingly only course of action for people, communities, organizations that find aspects and instances of schooling practices unacceptable. Of course, what is recognized as harmful varies widely, as is demonstrated in attempted reforms, for instance in differences between fighting to hold individual SROs accountable for actions documented and deemed excessively violent, calling for more training and vetting of police officers that are stationed in schools (Virginia Legal Aid Society, 2015), and demanding that the police/SRO programs be removed from schools entirely (Dignity in Schools, 2017). Notions of accountability and justice are also highly contested.

It is also important to investigate what harms have been so deeply accepted as anything but, that actions which place and enforce value on the thinkable (and the thinkers) and that limit the imaginable (and the imaginers), through evolving ranges of institutional force and coercion, are largely not even conceptualized (unthought) as in need of reform or are at all reformable (Miller & Miller, 2020). This is a primary point of this thesis, which finds the STPP framework limited in both how those confronting the effects conceptualized within the framework understand problems within the US education system, as well as how actions are gone about to solve/alleviate them. The limited, reformative mobilizations of the STPP framework allow space for institutions of education to maintain semblances of legitimacy and goodness. To take and redirect the title of this section, this thesis works with having zero tolerance to educational systems and pedagogies, of and excessive to officially designated sites of learning, which contribute to legitimating and legitimated practices of violence through such means as “policing/surveillance, criminalization, and immobilization [that are] as much *schooling* practices as they are *imprisonment* practices” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 10, emphasis in original).

This is not to say that nothing within a register of being good or supportive can be accomplished in schools. Before the mandates of policy and pressures to perform, “there is the experience of being taught and of teaching” that can lead to what Harney & Moten (2013 p. 27) have described as the beyond of teaching. This is about staying open and unfinished “in between various modes of being and belonging” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 5) – not an act of becoming which leads to an eventual achievement (e.g. where teaching is just a stage to pass through) or attainment (e.g. possessing “an agency that can hold the regulatory forces of subjecthood” [Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 28]), but an unbecoming and unlawful assembling, getting together with the intention and as a form of study, of communing. If Zero Tolerance policies are meant to give no room for interpretation, contextualization, or openness, the beyond of teaching experiments, is itself an experiment, with and for a chance of alternative modes of being and being together that can transform self and social relations/expectations, in part by questioning fundamental values within understandings of education as it is. This is to “perceive the potential fates in the present” (Desideri & Harney, 2013 p. 166) rather than being concerned with preexisting notions of a thing being within the simple and assumptive register of good or bad and strategizing with a predictable future based on these assumptions in mind. Zero Tolerance policies are entirely based on the premise that there is a good and a bad, a proper and an improper, and that policy makers can know these at all and to such an extent as to impart and impose what (pedagogical) measures should be taken to both ensure that the good is taught and the bad is punished – even as these knowledges are differently mobilized and evolving.

This thesis attempts and experiments with challenges to how policy connected to the STPP framework is taken up and naturalized – ways that spring from promises of ontological security in categorizations of good and bad, of a proper modern subject and the deficient other (Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti, 2017) and the knowing of the differences between (da Silva, 2007). These include manifestations leading up to the conceptualizations of the STPP framework such as broken windows policing and pedagogical processes of individuation in American Indian boarding schools (Policy and

Call to Order chapters), as well as consequences of specific policies directly and recently linked to the framework such as Zero Tolerance and Disturbing Schools policies (Policy chapter). Reforms and reactions stemming from figures, footage and stories consisting of and emanating from the STPP framework, largely premised on assumptions of certainties of knowing, are also engaged with in efforts to stay in a precarious nonplace of not knowing – an undercommon place with and for abolition preserved by being inhabited (Harney & Moten, 2013). Preserved in the constant, improvisational practice of what Desideri & Harney call fate work (2013) which unboundedly proliferates multiple and uncertain presents rather than trying to stabilize a single, set, determined future. To stay in the uncertainty, to stay with the violence is to deny illusory stability and security, is to be open to wounds that will variously come with recognizing that anything based on feelings of ontological security were fantasies (Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti, 2017).

“Civilisation, or more precisely civil society, with all its transformative hostility, was mobilized in the service of extinction, of disappearance. The shit is genocidal. Fuck a home in this world, if you think you have one” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 140).

The (interpretations of particular) roles and responsibilities in institutional education will differ (e.g. cops and counselors), yet the overarching concept of imposing expected regulations of behavior/movement/thought can be placed into what Harney & Moten (ibid.) name as the call to order. Elaborated on in the chapter of the same name, a way that the call to order is supposed to work is that the presumptions of what needs to be ordered and how are almost entirely unquestionable, and thus whether in an official position or not, one is to police oneself, to police others, and to be their own police force. This thesis works to question presumptions such as these, to be with fugitive movement refusing these, and yet there is no clear way to do this that doesn't quickly echo the same techniques and ideologies that are being questioned. Engaging with genealogy within a project of abolition, the next chapter will discuss the importance of suspending solutions and the obligatory search for them, to instead stay with, destabilize, and destroy the roots



of our assumptions. Importantly, an abolition genealogy is intended also to destabilize foundations and assumptions regarding genealogy and the genealogical method itself, and thus carries with it an attentiveness to iterative carceral movement. The next chapter will bring discussions on why I have chosen genealogy, specifically for and in experimenting with the before and beyond of carceral educations and abolition pedagogies.

## 3

**GENEALOGY**

Genealogy is an excessive term. Its definition is also its undoing. It holds untenable contradictions within and around it. This is genealogy's potential – the fugitivity of genealogy. Genealogy is an ordering structure and an approach to questioning natural orders.

As an ordering structure, genealogy marks familial lineage - "line of descent, pedigree"<sup>22</sup> - and instantiates notions of gendered, classed, and racialized difference. This genealogy is used to translate and marshal created/established means of identifying into created/established claims to rights, such as indicating (and thus further naturalizing) property rights, which have been mobilized to solidify, determine and order gender, class and race and differences among and between. Property and the rights that have been enforced around their materialized conceptions are inextricably bound with the racist, white supremacist legal and moral foundations, justifications and continuations of the United States. Angela Mitropoulos, writing on the reproducing qualities of genealogy, makes clear that "there would be no way to think of race, or a people, or a nation without the ordered inscriptions of genealogy" (2012 p. 98). This genealogy is about locating origins as well as instances of descent and dissent. Because this approach seeks to limit, exclude, impose value, and define, this is the carcerality of genealogy.

As a method for questioning orders and ordering, genealogy sets alternative, oppositional and counter aims to general standards of research-based endeavors. Genealogy as a critical tool is not used to trace origins nor search for truths but instead works to disrupt "a straightforward head-to-head measuring up of 'supposed truth' with a 'truer' counter-example" (Hook, 2007). Regarding the "roots of our identity" of which the conventional, ordering genealogy marks as its aim, the use of

---

<sup>22</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=genealogy>

this genealogy is a commitment to its dissipation (Foucault, 1977). This genealogist is “a creature born of Nietzsche and nurtured by Foucault” (Allen, 2014 p. 23) whose task is “to uncover buried histories and reactivate them, make their struggle significant to the present” (Ben-Moshe, 2011 p. 99). Genealogy’s combative power pushes to subvert not just the order of a thing but of ordering in and of itself. For instance, the STPP framework is often mobilized to highlight problems in education that are unknown to or of which the consequences are unrecognized by those not directly or closely impacted. The framework puts forward perspectives that can run counter to commonplace narratives of educational institutions being (safe) places to cultivate knowledge, develop skills, and enrich opportunities (though most pushing this narrative seem to believe institutional education can be and thus seek to remake the school as a site that does these things through policy/personnel reform). For these reasons and more genealogies hold radical potentials, and this thesis experiments to further the understood intentions beyond particular/recognized pitfalls such as the recuperation of challenged ideologies, or the upholding of contested logics (knowingly or unknowingly) in part by the very counter-narratives generated in genealogical projects. Similar to Nietzschean and/or Foucauldian Genealogies, this study’s undercommon experimentation is in engaging with and contributing to manipulations, speculations, fabrications, and accidents that cannot be contained within a historical, traceable, knowable register before and beyond the STPP framework, which in turn contributes to these manipulations, and encounters and creates more accidents.

Thinking explicitly with these engagements, another reading of the trials and trial of Alexa Gonzalez (School-to-Prison Pipeline chapter) opens up “sociality’s ecstatic existence beyond beginning and end, ends and means” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 95). Alexa’s sociality demonstrated a risk, minute as it seemed and whether her teacher and principal and the police and the judge could articulate it. Her arrest was an attempt at educating Alexa, her friends, her classmates, and school peers about the consequences of disobeying school rules/the law (e.g. the perp-walk as a shaming of Alexa and a warning to others). What the event revealed, especially in its publicity, was the unjust and extreme

handling of a very minor transgression by school officials/police officers (which is not to suggest that a major transgression would have justified extreme handling – this is not an argument for or attempting to uphold the dichotomy between major and minor). But even further than the immediate reactions to Alexa’s arrest and suspension, surely unintended consequences from a school/police force that routinely criminalizes students through highly subjective policies and laws (e.g. Disturbing Schools), this event demonstrates the frailty of policy/law enforcers and the apparent ideological certainties of something like property with the swift and violent regulatory force imposed upon the most inconsequential of deviations (“I love my friends Abby and Faith. Lex was here 2/1/10” written on a school desk with an erasable marker; Gonzalez, 2010 n.p.). Alexa’s improper adherence to property was a problem for the school/police, and what compounded this issue was her unrestricted expression of joy and openness, what could be understood as an undercommon sociality that was going on before, extends well beyond, and is generally without interest in schooling’s carceral imposition onto and in everyday life. This ‘ecstatic existence’ is a “coalitional, collective quotidian choreography of possibility” on anarchic ground (Bey, 2020 n.p.). Existing without or beyond interests (Harney, n.d.) is a world-shaking threat that, discussed below and throughout this thesis, is so often met with any number of forces to fix, silence, and/or otherwise destroy.

As a method flowing through a thesis structured by and as an undercommon study, genealogy is taken up as weapon of self-preservation (Study chapter), as a means of escape (Fugitivity chapter). This is not an escape from a fixed (or fluid) space (be it physical, intellectual, or otherwise) into a new one devoid or free from those violences which are attempting to be escaped from. For this thesis these fugitive movements are from the assuredness of methodological certainties and essentializing and/or repeating critiques; from the moral/juridical foundations and justifications for educational exclusion and the commonly accepted classifications of mis/behavior; from calls/enactments of police reform and rights-based arguments that evolve and expand institutional

and structural carcerality; from and experimenting with imagining beyond the carcerality that is embedded in some genealogies. But escaping from is not quite right – the from implies a separation of which, ultimately, this thesis challenges through study with and for the undercommons along with excessive, rupturing genealogies. The emphasis here and throughout is in working to emphasize the manufactured ordinariness of logics and manifestations which, when taking an abolitionist approach, are found to be perceptually, tangibly, imaginatively and communally limiting. Taking up and experimenting with genealogies are but some of the possible approaches to the impossible and necessary study of and toward abolition, and are useful here so long as they help the wielder “challenge what is given to us as universal, necessary, obligatory” (Allen, 2014 p. 68).

“We run looking for a weapon and keep running looking to drop it. And we can drop it, because however armed, however hard, the enemy we face is also illusory” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 19).

Genealogy then, is a weapon. And running need not bring us anywhere new (indeed, fugitivity’s movement is inhabitation of and on anarchic ground [ibid.; Bey, 2020]). But perhaps our flights will allow for a new or renewed presence. Escaping does not and need not achieve anything or get the fugitive anywhere. As Moten said in conversation with Saidiya Hartman (2016 n.p.), “the whole point about escape is that its like an activity, it’s not an achievement. You don’t ever ‘get’ escaped...NO...and what that means is that what you’re escaping from is always after you, it’s always on you.” Further, it (that which is being escaped from) is in the one who would be the fugitive, not separate from, and the fugitive is on, in, and as it.

\* \* \*

“They study without an end, plan without a pause, rebel without a policy, conserve without a patrimony.” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 67).

This chapter is a discussion and an engagement in the vast, intuitive, patient, relentless work required by genealogy. As Foucault notes, “Genealogy is gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary.” (1977 p. 139). As has been written above, the undercommons structure this thesis, and flowing in and throughout are various takes and multiple readings on genealogies that contribute to a larger genealogy before and beyond the STPP framework. This chapter is shaped by the (re)shaping of genealogical understandings that neither seek historical origins of that which has become natural (e.g. morality was Nietzsche’s genealogical topic in 1887, resistance to incarceration was Ben-Moshe’s in 2011), nor offer alternatives within an easily perceived and actionable register. This is partially in order to contribute to, and experiment with, the refusal of “typical demands for policy reform” to instead consider the “limits of ‘demand’ itself” (Rodriguez, 2019a pp. 1575-76).

With this, the limits of demand are considered alongside the presence and persistence of abolitionist demands. Abolitionist demands are for the impossible, they are at the limits of demand itself. The radical potential of demanding too much, so often perceived/dismissed as unreasonable/unimaginable, makes capable ways to confront (and thus threaten) perceived foundations of that which was perhaps previously understood to be a stable, inseparable and unthought element of day-to-day living. These considerations are guided and propelled by the work of da Silva, particularly her writing on knowing at the limits of justice (2013b). Notions of justice and injustice, as defined and distributed by criminal justice systems as part of the PIC, are based in “warm and familiar intellectual comforts” that presume the very possibility “of knowledge with certainty” (ibid. p. 44). These knowledges are what calls for justice stem from – as in:

“No justice! No peace! No racist police!”

Here is a chant/cry/demand heard in protests and demonstrations and uprisings all over the US and beyond, like those in the wake of George Floyd’s murder by Minneapolis police. But what justice is sought? What would justice look like, feel like in this criminal justice system? What does peace

mean? Peace as in there will be no peace until we have justice. Recalling the opening of this thesis, chants of “no good cops in a racist system” were met with “the USA *is* the racist system!” This was a correction and simultaneous demand of the protestors below to abandon the ‘warm and familiar’ knowledges and certainties that those closest to blackness are refused and refuse. For many, justice would mean arresting killer cops and holding police departments to semblances of accountability (and thus an injustice occurs every time the police officer is not indicted, is declared not guilty, is fired from one police department only to be hired in another). To some, justice means changing the way policing is done, as in ‘No racist police!’ But these demands can only hold so much when based in the familiar, in the already-known, or in seeking results from and of the institutions and institutional thinking within the PIC that uphold and define the certainties of justice and injustice.

The radical potential of a mass movement is redirected in (understandable, complex, pain- and rage- and imagining a less violent world-filled) cries for justice. “Knowing at the limits of justice,” writes da Silva, “is a praxis, one that unsettles what has become but offers no guidance for what has yet to become” (ibid. p. 44). This is the radical potential of genealogy, letting go of the urge to know what is to come and what is to be done. Foregoing certainty, or at least notions and desires thereof. Engaging in a praxis that ‘offers no guidance’ is not passive. The abolitionist, genealogical endeavor of this thesis is an attending to these limits. As da Silva elaborates:

“Thinking the limits of justice does, however, require a plan of sorts, a certain procedure, but one not committed to resolving the conditions it exposes into a more effective measure, grid, or account that can inform preemptive actions or preventative mechanisms” (ibid. p. 44).

Though taking up genealogies can reveal what is hidden through an immersion in a vast amount and assortment of material (Tamboukou, 1999), genealogies are not endeavors to trace or uncover origins; nor are they to observe how specific events of the past have evolved into and shape similar

events in the present (Foucault, 1977). Genealogy provokes and offers guidance for questioning. For the purposes of this thesis, different emphases within (often difficult, sometimes oppositional) readings of genealogies (e.g. having no political aim, offering no suggestions, valuing no single interpretation over another) are taken up along with specific emphases of this study (e.g. abolition, fugitivity, refusal). A primary component of this abolitionist study is questioning what is known about student (mis)behavior – those actions and inactions sweepingly considered deviant or inappropriate – that are said to be moving students into the STPP.

One reading of genealogy poses the provocation of not privileging one interpretation or meaning above another, to instead be improvisational with definitions, associations, and what it is we think we know. With this, Ben-Moshe describes the core of genealogy being “to collect and analyze formalized sources with as much rigor as popular or mundane sources” (2011 p. 117). This endeavor is my intention, and the archive I draw on for this genealogical project is setup to accommodate the emptying (or at the very least questioning) of value from notable names, canonical texts, and prestigious publications to sit alongside/in generative tension with apparently less-reputable figures, social media posts, independent publishers and self-published zines.

In discussing Nietzsche’s writing on genealogy and punishment, Ward (2007) writes on the possibility to/possibilities of not privileging any single interpretation or meaning above another (with a focus on observations that meanings are fluid and ever-changing). This is done, in part, with a discussion on interpretations of Nietzsche himself, of which Ward offers two considerations. The first is that a single understanding or position need not necessarily exclude others or have that be the only or definitive understanding – one interpretation is not necessarily exclusionary. The second is that Ward doubts the possibility that one can affirm all interpretations while at the same time hold no special status to one’s own interpretation. Ward asserts in *Genealogy and its Shadows* that the interpretations of Nietzsche by Deleuze, Foucault and Derrida do not achieve this, and instead results in three “highly individual, original readings” which compete against others and assert



privilege to their own readings (ibid. p. 12). Indeed, Foucault (1998) spoke similarly in a 1983 interview: “I do not believe there is a single Nietzscheanism. There are no grounds for believing that here is a true Nietzscheanism, or that ours is any truer than others” (p. 445). Whether successful or not, to value no interpretations differently is a challenging engagement, and I do not understand this to mean one has to accept and embrace each and every interpretation. Rather, it is to observe that there are infinite, and that ours is not the one (nor has it been, nor will it be).

What I have found to be the typical demands for (prison or school) policy reform are largely based on and further concretize particular (dominant, prevailing) truths (e.g. conceptions of violence; understandings of what behavior needs disciplining) while simultaneously expanding them by altering (re-forming) existing policy language or creating new policy yet keeping the logic of that which the new is responding to. Genealogy supports an engagement with the STPP framework that suspends solutions (more on this below). The work of a genealogy is not to convince the reader of a truth that is superior to what was known or assumed prior. A genealogy is investigatory to dominant understandings yet offers no alternatives beyond evidence and argument for questioning what it is and how one has/ways that we have come to understand at all. This is typical of what genealogy is, however. There are genealogies that do offer alternatives, and this contradiction is generative for what genealogy contributes to this project and what this project is attempting to contribute to genealogy – in part through the thinking with the carcerality of genealogy even and especially when it is a method of investigation that is set up to be distinct from what are understood to be limited and limiting approaches to research, reasoning, value and what it is/how we have come to understand and imagine at all. Dominant understandings this thesis confronts are reforms about and around the variously titled, framed and understood STPP, including radical reforms which are often recognized as attempts to change educational and carceral systems that are generally perceived to be fringe, excessive, unrealistic, naïve, or utopian<sup>23</sup>. Reforms dismissed as radical/fringe are not

---

<sup>23</sup> Interestingly, there is also the fringe of the fringe where what some would consider radical is quite conservative to others.

usually considered dominant – yet I find dominant approaches and understandings within much of these attempts.

\* \* \*

Genealogy is both a research methodology that is recognized as institutionally legitimate, one which might contribute to my accreditation, as well as an approach which works to delegitimize the institution and notions of accreditation itself. Genealogy sets up the wielder to question the taken-for-granted of a subject (of the subject), including notions of what material is relevant or important. This allows for a creative, expansive, perhaps nonsensical or unwieldy archive that includes potentials, imaginings, whispers, intuition, repetitions, false starts, and includes that which is not there/excluded.

“...genealogy must define even those instances when they [events] are absent, the moment when they remain unrealized.” (Foucault, 1977 p. 140).

“The absences matter and the histories and conditions of those absences matter” (Dilts, n.d.).

*The Undercommons* (Harney & Moten, 2013) is a text that provokes, questions and challenges understandings of systems (of thought, emotion, physicality, relationality, etc.) that establish and enact new and/or push existing structures of what is recognized as personally and socially acceptable. There is a similar approach with genealogy, and what is questioned include such foundational knowledges (especially in academic settings) as critique and criticality. To have a critique of existing institutions (like public education) or to be critical of particular accepted norms is not ultimately corrosive to that which is being critiqued. Instead, the critical researcher is actually keeping and strengthening a kind of status quo. Thus, if genealogies are to be useful to this study,

they will include the above-mentioned challenging of the ‘universal, necessary, obligatory’ but can be mobilized beyond practical, realistic demands and tempered, reasonable responses. Utilized as a way of thinking, genealogy “destabilizes the very foundations of our assumptions” (Ben-Moshe, 2011 p. 94)<sup>24</sup>, and I take that to mean assumptions of structured institutions and their mechanisms of maintaining and expanding their power, as much as assumptions of how to think about and challenge these structures and systems<sup>25</sup>.

“Our goal – and the ‘we’ is always the right mode of address here – is not to end the troubles but to end the world that created those particular troubles as the ones that must be opposed.” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 9).

For its erudite attempts and fundamentally challenging scope, genealogy offers opportunities for alternative perceptions and engagements with the STPP framework and the STPP archive of this thesis that extend beyond the critical responses that are often found within the archive. I also recognize regulated, acceptable criticality in readings of genealogy that need investigating. Derek Hook for an example, provokes further rumination on the (desired) uses of genealogy, writing that the “combative power” of genealogy should be deployed toward “oppositional knowledges capable of contestation” (2007 p. 142). I find and welcome the tension within this and other statements on genealogy that, to one reading bring different agendas to the generative potentials of genealogy when framing projects that go against some dominating truth, widespread belief or powerful institution. Yet as previously stated, Hook also describes a genealogy that should not work in a way that is a “straightforward head-to-head measuring up of ‘supposed truth’ with a ‘truer’ counter-

---

<sup>24</sup> Genealogy as a method toward its own undoing will also destabilize foundations and assumptions about genealogy itself, along with the topic(s) of the particular genealogical project/sabotage.

<sup>25</sup> Unquestionably I am at times both knowingly and unknowingly participating in and reproducing foundational assumptions referred to here, not least by my struggles to express and experiment with and for abolition as the end of the world as we know it (da Silva, 2014; Miller & Miller, 2020) in multiple variations that consider and enact imaginings that (attempt to) attend to that which is excessive of routine and even radical pedagogies when, again following Rodriguez, these efforts are “capable of even remotely *justifying, defending, or tolerating* a proto-genocidal prison regime that is without precedent or peer” (2008 p. 8, emphasis in original).

example” (ibid. p. 142). With this, the task then becomes holding tensions and even contradictions. One such tension I commonly find in writings on genealogy, exemplified with Hook and even Ben-Moshe, as well as in my own attempts, is in the recognition and reckoning with pressures to effect change through appeals to predetermined, established parties and institutions. To attempt an appeal such as this, alternative and innovative as it may be, is to defang genealogy’s potential and “ultimately re-form the violences attempting to be mitigated” (Miller & Miller, 2020 p. 385) by such efforts.

\* \* \*

Genealogy as methodological approach to this project largely emerged through my engagement with research being produced on educational reform, inclusion, school violence, at-risk students, and the STPP framework. I was thinking about mundane violence in schools and naturalized violence of education, seeking to stay with while getting beyond what is often the sensational and shocking. Yet so much of what I came across was centered on examples of what are currently recognized as more obvious and up-front instances of direct violence, “where the actor(s) and object(s) of violence are readily identifiable” (Ho, 2007 p. 3), such as physical combat and/or aggressive and threatening language (e.g. Klein, 2018; Ralph, 2018; Watts, 2020). My intention for this thesis was to explore often unacknowledged instances of violence, as well as resistance, in educational institutions. This quickly became a study of the mechanisms of control and punishment, not just of those individuals and groups deemed violent, but how violence itself is and comes to be understood and how these parameters become and remain naturalized.

“If it is the case that the task of genealogy is to take what is known to us already, often in abundance, and know it otherwise, then we ought not be surprised to find ourselves in the

archives, tracing contingencies, mapping disruptions and dislocations, and generally finding the resources to redescribe the dominant description” (Dilts, 2017 p. 71).

## ABOLITION GENEALOGY

This thesis is an abolitionist project focusing on components contained in and excessive from the framing of the STPP. Thus, it follows that in being influenced by various genealogies and in experimenting with an undercommon study, an abolition genealogy would begin to form as a contribution to the ongoing plans of the undercommons. A main contributor to my thinking with genealogy (specifically related to abolition and disability), Liat Ben-Moshe, writes that “genealogy does not prescribe political aims, or draft formulas for alternative futures” (2011 p. 121). The potential usefulness of a plan that refuses the obvious goal of pursuing new agendas is in its intention. What might it be to stay with “the unbearable precarity of intention” (da Silva, 2017a)? to take literally these uncertain imaginings and ways of moving/remaining? particularly in the face of such overt violence described within the STPP framework? with so many urgent calls to respond within predetermined registers? with demands made of individuals and institutions to make recognizable change to recognizable violence?

Those committed to study without end, with a plan to be ‘absolute about abolition,’ exist with and for a radical openness. This openness of the undercommons is “unconditional - the door swings open for refuge even though it may let in police agents and destruction” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 38). So when we open ourselves to precarities and potentials - or rather, when we cease working toward and sustaining illusions of fixity and certainty regarding fundamental knowledges which Sharon Stein (2019a) describes as “a colonial habit of being” (n.p.) - we make ourselves open to good and bad, to gifts as well as to wounds and to no longer being concerned in the same ways with the value given to either (Desideri & Harney, 2013). This radical openness applies to letting go of valuing

any genealogical material above another (Ward, 2007). Again, this unconditionality can bring in trouble, and it is with an unstrategic presence that could make possible a generative trouble.

Of those committed to study without end, their vulnerability is “uncollegial, impractical, naïve, unprofessional” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 28). Conclusions are drawn about them that, without strategy, “they are not practical, not serious about change, not rigorous, not productive” (ibid. p. 39). Strategy here is distinct from planning, from intention. Strategy, understood with Desideri & Harney (2013), is based on an understanding that the future can be presently determined; can be “made singular and worked toward, predicted, managed, hedged” (p. 160). The strategist works toward change, proposes and finds it in policy (see Policy chapter). Writing on genealogy, Ben-Moshe proposes that “a political commitment focused on policy changes or any specific prescription for change would further reinforce the administration of everyday life by the state” (2011 p. 122). This interpretation of (obscured) consequences of the use of actionable change contributes to the usefulness of genealogy as a way of suspending solutions within a typical conceptualization of a worthy/achievable goal, and to a better understanding of reform. Further, the state is recognized in this thesis as that which includes and exceeds institutions and apparatuses within/of the “political organization of a country,”<sup>26</sup> leaving open and making account for the myriad, mundane ways the state is reproduced, reinforced, and lived in individuals (Heckert, 2014).

With this there are different approaches to what might be an abolition genealogy in conceptualizing parameters/ends (e.g. of the state; of a self) and with that, considerations of just what needs abolishing (e.g. the state; a self; strategy). In a 1950 essay titled “Why Do Men Fight and Destroy Each Other?” Laurence Labadie writes:

“...not only [is] armed warfare [an] unavoidable concomitant of the division of people into nations, but also that individual liberty and wellbeing requires the abolition of the State, no

---

<sup>26</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: [https://www.etymonline.com/word/state#etymonline\\_v\\_24422](https://www.etymonline.com/word/state#etymonline_v_24422)

matter what form it takes. The State itself, your State, is the enemy...To be governed is, by definition, to be coerced" (2014 pp. 135-136).

This militant position against the state is troubled, or expanded, when considering the embodying of state practices/logics on an individual level. Harney & Moten (2013), in writing on governance, expand this (internalized) coercion: "Unlike previous regimes of sovereignty, there is no predetermined interest (no nation, no constitution, no language) to be realized collectively. Rather interests are solicited, offered up, and accumulated...the imposition of self-management becomes imperative. That imposition is governance" (p. 54-55). In other words, if the state (commonly associated with government, police, military and the economic powers they constitute/impose) is the enemy to (attempts at and dreams of) freedom by its multitude of restrictive impositions and efforts to conserve a particular formation and understanding of order, but the state is also felt and expressed in thoughts and actions of individuals (challenging just who is an agent of the state), then again the enemy we face is illusory (ibid.). Here there is no fixed enemy, no static self, no determinable future and thus to employ strategy is to perpetuate various manifestations of carcerality.

"An intention," on the other hand, "is not some kind of wish for the future, on the contrary it operates and changes directly the present" (Desideri & Harney, 2013 p. 161). Thus, a particular usefulness of genealogy is being vigilant and intentional to staying with the present rather than strategizing for a future, to being open to multiple interpretations of a moment. Vigilance, along with a certain conviction for the genealogical experiment, is required not just in light of the meticulous work of an abundant archive, but also because of the conclusions drawn about "not [being] practical, not serious about change, not rigorous, not productive" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 39) when not committed to a political or prescriptive strategy. With this then, abolition need not be in the register of the political. Johanna Hedva (2020), for instance, problematizes the political when discussing those who are not/cannot be recognized as political beings because of their being in bed

with disability/chronic illness rather than in public (discussed further below and in the Fugitivity chapter with crip).

Genealogy is not work separate from, outside of, or antagonistic toward, but instead includes homogenous understandings, recognizable goals, measurable changes, policies and reforms. This inclusion is not the only or even the main focus, however, nor is it an elaborating or extending of these ideas/actions. Inclusion does not imply acceptance (of the reform or call for change, nor of the stated intent or assumed logic), nor opposition. This genealogy supports something other than being for or against reform. This genealogy is an experiment in prefiguring, an outlaw planning (see the Fugitivity chapter), a speculative practice as study in movement (see the Study chapter).

“...planning in the undercommons is not an activity, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the futural presence of the forms of life that make such activities possible” (Harney & Moten, 2013 pp. 74-75).

Here is an intention and use of an abolition genealogy. The typical (expected) and even progressive (alternative) calls for action and change are refused. With an unfolding understanding of an abolition without end, named above as study without end, ideas of being critical as much as ideas of reason and rationale lie within the scope of this refusing. The refusal is guided in part by Rodriguez’s (2010) call to make distinctions from any pedagogical approach that is not making abolitionist attempts “to generate new epistemic and intellectual approaches to meaning, knowledge, learning, and practice for the sake of life, liberation, and new social possibilities” (p. 89). Connectedly, Harney & Moten (2013) write about distinguishing “between the desire to correct and the desire to plan with others” (p. 82). With schools as part of the PIC, the desire to correct is explicit. But those deemed to be in need of correction are not inherently flawed, incapable, or unwilling, there are conditions (e.g. surveillance, policing, standardized expectations) that create the at-risk student (Policy chapter). Recognizing the movements in these differences of approach and intention are necessary when



attending to the vastness (topically and scalarly) of the STPP archive as well as in the demands of fugitivity, genealogy, and abolition. An intention with this thesis is to experiment with the radical potentials of genealogy in its multiple and mutating understandings.

These many interpretations and corresponding agendas for the use of genealogy allow and are taken up in this experimenting – not only within a use for engaging before and beyond the STPP framework, but also within and excessive of genealogy itself. This is an unconditional openness that the undercommons allows and requires, an abolition of a knowing in certainty and the many vulnerabilities and dangers that come along with such an (im)position. And this is the excess in working with the STPP framework through genealogies, with the undercommons and others whom I am studying with. Valentina Desideri, in conversation with Harney, discusses the vulnerability created when refusing the work of securing a future to instead struggle with the unknown, experimental, actionable work of building presents. Desideri says:

“the unstrategic opening of vulnerability allows us to sense the present differently, to perceive the potential fates in the present, to perform multiple readings. And from this very concrete practice other perception emerges, other thoughts, other realities, other politics and other futures.” (2013 p. 166).

Returning to Hook’s writing on genealogy as a critical research method, there is much aligned with the plural truths made recognizable in an unconditional openness described in *The Undercommons* and from Desideri. Disinterested in a critical project of knowledge production, Hook draws on Foucault to find “operative, action-directed ‘truths,’ capable of opposition and/or resistance” in genealogy, “rather than ‘truths’ of a static or merely factual variety” (2007, p. 142 emphasis in original). Yet in wanting to contribute to a “counter-evidence that cannot simply be dismissed” Hook forms genealogical research into something “tactical rather than unconditional” (ibid.). The tactical here reads as a strategizing which would position itself apart from an unconditional, vulnerable

undercommon openness. But read with Hartman (2008), the project of offering counter-evidence (through producing a counter-history) can go beyond an opposition to prevailing and prevalent understandings. This counter is a working toward experimentally and obliquely describing an ongoing insurgency excessive of dominant, persistent modes of thought and research.

“The necessity of trying to represent what we cannot, rather than leading to pessimism or despair must be embraced as the impossibility that conditions our knowledge of the past and animates our desire for a liberated future” (ibid. p. 13).

Here Hartman’s liberated future as part of an undercommon openness is read along with Desideri and Harney’s discussion (2013) of plural futures that emerge from the concrete practices of perceiving potentials in unfixed, uncertain, and multiple presents. An abolition-based genealogy, in not being equipped or interested in finding truer truths or strategizing for a better future based on past and current occurrences and understandings is a means of study with and for precarity, unknowns, being suspicious of what is known and the intention to conserve rather than restore. This is a project experimenting with the “unbearable precarity of intention” (da Silva, 2017a).

This thesis deals with the violences conceptualized in and excessive of the STPP framework, and a major point of focus (whether overt or not) within that framework is on securing a future. Depending on the approach of those involved, there are generally two different tactics. The first is in securing a future that maintains the prominence and dominance of institutionalized education. The attempts at securing this future necessarily foreclose opportunities of imagining liberation beyond dictionary definitions. Those who take up this role are those in positions named as helpful, supportive, protective and necessary (e.g. teachers, counselors, SROs). This attempt at securitization is done through prediction in the present, under dominant modes of value judgement that move with a fixed understanding of acceptable and unacceptable, or good and bad. The policy maker and

enforcer surveils/polices present conditions in order to find future criminality through what are currently minor aberrations.

The second way securing a future in and through schooling is with attempts at bettering conditions for students by targeting policy and practitioners that supply increasingly negative consequences for students who break and/or are punished for breaking rules/laws. As with policy makers/enforcers, this approach is an effort to stop current criminality that will lead students into the STPP, but it does so by (re)enforcing normative ideas and expectations of students to fit limited (not liberatory) roles. This is evident in STPP discourse that finds fault in and a target to criticize in the disciplining/criminalizing of what is largely understood to be normal and expected behavior from school-aged children (e.g. Ripley, 2016).

Further with this second approach which is more focused on student safety and experience, the student is also a part of their own problem because the student is in need of help, repair, and/or specialized attention from teachers/counselors in order to better fit an accepted standardized expression. One such standardized expectation is on and in disabled students to, very plainly, become non-disabled, or at least strive to their closest approximation (Sauder, 2015)<sup>27</sup>. This is another way of describing what Eli Clare (1999) (and others) name 'supercrip,' which describes the desired/expected inspiring story of disabled people 'overcoming' their disability. Though often well-intentioned, this does the work of solidifying dominant "notions of whose bodies are considered valuable, desirable, and disposable" (Mingus, 2011).

As I write this there are more and more demands being made to get police out of schools, which is an issue within a wider call to defund police departments and a wider call yet to abolish police

---

<sup>27</sup> Disability in schools is a very complex issue and points within the issue will be discussed further in *Fugitivity*, such as the racialization of who gets labeled as disabled; the attempted distancing of other marginalized, criminalized, and targeted groups; the (mis)treatment of disabled students. Further, the refusals, resistances, and fugitivity of disabled students that is excessive of narrow narratives will be emphasized in discussions of crip.

entirely. And more than negative demands to get rid of, these are guided by abolitionists or those taking up the abolitionist call to demand the reallocation of funding to other resources that are better set to provide support and desired services. Yet when demands are made for #CounselorsNotCops, as if that will be an answer to these violences perpetuated by SROs/police, there is an adherence to ideas that self-governance should be established, maintained, and fixed, in and by those recognized as needing counselors<sup>28</sup>. In other words, the future strategized from STPP reforms still adhere to ways of thinking, imagining, behaving and expressing that maintain the function of policing even if the wielder of the gun and the badge are not there.

Abolition genealogy is interested in the undoing of futures, and thus opens up/allows for/demands experimentation with and for liberated futural presents. The intention to attend to different and multiple fates is needed even and especially when present conditions seem and are overwhelming and horrific. That students, teachers, community members, activists, organizers, anarchists and others are demanding school districts rid their schools of police officers is amazing and inspiring. Yet the conditions from which these radical demands have emerged from and caught on to a huge collective across the US and around the world (with recognition and respect to the long history of grassroots abolitionist organizing, planning and living otherwise) are devastating. People come together under immense, unbearable conditions of duress to fight, to mourn, to plan, to learn, to commune. The cruelty under which people come together, as indescribably brutal and painful as it is, becomes less important than the coming together itself. It is not the cops that bring people out to the streets in radical, mobile, fugitive forms of congregation, they do not get that much credit. And the organizing for #PoliceFreeSchools for example, is also less about the police and more about the organizing and collective struggle in imagining and creating liberated futures and presencing them.

---

<sup>28</sup> The abolitionist demand is about policing (not just police), and so #PoliceFreeSchools might be too narrow an approach (though it carries great potential). Considering policing and police, #PoliceFreeSchools is quite different than #CounselorsNotCops (though there is the potential for the latter to contribute in important ways to abolitionist futures).

In talking about the relationship between struggle and joy, Moten has spoken about Manolo Callahan's phrase of "renewing our habits of assembly" (2015 n.p.). This imagining of why and how we fight is brought up in another discussion from Moten about protest and activist organizing. He says: "The way you organize, and the way you fight is really not so much about them as it is about us, you know?" (2018 n.p.). So again, it is not the police that bring us together nor is it our antagonistic relation to those who act on behalf of policy. Those seeking liberation have been and are finding each other not because of but despite the oppressive events and mundane realities that constitute the carceral conditions that permeate "the most taken-for-granted features of everyday social life, including 'family,' 'community,' 'school,' and 'individual social identities'" (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 7). Moten continues: "These antagonisms create for us, constantly the conditions to renew, what our old good friend Manolo Callahan would say, these create conditions for us to renew our habits of assembly" (2018 n.p.). These habits of assembly will be further discussed in the Fugitivity chapter, particularly with considerations of gathering and wandering. Elaborating on "re-learning the habits of assembly, and fostering anti-capitalist social relations" Callahan (2017 n.p.) emphasizes, in terms used so far in this thesis, the need of working "to perceive the potential fates in the present, to perform multiple readings" (Desideri & Harney, 2013 p. 166) in an uncommon openness that expands what is imaginable and achievable rather than continuing an education system that advances a settler colonial project.

"If we only focus our efforts on disrupting formal education as an industrial tool, we lose sight of other vernacular and oppositional knowledge practices and spaces of learning that could potentially undermine and eventually go beyond the authority of the subject/object relationship, the celebration of the individual, and imposition of capitalist command" (Callahan, 2017 n.p.).

Put another way: "We get together to fight. What are we fighting for? We're fighting to maintain our capacity to get together" (Moten, 2018 n.p.). Here might be a knowing at the limits of justice (da

Silva, 2013b). A crucial part of this fight and renewal comes from disabled, crip, mad, neurodivergent and/or chronically ill people who out of necessity have been finding ways to find each other through and within the carcerality of an inaccessible world. Here Johanna Hedva's Sick Woman Theory (2016) provides important and often unconsidered provocations on what it is to protest when chronically ill and/or disabled. On coming to terms with Sick Woman Theory, Hedva writes:

“So, as I lay there, unable to march, hold up a sign, shout a slogan that would be heard, or be visible in any traditional capacity as a political being, the central question of Sick Woman Theory formed: How do you throw a brick through the window of a bank if you can't get out of bed?” (n.p.).

Whether in the streets or in their bed, at the protest in person or over the internet, the next chapter elaborates on these fugitive movements toward and as abolition. *Disability Incarcerated: Imprisonment and Disability in the United States and Canada* (Ben-Moshe, Chapman, & Carey, 2014) brings together “seemingly distinct and unrelated sites of mass incarceration” (p. x) like prisons, detention centers, Canadian Indian Residential schools, public schools, institutionalization in/and psychiatric institutions including asylums, hospitals, and nursing homes, to demonstrate how the functions of institutional care (e.g. psychiatry) and containment (e.g. criminal justice) are inseparable. Further than physical sites, the text discusses ideologies/logics that manifest into carceral geographies like prisons and schools, such as the interconnectedness of ableism, nationalism, and white supremacy. As with this thesis, the content of this book can feel daunting and horribly violent – yet the authors in this edited book also name, highlight, allude to, and offer hints at reading histories and ongoing efforts of resistance and refusal to institutions and institutionalization; to mundane violences so often put forward as distribution of care<sup>29</sup>. In considering the treatment of and ‘treatments’ for disabled/crip, neurodivergent/mad people in

---

<sup>29</sup> As Fabris & Aubrecht (2014) write: “People considered less than deserving of rights, like those considered ‘mad’ or ‘ill,’ are not only arrested or detained, but are medically impaired and told to stay on ‘medication’ for the purpose of control” (p. 189).

psychiatric institutions/asylums and through eugenic science, for instance, the authors connect regimes of care<sup>30</sup> to the PIC.

But what's more, these moments of horror (the conditions we get together to fight) are, for the most part, easy to recognize and be opposed to (even if not being against them, thinking geographically, physically, etc.). Here is where distinguishing between abolitionist refusals and reformist reforms (however radical/fringe) brings importance. Here is where Harney & Moten's insistence that our enemy is illusory (2013) and what we fight is more of a self-defense so as to "maintain our capacity to get together" in renewed and enhanced "habits of assembly". As Moten elaborates:

"Sometimes there's a kind of righteousness and kind of moral purity that people can imagine they have attained, strictly as a function of the evil of their object, the evil of their antagonist, and I think that's a dangerous pathway to go...Doesn't mean don't fight them, but when we're fighting them we're really dealing with ourselves" (2018 n.p.).

The acceptance and attempts at securing a standardized future based on a movement like #CounselorsNotCops would have sent a counselor to Alexa Gonzalez rather than police officers. Though materially different and presumably less immediately traumatizing (and so something that should swiftly and easily be implemented in any caring environment<sup>31</sup>), the need for Alexa to conform her expression to the expectations of school officials would remain. The outrage that Alexa's treatment received would never have affected people on the same scale and in the same ways had her actions been addressed/corrected by a school counselor. This outrage brought people

---

<sup>30</sup> Here I am thinking of regimes of care with Christina Sharpe (2016) who distinguishes care from "state-imposed regimes of surveillance" (n.p.). Sharpe asks in *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being* (ibid.): "How can we think (and rethink and rethink) care laterally, in the register of the intramural, in a different relation than that of the violence of the state?" (n.p.).

<sup>31</sup> As above and brought in more below, Adams & Erelles (2017) rightly identify institutions promoted as caring (i.e. educational institutions) to be unexpected (to some) spaces of confinement, especially for students "living at the dangerous intersections of race, class, gender and disability" p. 348).

together, but it was largely in relation to the actions of the teachers and officers involved, in defense of Alexa, and to fight against the Zero Tolerance policies that justified her arrest - the calls were for justice in the register of the criminal justice system. But a different reading is available, beyond “efforts on disrupting formal education as an industrial tool” (Calahan, 2017 n.p.), beyond the outrage which actually does the work of accepting and perpetuating the fundamental differentiation of normal and abnormal, acceptable and unacceptable behavior. This reading, following Harney (n.d.) understands that Alexa Gonzalez is guilty.

The punishment was less about the desk than it was about Alexa’s lack of properly understanding and treating property, which had to be punished and made an example of. Because she had not properly learned/been educated to respect property, a foundational certainty was threatened<sup>32</sup>. This may be a small example, but the force brought to the response to Alexa’s little deviation is a demonstration of the major risk that was posed by not showing proper interest and was thus made to be at-risk. Though the primary efforts were within and abiding an unjust criminal justice system, those who came to the defense of Alexa were showing that property is not the ultimate thing needing protecting. Alexa exposed the fragile lie of property and the proper that predicates so much pain, suffering, destruction and death.

#### ABOLITIONIST GENEALOGY

The work most explicitly influencing my experimenting with an abolition genealogy toward abolition pedagogies is Andrew Dilts who has written on the method and philosophical practice of Abolitionist Genealogy (2017), which seeks to “draw simultaneously on genealogies of abolitionist projects and

---

<sup>32</sup> See the Policy and Call to Order chapters for a larger discussion on property, specifically in relation to institutional education as a fundamental component of the continuing settler colonial project of the US. Through brutalities in and around American Indian boarding schools, pedagogical processes of individuation imposed notions of property and the proper that persist today.



re-read non-abolitionist projects in a motivated fashion” (p. 51). Dilts encourages over-reading and critical fabulation as key components to liberatory genealogies that endeavor to explain “what could have been otherwise and *how* conditions came to be what they are” (ibid. p. 72). Over-reading is integral to genealogy’s vast amount and assortment of “entangled and confused parchments” (Foucault, 1977). Following Saidiya Hartman, critical fabulation illuminates the “contested character of history, narrative, event, and fact, to topple the hierarchy of discourse, and to engulf authorized speech in the clash of voices” (2008, p. 12). In reading Dilts’ abolitionist genealogy with the STPP framework, this thesis includes and expands with the explicit context of being with and for queer, trans, gender-nonconforming, and intersex people of color who are impacted by the PIC, to research and further contest the histories and events that supported such occurrences, institutions and systems.

Dilts describes carceral mechanisms of prisons as well as academic institutions/disciplines that, though operating differently, make or keep critical genealogists absent from being recognized as contributors to knowledge/theorization, and as critical genealogists themselves. Both prisons and academic institutions have carceral practices – the workings of and literal walls of a prison (and the corresponding surveillance measures that extend beyond, for those on court-ordered probation for example) are more obvious inhibiting and suppressing forces to (what becomes deemed) challenging, unregulated, fugitive expression, than an institution of formal education. Prisons also have more obviously brutal means of regulating expression, controlling movement, and punishing<sup>33</sup> than do schools – though there are many analogous claims from STPP critics and, with Dilts, critical genealogists who are immediately impacted by what the STPP framework begins to describe, that conceptually identify features of prisons in features of schools. Angel L., a Washington D.C. high

---

<sup>33</sup> The regulation of expression, the control of movement and acts of punishment include direct, immediate and recognizable violence and the threat thereof, as well as not-as-obvious, coercive and systemic violence that, amplified within the walls of prison, permeate and constitute institutional life outside (e.g. in schools and families).

school student, described the checkpoint and storage lockers in place upon entering school: “Coming in the building feels like turning in my stuff before entering a jail cell” (Critical Exposure, 2014 n.p.)<sup>34</sup>.



*Figure 2: Photograph by Washington D.C. high school student Angel L. for the Critical Exposure project documenting student experiences with the School-to-Prison Pipeline.*

*[Image description: The right side of the picture shows light blue numbered lockers. The left side shows a person seated at a desk with their back to the camera and a red jacket on the chair. To their left stands a student facing the seated person, whose features are difficult to discern. Beyond them is an exit sign and a set of doors that lead to another set of doors.]*

<sup>34</sup> This is the caption of a photo taken by Angel L. through a program from Critical Exposure, a group in Washington D.C. that, through photography, supports local youth to “think critically about their schools and communities and document issues that affect their lives” (Critical Exposure, n.d.). Angel L.’s photo, titled The Lockers, was taken in the 2013-2014 academic school year and begins a series of images under the banner School to Prison Pipeline on the Critical Exposure website. Available at: <https://criticalexposure.org/gallery/School-to-Prison-Pipeline>

This analysis of the everyday conditions of some students in US public schools highlights the never clearly delineated nor fixed inside and outside of carceral geographies, institutions, and procedures. The tangible walls of a prison do not contain the carceral practices said to be reserved for the criminal. To highlight and bring back a key figure in my work before and beyond the STPP framework, particularly regarding abolition pedagogies, Dylan Rodriguez (2010), articulates that “at its farthest institutional reaches, the prison has developed a capacity to organize and disrupt the most taken-for-granted features of everyday social life, including ‘family,’ ‘community,’ ‘school,’ and individual social identities” (p. 7). This organizing and disrupting is reproduced, reinforced, and lived in individuals (Heckert, 2014) in part through the literal and figurative walls of academic disciplines, and it is this abolitionist understanding of the prison (far different than the understanding of the site and symbol of the prison that is circulated by the prison system itself) that reflects the attempts and experiments of abolition genealogies, abolition geographies (Gilmore, 2017b), and abolition pedagogies in this thesis. Brought in later in the Study chapter, the cop-in-the-head is relevant to include here when considering the different ways carceral institutions (for instance the prison, as well as the less apparent academic institutions/disciplines [Dilts, 2017]) are understood from and within the PIC, absorbed intellectually/emotionally/psychically, and mobilized personally/societally through being policed, self-policing, and policing others. Thus, conceptions of and efforts at abolishing the PIC include the individualized, internalized workings of carcerality, and discussed later, the very notion of an individuated self.

“When we say abolish police. We also mean the cop in your head and in your heart”  
(Tourmaline, 2020).

Though disciplined and silenced by disciplinary norms and targeted by institutional practices, these critical genealogists (Dilts, 2017) doing the work no matter what it is misnamed, are around, in and being called to the fugitive public (Harney & Moten, 2013). These delinquent and disengaged students whose various and often difficult-to-detect refusals to uphold violent conditions that

permeate their (school) lives make them “both illegible and dangerous within a liberal framework” (Sojoyner, 2017 p. 518). But what the fugitive public does is conserve rather than restore, fix, or reform, and the conservation is always new because the refusals are “beyond justice, beyond law” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 64). Institutional practices variously attempt to fix the delinquent through the restoration of a very particular form of order. In schools this restoration is often attempted by removing (isolating, excluding, suspending, or expelling) the students who demonstrate illegible and dangerous expressions to this (highly policed, illusion of) order. Restoration does not approach the limits of justice, partly because it is an attempt at re/integrating deviant expressions via their exclusions.

In writing on abolitionist genealogy Dilts found examples of the fugitive public through reading some of whom are engaged in projects not explicitly abolitionist as not just contributing to or being subject to the research of others, but in being critical genealogists themselves, “not simply because their experience validates their claims, but because they have done the work...of identifying the contingencies that have been naturalized by institutional arrangements” (2017 p. 61).

Another reading of critical genealogists in the fugitive public is with Damien Sojoyner’s conceptualizations of the refusal and disengagement of Black male youth in Los Angeles, CA. Elaborated on in the Fugitivity chapter, Sojoyner challenges a seemingly unquestionable understanding of the formal US education system when he asks “what damage is done by reinforcing a narrative that Black students should not drop out of school?” (2017 p. 516). Sojoyner raises fundamental challenges to the “liberal tropes of freedom and democratic belonging” by finding in disavowal, disengagement and refusal, expressions of Black Fugitivity as “an understanding of education as one of the key sources of support for forms of structural oppression” (ibid. pp. 516-517). The multiple readings of an event, a pattern, a movement such as that which is confined to a normative understanding such as delinquent and/or disengaged student is a useful example of what I strive for in my genealogical endeavor. Multiple readings are also excessive in that there will be

readings that cannot be read yet because, again, words don't go there - but we're all up in it anyway (Moten, 2004). There are also readings that cannot yet be heard, or spoken, or otherwise communicated as one might perceive – so there are readings that cannot be contained, should not be contained, but space should still be made by us, in the breaths between sentences, paragraphs, and pages, to know that this too is a limitation and simultaneous offering with the potential to both open and close space, where necessary.

## 4

**FUGITIVITY**

“Fugitives are ruled by unruliness, which is no rule at all, but rather a movement in which life is garnered, in which the improper thrives due to its obstinacy. Refusing to sit still, refusing to settle, refusing to commit to being is the fugitive’s lot” (Bey, 2019c p. 16).

“The movement of things can be felt and touched and exists in language and in fantasy, it is flight, it is motion, it is fugitivity itself. Fugitivity is not only escape...” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 11).

Fugitivity, and the one of many who would be captured in the formulation of the fugitive, describes an act of and actor who flees<sup>35</sup>. The fleeing is often from the law, and from the justice that the law and its enforcement claim. This capturing is a conceptual one in that the designation of fugitive indicates a momentary lack of law enforcement in the ever-present presence of Law Enforcement for those expressions that escape and are sought, for they who exist outside/beyond the rule of law. Synonyms for fugitive include both an escapee as well as momentary, as in a momentary escapee<sup>36</sup>. The pervasive use of a fugitive being somebody escaping the law, with connotations of a temporary state of being, works to reinforce the notion of an original and necessary law of which that somebody has gone against.

Discussed and alluded to within this chapter and throughout this thesis, the misrecognition and/or misnaming of refusal as reactionary resistance, deviance, truancy, delinquency, etc., works to

---

<sup>35</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at:  
[https://www.etymonline.com/word/fugitive#etymonline\\_v\\_14234](https://www.etymonline.com/word/fugitive#etymonline_v_14234)

<sup>36</sup> An internet search for fugitive displays definitions, synonyms, and example sentences containing fugitive.

substantiate and represent the law as that of which one is to be one within, lest one become an outlaw. Yet the outlaw has been around, already here, already moving (Harney & Moten, 2013). The law is in reaction to those who would represent criminality, whose 'can't' and 'won't' shapes fugitivity. This shaping of expression as deviant by and for policy and law seeks to justify future punishment (e.g. they broke the law) and preemptive policing (e.g. surveilling for and disciplining minor offenses). This correctional attitude of schooling establishes schools as correctional institutions. An example is the previously discussed Zero Tolerance policies which are part of particular mandates schools must adhere to in order to receive federal funding, which mandate predetermined punishments for students determined to have misbehaved/broken a rule, no matter the situational context (Aull, 2012). Zero Tolerance policies are criticized as contributing to the increased criminalization of student (mis)conduct where previous in-school discipline is increasingly handled by the police which (continues to) disproportionately target disabled/crip, neurodivergent/mad, poor, queer, Black, Brown and/or American Indian students (e.g. Meiners, 2007; Watts and Erevelles, 2004). This does the work of shaping students suspected to become or perceived to be misbehaving as (at least potential) criminals (Rose, 1985) which is a large contributing factor as to why Zero Tolerance is a primary focus within the STPP framework. Yet the focus on law and policy becomes a distraction from insidious, systemic violences (a theme of the STPP framework). It is also a distraction away from the refusals of the fugitive, with those seeking policy change finding criminalized students as victims of over-policing and trapped in an education system that has strayed too far from its apparent intent<sup>37</sup>. This chapter is an attempt at attending to (rather than defining/capturing) fugitive moments and movements.

Discussed in the Study chapter, those who 'can't' and/or are understood as being unable/disabled are often confronted with quarantine and other enclosed spaces (Erevelles, 2014; Sojoyner, 2013;

---

<sup>37</sup> On the other end of the argument, there are those who understand the police to be victims of unfair treatment by the press and/or students. This is an important point within the debates surrounding the STPP, with many blaming/finding faults in students for disobeying orders and breaking rules, and thus being deserving of legal punishment/criminalization.

Selman, 2017). Discussed below, those who (are perceived and/or recognized as expressing a 'won't' face various punishments and manifestations of exclusionary spaces and pressures (Sojoyner, 2017; Omowale, 2013; Adams & Erevelles, 2017). As will be elaborated on specifically with factors within and around the STPP framework, the differences between enclosure and exclusion are quite blurred, yet in US public schools these enforcements and allotments have immediate, disproportionate, and long lasting consequences that the STPP framers and fighters have largely missed or avoided in pursuit of institutional recognition and reform. The student who lacks interests, who can't/won't be made interested in the choice's education has to offer neither seeks nor is given recognition and is thus not reformable, not governable. Rather than failing at integrating into a reactionary system whose actions are in resistance or response to fugitivity, the fugitive's is "a game-changing kind of refusal in that it signals the refusal of the choices as offered" which is generally "to refuse interpellation and the re-instantiation of the law" (Halberstam, 2013 pp. 8-9). Thus, resistance, deviance, truancy, delinquency, which are (mis)directed onto the fugitive's movements, have radical potentials to disrupt, transform and abolish the reactionary measures, understandings and manifestations of the terms/labels.

#### MISNAMING THE FUGITIVE

The order of the law is secondary to those who would be (mis)named fugitive, not the other way around. It is the law (e.g. vandalism; destruction of property) and those who variously regulate it (e.g. the police; school officials) that are reacting to what came before (e.g. expression before and beyond regulation). Not an original law broken, but an original lawlessness (Moten, 2007) that is not framed within nor traceable to a historical stage, and which is an ever-present (if not hidden) threat to what the Policy chapter elaborates as the illusion of modernity's ontological security (Stein, Hunt, Suša, & Andreotti, 2017), which here represents the foundation of law, policy, and the



enforcement/adherence thereof. The threat to the law was and is already there, before the law, and the risk of a break is only possible with its violent enforcement<sup>38</sup>. But here, before the law and an original lawlessness are not placed in a teleological register. The before is a failure of language or imagination. The before is misnamed. There is no accounting for those an original expressions and expressors. Reiterating the reaction that is the law and/or policy, Sojoyner writes that “as the historical and contemporary record has demonstrated, state power is neither omniscient nor is it a proactive force” (2017, p. 526). Discussed below, Sojoyner’s work on Black fugitivity and refusal simultaneously clarifies and blurs this undercommon study of the fugitive (student) who is misrecognized, of fugitivity as that which “escapes even the fugitive” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 50).

The fugitive is misnamed. Fugitive is one of many misnamings that the law as the way things are and should be asserts its own form as a correct and correcting force. This misnaming “manifests itself at the level of...law and the state which enforces this assumed criminality that a certain kind of intellectual formation produces the assumption of,” which develops as a process of learning that is recognizable in schools (Moten, 2013 n.p.). Fugitive need not always be explicitly named for those who embrace and are embraced by fugitivity to be outside of the law – the law which is also an attempted embrace, its long arms a constant experiment with the boundaries of its own reach (Rodriguez, 2017b). Indeed, as journalist, activist, and political prisoner since 1981, Mumia Abu-Jamal, makes clear:

“All of us live (whether inside or outside of the joint) in an age of unrivaled and unprecedented police power, where an arm of the state dictates public policy and directs public discourse along the lines of the expansion of its influence” (2000, p. 22).

The law being behind (chasing) the an original drive (misnamed as fugitive) is always in the process of re-instantiating itself and the methods/technologies used on and developed from that which it must

---

<sup>38</sup> Here I am asserting that both the general enforcement as well as the means in which enforcement is demonstrated and justified are enactments of violence.

always find itself in opposition to. Writing about the fugitive slave, Harney points out that conceptions of freedom are not mobilized in relation to/acceptance of oppressive systems/institutions.

“...the drive for freedom exceeds in ambition any forms of oppression that it confronts, making it both dangerous and productive of new oppressions” (Harney, n.d. n.p.).

The expression of fugitivity – discussed in this chapter specifically with Black fugitivity (Sojoyner, 2017; Harney & Moten, 2013) and what will be discussed as a crip fugitivity and the tangles among, between and beyond – instantiates the law which writes out (outlaws) those misnamed fugitives. The fugitive and those who are represented within the rubric which the law writes out is one of many misnaming’s, others in an educational imagination include but are not limited to criminal, delinquent, deviant, troublemaker, disordered, abnormal, at-risk.

“What we end up doing constantly is not just trying to refute the insult but have to figure a way to take on the insult as something other than itself” (Moten, 2013, n.p).

Fugitivity as an original lawlessness unsettles the law and its pursuits as that which determines and corrects that and those needing correction; disturbs the law calling for order – an order of which the laws enforcement makes tangible, felt on a physiological level as well as misheard, unspoken yet impactful at the level of affect. Fugitivity’s disruption repositions place rather than our location in it, as the law is not a call – it is the response. It is the reaction and reflection (echo) that names itself as the origin and requirement for policing the order it evokes. In a backwards seeming way it is criminality which introduces the law (Harney & Moten, 2013).

“...so let’s make some noise

Like deaths dragged across floors

for the mislabeled shorty’s

Who were never taught more

Whose frequent qualms with teachers pissed on their potential as leaders

Because they lacked the status quo

Of a calm, cultured demeanor...”

(School to Prison Pipeline Hip Hop Performance, 2014 n.p.).

Describing police presence in protests and demonstrations, Andre Lepecki (2013) understands the policing of movement as choreographic mastery, with the police defined as the force which “determines the space of circulation for protesters” (p. 16). These determinations and implementations often get manifested by way of blockade, dispersal, arrest, and/or detainment through asking, ordering, threatening, and/or physically forcing. Demonstrations and policing here are understood as exceeding marches, occupations and other more recognizable forms. There are movements (sometimes including the mere presence) of lawlessness that are imposed on students regardless of in/action. While not explicitly developed in his work, Lepecki’s choreopolicing is generative in thinking with how fugitivity is found in and escapes the STPP framework – choreopolicing as the regulation of movement “where to be is to fit a prechoreographed pattern of circulation, corporeality, and belonging” (ibid., 2013 p. 20). This includes and exceeds a protest or demonstration, is inscribed on particular bodies and expressions, and is an ‘impoverishment of choreographic imagination’ where the police-as-agent need not be present for the ‘daily choreography of conformity’ to be. Choreopolicing, as a general attempt at regulating circuits of movement, places those who do not/cannot conform to this predetermined ‘circulation, corporeality, and belonging’ as outside of reformable, governable existence, at which point the fugitive is (mis)identified. These (mis)identifications take various forms – for example, from the

ungovernable being portrayed as coming to their guilt from a place of innocence (e.g. the system failed them), or as fundamentally guilty (e.g. being born into guilt; the existence of bad people). Whatever the origin narrative, their guilt is secured, and also serves as a securing of the law, of prechoreographed movements and imaginings, through the fugitive's exclusion. As Abu-Jamal writes:

“If one may be properly projected as demonic, then the state may freely use extraordinary methods to deal with someone like me, someone who is seen as beyond the pale of humanity” (2000 pp. 22-23).

Fugitivity is an unsettling and repositioning of place. This redefining comes before the law and law enforcement positioning the fugitive as out of place, out of time, outside of the law and its inhibitory promises and practices of redemption, restoration, and inclusion. These promises are for those whose circulation is confined/controlled/permitted within institutional education. What place is there in the world shaped by law and order for the fugitive? The fugitive has no place, and can leave without going anywhere, is on the run and underground in an unconditional openness, in the nonplace of abolition (Harney & Moten, 2013).

An example of a repositioned place, one framed within the STPP as problematic when relying on punitive disciplinary measures, is the school and specifically the teaching act. Rodriguez (2010) articulates a naturalized, systemic disorientation that has taken place with the teaching act, contending that the conditions of schooling, education, pedagogy and teaching have become inhabited by, produced within and (re)produce the US prison regime<sup>39</sup>. With this, the teaching act is “no longer separable from the work of policing, juridical discipline, and state-crafted punishment

---

<sup>39</sup> Rodriguez (2010) discusses the prison regime as informal routines/protocols of white supremacist “militarized physiological domination over human beings held captive by the state” which is a fundamental (rather than consequential) “modality of social (dis)organization” “beyond the physical sites of imprisonment” which encompasses and circulates “multiple knowledges and meanings” of the prison. These are elaborated on as shaping, being shaped by and representing primary conditions for multiple ‘schooling regimes.’

(ibid. p. 8). More than circumstantial, this disorientation is a choreographed cleave, one which the STPP framework also (re)produces. This is recognizable in the numerous reforms which contribute to and are attempts at counteracting consequences of the policies and practices constituting the STPP framework.

Detailed below and further in the Policy chapter, South Carolina's recently reformed Disturbing Schools law highlights the work of policing which is fundamental to teaching. The Disturbing Schools law was an effective blank check, "permitting arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement" from school officials/SROs to determine/distribute punishment to students for any reason that could be argued brought about some kind of disturbance to or in school (Kenny v Wilson, 2016 p. 230). The reform came after a (brutal) demonstration of police force went viral, bringing attention to the over 100-year-old law, resulting in the firing of the single SRO involved, and the wording of Disturbing Schools altered to be less vague. These reforms "incorporate obedient and nonthreatening forms of racial, gender, and sexed difference to prevent the exposure and consequential undoing of highly oppressive forms of governance that are key to the liberal project" (Sojoyner, 2017 p. 521). Reform here is a project which reproduces and legitimates state power, in part through everyday discourses that place the school as a site where various pedagogical approaches and practices "invest in producing or edifying 'free' and self-governing citizen/subjects" (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 11). Here is a troubled notion of what it is to be free. A disorienting of freedom itself as that which is shaped by the promotion of movements (including and beyond the recognizable and/or corporeal) away from practices of a freedom not yet known (Lepecki, 2013), recognizable in the teaching act which artificially separates teaching from policing. A repositioning of freedom from the regulated distribution of students to "pre-assigned places for circulation"<sup>40</sup> (ibid. p. 20) under the generalized rhetoric of schools being places of (upward social) mobility. That these examples are mundane occurrences might represent the nonthreatening inclusion of fugitive movement, expression, and

---

<sup>40</sup> Discussed differently in the Call to Order chapter with wandering and gathering.

embodiment in reforms which remove “any structural analysis and [are] intensely focused on individual behaviors” (Sojoyner, 2017 p. 245).

In South Carolina, the event and ensuing media coverage that temporarily sparked a mainstream debate of educational policy and law in the US, a result of which reformed the institutional state violence of the Disturbing Schools law, involved a Black female student and a white male SRO. The initial influx of stories, articles, commentaries included a wide range of discussions centering on, including, as well as avoiding race and racism in schools, in policing, and in law. Yet the coverage of the resulting reform arriving 2 years later was both comparably miniscule in the amount of material produced and attention given, as well as in the content of the news stories. The obedience Sojoyner describes was so extensive that any mention of race and racism was almost entirely erased from the coverage. The primary exception here being the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which is the organization that filed a federal lawsuit against the state of South Carolina regarding this and similar Disturbing Schools charges (2016). While race and disability were central and explicit in the reasoning for suing, so too was the reliance on generalized conceptions of normal adolescent behaviors and development – attempting to decriminalize movements in a legal understanding while simultaneously calling for more appropriate corrections to be administered by school officials<sup>41</sup> (American Civil Liberties Union, 2017). The lawsuit was also framed within an understanding that the police/SROs are in schools to protect students – claiming inconsistencies between job descriptions and the discriminatory, excessive actions of officers, disproportionately toward Black South Carolina students who in 2014-15 were almost four times as likely to have a Disturbing Schools referral than their white classmates, and/or disabled students who are also disproportionately more likely to face exclusionary discipline than their non-disabled classmates (Kenny v Wilson, 2016). With an abolitionist understanding, what tends to be recognized as excessive force from police is not just

---

<sup>41</sup> Attending to and contending with what are often calls for common sense disciplinary practices and practitioners, discussion of policing beyond the police officer are offered throughout this thesis – a pertinent example being #CounselorsNotCops in the previous chapters, as well in the Call to Order chapter which includes elaboration on policing and counseling.

demonstrated in exceptional circumstances (e.g. events captured on video that are recognizably violent), nor just legally permissible (it is rare that police/SROs are indicted/found guilty of wrongdoing), but is also a necessary (and naturalized) function of the state.

Further, the ACLU lawsuit and ensuing reform was touted as eliminating one of the main causes of the STPP for the state (Disturbing Schools) – mobilizing a policy-centered problem/solution formulation. This was done in part by debates and comments centering around the merits of this specific reformed law, as well as isolating events and individualizing actions of particular students and officers (Hinger, 2018). Here again, the law and its reform (a collaborative negotiation with the ongoing experimentation of the law's reach), is in reaction to expressions that have become naturalized as disturbing/disorderly.

“The glaring problem with the STPP’s framework is that it never accounts for the possibility that the structure of public education is responding to the actions taken by Black students that are perceived to threaten the status quo” (Sojoyner, 2013 p. 245).

More than resembling each other in certain (pedagogical, policing) practices of ordering, regulating, and enforcing circuits of movement for particular expressions, the prison and the school ‘talk’ to each other (Harney & Moten, 2013) and other state (influenced) institutions (e.g. hospitals, corporations, community, family). Staying with a fugitive movement and breaking from the trajectory of school-to-prison, public education in this sense has a lot to say regarding the expansion of the PIC/US prison regime. Rather than schools being training grounds for prison for students at-risk of becoming or found within a register of the fugitive, rather than schools bringing in carceral technologies from prisons, Sojoyner (2016) describes the school as foregrounding technologies of control that would be later incorporated in prison.

More than talking to (and about) each other, the cultural symbols of school and prison exist in a ‘structural symbiosis’ where the “prison regime is the assumptive premise of classroom teaching

generally” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 14). The physical sites of the school and of the prison connected by a metaphorical pipeline - as has been discussed in the STPP chapter, with further elaborations connecting enclosure offered below - creates a false image and artificial distinction.

#### FUGITIVITY & MOVEMENT

Sojoyner contributes and expands on fugitivity by way of his conceptualizations on refusal and disengagement. This is a generative and multifaceted refusal and disengagement, often misnamed by state agents (official or deputized) as resistance connoting an against, rather than before-the-law. Sojoyner’s project is specifically engaged with Black fugitivity and Black education within the context of Black male youth in Los Angeles, CA (2017). While framing a localized context, this Black fugitivity advances understandings of (perceived, imposed, misnamed) movements, expressions, and behaviors that are not only written out of the law (outlawed), but in imagining and enacting alternative social visions, Black fugitivity poses a risk to exposing and undoing violent state processes that, in part, work to solidify and naturalize the outlaw status of student disengagement.

Disengagement in an educational context might be recognized as tardiness, failing grades, or truancy. Yet these fugitive expressions are not legible within juridically framed concepts of what constitute appropriate behavior in the liberal project of legitimating state power through regulating conceivable movement. This disengagement is an enactment/inaction and a study with and all wrapped up in Black feminist fugitivity which refuses summation (Campt, 2014; Spillers & Gumbs, 2017).

”...there is this Black/feminist/fugitive force that exists, or rather *moves*, before the designation of Blackness as abject and evil. It is an escape that always, and already, escapes



prior to historical erasure, the Law, or the racializing iron fetters of enslavement” (Bey & Gumbs, 2017 n.p.).

Similarly, as there is no capturing fugitivity in a definition, there are no parameters of in/action that would constitute disengagement and refusal as Black fugitivity. Sojoyner’s provocation – “what damage is done by reinforcing a narrative that Black students should not drop out of school?” (2017 p. 516) - is testament to that fugitive movement, questioning an almost fundamental tenet of the state-sponsored educational system as being “a redemptive structure of social progress” (ibid. p. 517). Student dropout and the conditions that are positioned as contributing to/causing this disengagement is a main point of focus within the STPP framework.

For instance, one primary line of reasoning that frames the problem of student dropout finds fault with (the implementation of) punitive school policies that officially push-out students via suspension and expulsion. Consequences are framed as these students losing valuable seat-time and falling (even further) behind in classwork when and if they return. This reasoning is generally supported with figures showing recognizable and measurable probabilities, such as a student who has been suspended being more likely to be suspended again, or held back a grade (Ross, 2016). All of this is understood to have disaffecting and disengaging results for the pushed-out students, which, while excluding the part schools and teachers have to play, leads them to making the decision to drop out of school entirely (Kim, Losen, & Hewitt, 2010; Rodriguez, 2013). It is often emphasized that those being suspended, expelled and arrested in-school are the most likely to dropout (Advancement Project, 2010). This framing of the STPP takes concern with disciplinary and behavioral problems, and efforts toward change within this understanding are largely focused on policy issues around how to better address and prevent dropouts (Omowale, 2013). Yet, this framing inhibits other questions and imaginings...

“the fugitive strategy is revealed to be both illegible and dangerous within a liberal framework” (Sojoyner, 2017 p. 518).

...such as questioning the worth of schooling for those who are made to exemplify deviance and criminality and imaged as victim in need of support (as within an altruistic educational position), or offender needing correction (which is an extension of the same altruism by different means). At the same time, the pushed-out are expected to conform to confined circulations of movement, regulated and routinized movements which are intended to legitimate that which is predicated on (the outlawing of) fugitivity.

Figures and arguments that correlate dropout with incarceration and/or unemployment (e.g. U.S. Department of Education, 2008) are what give way to the framing of student dropout (and the dropped-out student) as a problem. But this is not the only possible trajectory, and Sojoyner’s provocation (2017) pushes the common-sense assumption that no student should drop out of school. Whether it be higher rates of suspension and expulsion or lower rates of graduation<sup>42</sup>, however measurements are taken the students classified as “minority students [Native American, African American, and Hispanic], students with disabilities, and English language learners” (U.S. Department of Education, 2008 p. 8) are disproportionately negatively impacted<sup>43</sup>. If, however, the reliance on the same understandings of disciplinary and behavioral problems were pushed aside, there might be more space made for different questions and engagements with the so-called dropout problem/crisis. Resituating the path to policy reform as leading to limited effects and reforming identified issues orients the ‘won’t’ read in disengagement as something more like self-defense rather than attack on, protest against, or inability to be formed and/or reformed in educational institutions as properly mobile learners. Thinking of schools and other state institutions,

---

<sup>42</sup> Even though there is discussion of ‘the dropout crisis,’ the report from the U.S. Department of Education assessing ANAR 25 years after its publishing measured On-time Graduation Rate (2008).

<sup>43</sup> Discussed more in the Policy chapter, data about the rates, forms, measures, and demographics of those being punished under certain policies and laws are inconsistent in availability and reliability.

beyond prisons and courtrooms, as criminalizing and carceral sites (Rodriguez, 2013) underscores and articulates this undercommon engagement with the STPP framework.

## DROPOUT

“[I]f schools are worthless, the question is not ‘how do we prevent dropouts?’ The question first is ‘how do we have a worthwhile education that is meaningful to go to?’” (Omowale, 2013 n.p.).

This thesis is at times, perhaps entirely and often unavoidably or intentionally, unfolding as contradictory contributions to a participation in abolitionist study. The next chapter, *Study*, elaborates on the sociality already going on of which the term study marks the “incessant and irreversible intellectuality” of certain undercommon activities which are already present (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 110). These intellectual activities include what might not be obvious or even recognizable (multiple readings). This is a study that might seem contradictory from the requirements of elementary, secondary, and higher education – a study without an end, with people in service of the project of more study – which is as connected to an educational institution as it is with a smoking room at the hospital – the institutions have a relation to study in that they are “not necessarily excluded from the undercommons that [they try] so hard to exclude” (ibid. p. 113).

This is a sociality escaping the confines of the private and is inseparable from fugitivity – a fugitive public. With these fugitive publics, a Black fugitive disengagement does not need restoration “from state-governed projects that attempt to adjudicate normative constructions of difference through liberal tropes of freedom and demographic belonging (Sojoyner, 2017 p. 516), but conservation in movement and in being moved “beyond justice, beyond law” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 64). The beyond here is not the same as a fleeing from, as the fugitive from the law is defined. The beyond of

the fugitive public calls to the fugitive, announcing where to look for it. Perhaps contradictorily, the fugitive public doesn't flee from but can be seen "where they say the state doesn't work...where new policies are to be introduced...where tougher measures are to be taken..." (ibid. p. 65). The movement misnamed fugitive was before the correcting forces. The fugitive here runs but doesn't go anywhere, an expression of this might be glimpsed in disengagement and/or academic/social withdrawal, in movements and moments even for "A few minutes, a few days when you cannot hear them say there is something wrong with you" (ibid. p. 65).

In unpayable debt (and thus refusing terms like 'indebtedness'<sup>44</sup>) to and with Marquis Bey, this study with *fugitive planning and black study* is, at least in part, a "subversive refusal of the tenets of legibility" (2019b p. xiii), working and weaving with "words that break free of grammar's lexical dictates" (ibid. p. 6). Where contradictions might be perceived, the utilization of genealogy within an undercommon study imagines (an) otherwise. This imagining is not a refining of the expansive material in the STPP archive<sup>45</sup>, but the approach and use of the compiling and engaging with the excessive archive is itself a proliferation. Attempting something different is not only needed when considering the presentations and approaches of what are too-often unconvincing arguments (Rodriguez, 2017a), but is also what I perceive to be an obligation within this abolitionist approach toward the violences framed within yet exceeding the STPP framework. This doing something different here is not a claim at originality – far from it. This is a study with and a repurposing from the recurring names woven throughout this thesis.

The etymology of dropout is to "withdraw or disappear from place,"<sup>46</sup> and this formulation within fugitivity marks another misnaming. It is a being written-out rather than fleeing. An escape, in that the capture is not wholly possible. Another imagining of withdrawal or disappearance is with Black

---

<sup>44</sup> Harney & Moten (2013) consider bad debt (different from 'debt' and 'credit') as excessive and incalculable and that which cannot be repaid; as "debt broken from credit" (p. 61).

<sup>45</sup> Described above in the School-to-Prison Pipeline chapter.

<sup>46</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: [https://www.etymonline.com/word/drop-out#etymonline\\_v\\_31902](https://www.etymonline.com/word/drop-out#etymonline_v_31902)

fugitivity as refusal and disengagement (Sojoyner, 2018). In this escaping, educational institutions expose themselves as mobilizing specific means for a general project of the continued substantiation of confining circuits of physical, affectual, imaginable and not-yet-imagined movements. Considering the U.S. prison regime and calling for abolition as a pedagogical position, Rodriguez (2010) asserts that “the primary question is whether and how the act of teaching can effectively and radically displace the normalized misery, everyday suffering, and mundane state violence that are reproduced and/or passively condoned by *both* hegemonic and critical/counter-hegemonic pedagogies” (p. 8, emphasis in original). This disorienting understanding, within the context of this thesis being written as a willing university student (evidenced by my literal buying in), necessitates that “the only possible relationship to the university today,” as Harney & Moten put it, “is a criminal one” (2013 p. 26)<sup>47</sup>. And though the university is named here and taken up elsewhere (e.g. Abolitionist University Studies), this criminality, this noncompliance, this disengaged and without interest abolitionist fugitivity is not confined to any specific site or institution. The necessarily criminal relationship encompasses every institution – from the prison and school to the family, the self and relationality. The zine *Accomplices Not Allies: Abolishing the Ally Industrial Complex, An Indigenous Perspective & Provocation* (Indigenous Action Media, 2014) reiterates this criminality in relation to the university and beyond: “An accomplice as academic would seeks ways to leverage resources and material support and/or betray their institution to further liberation struggles” (p. 5).

But why make what should be secrets known? risking vulnerability beyond expected shades of humility, claiming a not-knowing amidst presumed burgeoning expertise? Because it is unconditional in the undercommons, “the door swings open for refuge even though it may let in police agents and destruction” (ibid. p. 38). This is a fugitive refuge that is and is more than a refuge for the fugitive.

---

<sup>47</sup> This thesis is not a critique of the university, schools, nor a critique of the School-to-Prison Pipeline framework. The critique gives these things movement, works to make them seem relevant by updating, mending, recuperating, adding to and even attacking. What is beyond the critique? Before it?

A similar understanding within the etymology of dropout is “one who ‘drops out’ of something,” which underlies the blame and imposed pressure of individual accountability – i.e. the student is at-risk of dropping out. These knowing's and doings of dropout do not give much space (imaginative, physical or otherwise) for the conditions (e.g. punitive and criminalizing policies) of institutional education that increase violence and the probability of dropout, especially, always, yet not limited to/for Black (Sojoyner, 2016), indigenous (Martineau, 2015) and/or (Annamma, 2018) disabled (Erevelles, 2012) students. Alternatively here, the student is at-risk of falling victim to punitive policies, which begin to describe the above gestured conditions, and both cite specific points of contestation such as Zero Tolerance and Disturbing Schools, as well as site wider physical and conceptual locations in the PIC like schools and (other) institutions of the juvenile criminal justice system. These understandings are what the formulation of and attempted recuperations from the STPP framework (mis)name and take up.

ON THE RUN



*Figure 3: "The Box" is a photograph taken by Samera, a Washington D.C. student for the program Critical Exposure. The caption for the photo reads: "Every morning for the past three months after walking through the metal detectors, 17 year old Skinny has to explain to the security guards before being wanded why the machine went off. Skinny has an ankle monitor on, or 'the box.' With a curfew of 8pm every night, he feels trapped and isolated from the world. Skinny is on probation and was told he would get the monitor off a month ago. When that did not occur he became disappointed. At times he refused to go to school due to his frustrations. D.C. public schools allow up to three unexcused absences until truancy reports are sent out. I am very concerned about his education and the consequences from the days he has missed." This is within a series of images asking students to consider how the School to Prison Pipeline affects their lives (Critical Exposure, 2014 n.p.).*

*[Image description: A black and white picture shows a pair of legs wearing black pants and white socks on a white bedsheet with a gray leaf pattern. On the bed is a composition notebook. The left leg shows a rounded black monitoring device strapped to the ankle over the sock.]*

The above photograph and description express some of the many ways schools interact with (or talk to) prisons, conceptualized in the PIC. The student Skinny, as described by Samera, was made to wear an ankle monitor, which is an electronic monitoring device, a technology of surveillance which functions as a form of e-carceration (MediaJustice, 2019). Here is another attempt, often touted as an alternative to imprisonment, to (overtly) enforce the circulation of movement and contain fugitivity. This alternative, though keeping Skinny out of juvenile detention, does not allow him to move freely<sup>48</sup> or continue his life and schooling largely unaffected. His tracking and curfew are not reforms that lessen the impact of the criminal justice system on Skinny, his family and community. Instead it works to extend the reach of the PIC, normalizing being policed as a part of an everyday experience of those captured in the categories and systems of criminality (Ben-Moshe, 2011; Critical Resistance, 2018).

Why Skinny was made to wear 'the box' is unknown, but the realities of a carceral education are made explicit in the daily encounters of metal detectors and security guards. The truancy reports mentioned in Samera's caption, attempts to maintain student attendance by threatening punishment for non-compliance, offer another example – not of the unintended consequences of too-harsh discipline policies – but of the general institutional attitude of the administration of education. The less explicit carcerality of education is recognizable in Skinny's feelings of being trapped, isolated and frustrated. Further than the three months of being singled out daily after setting off the school metal detector because of the ankle monitor, the failure of getting 'the box' off on time and a continued nightly curfew without knowing when or having trust that it will end are conditions that both heighten and exemplify why a student under these conditions would neither find value in nor feel safe in and by schooling (Omowale, 2013). Too often understood through a normative gaze as inability, truancy, and/or delinquency within the STPP framework, this fugitive

---

<sup>48</sup> This is not to imply that those without tracking devices attached to their body move in and with freedom. Skinny is unable to move freely only in part because of obvious/overt reasons (the ankle monitor).



disengagement of underprivileged students is a refusal of that which has been refused them<sup>49</sup>. This refusal is misrecognized as dropping out rather than escaping a system that is worthless and instrumentalizes containment and capture overtly through disciplinary policies and more-to-the-point covertly, through narratives of safety and schooling being an unquestionable need for all students.

Another form of escape is described by Jazzy, a Black female student in California who like Skinny had a court-ordered electronic monitoring device. In the book *Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools* (Morris, 2018), Jazzy described cutting off her ankle monitor as being “on the run” (n.p.). This fugitivity is in close alignment with a law-based definition, as it was a direct disobedience against a carceral system that was openly tracking and controlling where Jazzy could go and when. But the controlling of movement and expression of Jazzy and other (Black, female) students does not start with anything so obvious as an ankle monitor on a student captured in guilt for committing a crime. Movement has always been policed, before and ever since there were police (a relatively new invention and institution), and this policing has always been racialized.

Curfews like Skinny was subjected to have a long history in the US, with early manifestations being the legally sanctioned patrolling and controlling of the movement and sociality of Black people in fear of/attempts to prevent slave uprisings. Known as slave patrols, the (brutal) regulation of Black movement (both enslaved and free) entailed more than preventing escape, stopping rebellion, or catching fugitive slaves. Being Black in public meant one was subjected to being stopped at any time and made to show their papers either naming them as free or having permission from their slave holder to be out (Delsol & Shiner, 2015). If a slave had a pass, they were still not exempt from patrollers’ scorn and violence – for instance being dressed well for church might be offense enough,

---

<sup>49</sup> To “refuse that which has been refused to you” is a statement Fred Moten made which he describes as “giving a theoretical spin on a formulation [Fannie Lou Hamer] made in practice” (2016 n.p.). Hamer was (in part) a sharecropper, domestic worker and part of the US civil rights movement as a leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

a probable cause for seizure, getting beat and having a pass torn up (Williams, 2015). Although he was made to wear an ankle monitor as part of a court-ordered punishment, Skinny was subjected to routine singling out, further surveillance and increased policing beyond the e-carceration device when attending his high school. While the (known) punishment for Skinny's unknown crime(s) were a curfew and being electronically monitored, his movement (and very presence) as a marked criminal made him even more prone to an already hyper-policed educational environment. Skinny was not expelled from school, and thus was mandated to attend. Yet, the compulsory conditions under which he (and all students though not equally) was forced to navigate only made inhabitation and continuation more difficult, recognizable in Samera's concerns with Skinny and his attitude toward and trust in continuing his education.

Unsurprisingly and unfortunately there is no shortage of examples of historic, modern, ongoing curfews in the US. An obvious spark during the writing of this thesis was the police murder<sup>50</sup> of George Floyd in Minneapolis, MN. From this, uprisings across the US and around the world are taking place. Already-existing insurgent experiments (Moten & Harney, 2020a) became modes of defense through marching, protesting, shutting down streets and highways, demonstrating, looting retail stores, vandalizing, burning cop cars and police precincts, tearing down statues which celebrate slave owners, tweeting to #DefundThePolice, giving money to a local bail fund, joining a zoom study group formed to read about mutual aid and other legitimate forms of rebellion, resistance and refusal. These were and are ongoing responses, not to the state, but to the various and generational contributions to the "incomplete project of freedom" (Hartman, 2008 p. 4). By practicing the practice of freedom (Lepecki, 2013), insurgent forms of fugitive expression were and continue to be met with extreme violence, which is a state-sanctioned violence practiced and trained for earlier in other, similar acts of defense as a part of the history and evolution of policing.

---

<sup>50</sup> Any adjective here feels repetitive and reductive: brutal police murder? unlawful police murder? I am with Rodriguez who sharply points out that "if the state sanctions the violence, at that point you move from calling it police brutality and call it policing" (2017 n.p.).

These violences include the use of and further justify violence by way of issuing and enforcing curfews, which allow/require the surveillance, stopping, and arresting of anyone agents of the state decide is breaking the law. Here breaking the law means being where law enforcers determine you should not be. This is a subjective determination on the part of the officer which overly impacts Black, Brown, American Indian, queer and/or poor people and communities.

Outside of curfews issued in reaction to insurgent movements, sweeping curfews for juvenile's are issued in reaction to insurgent movement. During the Clinton administration, for example, the US Department of Justice released a report recommending and attesting to the positive results of "comprehensive, community-based curfew enforcement programs" (1996, p. 1) based on what would be revealed as unfounded and/or inaccurate data on "rising juvenile delinquency and victimization rates" as well as the effectiveness of juvenile curfew laws (Roman, 2018, n.p.). The Clinton administration did not start juvenile curfews, which have become "yet another tool to make public spaces unsafe for communities of color" (Poon, 2020 n.p.), but did setoff their increased enforcement. This was the case particularly after the uptake of a 1995 article titled "The Coming of the Super-Predators" which suggested that in the coming years there would be

"tens of thousands of severely morally impoverished juvenile super-predators. They are perfectly capable of committing the most heinous acts of physical violence for the most trivial reasons (for example, a perception of slight disrespect or the accident of being in their path) (DiLulio, n.p.).

This fear-mongering perspective is a strange turn and reflection of the above-mentioned slave patrollers violences on any Black person for even the most trivial of reasons. These Clinton-era curfew laws created a problem of crime and promoted its solution as further/increased repression. Still enforced, this is another way that school-aged youth un/officially enter the criminal justice system (as the imposition of these curfew laws affect them and restrict what can be done/where

they can be regardless of being caught), oftentimes being tried and charged as adults (Roman, 2018). While not directly, this extension of carcerality and policing of youth, including the (always race- and class-based) judgements of who can even be considered a youth cannot be thought separate from schooling practices, contributes to the STPP and is just a part of the legacy of brutality enacted within and on behalf of the US.

As with a slave having permission, being Black and free did not mean that one would escape the violence of policing either, and this has obvious, traceable connections to its modern manifestation known as stop and frisk. Similar to broken windows policing (discussed in the STPP chapter), which was/is discursively enacted to police small crimes in order to prevent future, more serious crimes, the warrantless searches of stop and frisk policing preempts the supposed small crime by stopping, questioning, and searching any person a police officer thinks looks suspicious (Sexton, 2007). This method of policing overwhelmingly targets Black, Brown and/or queer people, particularly youth in and beyond the site of the school, and “is a way of intimidating people and making communities feel like they’re totally controlled by the police” (Critical Resistance, 2004 p. 14). As the police are now, slave patrols/patrollers were legally compelled (in that they were granted the power) to violently enforce the regulation of any movement they deemed (potentially) criminal. There is no law enforcement that is not violent, and while attending to the direct, overt brutalities it cannot be missed that the mundane offenses like being stopped but not physically/sexually assaulted, or knowing that you could be stopped at any moment for any reason (e.g. being dressed too well; wearing the colors affiliated with gangs – read below), has similar effects and justifications. Police are trained and re-trained to enforce the law and do so almost entirely with impunity, so it is never a coincidence, momentary lapse in judgement, or bad-apple police officer to blame when violence is threatened and/or experienced.

So, these traceable extensions of policy through policing Black sociality emphasize two things here. First, there is a long trajectory of reforms and attempted reforms of what and how police can and

should enforce the law. These reforms are ultimately inconsequential to an abolitionist agenda as they prop up certain narratives that, if accepted, guarantee the continuation of the order of things and serve here to highlight the persistent failures of working within the choices as offered, or what is elaborated on below and might better be named as “The possessive investment in whiteness” (Hartman, 2020 n.p.). Second, there is a deeper anti-blackness that is foundational to police and policing as appendages of the settler colonial project of the so-called US which itself is a manifestation of what this thesis refers to variously as whiteness, policy, and the world as we know it. Without recognition (at minimum) of this anti-blackness of which feelings of ontological security seem to settle, similar singular efforts to refashion parts of the world as we know it (e.g. the abolition of slavery; removing police from schools) will never bring about meaningful abolitionist change.

#### PATROLLING MOVEMENT

The slave patrols were created to try and maintain control over slave populations - it was part of the establishment, maintenance, and protection of (the very concept of) property. Described variously as providing a transitional model (Williams, 2015), or establishing the blueprint (Wagner, 2009), “Scholars and historians assert that the transition from slave patrols to publicly funded police agencies was seamless in the southern region of the United States” (Archbold, 2012 p. 5). Similar forms of surveillance took place in the North as well. In New York there were laws “which forbade unaccompanied black people from walking the streets at night without carrying a lit lantern, [which] were originally instituted because of white fear of antislavery insurrection” (Scannell, 2016 n.p.). These lantern laws, a term from Simone Brown, offer another instance of attempts to manage fugitive movement, even if the (Black, mixed race, American Indian) bodies being policed/illuminated were not officially those of criminals (as in convicted of a crime). Blackness is

always criminal in this criminal justice system, so (unregulated) Black movement is fugitive. In the eyes of the law (white gaze) blackness is guilty before and without the sentence. Brown moves through the horror of these lantern laws to bring forward not just another example in a long history of examples of an overtly anti-Black sentiment and sentencing, but a deeper process of knowledge production through criminalizing, racializing modes of surveillance.

“Here technologies of seeing that are racializing in their application and effects, from a candle flame to the white gaze, were employed in an attempt to identify who was in place with permission and who was out of place with censure” (Brown, 2015 p. 25).

Though different in form, these processes of knowledge production evolved and continued in post-bellum US. The slave patrols had officially ended, but curfews “often worked in tandem with vagrancy laws to control the movement of recently freed slaves” (Correia & Wall, 2018 n.p.). Curfews are used to justify the control of expression (literally restricting where a person/people can be at certain times or at all) and capture of (what gets deemed) movement out of time and place. This is especially true for youth, but all of these violent extensions and enforcements were/are in reaction to the unregulatable excess of blackness and/as Black sociality. Stated elsewhere, as long as there have been prisons there have been prison abolitionists, and so with the elaborating of tools of social control comes a diversity of tactics to challenge, undermine and otherwise refuse the continued and expanding forms of control and containment, evident in Jazzy being on the run after cutting off her ankle monitor. Yet Jazzy was already on the run before the patrollers caught, tagged, and sought to track her. The trick of these forms of rebellion is that they were already happening before the conditions of enslavement and carcerality were imposed and enforced. The desire for freedom was already present, already being experimented with, imagined, and enacted.

Slaves escaping from and revolting against conditions of their enslavement were *responded to* with a slew of tactics. Slave patrols were created, and slave patrollers were afforded legal standing for their

policing/brutalization of (any) Black movement. For instance, the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 “bypassed the laws and practices of the free states and threatened the freedom principle in the North” (Sinha, 2016 pp. 500-501). The Act was created and enforced to increase the ability for the capture and return of escaped slaves to their Southern enslavers, a legal requirement for all public officials in the country (Woods, 1998) but it effectively deputized white citizens under “the obligation to report fugitives and the ensure social order” (Warren, 2018 p. 105). However, “granting extraterritoriality to southern laws of slavery in the free North” (Sinha, 2016 p. 382) was nothing new by 1850. In fact, this Act came after the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793, which itself was a congressional elaboration of the Fugitive Slave Clause which is Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 of the US Constitution, immediately following Clause 2, the Extradition of fugitives (U.S. Const. art. IV, § 2). Some complied with these increased demands and others resisted.

A prominent group that both complied and resisted was the Pennsylvania Abolition Society (PAS). Discussed further in the Policy chapter, the history of the group is filled with contradiction and, because of their simultaneous adherence to US law and their opposition to specifics therein (i.e. slavery), what actions were taken by the group and its members are somewhat unknown. Yet as a genealogical endeavor, the details regarding just what was done within and because of the PAS are not so important, but more so what the tensions within and around the PAS contain and offer upon placing them in conversation with fugitivity and blackness. The PAS was the first abolitionist group of its kind in the US, initially being named the Society for the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage, and included some notable members like Benjamin Franklin (who was elected president in 1787) and Benjamin Rush (who was elected president in 1803). What is notable about these two further than their names and social status is (the brutalities of which cannot adequately be written) that they had each been enslavers, having legally bought, owned, considered and treated Black people as their property. By the time of their presidencies in the PAS both men had freed those they

had enslaved, as within the constitution of the group: “No person holding a slave shall be admitted a member of this society” (Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, 1787 p. 6).

The PAS included in their constitution an Act for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery, which in Section XI made clear that the group’s intention was to follow the law. It states, in part, that:

“this act or anything in it contained, shall not give any relief or shelter to any absconding or runaway Negro or Mulatto slave or servant, who has absented himself, or shall absent himself from his or her owner, master or mistress residing in any other state or country, but such owner, master or mistress shall have like right and aid to demand, claim and take away his slave or servant” (ibid. p. 14).

The adherence to not assisting (being an accomplice) and with the aid/return (deputized in whiteness) of runaway slaves is immediately contradictory to the stated aims and name of the group, which was for the abolition of slavery. However, its inclusion actually aligns with the group’s position of seeking a gradual (rather than immediate) end to the institution of slavery. This gradual approach was one partially based in fears/white imaginations of repercussions resulting from an uneducated, free Black population (uneducated here indicates white settler colonial standards and impositions of education and respectability and exposes the imaginative ineptitude of white supremacy). Thus, the group eventually sought (legally free/d) Black integration into standards of white society:

“In conjunction with the Free African Society, PAS attempted to create black schools, help free blacks obtain employment, and conduct house visits to foster morality and a strong work ethic in Philadelphia’s black residents” (Historic la Mott, n.d. n.p.).

The attempted integration and assimilation of a free Black population into a burgeoning white America, replete with particular ideas of property and the proper, of value and worth and work, of



customs and protocols widely enforced, was not a new concept to the colonizers of the land (evidenced with American Indian boarding schools as discussed in the Policy and Call to Order chapters). Neither are these efforts of the PAS relegated to the past. Instead, these assimilationist logics are very recognizable in modern liberal frameworks and of the pursuits of practitioners in institutions of education. In mobilizations against the effects framed in the STPP, the persistent reliance on naturalized understandings of what, for instance, constitutes proper behavior and intellectual development (and the best methods of correction for non-compliance) are apparent. For example, too-harsh disciplinary policies are blamed for criminalizing what is propped up as normal, age-appropriate behavior. These understandings come across as compassionate and in the (at-risk) student's best interest, not unlike the seemingly altruistic reasonings for instilling a particular expression of a strong work ethic to free Black people – yet the quick and easy outrage at violations of what has become normal do the work of concretizing narrow definitions of acceptable and not-acceptable. Rather than the policies themselves, it is the adherence of these policies that might be a better target of scorn, since the protocols might be in place, but the adherence to them is not standardized. As Moten says in conversation with Harney, “you can produce the protocols, and then they get violated immediately” (Harney & Moten, 2017 n.p.). So why take part in something (e.g. calling, and thus becoming, the police on a misbehaving student) that can so obviously become violent (e.g. physical harm)? In part, it is the general acceptance and mass investment in the apparent security that police/policy/whiteness is supposed to provide that actually requires those issuing the call to be standardized in their implementation (assumptions of the call to order). Conformity is key, lest the violator (e.g. the principal who tries to stop the SRO from arresting a student) be open to violation, lest the outlaw be faced with (ontological) insecurity, instability, and fugitivity at the point of death (conditions which the protocols require).

The attempts made by the PAS and others to integrate a free Black population into white society hold and hold more than just insidious violences that are still perpetuated today (e.g. dress codes;

loitering laws; teaching and surveilling un/acceptable behavior). Considering the brutal implications of a Black education in the US South, especially but not limited to the antebellum South, these attempts by abolitionists were immensely radical. It is just that these gradual abolitionists' idea of abolition was limited to the seemingly singular institution of slavery. Those fighting for the gradual abolition of slavery wanted and worked to uphold their nation (e.g. the land they would continue to settle [genocidal settlement]; the economic system they would continue to profit from [racial capitalism]) and ways of being in the world. Thus, ontologically their efforts were always going to be contained within the permissible, radical as their goals and efforts were. This aligns with the radicality recognizable in modern movements that too fail to imagine beyond the strictures of policy and politics, as with reformist efforts that want #PoliceFreeSchools but still accept a need for police as an institution and policing as a general concept and practice.

By contrast, abolitionists who fought for the immediate abolition of slavery made demands that more closely examined and threatened white citizenship and recognized that an end to slavery did not mean full liberation for Black people (enslaved or free). For instance, the work of William Lloyd Garrison, who headed the abolitionist paper *The Liberator* starting on January 1, 1831 and who founded the New England Anti-Slavery Society in 1832, "broke from the moderate, conciliatory, and procolonizationist politics of earlier antislavery societies" that sought a long period of preparation for and gradual emancipation of slavery (Olson, 2004 p. 134). Garrison and others (called Garrisonians) were not reformist abolitionists – they did not run for office nor try and pass new laws. They recognized that the systems of law, the government, the nation were founded and reliant upon the continuation of slavery. So, they refused to concede to the tempered efforts of gradual abolition. In a well-known rebuke to objectors of the "severity of [his] language" Garrison writes in the first issue of *The Liberator*:

"I *will be* as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject, I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation. No! no! Tell a man whose house is on fire, to

give a moderate alarm...I am in earnest – I will not equivocate – I will not excuse – I will not retreat a single inch – AND I WILL BE HEARD.” (1831 p. 1, emphasis in original).

Pursuing alternatives that neither worked within nor relied on the legal system and dominant economic means of production, Garrison was someone who participated in the founding of the American Free Produce Association, which searched for alternatives to slave-grown products, deeming the products of slave labor to be stolen goods (Sinha, 2016). And though Garrison is a primary figure in abolition, he recognized the work that came before his, which influenced the direction and force of his many abolitionist pursuits. As Manisha Sinha writes: “What distinguished Garrisonians from previous generations of abolitionists was how firmly Garrisonianism’s roots lay in black abolitionism” (2016 p. 215) rather than centering whiteness.

The differences and tensions between gradual and immediate abolition are still present in demands today. Discussed earlier, the demands to #DefundThePolice and for #PoliceFreeSchools highlights what could be considered gradualist and immediatist attempts. The demands emerge from what could be considered a more immediatist abolitionist position that recognizes “it’s fucked up for you, in the same way that we’ve already recognized that it’s fucked up for us...that this shit is killing you, too, however much more softly” (Moten & Harney, 2013 pp. 140-141). These abolitionist demands that attend to forms of “mundane state violence that are reproduced and/or passively condoned by *both* hegemonic and critical/counterhegemonic pedagogies” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 8, emphasis in original) get coopted and folded into standard appeals for reform by the hegemonic and counterhegemonic. Expanded in the Policy chapter, these abolitionist demands tend to get reimagined as appeals to the state rather than as refusals to rely on and reproduce the state.

All the while happening on top of these differences are those (with great power and through violent force, coercion, and manipulation) who are vehemently seeking to conserve the present conditions of the world. During the time of the legal institution of slavery these conservative perspectives were

coming from Southerners (in states where slavery was legal) as well as from Northerners (in states where slavery was illegal). These distinctions between those who want to uphold any and all of the world as we know it and those whose praxis is with and for the end of that world are not clear in current conditions either. Both Skinny and Jazzy were made to wear electronic monitoring devices, an alternative to standard incarceration. They were both still able/made to attend school, yet as with Skinny, the conditions of this educational environment, already carceral, were made less safe, less supportive and imposed more reasons for feelings of frustration, abandonment, and disengagement. And these e-carceration devices and logics, rather than lessen the carceral immediacy in the lives of those court-ordered to be traced and tracked, actually extend the jail/prison and blur institutional boundaries of what is and where are sites of regulation, restriction and policing, as well as who is deserving, in the case of ankle monitors, of carceral reform (all functions of the PIC). On the carcerality required and imposed in the world as we know it, an extension of which is the teaching act, Bey writes in *Anarcho-Blackness* that

“the State manifests an underlying logic of carcerality—which is to say, the bedrock ground for intelligibility and, at a more fundamental level, reality; logic as the very grammar by which things are expressible and understandable and, indeed, possible. This forces many social relations to depend on various mechanisms of confinement, punishment, capture, or circumscription. Anarchism is a deshackling from capitalism and the State and its attending conscripts; anarchism is a kind of abolitionism” (2020 n.p.).

Indeed, the pressures put on students being electronically monitored (a form of being shackled) impact more than an individual. Social relations, from the assumed intimacy of family to the assumed distance from strangers, are meant to be based in, uphold, and distribute carcerality. The extension of carceral circuits of movement for those captured in anarchic, deshackled criminality “expand[s] the imprisonment system into people’s home and into the lives of their loved ones” (Critical Resistance, n.d. n.p.).

The fear of runaway slaves and slave rebellions had slaveowners and slave patrollers considering any Black person a suspected fugitive, stolen life. This extended to citizens deputized in whiteness, including to a complicated extent some abolitionists. A slave deshacking themselves was considered property theft. They stole themselves because under the law they were someone's property. People as property. Here is an immensity that must be explicitly included in this discussion of fugitivity and the STPP. Yet hints and starts and glimpses might be all that is available in this format for this project. Saidiya Hartman sculpts for us our presence in the afterlife of slavery, in which "black lives are still imperiled and devalued by a racial calculus and political arithmetic that were entrenched centuries ago" (2007 n.p.). These centuries-old devaluing's map the carceral, educational, medical, scientific terrains that constitute the ordinariness of the world as we know it. Hartman continues: "This is the afterlife of slavery – skewed life chances, limited access to health and education, premature death, incarceration, and impoverishment" (ibid.). Bey's writing on anarcho-Blackness, in study with Hartman, contributes to the being-with of this afterlife, the afterlife of property (Hartman, 2008), the stealing and stealing away, where every step of a slave on the run marked anarchic ground<sup>51</sup> and a world-ending threat:

"Enslaved people were themselves property, disallowed personhood. Such a history is imperative to bring to anarchist theorizations, as one cannot assert the ills of private property without noting that not only is the factory or storefront over there 'property' but there are people who have historically been property, and the descendants of those people—or those who might optically or politically be placed in proximity to those people—are living with the effects of, as it were, property's afterlife" (2020 n.p.).

---

<sup>51</sup> Here I am thinking particularly with Blackness and anarchism and recent works from Hartman (2019), Samudzi & Anderson (2018), and Bey (2020) who meditates with anarcho-Blackness as "the primordial mutiny to which regulation responds" (n.p.). This is a departure from classical anarchism, where "Neither anarchism nor Blackness can be what it once was (which is itself an unsettled open question) after colliding in a critical, generative intimacy with one another" (ibid. n.p.).

Consequences of these expanding terrains of the PIC, these carceral geographies which seek to enclose fugitive social relations (e.g. undercommon sociality; the fugitive public), are not unintentional from a reformed carceral modality (from being captured and caged in a prison to being captured and tracked outside of prison walls). Instead, they should be “understood as fundamental and systemic dimensions of the policing and imprisonment apparatus” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 8). The work of the Critical Exposure picture series which featured Samera and Skinny demonstrates these systemic dimensions within and extending out of the site of the school. But these pictures and captions should not be mistaken as examples of fugitivity (“Oh, that’s what that means. I get it!”), that is not my point nor effort. Instead, they gesture to and begin to express what can happen in a flash, around a momentary fugitive movement that is always on the run. The series does not contain something like photographic evidence of a fugitive enacting fugitivity, “since fugitivity escapes even the fugitive” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 50).

There are many articulations of fugitivity, some of which appear in and escape from and out of this chapter, as well as this larger thesis; this study as a practicing and a planning, an offering to “those side-eyes saturated with subversive meaning” (Green & Bey, 2018 p. 451), to the fugitive public and to black study (Harney & Moten, 2013). Reiterating or continuing the point of engaging in (potential and perceived) contradictions, writing on fugitivity might be a substantiation of and elaboration on the relationships between pursuit, capture, and escape – rather than redefining the perceived relationality as a reaction to instead of escape by those who would be captured in definitions of fugitive. Further still, writing with and for *Fugitive Planning & Black Study* may too seem contradictory – particularly with my writing from a position of being in a university and in many registers (willfully) captured and in-turn expected to capture via research, and my coming to this research with a lot of whiteness at that. While questionable, here is not a contradictory or incompatible move, but a refusal within research and/as whiteness. Writing of and within the settler colonial context of the US carries a weight of historical and ongoing violences perpetuated to

establish/maintain (fantasies of) ontological security (Stein, Hunt, Suša, & Andreotti, 2017) based on enslavement and anti-black racism, and American Indian land displacement. This is not a (generally understood) resistance in that I don't want the reader to know certain things, it is not about the reader in that sense. It is a resistance as refusal as "attempts to place limits on conquest and the colonization of knowledge by marking what is off limits, what is not up for grabs or discussion, what is sacred, and what can't be known" (Tuck & Yang, 2014a p. 225). With this, any definitions of fugitivity will be already on the run.

## BLACKNESS

This thesis is with and for black study as displayed in and out and through the undercommons where amidst all kinds of movements, gestures, offerings and experiments, "the only constant is losing the individuality and finding the sociality of our words and ideas" (Harney, 2017a n.p.) - the insurgent sociality that is blackness (Bey, 2016b). This thesis is with and for black study in the thinking with and for blackness - "which must be understood in its ontological difference from Black people who are, nevertheless, (under)privileged insofar as they are given (to) an understanding of it" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 47). This understanding is in part, insofar as any capture is partial, constitutive of state-sanctioned and state-sanctioning racism and anti-black violence<sup>52</sup> that is simultaneously hidden and written all over a thinking such as the STPP framework. Further but no more than the state, the "non-ontology of blackness" writes Calvin Warren, "secures the boundaries of the human; it delimits the coordinates of the human" (2017 p. 6). The underprivilege is the positioning in the non-place of blackness, inscribed upon Black people under the hegemony of whiteness and its "unrelenting violence and its brutal failure" (Harney, 2017b n.p.). It is, as above, an embracing and

---

<sup>52</sup> Anti-black violence here is to indicate specific racist formulations enacted toward/upon Black people and to not collapse all racism under a generalized understanding of an imaginary (with real consequences) toward non-white people – with that generalization, white-supremacy would be another indicator.

being embraced by fugitivity, which gestures toward what Moten's work beautifully, horribly enacts and makes imaginable. As Moten writes in *Black Optimism/Black Operation* (2007a):

"I'm trying to own a certain dispossession, the underprivilege of being-sentenced to this gift of constantly escaping and to standing in for the fugitivity (to echo Natahaniel Mackey, Daphne Brooks and Michel Foucault) (of the imagination) that is an irreducible property of life, persisting in and against every disciplinary technique while constituting and instantiating not just the thought but that actuality of the outside that is what/where blackness is—as space or spacing of the imagination, as condition of possibility and constant troubling of critique" (p. 3).

Glimpses of this dispossession, this non-proximity to blackness are found in the STPP framework, which often takes as its point of critique the disproportionately high rates of punitive disciplining and school dropout for students racialized as non-white. But within a reiterated understanding of the disoriented complexities of everyday routines of teaching being inseparable from "the work of policing, juridical discipline, and state-crafted punishment" (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 8) it becomes more and more necessary to engage in what Harney & Moten (2013), following, among, and preceding many others of the fugitive public find in and as blackness. As a "radical movement of escape...Blackness is the disposition, the posture, the moving force of *fugitivity*" (Bey, 2016a n.p., emphasis in original).

The underprivileged familiarity of blackness for Black people comes from, emerges out of, breaks out and steals away from more than the shocking and mundane routines of violence of slavery and its afterlife (Hartman, 1997). Here offers a moment to be overt. Blackness is not only tied to terror – if the sole emphasis is on the subjugation and duress of the underprivileged, then that is another move centering a narrative of whiteness. To reiterate and extend...



“...anybody who thinks that they can understand how terrible the terror has been without understanding how beautiful the beauty has been against the grain of that terror is wrong. There is no calculus of the terror that can make a proper calculation without reference to that which resists it. It’s just not possible” (Moten, 2016 n.p.).

Blackness makes up and is the excess of otherwise stated moments and movements of sociality, freedom, fugitivity, refusal and study.

Connected but on the other hand, “Whiteness,” according to Marquis Bey, “is a kind of ideology, a violent way of inhabiting oneself racially, and it is whiteness that operates pervasively as one of dominative power’s ligaments. It naturalizes itself and becomes ‘lifestyled,’ simply the way of the world” (2019b p. 18). Whiteness then, is not a chromatic signifier but is glimpsed perhaps in (and by) those who are both necessary via their exclusion, and/or those who refuse to be proximal to power’s embrace. Which does not mean white people are not closer to whiteness. Echoing Harney, I am not coming to this study with much blackness - yet, “in the practice of abolition [people marked as white] will move closer to the only thing they ever had that was about life and not death, about love and not hate, blackness” (2017 n.p.).

Attending to blackness as part of an abolitionist experiment allows and requires a weaving, drifting, escaping and staying with violences, specifically of and as education conceptually contained within a recognizable register of the STPP framework. Whiteness forecloses abolition for the rational work of reforming violence. And thus, whiteness is reformed. Reforming what are fundamental functions of institutional education is a process that continues rather than abolishes the general and specific oppressions that these institutions weaponize. Following Rodriguez (2010), all students are,

“by ontological necessity, hierarchically separated through the protocols of pseudo-standardized intelligence quotient, socioeconomic class, race, gender, citizenship, sexuality, neighborhood geography, etc. This seemingly compulsory, school-sited reproduction of the

deadly circuits of privilege and alienation is anything but new, and has always been central to the routines of the U.S. schooling regime, particularly in its colonialist and post-emancipationist articulations” (p. 9).

This position on reform is not to suggest that the disproportionate violences imposed on Black and/or disabled students, referred to within the STPP framework, are to be dismissed or not fought against. It is something more like trying to express the impossible expectations of Black people existing in a system that is incapable of holding them and is only sustainable via their oppression and exclusion (even in the guise of inclusion). With distinctions, this impossibility relates very much to disabled people, discussed below. There is no regimented practice of movements toward freedom (Lepecki, 2013). These fugitive movements, offerings, experiments (the work) will not and cannot be the same. I understand my work with an abolitionist engagement in the STPP, this genealogical sabotage, my undercommon study with and for the fugitive public as both allowing and requiring that I engage with, in a general sense, as much as I can on the material<sup>53</sup>, and in a specific sense, as much as I can of myself<sup>54</sup>. Embedded throughout this thesis is my own proximity to whiteness, to expressions and claims such as social justice, ally, and being in solidarity, and to the refusal thereof<sup>55</sup>. But in black study, being in relation to identities like ally is a false materiality, a false image, a false distinction. The allied position is really no position at all. In a very real sense, as Harney asserts, I have no resource to bring as a white person:

“do words like solidarity, affinity, to say nothing of the unlovely term allyship, accidentally preserve something we want to abolish?” (2017 n.p.).

---

<sup>53</sup> “Genealogy, consequently, requires patience and a knowledge of details, and it depends on a vast accumulation of source material” (Foucault, 1977 p. 140).

<sup>54</sup> Liat Ben-Moshe’s take on genealogy describes the process as “transform[ing] those conducting and using it. In its extreme, genealogy calls for a change from within. It is a political tool in the sense that it encourages us to question what we took for granted before, and begs us to be what we have not been before” (2011, p. 123).

<sup>55</sup> For further considerations on various allyships, refer to the zine *Accomplices Not Allies: Abolishing the Ally Industrial Complex, An Indigenous Perspective & Provocation* from Indigenous Action Media (2014).

“we move next to each other, so we can be beside ourselves” (Harney & Moten 2013 p. 19).

Here and now I am still facing/faced with white supremacy in education. Confronting this (and a primary concern of this thesis), Rodriguez (2010) has argued for drawing distinctions between

“liberal, social justice, critical, and even ‘radical’ pedagogies that are capable of even remotely *justifying, defending, or tolerative* a proto-genocidal prison regime that is without precedent or peer, on the one hand, and those attempts at abolitionist pedagogy that...are attempting to generate new epistemic and intellectual approaches to meaning, knowledge, learning, a practice for the sake of life, liberation, and new social possibilities” (pp. 8-9).

This call is a primary point that has brought me to this work. A call of which the echoes, if I am successful in my attempts, will be recognized throughout this entire text. Within this section various questions persist, including – who am I to participate in drawing these distinctions? and who am I not to? Where do I find myself variously within the divide? In part, I am attempting to express some differences between the violences of self-preservation, and self-defense which can be violent.

“...we were thinking about how the undercommons of study might be a place where those in blackness and those coming into blackness might commune...” (Harney, 2017b n.p.).

Communing is not what a community does. The fugitive public is not a community. A commitment to community might bring analogies (‘To be blank is like being Black’), proximity, or affinity, but not fugitive planning. This blank is a particularly poignant phrasing in study with Calvin Warren’s writing (2017) on the non-ontology of blackness. The non, however, should not be understood as a lack - as Bey asserts, the non-ontology of blackness is “not an incapacity or absolute abjection and subjection to being defined by legacies of white supremacy” (2019b p. 59). Discussed in the following section are tensions of blackness (commonly positioned on and as Black people), disability (commonly

positioned in signaling white people with physical impairments), and some of the ongoing histories of these communities, positionalities, identities and labels as they relate to education.

## BLACKNESS AND DISABILITY

When disability is perceived as an ‘immutable and pathological abnormality,’ of which the above and ongoing understanding of whiteness and those drawn in could be attributed in naturalizing, Erevelles and Minear (2010) amongst others find that a distancing from disability often occurs. (To make a distinction, this move away is not a fugitive movement). With this, it is no surprise that those embracing and embraced by the allure of whiteness would make clear moves away from disability – it is asserted by many that, similar to blackness, disability is constitutive of the human in its exclusion.

“...the surveillance of disability is always already racialized, reminding us that the visualization of blackness is inseparable from the historical formations of power through which disability emerges as a modern categorization of human difference” (Hilton, 2017 p. 226).

More to the point, the disability distancing considered here is from those who have also been or are at risk of being cast to the bottom or entirely excluded from the ‘natural order of things.’ Put another way, people resist being associated with attributes and expressions they accept as fundamentally flawed – even and especially when they themselves have been/are being similarly considered. These moves away include and are themselves assertions of who are and are not the “proper subjects for discrimination” (Baynton, 2001 p. 34). The inclusion of this here is not that these discriminating claims against, made by people being discriminated against, should necessarily be chided or rebuked – to some extent it is understandable that one would not embrace or ask for

more discrimination. It is the creating and distributing/enforcing the dominant discourses that are the issue. And more so, it is the acceptances (rather than refusals) of dominant discourses that are the issue here - acceptance and consequent enactments (which acceptance itself is a form) of dominant, naturalized understandings of disability being associated with lack, deprivation, inferiority, etc. These are moves within the register of ableism, which finds implicit worth in, and unendingly defends able-bodied and able-minded supremacy. Increasingly taken up/theorized by scholars in mad studies, here again the term *bodymind* (Price, 2015) might be better suited. Lzz Johnk & Sasha Khan (2019) write about the term *able-bodymindedness* in their article "Crippling the Fuck Out" to describe the symbiotic relationship between pathologizations of non-normative *bodyminds* and other systems/institutions of oppression. The adherence to these systemic, pathologizing norms is an adherence to the law as well as a writing out certain expressions categorized as disabilities from the law (outlawing). More than acting like, this too is a deputization, a being in and of the state as the state of whiteness.

"As if the ruthless violence of able-bodied supremacy were not bad enough, we also find ourselves confronted with the myriad ways in which ableism renders this violence invisible" (Berne, Langstaff & Morales, 2016 pp. 58-59).

This seemingly reasonable distancing from and (simultaneous) making invisible the violences of ableism, inextricably connected to anti-black violences required and made mundane by the law, occur in educational institutions as they do in more immediately recognizable spaces of carcerality. The extent of both the occurrences/rates, as well as the manifestations of ableism and anti-black racism in education, or what might more directly be categorized as whiteness, seem to be without end or origin (naturalized). Here is where a movement such as *in* but not *of* might be well-positioned in this genealogical endeavor, with the insistent/incessant use of a battery of approaches, investigated under the rubric of policy and reform. Violence *in* education could, toward the ongoing project of abolition, be better expressed with violence *as* education.

This ableism is similar to dominant, racist understandings and moves away from blackness inscribed on Black people.

“One cannot look at the history of US slavery, the stealing of indigenous lands, and US imperialism without seeing the way that white supremacy leverages ableism to create a subjugated “other” that is deemed less worthy/abled/smart/capable” (Berne, 2016 p. 14).

This ableism is similar to dominant, lawful understandings and moves away from fugitivity.

disability (n.) Meaning “incapacity in the eyes of the law” is from 1640s.<sup>56</sup>

This lawful creation of disability underlies the outlawed positioning, and I attribute this as a main reason why educational reform pales (whitens) to be effective further than temporary and contingent relief. Here is why, without knowing but still with a plan (Harney & Moten, 2013), an abolitionist imagining is the echo reverberating through these pages. To bring in Moten, not as a ‘however’ to the violence but as an always here (and there): “There is no calculus of the terror that can make a proper calculation without reference to that which resists it” (2016 n.p.). So, with dominant, ableist understandings and moves away from disability are also moves toward disability, a fugitivity which is a similar though not the same nor analogizable to moving toward blackness. Also, as with blackness above, ableist conceptualizations of disability are inscribed on recognizably disabled people. That is, people with noticeable impairments - as not all disabilities are visible, nor (as will be described below) within a categorizable register of a diagnosis. As with school dropout rates, disciplinary measures, official police encounters, etc., disabled students have more familiarity, are more overtly impacted, are underprivileged. But ultimately these dominant discourses affect everyone.

---

<sup>56</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: <https://www.etymonline.com/word/disability>

“[N]ormative civil whiteness implies an ongoing and complex relation of hierarchy, discipline, power, and violence that has come to oversee the current and increasingly incorporative ‘multicultural’ modalities of white supremacy, wherein ‘people of color’ are selectively and incrementally solicited, rewarded, and absorbed into the operative functionings of white-supremacist institutions (e.g., the military, police, and school) and discourses (e.g., patriotism)” (Rodriguez, 2006 p. 25).

Thinking with policing power and the US prison regime informing and enforcing circuits of movement with what Rodriguez (2006) titled *Forced Passages*, a familiar thread of the STPP framework is found. With the discourse of there being a disproportionate amount disabled and/or Black students funneled out of schools and into prisons, there is an absence around any committed discussion within the STPP archive beyond a passing “compared to their white peers”<sup>57</sup>. This also applies to discussions of “non-disabled peers”, both of which elide what might be more obvious observations of ongoing white supremacist legacies, which in turn make it all-the-more imperceptible to imagine and confront the everyday circulations of whiteness/white supremacy.

“It does not go without saying that if one reads from an ableist perspective, one will create an ableist critique. The same is true for racist perspectives and critiques” (Pickens, 2017 p. 102).

#### CRIP

“...the white Western drive to eradicate unnatural and abnormal bodies and cultures has never targeted disability alone. Patriarchy, white supremacy, and capitalism have twined

---

<sup>57</sup> This statement is in almost every article/discussion/column of the STPP that brings in statistics for race and/or disability overrepresentation in educational disciplinary actions

together in everchanging combinations to make eradication through genocide, incarceration, institutionalization, sterilization, and wholesale assimilation a reality in many marginalized communities” (Clare, 2017 p. 258).

Something that holds much and more of the discussion in this chapter, pushing and redefining without fully capturing/being captured in a definition, is crip. Crip and Crip Theory are immensely generous in thinking and being with fugitivity. Crip as a guiding theoretical orientation locates “ability, race, gender, sexuality, class, nation state and imperialism” not as separate categorizations but as bound together (Sins Invalid, 2016, p. 14). Crip too directly offers and opens imaginings beyond the often biologically determined ordering and understanding of disability, race, gender, sexuality. Crip challenges definitions that find the body distinct from the mind. Crip challenges understandings of individuality, particularly when considering interdependency. Crip is something that is done. Crip is a descriptor for someone identifying themselves as crip, perhaps rather than identifying as disabled, or even for people without disabilities per se, such as a person with a chronic illness, someone who lacks "a 'proper' (read: medically acceptable, doctor-provided, and insurer-approved) diagnosis for their symptoms" (Kafer, 2013 p. 12) - a diagnosis that is a common and naturalized requirement in both formal and informal contexts. This claiming of crip can disrupt the notion that disability must be and is inherently linked to a diagnosis and label, and further delinks standards of what and who passes (e.g. passes an examination; passes as non-disabled). That in order for someone to receive certain provisions and care a diagnosis must be secured is a commonplace assumption that, through crip, is disoriented.

This is a disorientation of the order of things. An unsettling without promise or proposal for settling. "We are still collectively discovering what it might mean 'to crip.' As a verb, the term is still perhaps best defined by what it might become" (McRuer, 2016 p. 124). The openness and sociality of fugitivity is in and as the collective, communal not-knowing and not-intending-to-find-out (capture) of crip as “the ceaseless experiment with the futural presence” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 75).



Further, *crip* can be a proclamation of social dissent, thinking of Nancy Mairs writing of the reactions received from non-disabled and disabled people alike when she referred to herself as a *cripple* rather than the more socially couth *handicapped* or *disabled*. Not one to mince words, Mairs shrewdly wrote, "Perhaps I want them to wince, I want them to see me as a tough customer, one whom the fates/gods/viruses have not been kind, but who can face the brutal truth of her existence squarely. As a *cripple*" wrote Mairs, "I *swagger*" (1986 n.p.).

This *swagger* hip-checks and disorients an already unstable understanding and uneasy term. Here is fugitivity's refusal to conform to prechoreographed movements/corporealities; refusal to internalize the reactionary external forces imposing standards (of intellect, beauty, desire, desirability, etc.); refusal to adhere to the coercive assignments that, through procedures of individualization (and individuation), impose particular expectations onto core traits such as who one is/must be, and how one is to be characterized/recognized based on various analyses of status, attributes, etc. (Foucault, 1977). Mairs refused and was nonetheless impacted in many ways by "a relentless pressure to please" (1986 n.p.). Described similarly on the *crippledscholar* blogpost titled "Fighting my internalization of the hierarchy of disability," is the exhaustion resulting from the "constant vigilance to police [one's] own behaviour and function in society" (Sauder, 2015 n.p.).

Alison Kafer describes *crip* as "an urge to shake things up, to jolt people out of their everyday understandings of bodies and minds, of normalcy and deviance" (2013 p. 15). Whether this is a deliberate expression or a self-affirming disinterest in the endless string of *should's* is unimportant, as either gets to the before and beyond of which the fugitive inhabits. Mairs' *swagger* offers a glimpse of a fugitive movement. It is threatening as it both cannot and will not conform.

Further still, among the many open understandings and possibilities of the use of *crip*, and the everyday understandings of normalcy and deviance, is the linguistic association with the *Crips*. A contested and controversial point, the *Crips* mark a specific convergence of state sanctioned

violence specifically in regard to race, disability, economic and geographical location. There are many origin stories, some of which will be elaborated on below in efforts to explore some tensions and connections with blackness and disability. The Crips are almost certainly known as a street gang primarily located but not confined in Los Angeles, California notably connected with the rival gang, the Bloods. The majority of members are young Black men and are associated with overt acts of violence including drive-by shootings, as well as with wearing the color blue (whereas red is with The Bloods) (Bone, 2017). A general internet search for Crip Fugitivity results in news stories and sensational headlines of FBI most-wanted criminals and police investigations of fugitives from the law.

In part because of the 'long history of negativity being used' around crip, Leroy Moore Jr. changed the C to a K and created Krip-Hop, an expression and extension of the hip-hop music genre, and the Krip-Hop Nation which is a network of hundreds of hip-hop artists with disabilities around the world<sup>58</sup>. As with Moten earlier and Mairs just above, Moore Jr. writes:

“we have named ourselves and have used the negative terms to our own benefit to not only shock people but to respect that these words are our history and we must reclaim them”  
(2012, n.p.).

One of the various origins of the Crips is that some early members used canes – “as fashion accessories...or – conversely or in tandem – as accessories useful or necessary for increased mobility” assumedly necessary because of being ‘crippled’ due to violence from The Bloods (McRuer, 2006 p. 66). While there are many counternarratives, this is an immediate example of blackness and disability converging, an assumed and often expected (violently) acquired disability.

---

<sup>58</sup> For more: <https://kriphopnation.com/>

Another beginning of the Crips that doesn't come from but is a rebuke to the operation of state sanctioned violence traces its origins to radical Black organizing in Los Angeles, California in the 1970's. Crip was an acronym for Community Revolutionary Interparty Service (Sojoyner, 2016). Similarly but in a different telling, Crip meant Continuing Revolution in Progress, or Continuous Revolution in Progress (McRuer, 2006). The organizing within Black communities - by way of policies and policing's - were undermined, criminalized, and co-opted. For example, Sojoyner's study (2016) explains that the Crips were initially offered support from the state, as a continuation of an ever-persistent project of whiteness, an attempt to capture the fugitive in the form of financial assistance in exchange for an R of reform rather than revolution. Various inclusions and exclusions from conditional state support attempted to deradicalize Black youth, while simultaneously constructing any other organizing as gang activity, which consequently justified updating and increasing resources for the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD).

With Krip, Moore Jr.'s letter change from C to K is an important one. It is a distancing from the negative association of gang violence attributed to young Black men, but not necessarily a distancing from young Black men. The work of Krip is a distancing from the whiteness that creates the conditions of gang violence and that, as with the LAPD, benefit from it. It is a renaming of a misnaming, a fugitive swerve, a claiming of fugitive movement outside of the lawful circuits of movement.

"I wanted to again reclaim the term Crip to advocate and educate with a proud framework of the music and struggles of Hip-Hop artists with disabilities. Just like in Hip-Hop you turn something that the so-called mainstream has discarded with a fresh spotlight thus changing the C to a K in what we know today as Krip-Hop" (Moore Jr., 2012 n.p.).

Rather than Krip being a disambiguation, the racial connection to disability is highlighted by Crip and the Crips, and Krip is a rebuke of the violence and negativity inscribed on crips and Crips.

Crip and Crip Theory is within and around the field of Disability Studies, where there has been an increasingly recognized (and amended) lack of literature and coverage explicitly discussing and imagining intersections and co-constitutions of disability and race. Disability Studies has absorbed and produced many critiques in terms of race. Pushing the field, critiques have included *White Disability Studies* by Christopher M. Bell (2006; 2011), as well as #disabilitytoowhite – an internet hashtag started by Vilissa Thompson (2017) which seeks to address the discipline’s disproportionate emphasis on disabled white people (whether intentional or not). Bell writes that Disability Studies “by and large focuses on the work of white individuals and is itself largely produced by a corps of white scholars and activists” (2006 p. 275). These examples twist and echo back to the previously discussed distancing from an accepted dominant definition of disability as that which is pathologically abnormal, which on the whole cannot be disconnected from the many expressions of abnormality required by and for the understanding of whiteness as an expression of dominative power which, as above, is overwhelmingly yet not exclusive to white people.

But here is a moment for suspicion in regard to the consideration, inclusion, and contribution of race into the field of disability studies. In *Blackness and Disability: Critical Examinations and Cultural Interventions*, the late? editor and author Christopher M. Bell writes that “this collection is borne out of a desire to interrogate the meanings and uses of ‘blackness’ and ‘disability’ (2011 p. 3). Blackness and crip (as above), two terms that in their conjoining allow (require) a different interaction with the meanings of blackness as attributed to Black people (Harney & Moten, 2013) and disability as attributed to those with a medically acceptable/proper diagnosis (Kafer, 2013). Here are opportunities for different ways of being, present in part because of all the anarchic, open-door uncertainty that blackness and crip signify.

In their *Disability Justice Primer: Skin, Tooth, and Bone* (2016), members of Sins Invalid work to make clear that ablebodied and ableminded supremacy is inextricably entwined with white supremacy,

and that white supremacy functions through ableism. This is a ‘way of the world’<sup>59</sup> as “the fatal dislocation of certain marked bodies as matter out of (White) (normative) place” (Adams & Erevelles, 2016 p. 132). These fatal dislocations operate discursively through sensational everyday headlines describing direct violences – some of which are referenced throughout this thesis. The marking of bodies as matter out of place is enacted upon (some) students entering their schools – as was the case with Samera and Skinny, students in Washington DC who had to pass through metal detectors and armed guards before being allowed passage into their institution of learning<sup>60</sup>. Being simultaneously dislocated and still marked as out of place is felt in (some) neighborhoods - where the regular and regulative surveillance and patrol by local, state, federal and unofficial law enforcement – as exemplified in Broken Windows policing. These manifestations of whiteness - underrepresentedly felt by people marked as white, non-disabled, law-abiding and citizen - are what occasionally gain the attention of people wider than those immediately impacted by (what is too often described as) an isolated incident that is recognizably violent<sup>61</sup>.

“When we focus on a person’s individual impairment, or diagnoses...it kind of like lets society off the hook. It makes all the focus on that individual circumstance, when really ableism and exclusion and violence happen because of systems of oppression. So, we know it’s not like an individual person with a disability that’s the issue, but we can look at...the special education system. It’s not the individual special education student [that’s the issue], but we can see how special education becomes continued segregation for so many Black and

---

<sup>59</sup> If this is the way of the world, then here speaks to the necessity of abolition, not just of one institution (e.g. the police; the school) or institutional practice (e.g. systemic racism in policing; ablebodied and ableminded supremacy in education) but with da Silva (2019), of the world as we know it.

<sup>60</sup> Which schools have metal detectors, as with which have armed SROs, speaks to the wider oppressions foundational to and perpetuated by the US. In New York City alone, in 2015 almost half of all Black students were scanned every school day, while white students made up only 14% of those scanned (Lemire, n.p.).

<sup>61</sup> Such as the Disturbing Schools example from South Carolina discussed in the School-to-Prison Pipeline chapter.

Brown students. So, when we focus on like the individual impairment, it kind of takes away from that bigger picture” (Milbern, 2017 n.p.).

Illuminating part of this bigger picture is the disability justice movement. Similar and connected to crip, a movement started by crips, disability justice is a movement that was first named in 2005 by Patty Berne, Mia Mingus, Stacey Milbern, Leroy Moore, Eli Clare, and Sebastian Margaret – disabled, Black, Brown, queer, and trans members of the original Disability Justice Collective (Piepznasamarasinha, 2018). Disability justice centers the “lives, needs, and organizing strategies of disabled queer and trans and/or Black and brown people marginalized from mainstream disability rights organizing’s white-dominated, single-issue focus” (ibid. n.p.). To be sure, people and groups have been doing disability justice work, distinct from inclusion- and rights-based work, before 2005, but this collective and what emerged from this naming have been massively transformational. As Mia Mingus (2014) writes on the differences between disability rights and disability justice: “We are not talking about a kinder, gentler oppressive system or only access to the current system we have...We want a different system that does not rely on ‘good’ or ‘deserving’ disabled people...we want true justice that moves us toward liberation for all people” (pp. 109-110). Again, following the late great Stacey Milbern, focusing on single-issues or individuals misses the bigger picture. Without disregarding the more recognizable (of which reformist, rights-based efforts largely derive), this thesis is attending to and pushing what is considered the mundane. As Adams & Erevelles (2016) write:

“[B]ecause some dis-locating practices are so obviously violent, they serve to obscure other normalized everyday practices enacted by seemingly well-intentioned individuals to dis-locate bodies from classrooms, families, and communities and into carceral settings” (p. 132).

This state-shaped understanding of dislocated (fugitive) students being unable or unwilling to conform to lawful circuits of movement finds disabled people and/or Black, Brown, American Indian people as outlaws, regardless of any particular in/action. The classification and violence toward the Crips and other forms of black sociality as dangerous, deviant, thuggish, threatening activity is but one example of the outlawing of a misnamed fugitive throughout (US) history. The suppression and violence of the state was an is framed as countermeasures to unlawfulness rather than variously initiating and creating the conditions for its own legitimacy and necessity. Writing on fugitive life, Dillon (2018) asserts that “Power emerges to capture what escapes” (p. 124). One way this takes place within the confines of and working to expand the STPP framework is through school dress codes.

During the Beyond the School to Prison Pipeline panel Q&A (Rodriguez, 2013)<sup>62</sup> an audience member asked about the practical approaches possible to confront school disciplinary regulations in relation to school dress codes. The person in the audience, a high school teacher presumably in or near Los Angeles, CA<sup>63</sup> was made to attend a school-sponsored professional development session facilitated by a police officer in relation to the risks, in this specific question, represented in wearing a hat in school. The experienced example is about students in the Los Angeles area who are pulled out of class for wearing the hat of the local professional baseball team, the Dodger’s, whose team color is blue - as in the blue represented and worn by the Crips. The reason of student safety was given, implying that anyone wearing gang-affiliated colors (i.e. blue) poses a threat to ideas of safety. But it is not everyone wearing blue that is targeted nor poses a material and physic threat - in Los Angeles

---

<sup>62</sup> Held at the University of California, Riverside through the Critical Ethnic Studies Research Center, Beyond the School to Prison Pipeline: Radical Perspectives on Criminalization & State Violence Across State Institutions was facilitated by Dylan Rodriguez and the featured panelists were Connie Wun (paper: Zero Tolerance Policies as Excess: Race and Gender in School Discipline and Punishment), Damien Sojoyner (paper: Undoing the Myth of the School-to-Prison Pipeline), and João Costa Vargas (paper: Borrowed Land as Prison: Spectacles of Homeland Warfare in Rio de Janeiro).

<sup>63</sup> The University of California Riverside is about a one-hour drive (probably more depending on traffic) east of Los Angeles, which is in the traditional territory of the Tongva, Payómkawichum (Luiseño), Kizh, and Cahuilla tribes (Native Land Digital, n.d.).

County there is a consistently higher number and/or rate of Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native students suspended for non-violent defiance than their White peers (specifics such as dress code violation are not recorded) (Ed-Data, 2020).

On school dress code enforcement, panelist Damien Sojoyner challenged the premise given (one that is founded in racist, state-crafted violence [e.g. Galvin-Almanza, 2019]), and homed in on the point of safety, asking “what does it mean to be safe? Does it mean you have employment? Does it mean you have health care? ...Not taking off a hat” (2013 n.p.). Panelist Connie Wun also responded to the audience member about these students, “you’re taking off your cap, but it’s not going to save you” (2013). Stated otherwise, a student who conforms to the enforced circuits of movement by taking off their blue hat is still not necessarily going to benefit or even be redirected away from the movement out of school and into prison (or the carceral educations in and of schools).

Here is another opportunity to restate why I perceive an abolitionist study of the STPP framework being so necessary. What is focused on, valued, and enforced in schools that are framed as contributing to the STPP framework, as well as with projects confronting the framework are still unable to change the course of things because the way things are remain. In the following section a discussion of movement in schools is offered in relation to the risk attributed to fugitivity and blackness.

#### RISKING FUGITIVE MOVEMENT

Lepecki’s choreopolicing is a helpful articulation when thinking about the mundane violences that show up (or don’t) in educational institutions, pedagogies, imaginings. Choreopolicing described again as “a certain kind of movement that prevents any formation and expression of the political” (2013 p. 20) – where the political, following Arendt is to be read as a “general orientation toward



freedom” (p. 14). The police in choreopolicing is not given to just police-as-agent but expanded to be recognizable and even mandated in such expression as the teaching act, as a generalized police-function.

Disturbing movement or movement that disturbs – “those side-eyes saturated with subversive meaning” (Green & Bey, 2017), those swaggering crip hip-checks (Mairs, 1986) – might not be expressed as any particular bodily movement at all. This fugitivity might be otherwise understood within Lepecki’s choreopolitical, described as “the formation of collective plans emerging at the edges between open creativity, airing initiative, and a persistent – even stubborn – iteration of the desire to live away from policed conformity” (Lepecki, 2013 p. 23). I read both choreopolicing and choreopolitics as experiments pushing, blocking, expanding, redirecting circuits of movement (just for extremely different reasons). Rodriguez (2017b) speaks of police as “constantly experimenting with what the boundaries of police power entail”, and it is with this that both “a daily choreography of conformity emerges” (Lepecki, 2013 p. 20) and the “going on underneath it that constitute the ubiquitous chance of it having been some other way” (Moten, 2016 n.p.) – under and before as fugitive movement.

“What is the practice that needs to be practiced in order to ensure that the political does not vanish from the world? Precisely that thing called freedom. The vanishing of the political thing from the world is the vanishing of the experience and practice of movement as freedom.” (Lepecki, 2013 p. 14).

Lepecki wants to rehearse and thus keep alive the political, which here is understood to be freedom. This is a freedom and a practice that we “do not know - at least not yet” according to Arendt<sup>64</sup>. But what repetition might be in this rehearsal? What is being produced, what are we producing and reproducing with this practice? If we are to learn to move politically toward freedom as an enacting

---

<sup>64</sup> Translated by Lepecki from Arendt, H. (1993) *Was ist Politik? Fragmente aus dem Nachlass*. Munich: Piper.

of a freedom we do not yet know; to practice a practice to keep the political from vanishing from the world, it must also be asked: what world are we keeping from being vanished in our practicing?

What might be taken for granted (conceptually, materially, spiritually, imaginatively) or considered self-evident and thus at risk of remaining in our attempts and demands of abolition toward and as the end of the world as we know it?

## 5

### STUDY

“If you truly understood what study is, you would know that it is this sort of sociality. That’s all that it is” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 111).

Study in the undercommons, with and for the undercommons, is a defense, a preservation of a fugitive movement which is never fixed and always social. In that sense, an undercommon study is not a creation, the defense is of a being and moving together which has been defined, confined, and regulated to particular expressions (e.g. the student) and institutions (e.g. schools). Study is not a means to an end, study is not a building toward something, some goal, strategy, but is the goal itself. If anything is to be built it is space for more study - which might be more accurately described as a lessening or ridding of that which limits our ability to be with and/or recognize each other as ourselves in study. We don’t get together in study so as to be better prepared for examination. In educational settings, the examination is a condition of which we can get together in study, to renew and relearn our habits of assembly (Callahan, 2017).

Study in school is antagonistic to the sociality of study in the undercommons. Study as strategy culminating in a credible, creditable project (e.g. study for an examination) differs from the ongoing project of study in the undercommons. These undercommon, ongoing, open, fugitive expressions of study are not and cannot (despite a persistent and pursuant regulatory attempts) be confined to any particular place, time, or person.

“Studying is not limited to the university. It’s not held or contained within the university. Study has a relation to the university, but only insofar as the university is not necessarily excluded from the undercommons that it tries so hard to exclude” (ibid. p. 113).

This non-exclusion of study extends to every educational institution, which have conditions that would be associated with general ideas of study (e.g. books, desks, instructors, preparation for formal examinations) in large part because the institution, and the cross-talk about and between institutions, shapes its own image - how it is to be perceived and interacted with. Importantly, the institution also shapes under what conditions and how it is to be critiqued and/or reformed (Foucault, 1977; Millei, 2005; Rodriguez, 2010). Knowing this, the undercommons offers spaces of study for different understandings and imaginings of how we might live with while simultaneously supporting an end of educational institutions (Andreotti, Stein, Ahenakew & Hunt, 2015). “The only possible relationship to the university today is a criminal one” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 26). With this, to study with and for the undercommons is to be outside the law – simultaneously representing a risk and being at-risk (Policy chapter) – with any manner of attempted corrections imposed by the law enforcers upon the outlawed student. As elaborated on below with examination, these corrections, while associated with, found in, and emerging from particular institutional structures, are unattached to any site-specific place. The attempts to institutionally confine and define study (e.g. what is worth engaging in; what results should be desired and attained upon completion of a particular engagement with a topic) marks a long history of failures – from the banning of books to loitering laws, both of which attempt to police particular people and communities from exhibiting and attending to insurgent forms of study as sociality. Prisons, street corners and schools are all sites that work to delineate what is and is not, who can and cannot engage in study - and even in the face of this, the study continues. Even with their similarities, relations, influences and inseparability’s, it is not to superimpose or exchange one branch of education for another (universities do and do not function like/as high schools, etc.), nor one institution for another (schools and prisons have distinct manifestations and contributions to carceral projects).

\* \* \*

A concept such as study in the undercommons is not one that is made a system of (e.g. X is an example of study; study is done when elements X and Y reach Z), but where the concept of and those thinking with study can move through different situations (Harney & Moten, 2013). It is less whether or not a particular configuration of people came together under certain pretenses and the outcome/occurrence was recognizable as study. It can be better imagined as abolition - abolition as study. It is a ridding-of (prisons and a world that could have prisons) within a negative register, and simultaneously a changing and building (worlds we want and do not yet know) in a positive sense. When study is understood to create nothing except maybe space for more study, I understand that within a context of and itself as abolitionist, which this thesis takes up as challenge and opportunity. Giving the name of study to the ways people get together outside of, before, and despite institutional pressures and requirements is just one way to imagine a practice of sociality. There are other words and phrases that could, will, and do conjure the fugitive communities and insurgent movements study allows and requires attending to. As in *The Undercommons*:

“...there are these props, these toys, and if you pick them up you can move into some new thinking and into a new set of relations, a new way of being together, thinking together. In the end, it’s the new way of being together and thinking together that’s important, and not the tool, not the prop. Or, the prop is important only insofar as it allows you to enter; but once you’re there, it’s the relation and the activity that’s really what you want to emphasize” (p. 105).

If illusory, study is describable, and not only in relation of what it is not, which can make study seem like it is determined after-the-fact and/or what needs to be created rather than an expression of a present and ongoing intellectual sociality/social intellectuality. Put another way, framing study in opposition or distinction to what it is not misrecognizes the generativity of study and forecloses engagements with and for study that is already happening, is ongoing, and will continue after institutional establishment of a designated and regulated study has come and gone. Institutional,

policy-based framings make study seem like it is housed (e.g. in educational institutions; at a desk; in a library), embodied (e.g. students; instructors) and something that is to be taught and refined (e.g. proper study skills/habits). These are symbols of a study which is for and of examination. They work to define how and what one is to study.

It doesn't matter that there is more than one way to study for a test, the multiple interpretations and methods of effective study set parameters guided by and enforcing metrics on everyday circuits of movement. These metrics (e.g. examination; school disciplinary policies) are mobilizations of control that attempt to capture the fugitive in the act, to patrol for criminal behavior with various means to enforce/preserve seemingly definitive modalities of being. This is described by Lepecki as "the endless reproduction of an imposed circulation of consensual subjectivity, where to be is to fit a prechoreographed pattern of circulation, corporeality, and belonging" (2013 p. 20). These patterns are not the same for everyone, which in schools simultaneously works to justify examination in order to determine where each student fits (in multiple scales and registers), as well as to promote ideas of the school as a dynamic institution capable of producing, supporting and adapting to a diversity of learners with various needs and desires (and not that of structurally intent to influence/determine/fix the individual and an individual's path).

These symbols of study for examination also do the work of examination. In part this is through enforcing what is being studied, how, and determining whether the study was effective in creating the desired results. These results might be via formal examination such as with standardized testing, or more subtly in monitoring and measuring the progress of students behaviorally (e.g. emotional intelligence), tracked individually and compared to set perceptions of appropriate development. Describing choreopolicing, Lepecki contributes to articulations of the workings of informal, unspoken control of movement as "not the art of controlling behavior by the police, but the already controlled behavior of the public" (ibid. p. 18). An example engaged with later in this thesis, the call to order describes a process of delineation that, with official or unofficial authority, administers, reifies and

otherwise teaches the parameters and surrounding cues of contextual etiquette and expectations – this is how a space like a classroom comes to be known, including the expected behavior therein for all in and around the classroom. So too do these acts of delineation affirm themselves as the place they seem to represent. A teacher calling a noisy class to order indicates that study is to occur in that space where it wasn't before, as directed and determined by the teacher (who in turn is legitimizing authority in the act of teaching) and rehearsed by the students (who further solidify their own roles), of material that is packaged and delivered as valuable.

A teacher's attempts to call the class to order reflects and revives those systems that maintain "the already controlled behavior of the public" (ibid., 2103 p. 18), which serves as an ongoing examination of the effectiveness of previous and ongoing attempts at uninterrupted examinations by determining where some students fail to anticipate and adhere to the impetus and impulse of the call to order. These movements often placed within the register of either can't or won't, are institutionally recognized as failings. Blame for these failings is variously ascribed, but what is wrong is ultimately found/imposed in the individual student perceived to be unable (can't) or unwilling (won't) to develop, conform, and/or behave according to an endless list of expectations. But to understand a can't and a won't within the world as we know it as an individual (or even familial, community, or institutional) failure is a propping up of already dominant/dominating forces and adherence to/enforcement of choreopoliced circuits of the imaginable. To refuse these calls is to tap into the profound and simple understanding that "there's *nothing wrong with us* (precisely insofar as there is something wrong, something off, something ungovernably, fugitively living in us that is constantly taken for the pathogen it instantiates) (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 50, emphasis in original).

Deviancy, criminality, risk is attempted to be attached to the student who is perceived as failing to fit, who is suspected of future failures (Aull IV, 2012; Rose, 1985). These suspicions and labels are beginnings and extensions of carceral, hierarchically ordering apparatuses that immediately shape

student life such as standards of intelligence, race, sexuality and citizenship status. For many students this is a prechoreographed movement into the trappings of the STPP – a necessary result shaped as unintended anomaly of an institution among institutions set on privatization and property, against sociality for the upkeep of society, and promoting individual achievement and accountability. This is continued with the notion that deviancy needs disciplining and criminality needs policing. Examination of/for deviancy and criminality evolves, expands, gets refined, reformed, as does the consequential disciplining/punitive measures.

“This seemingly compulsory, school-sited reproduction of the deadly circuits of privilege and alienation is anything but new, and has always been central to the routines of the U.S. schooling regime, particularly in its colonialist and post-emancipationist articulations”  
(Rodriguez, 2010 p. 9).

To confront and/or be confronted by an abolitionist perspective on schooling, where schools are but extensions of schooling and abolition is without end, necessarily expands the boundaries of abolitionist intention. Abolishing prison in this world is impossible. Abolishing school in this world as we know it is impossible. It is the task and fate of the abolitionist to do the impossible, to collectively study the impossible formations of social life and living that neither relies nor reforms nor replicates the “assumptive necessity, integrity, and taken-for-grantedness of prisons, policing, and the normalized state violence they reproduce (ibid. p. 9). These assumptive necessities of prison extend beyond recognizably similar state institutions such as policing, existing among, within and as extensions of other seemingly unrelated institutions such as schooling (although conceptually attached via pipeline), and the family. The PIC again brings these inter-institutional manifestations of suffering and control into fuller display. The prison, the military, the police, the family, the school, the nation, the law are articulations of each other, which profit and preserve on the continuing existence and expansion that these and other institutions forcibly experiment with. The world as we know it (which includes the prison, the police, the family, the school, the nation, the self and the



innumerable extensions and expressions that uphold and naturalize the catastrophes required of and holding up an unsustainable existence in this racial capitalist world [da Silva, 2019]) cannot accept or contain study but instead widely works to regulate (e.g. the proper and the improper), exclude (e.g. those expressions that can't and/or won't), and also include particularities of study that can be molded out of an abolitionist impetus and into a register of policy (e.g. defanging abolitionist demands into reforms). The world cannot abide the criminality of study that is for nothing more than the preservation of fugitive sociality. Thus, the world as we know it must be abolished (Abolition Pedagogies chapter). Again, Harney & Moten ask: "What is, so to speak, the object of abolition?" (2013 p. 42). Their answer could be a refrain throughout this thesis: "Not so much the abolition of prisons but the abolition of a society that could have prisons, that could have slavery, that could have the wage, and therefore not abolition as the elimination of anything but abolition as the founding of a new society" (ibid.).

\* \* \*

Study is illusive to its illusory designations - fugitive, on the run in every direction, in flight, obliterating in its inattention. "Some people want to run things, other things want to run" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 51). The project of institutionalizing study includes distinguishing acceptable, unacceptable, and wholly separate actions and purposes of study. These attempts to confine or know study contribute to redefining what would become suspect and outlawed movements such as disinterest (Fugitivity chapter), disturbance (STPP chapter) or any potential expression that could be attributed with deviating from the techniques of administering, and pedagogies justifying, the regulatory force of schooling's study. With and for fugitivity, the sociality of study was outlaw before the law made it criminal; self-defense that the law would then be built to prevent and control and shape as that which the law must defend itself against; fugitive beyond the law. A perhaps more

insidious tool of the PIC is the continued attempts at regulating study (and as will be extended below, black study) by passing off restricted/restricting definitions and imaginings as beneficent. At the same instance, policy enacted through and as extension of the PIC is a correcting force, (rightly) placing the at-risk student as threat to the orderly. As in the Policy chapter, the risk that the at-risk student inhabits far exceeds the more common forms of protection such as preventing disruptive students from interfering with complying students' learning. Nonetheless, these im/material regulations are enacted whether for the student's own good or for a higher purpose such as for the nation's.

“...colonialism is made to look like self-defense” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 17).

Here is how and why Black fugitive disengagement (Sojoyner, 2017) is categorized as delinquent and dangerous. The refusal of prechoreographed learning, the unwillingness to recognize the importance of institutional schooling as provided by the institution<sup>65</sup>, is repackaged not as practicing the practice of freedom (Lepecki, 2013) but as a threat needing to be eliminated and a brokenness needing to be fixed. But these distortions and repackaging's are not interesting, they are not anything ultimately worth thinking about and/or attacking. Fugitive sociality and finding more and new ways of being together in study toward abolition is the non-place this thesis seeks to escape to. But engaging with the STPP framework inevitably and immediately invites the mechanisms and mechanics of policy, those fixated on fixing, be it students to a prechoreographed expression of proper student (within the understanding that there are different roles and expectations based on race, class, gender, sexuality, geographic location and ability) or schools to lessen the effects attributed to the horrors of carceral practices (which fail to recognize insidious logics and techniques within and as carceral educations, which end up creating kinder, gentler, evolved violences).

---

<sup>65</sup> Institutions of schooling have unique roles but should not be thought unique from the overarching, interconnectedness of the PIC and other institutions therein.

How can studying (with) the institutional ways we are to study and those that would call study to order, including ourselves, contribute to an (ongoing) abolitionist project?

Vulnerability might begin to describe study with and for the undercommons, as the non-restrictive embrace of an unconditionality – “the door swings open for refuge even though it may let in police agents and destruction” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 38). And destruction does come, sometimes subtle sometimes apparent and so often in the form of aid. The policing of a sociality excessive of restricted and restricting law and order – destruction disguised as improvement, creating problems to be found and dealt with.

“[A]ll institutions are political, and all politics is correctional, so it seems we need correctional institutions in the common, settling it, correcting us. But we won’t stand corrected. Moreover, incorrect as we are there’s nothing wrong with us. We don’t want to be correct and we won’t be corrected.” (ibid. p. 20).

An alternative to orthodox correction yet remaining within the scope of policy, restorative justice programs are implemented into public schools, promoted as working to lessen student vulnerability of entering into the structural mechanisms in place associated with the STPP framework. At the same time, these institutionally recognized programs enhance notions that prechoreographed understandings of justice tied to the law are acceptable and should be sought. Restorative justice further fixes justice as something attainable which, as a response to a perceived wound or injustice, fits harm as something reducible to a describable, understandable register. Stories of the STPP are full of these recognizable, captivating narratives (e.g. risk of violence at school brings increased policing; student misbehavior is criminalized where it was once disciplined in schools from non-police school officials).

But what of the mundane in the teaching act sustains the notion that vulnerability, in the unconditional openness of study, leads to being wounded? Restorative justice practices in schools

offer generative alternatives to overtly punitive disciplining and/or legal criminalization, yet still depend on and further entrench understandings of schools being sites of an education necessary and worthy of participating in; as justice being conceptually understood, achievable and given the proper circumstances, expected; as harm being measurable and repayable. Restorative justice programs have the potential to be radically transformative, and the potential to be “nondisruptive adjuncts and/or expansions of carceral control” (Spade, 202 p. 142). Restoration is reparative. “Conservation,” as in self-defense distinct from an individuated and self-determined subject (da Silva, 2007; 2013b), “is always new” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 63).

As with the earlier mentioned Black Panther Party for Self-Defense educational programs like the Oakland Community Learning Center (It’s About Time, n.d.), there are examples of radically different approaches and understandings to school discipline. The Oakland Community Learning Center students ran a Justice Committee in which the student being disciplined addressed a board of their peers and after discussion a ‘method of correction’ was decided and agreed upon by all. This ‘method of correction’ sought to address and support changing what the student was struggling with. This is in stark contrast to the ‘correction’ of Zero Tolerance policies and/or police intervention, and might get us imagining more at the limits of correction and the limits of justice (da Silva, 2013b). The Justice Committee’s ‘method of correction’ was an expression with and for the undercommoners, “the incorrect, the uncorrected, the ones who do not know to seek their own correction” (p. 78), and this not knowing was study toward and as education (and the discipline therein) otherwise.

As with study, abolition is creative, not restorative. Abolition is and must be without end, and so pedagogical efforts must reflect on and engage with the impossible yet no less necessary abolitionist demands to be ongoing and open while simultaneously refusing any effort that lauds, defends, distances or upholds in any way the “normalized misery, everyday suffering, and mundane state violence that are reproduced and/or passively condoned by *both* hegemonic and critical/counter-

hegemonic pedagogies” (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 8). If abolition is impossible, what normalized misery do possible and reasonable agendas permit? What every day suffering does imagining and pursuing achievable goals uphold? What avoidance of being vulnerable and open to being wounded (Desideri & Harney, 2013) keeps us on guard and prevents us from studying together, without end?

“Taking down our critique, our own positions, our fortifications, is self-defense alloyed with self-preservation. That takedown comes in movement, as a shawl, the armor of flight. We run looking for a weapon and keep running looking to drop it. And we can drop it, because however armed, however hard, the enemy we face is also illusory” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 19).

“...in its unconventional vulnerability to not simply the relations of material or symbolic possession but also the very capacity to possess anything, it [abolition] can be understood as a mode of being with and in dispossession” (Bey, 2019c p. 82).

As a genealogical swerve toward the definitive, this dispossession might wrongly be read as being within a mournful or negative register (an opposite understanding of affirmative definitions of study). But the affirmative and negative do not exist in opposition nor isolation. This open study does not hold nor offer the framing of being just generative, productive, or positive (even in a critical and resistant sense of productivity, as in ideas/mandates of what Desideri and Harney call work fate that would still have the studier resist strategically [2013]), nor as just subtractive, in relation to what it is not, or negative. This study requires holding all of it: the beauty and the terror. To reiterate Moten thinking with Hartman and the complexities of “all the beautiful stuff we’ve made under constraint”:

“...anybody who thinks that they can understand how terrible the terror has been without understanding how beautiful the beauty has been against the grain of that terror is wrong.

There is no calculus of the terror that can make a proper calculation without reference to that which resists it. It's just not possible" (Moten, 2016 n.p.).

The vulnerability of study with and for this openness (as in the open-door policy of the undercommons), in grappling and finding new ways of living with the terror and the beauty, is fugitive work. These improvisational creations and occasions of renewing habits of assembly (Callahan, 2017) are not merely conceptual and/or romanticizations of fugitive study or criminality. The understanding of fugitivity and refusal as wholly in reaction/relation to violent conditions, and/or as outside of the horrors thereof (imposed by the police and policy makers, and more so the world which could have/have a need for police and policy makers), becomes an upholding of certain practices and habits that potentially are being fought against. A focus of this thesis is to study movements and moments before and beyond the STPP framework and the attributed/main institutional sites understood to be encompassed therein (e.g. school, police, prison). The before and beyond emerges from imagining what an abolitionist genealogy and *The Undercommons* (2013) has to contribute to the radical potential of the STPP framework. More so, a primary point of these before's and beyond's is to engage with those efforts that are more radical than mainstream discourse; that do push standards rather than adhere to/defend the status quo. It is from the nonlocality of study that staying with and being open to finding more tensions, more naturalized patterns and undisclosed regulated movements in actions against the horrible consequences of the already too-narrow framing in the STPP is possible and necessary. So, the setting up and moving with the conditions/creating a flexible structure (via this thesis) in going beyond definitions and understandings of framed violence supports the work.

Yet, even if mundane, unrecognized, and/or accepted violences are attended to, this is not ultimately the intended focus of this study. While I am studying with radical attempts and collective abolitionist efforts, dominant forces of violent institutional regulation keep imposing themselves, keep trailing these new and creative worlds being made. Or put differently, it is the world as we

know it which abolitionist worlds-making are working to refuse/imagining otherwise, so the processes that uphold the world as we know it, which have been positioned as fixed and fixing forces, are constantly showing up. These fixing forces (e.g. the law; school discipline policies) and their enforcers (e.g. the police; teachers deputized in whiteness [Warren, 2018]) expect and demand a strategy from the dissident studier – what does your alternative practically entail? and how are you going to get there?

But study as a speculative practice can neither provide the answers nor is it configured to engage in trying to and is thus placed as antithetical to the regulatory functions and carceral (under)pinning's of educational sites. Because study is “a kind of way of being with others,” as Harney & Moten write, “it’s almost impossible that it could be matched up with particular forms of institutional life” (2013 p. 112). In this open study, which again attends to the excesses in/of terror and beauty, the speculation and intention is in a planning for and engagement in more communal study, without knowing just what that is, has been, could be, or will resemble.

“There might be something useful in not wanting *this* and simply wanting *that* without knowing what *that* is. But because it's not *this*, it has a kind of value” (Bey, 2019a n.p.)<sup>66</sup>.

In the STPP framework archive being made and remade for this thesis, the regulating imposition is very present, demonstrated in the vast majority of work in and around the archive which, even in critique of prison-like atmosphere's/practices of schools, espouse various forms of carceral educations. These common reactions affect my engagement with much of the archive as well. The daily in-your-face conditions can be overwhelming just to read about, both within individual events and with the wide reaches of the conditions of carceral educations. This is especially the case because sensational headlines, social media stories, and news articles emphasize polarities – either friendly neighborhood SROs/minority students overcoming adversity, or brutalities of SROs

---

<sup>66</sup> This comment was during an organized discussion of *The Undercommons* and is in direct reference to a 2017 article titled “IMPOSSIBILITY OF THAT” by Eva Hayward & Che Gossett.

perpetuated on minority students written about as victims. But responses of outrage over violence (whether overt within negative events or insidious as within positive stories), are within a register of immediately identifiable problems, accompanied too often by restorative, repetitive, paint-by-numbers solutions. Instead, the work is to stay with the horrors and not reactively reach for prearranged choices to change what is perceived and rehearsed as a problem: “It is refusing to tell you what is to be done” (Halberstam, 2019).

An example of study-as-refusal is found in the recently created campaign called #8ToAbolition, which is “an offering for abolitionist vision and transformation” toward “a world without police, where no one is held in a cage, and all people thrive and be well” (2020 n.p.). #8ToAbolition offers an 8-point platform of actionable abolitionist items, such as (3) removing police from schools, and (7) provide safe housing for everyone, which addresses the issue of policing beyond single-issue problems/solutions within carceral institutions like police departments. It was put together as a “direct response to,” but not dismissal of, “a harmful reformist campaign” (ibid.) called #8CantWait (n.d.) from the activist organization Campaign Zero, which came out with an 8-point plan to reduce violence and killings by police. The #8CantWait platform is one of reform of and adherence not only to a need for police generally but accepting that police will perpetuate violence. While the struggle to lessen police violence and fight the general impunity in which that violence takes place is a difficult one given the power police have socially, economically, forcefully as well as psychically/affectively in everyday life, and is a commendable fight to engage in, the efforts are actually doing the work of recuperating rather than ridding (and thus taking up) defunct institutions and institutional thinking. The ways #8CantWait responds to policing and police brutality only makes for (the potential of) a kinder, gentler violence. For instance, by naming and distinguishing police violence/police brutality from the general practice of state-sanctioned policing (Rodriguez, 2017b), a subtle violence is accepted and perpetuated.



Far from an abolitionist imagining, the #8CantWait policy platform is actually taken up and used promotionally by police departments who use the campaign to demonstrate their progressive approach to policing. Here progressive might mean that there is already a policy in place not to shoot at moving vehicles, or requiring officers to verbally warn someone before shooting at them (two of the #8CantWait policies proposed to reduce police violence/killings). That the 8-point platform is just another insubstantial reform is summarized well in a tweet in response to the Milwaukee, WI Police Department tweeting that they already incorporate all 8 policies of #8CantWait.

“Police departments with a well-documented history of killing Black people are bragging about how they already adhere to #8CantWait, which just shows the weakness of those reforms and why the only path forward is to #DefundThePolice” (Tyson, 2020).

That on the #8CantWait website there is a graphic promoting abolition<sup>67</sup> and promoting to end the carceral state further highlights the emptiness of reform - it is unclear how having a sincere goal of ending the carceral state can be promoted on the same platform as wanting police departments (to continue to exist and) to implement Use of Force Continuum’s which restrict yet permit “the most severe types of force to the most extreme situations” (#8CantWait, n.d. n.p.; English, 2020).

#8ToAbolition however, engages in speculative study – it is not oppositional to the initial #8CantWait reform, but is its radical potential<sup>68</sup>. To elaborate, #8ToAbolition simultaneously was and was not established in relation to #8CantWait. Obviously, the abolitionist 8-point platform is in direct response (as with having specifically 8 abolitionist agendas), but the abolitionist work described and

---

<sup>67</sup> To emphasize a seemingly minor point but one that gets at how the #8CantWait campaigners understand abolition and promote their understandings via images, the symbol to go along with the abolition portion of their platform is a circle with a diagonal line through it (#8CantWait, n.d.). This is a widely used graphic to indicate ‘no’ or an end to something. That abolition is understood and promoted as a ‘no’ instead of a generative, speculative study and practice is indicative of a too-narrow use of abolition.

<sup>68</sup> The 10 authors of #8ToAbolition wrote this about who they are: “We are a geographically dispersed, loose formation of abolitionists across the U.S. The group of authors includes people who are Black, Latinx, Asian, Arab, Muslim, white, trans, queer, migrant, disabled, sex working, caregiving, and working-class” (2020 n.p.).

promoted is before the counterinsurgent calls for reform (Rodriguez, 2020). #8CantWait is an example of abolitionist imaginings/work being turned toward policy and turned into reforms. This speaks again to the precarity of the open-door of the undercommons and/as study. #8ToAbolition is a reiteration in a moment when abolitionist practices are proliferating, radical agendas are being considered more widely, and reformist moves to policy are all the while trying to do the recuperative, progressive work of making reasonable and rationale requests to existing systems.

“Reform is at best a form of casualty management, while reformism is counterinsurgency against those who dare to envision, enact, and experiment with abolitionist forms of community, collective power, and futurity” (ibid. n.p.).

Speaking on the point of “languages of prison abolition gaining currency and traction,” Rodriguez (2017) says that “we’re not necessarily hearing the same language being tied to the police” (n.p.). The taking up of abolitionist language to push reformist strategies toward particularities of the PIC are exemplified in #8CantWait, which in its recuperative attempts at policy reform, reinstates violences the organization Campaign Zero promoting the 8-point platform is (doing the worthy and difficult work of) fighting to lessen/end. Rodriguez (ibid.) continues by clarifying that “the rise of a reformist and even allegedly abolitionist practice, discourse, and analysis around criminal justice, prisons, jails, and so forth, is actually being accompanied by a buttressing and amplification and a strengthening of policing” (n.p.).

The #8ToAbolition website, however, offers 8 actionable points that reduce reliance on and points of contact with the police, such as (3) removing police from all schools. Within this point is a recognition that the work of policing is done by more than an individual officer. Moving with this recognition, #8ToAbolition further pushes the actionable agendas within the larger 8 points, including issues discussed previously in *Fugitivity*, such as “Remove surveillance tech and metal detectors from all schools” and “Urge states to repeal truancy laws” (2020 n.p.). Including and

further than material demands (physically having no police patrolling schools), the abolitionist positions and points demand and promote a general divestment from the very idea of policing, which is a position that recognizes policing beyond police officers (“Prohibit the surveillance of Black and Brown students by their teachers, counselors, and school officials through programs that criminalize students and exploit relationships of trust with school officials,” *ibid.* n.p.). In discussing the carceral logic of policing that has become naturalized (disproportionately) “into all of our thinking,” Mychal Denzel Smith notes the fallacy which #8ToAbolition highlights, “that the police are somehow a necessity in safety when they’ve proven over and over that they’re not” (2020 n.p.).

To this point, many do not need to be told that the police are inessential. The fugitive knows this, has known it, felt it, heard it, and though not needed, is reminded again and again. The fugitive is reminded through experiencing the violence of a persistent effort to establish and maintain the police as legitimate and relevant over and over and again and again. Here is the underprivilege of the fugitive, of those closest to blackness, set by and because of these reminders and re-enforcements. Those who study together do not need to be reminded of the ineffectual brutalities of policing. Yet the reminders come.

To articulate the practice of study in the context for this thesis, it is a practice of being in study with and for others toward abolition. Yet, the rehearsal of this study is “nonetheless caught up in a struggle all the time to maintain itself” because of the impositional forces of policy and policing (Harney, 2020 n.p.) which exhibit themselves externally as destructive forces (e.g. SRO; prisons; standardized testing), as well as internally as naturalized habits and acceptances (e.g. that police are necessary; that it is proper to police oneself; accepting an individuated self and internal/external, mind/body dualities). So, in practicing study, though not equally (e.g. the political prisoner and the disengaged student have different hindrances), “it is the case,” as Harney details, “that someone will come after you to stop you - landlords, bosses, teachers, police, the water man, whatever the case may be that you have had to struggle against...study is a struggle” (*ibid.*).

Harney and Moten make the point variously of intellectual practice being done outside of those sites typically understood to be and regulated to enclose it. Intellectual practice as study can be “around a whole bunch of various kitchen tables,” (Moten, 2018a p. 230), or “people working together in a factory” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 110), and can happen in, but is not exclusive to nor likely to have the space, given the protocols of and within, a classroom. As Harney & Moten share:

“The point of calling it ‘study’ is to mark that the incessant and irreversible intellectuality of these activities is already present” (2013 p. 110).

These intellectual practices are expressions of study before and beyond the persistent imposition of regulative institutions which try to capture study within school property. Here school property could be thought of as exceeding the walls and gates of the physical site of the school, to extend to the homework assigned, and the general carceral educations being taught and imposed as a function of naturalizing particular modalities of understanding oneself as one self and as being in (hierarchical) relation to others, the environment, etc. This can be in correcting someone’s ‘mispronunciation’ of a word, or making assumptions of a person’s (access to) education by the way they speak. Here (and there) gestures toward the non-locality of abolitionist study. Marquis Bey, in studying/” putting in the work necessary to bring the regimes of this world to an end,” describes

“Those of us who have been cruelly disposed of, and those of us who understand disposedness as an ethical site of critical interrogation of that which created the conditions of disposedness, will not stand still. Being accosted by the violence of the normative - the imposition of an intransgressible, illimitable, unconsented-to order - responds to that fracturous escape that has in fact preceded us, a fracturous escape that we must choose to claim, continually, all of us. In doing that, we come together as fugitives in unruly harmony. (Bey, 2019c p. 10).

The world-ending worlds-creating work is being done, through the fugitivity of a student's unregulated desire for sociality<sup>69</sup>, as much as through intentional, planned, practiced study that would be well-named as mutual aid. This is improvisational work to rid what has been imposed, what distracts from being here and now (Moten, 2016). As Dean Spade makes clear, "mutual aid is an often devalued iteration of radical collective care that provides a transformative alternative to the demobilizing frameworks for understanding social change and expressing dissent that dominate the popular imagination" (2020 p. 131). Abolition as study is communal and thus insurgent childcare; is rideshares during bus boycotts; is organizing grocery pickups/drop offs and cooking for each other; is reiki sessions for protestors; is forming study groups in prison; is claiming the gift of blackness (Moten, 2007) which "gives us some instances to study how it is that we can inhabit this radical force of differentiation as a mode of social life that isn't predicated on the discreet separateness of every individual subject...[it is] another way of being in the world (Moten, 2014 n.p.).

## BLACK STUDY

"Black study is the irreducibly social mode of concern that blackness enacts in its constant, preservative differentiation of and from itself" (Moten & Harney, 2015 n.p.)

"Blackness, I assert, signifies that fugitive movement, absconding with life it is not supposed to have, refusing fixity. It speaks to that insurgent sociality that keeps on unfixing (Bey, 2019c p. 31).

Throughout this chapter and overall thesis I am attempting and experimenting with articulating something of study that elicits and provokes illicit movement. More than just a referent, there is an

---

<sup>69</sup> As was the case with the sixth-grade student who's immediate disposedness began after kicking a trashcan (as discussed in the Call to Order chapter).

unfixed, broken but not in need of fixing movement that study opens and is open to. I am writing again and still of blackness. The illicit, excessive movement of blackness described in the Fugitivity chapter simultaneously names, conjures, and is conjured by the sociality of study.

One way to articulate the fugitivity of blackness is that it escapes (in that it cannot be contained within) the associations it is attributed. Blackness is not tied to the epidermal, is in “ontological difference from black people who are, nevertheless, (under)privileged insofar as they are given (to) an understanding of it” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 47). The relational impositions and understandings of blackness, what could be called dispossessions, have been thought of through “alliance and contagion, affiliations and attainment, proximity and capacity” (Bey, 2019c p. 99). But the undercommon defense named here as study is “self-defense as a radically transformative self-endangering, self-ungendering, degeneration of self in regenerative selflessness” (Moten, 2017).

The defense that is study is a self-defense of a self that is not single, separate, individual, but that is “more and at the same time less than one” (Moten, 2014 n.p.). This more and less than one is a “radical force of differentiation and a mode of social life that isn't predicated on the discreet separateness of every individual subject” (ibid. n.p.). Study with and for blackness offers instances for how this radical force can be and is inhabited. This study also emerges from within and is beyond attempted limits of (social) life. Consider the study going on before the teacher quiets the room (Harney & Moten, 2013); the music happening before the conductor's baton is raised (Halberstam, 2013). Further still, consider the ongoing planning and modes of social life that are institutionally unrecognizable as study (the unruly, the disruptive); the music happening that is incomprehensible and unacceptable to efforts of comprehension (the noise, the noisy). Consider the measures taken against these fugitive acts and those who would be misnamed fugitive, of which the STPP only begins to frame. Yet, with genealogical engagements and considerations of abolition pedagogies the STPP framework is useful in gleaning the various ways violences are understood, enacted, fought against, transformed, and recognized otherwise.

If “study is what you do with other people” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 110), then what of schooling allows, inhibits, regulates, outlaws and redirects studying together? Seeking to limit the sociality of study ascribes (through tactics such as standardized testing or informal examinations) value to that and they and we all who have no value and especially, incalculably those who have been given value, devalued, priced, owned, sold, stolen and who have stolen away. These valuing’s manifest within STPP discourse, in part, as disproportionate punishment of students of color (Advancement Project, 2010), disabled students (Gonsoulin, Zablocki & Leone, 2012), and/or disabled students of color (National Council of Disability, 2015). But the fugitives who are in a constant, spanning and expanding stealing away, denizens of the undercommons, have an underprivilege to blackness that school and prison reformers do not seem to, or perhaps cannot engage with.

And it is difficult to engage with.

“It’s easier to sound the alternative when you require an alternative” (Moten, 2017b n.p.)

These denizens have an underprivilege to blackness which does not have a predetermined melanin level or represented expression (Bey, 2019c; Harney, 2017b). But again, those whose recognition in schools is limited to and/or initiated with their risky embodiment, disruptive intellectual expression and deviating movement (i.e. Black students, disabled students, Black and disabled students) have a deeper understanding of being graded and degraded. On a more immediate and recognizable scale, those students who are closer to blackness named as Black, disabled, at-risk, trouble, failing, etc. know the manifestations of an evolving and expanding carceral society and education, represented in the STPP framework as disproportionately harsher and more frequent disciplinary action than their white, non-disabled peers. The imperative of recognition has immediately devastating effects on the students who are made to bear the brunt of these misgivings. Researching student expressions determined to be disruptive in the classroom, Zsuzu Millei writes that “teachers acquire and utilise psychological knowledges about children, teaching and learning and by exercising these

knowledges they exert power over children” (2005 p. 132). These knowledges, however incapable of capturing or accounting for the complexities of those who are to be fixed and made to fit, are imposed and enforced with such vehemence, through state sanctioned (extra)judicial and curricular violence as well as through unofficial institutions of interpersonal and pedagogical policings, that the ramifications exceed the sentence.

So too do the carceral effects of schooling produce modalities of social (dis)organization which Rodriguez (2010) describes as a necessary function of the US prison regime, such as “affective disruptions of community and extended familial ties” (p. 8). It is also the case that those who predict to prevent and punish to protect through various means of examination and fixing are examined and fixed. Further with Millei’s above mentioned research on the knowledges acquired of students that teachers use as a mode of power over children, “teachers are also controlled by this knowledge, because they have to act according to it...as they are judged and evaluated on the grounds of forming their practices in line with it” (Millei, 2005 p. 132). The controlling effect of knowledge manifests in particular ways for particular populations that come to represent a seemingly natural order and ordering. This is the educational inhibition of study.

\* \* \*

The more and less than one sociality beyond conceptions of society, relationality and community called blackness is open to all, without any exclusionary formations of who can claim blackness (Moten, 2014; Moten, 2017b).

“Blackness isn’t a people problem; it’s the problematization of the people. Black study—which is to say blackness: the preoccupied breath of the ones who have been taken, who have been made to leave—is the medi(t)ation of things as, breaking and remaking every law,



every bond, they shimmer in the absolute disappearance, the absolute nothingness, of their sociality” (Moten, 2017a n.p.).

“See, I just want to, ever so apprehensively, deregulate the affixation of Blackness to chromatics and place it elsewhere, in the critical intimacy we share with one another when we come together to pull things apart” (Bey, 2019c pp. 20-21).

The self-defense engaged in with study is not the defense of a fully or becoming self-determined individual, it is a self that inhabits “an openness to being affected by others, dispossessed and possessed by others” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 116) which pulls apart conceptions of others and otherness and in turn of a self.

As blackness so too does study include and exceed (in that it holds space for multiple, even counter or destructive understandings) institutional attributes and framings. These flights enact a vulnerability that, for those misnamed fugitives, for those close to blackness, in the undoing of institutional study and selves, can be imagined with what Denise Ferreira da Silva has called the unbearable precarity of intention (2017a).

“I’m not talking about relinquishing a self that you have, I’m talking about relinquishing a fantasy of self, a fantasy of fullness. It’s not losing something that you have, it’s disavowing or relinquishing the desire for that thing” (Moten, 2014 n.p.).

Fugitivity describes the errant sociality of black study. Study before and beyond the institution describes black study.

\* \* \*

The undercommons is for students with bad habits. It is refuge for the student who studies but does not learn, does not pass, is not ready.

So how to fugitively inhabit this nonplace within public education, before the university but after institutionalized education? What does it mean to not be ready in high school? in elementary school? What does it mean for the high school student to steal from the school when their very existence is perceived as a threat (Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti, 2017)?

What does it mean for a high school teacher to steal from the school? From the underfunded school?

Well, while Moten talks about literally stealing resources like internet access, pens and paper from the university (Critical Resistance, 2015), he and Harney and others talk about the incredible gathering of resources in certain institutional spaces like the university, but also the nurses smoking room at the hospital that these institutions are both not made to house, and in various ways work to inhibit.

Stealing and stealing away means stealing back what has been stolen – and that is a lot. It is an unpayable debt (Harney & Moten, 2013).

“[T]he stolen life, the life stolen by enlightenment and stolen back” (ibid. p. 28).

#### UNDERSTUDY

“Originality is our enemy, experimenting with what is already here is our friend(s)” (Harney, 2017a n.p.).

Within the context of this thesis, study is the before and beyond of the STPP framework. Study was already happening before institutional attempts to codify it (see the Call to Order chapter), despite structural and systemic impositions that differentiate study which strives toward<sup>70</sup> some finality, and study which we find and which finds us beside ourselves, in the fugitive public, without end (see the Abolition Genealogies chapter) (Harney & Moten, 2013). Finding the attempted categorization and regulation of the in-exclusivity and promiscuity of study true for all educational institutions (however variously articulated, implemented and disbursed within, among and beyond) clarifies some of the general and limited-in-scope imaginings of what is or could be study and, if sought, where study might be found.

But instead of hiding, the criminal sociality of the undercommons of study calls out to be found, an echoing call and response to and from the fugitive public.

The defense of the sociality that is study is precisely a generative and improvisational practice. It is a defense of an unbound and excessive knowing and doing, imagined in and as sociality, in and as communing before and beyond the notion of private property, of owning and being owned, owing and being owed, of a private self with individual interests that require protection through any means of fortification. This fortification becomes materialized as an enclosure against an illusory enemy. Whether the fort of the colonizing force or the school built in and as a force of colonization, the institutions find themselves and each other as surrounded and/or invaded (or if not immediately, then at-risk of invasion) by the dispossessed and disturbing, to which aggressive, violent (pre)retribution is enacted. As Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti write,

“having deemed certain peoples external to the law (and outside of Eurosupremacist humanity), the very existence of those populations is understood as a perpetual, violent

---

<sup>70</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=study>

challenge to the stability of the nation-state, which then rationalizes the use of violence against them. State violence is framed as self-defense” (2017 n.p.).

A risk of the at-risk student then exceeds posing a risk to themselves or even their classmates, threatening constitutional arrangements of schools and schooling in the ongoing settler colonial project of the United States.

### EXAMINATION

As discussed in the previous chapter, student truancy and/or student dropout is a primary concern with opponents of recognized consequences of disciplinary and exclusionary school policies and practices that contribute to the framework of the STPP. Where punitive school policies were the focus in the previous chapter regarding dropping out, this section engages, in part, with critiques of high-stakes examinations and/or standardized testing leading to student dropout. Like overly and overtly punitive policies and practices pushing (certain) students out of classrooms and into juvenile and adult criminal justice systems, formal examinations are blamed for bringing about similar results through alternative pressures/means. The logic follows that schools have become centers for examination rather than learning and that teachers, due to increasing pressure from various other state agents/agencies, are forced to now teach-to-the-test. Immediately this exhibits a nostalgic shaping of an education system that has deviated from earlier, purer intentions, and the apparently new/increased emphasis on examinations in turn imposes undue pressures on all involved, most disproportionately on students who are deemed at-risk, themselves deviant from standards of aptitude (be it intelligence, behavior or otherwise). These students who cannot or will not study properly or enough to pass (“They never graduate. They just ain’t ready” [Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 67]), whose study is fugitive and through examination (formal or not) judged lacking, are simultaneously at-risk of failing/dropping out as well as representing or posing a risk themselves.

One of the risks at-risk students represent discussed in the Fugitivity chapter was with movement, specifically any (predicted, imagined, embellished, recognized) movement interpreted to be excessive; as a deviation from regulated circuits of movement articulated through choreopolicing (Lepecki, 2013). These fugitive movements always pose a risk of exposing and fundamentally transforming (violent) state agents/agencies, including and redefining those specifically connected to various overt and covert implementations and naturalizations of examination in educational institutions. This ever-present risk, often explained as the student being at-risk of institutional injustices rather than posing the risk to institutional fixity and understandings of justice itself, both creates and justifies the disciplinary formations of formal education (with its informal procedures, lessons, and examinations). Punitive policies and high-stakes testing are only extensions here, yet remain largely the target of critique and efforts of reform. It is at least in part due to these dominant understandings of the problems with and risks involved in education and education's interlocutors, with the focus on extensions rather than constitutions, that shape what this thesis recognizes as limited understandings of and around the STPP framework. Taking up these dominant problem/solution formulations manifests into acceptance and production of reform as the main if not only imaginable response to already framed, regulated understandings of educational violence and injustice. While definitions of reform may vary (e.g. official change to policy/law; extrajudicial experimentation/expansion of the means and measures of judicial power), imagining education and the STPP with and for pedagogies of abolition<sup>71</sup> make (reasonable, accommodating and measurably attainable) reforms within education ultimately no goal at all.

As is discussed variously throughout this thesis, refusal is not just a no and abolition is not just an end. As an example, enacting an abolition pedagogy would not mean that currently designated places of learning would all be demolished and new, not yet imagined spaces for study would be constructed - but it might, and the precarity and vulnerability of study and planning to study must

---

<sup>71</sup> See the final chapter, Abolition Pedagogies for more.

hold that as an option/opening as much as with repurposing and redefining the use and understanding of the old/current structures. With similar openness, an abolition pedagogy doesn't (necessarily) mean that any and every recognizable gesture that could be within a register of teaching as we currently know it (a position that, if not oppositional to study, is one of regulating the criteria) is to be associated only with violence and wholly rejected. Yet, guided by and moving with abolition as pedagogical position (Rodriguez, 2010) there are important considerations to be had with what is known about the relationship between teaching and study, before common conceptions and beyond radical reinterpretations.

Teaching in relation to study is both meant for examination (e.g. teaching-to-the-test) and a form of examination itself (e.g. who is and is not fit to study). And teaching will always be in relation to study when its function is regulatory; a form of choreopolicing (Lepecki, 2013) that multiply, structurally, experimentally creates, develops and enforces cognitive, behavioral, physical and emotional standards, including the classifications and distinctions between them. The numerous implementations of legal, institutional regulating forces in and of schools and schooling that quell and attempt to altogether make unimaginable study's sociality are important to this thesis as they are examples and elaborations of uninterrupted examination that permeates modern living.

The teacher is no more positioned to permit study than the student is meant to engage in it. This represents not a deviation away from but a necessary function of an education system that, as but one institution connected to/extending from other seemingly distant or unrelated institutions like prison and policing (i.e. the PIC), clearly and distinctly works to limit what is (or at least is to be) thinkable, imaginable, felt, experienced.

“The structural symbiosis between schools and the racist policing/prison state is evident in the administrative, public policy, and pedagogical innovations of the War on Drugs, ‘Zero

Tolerance,' 'No Child Left Behind,' and the school-based militarizations of the 'school to prison (and military) pipeline'" (Rodriguez, 2010 p. 9).

The connectedness is overt in a framework that directly names the school and the prison, and the STPP identifies various ways schools and prisons interact. These more obvious innovations are introduced, implemented, justified, and reformed in various ways – themselves reforms of previous attempts to teach, examine, and control. No Child Left Behind, for example, was a reauthorization of the most comprehensive and financially invested federal education act in the US (the ESEA). Through its emphasis on schools meeting measurable academic achievements through standardized testing, and being held accountable under threat of federal funding being withheld, what of schooling is able or meant to tolerate, let alone facilitate study that is neither in preparation for nor itself examination?

What is less evident in these reforms is what Sharon Stein (2019a) described as “enduring investments in a colonial habit of being” (n.p.). These investments police our understandings of and engagements with institutional sites and cultural symbols (Rodriguez, 2010), importantly including our own interests and desires. These investments and interests pose a very difficult problem for recognizing and changing, in that their strength means they are either unconscious or resisted.

The cop-in-the-head is one way to illustrate and imagine these unconscious movements and conscious resistances to investments in the controlled, patrolled circuits of institutionalized study. One way to observe how oppression is internalized, unthought, is when we police our own movement even when there is no cop (or other regulating figure given authority and influence) around. The cop-in-the-head, as a function and amelioration of accepted, internalized regulation, is also on an externally aimed patrol when we police others' movements (an expansion, if unofficial, of policing and teaching). The cop-in-the-head is Augusto Boal's concept which is used in the framework of the Theatre of the Oppressed, where theatre “beyond the ordinary boundaries of

theatre” is “a process that must be developed, rather than a finished product that must be consumed” (Boal & Epstein, 1990 p. 35). The cop-in-the-head as a technique in knowing and transforming internalized oppressions (in part by working to generalize what are often considered individual, particularized points/issues) is a way to demonstrate how we are taught and teach as we are policed and police. The cop-in-the-head and the overall Theatre of the Oppressed (an example of transformative participatory, communal study) put forward two primary concerns. They are “to enhance our ability to know or recognise a given situation, and to help us rehearse actions which can lead to the breaking of the oppression shown in that situation” (Boal, 2002 p. 31). This rehearsal might be another way to practice the practice of freedom that Lepecki describes in the choreopolitical. Here Boal’s participatory theatre toward liberation as a “process that must be developed” (ibid.) swirls with “the formation of collective plans emerging at the edges between open creativity, daring initiative, and a persistent – even stubborn – iteration of the desire to live away from,” after recognition of, “policed conformity” (Lepecki, 2013 p. 23).

The cop-in-the-head is what can prevent the sociality of study, it is “how institutions and their corresponding regulatory practices live in and through each of us” (Quinn & Meiners, 2009 p. 102). This is inseparable from the tangible, institutionally and socially sanctioned mechanisms of control and patrol. “The cops are in their heads, but the headquarters of these cops are in the reality. It is necessary to locate both the cops and their headquarters” (Boal & Epstein, 1990 p. 35). These headquarters are evident with the abundance of formal examination throughout institutional education. While a focal point of NCLB, and formalized federally with the ESEA, the history of US education is one of experimentation with examination and accountability. This experimenting is distinct from, intersecting with, and always connected to other institutions’ experimenting with their reach of influence.

“In the clear, critical light of day, illusory administrators whisper of our need for institutions, and all institutions are political, and all politics is correctional, so it seems we need



correctional institutions in the common, settling it, correcting us” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 18).

With uninterrupted examination it is impossible to recognize, let alone change or even desire to change the conditions that necessitate correction and correctional institutions. Unquestioned, this represents “an epistemological and cultural common sense in which the relative order and peace of the classroom is perpetually reproduced by the systemic disorder and deep violence of the prison regime” which is the “assumptive presence of classroom teaching generally” (Rodriguez, 2010 pp. 16-17). Yet the impossible is what is required, is what is demanded of and from us.

\* \* \*

“I don’t have a worked-up conception of it, but what I like about *study* is that it’s the opposite of *exam*. Exam is the finish of study, if you like, and study is the exams yet to come. It’s the opposite of expertise, in some ways, you know” (Harney, Moten & Bousquet, 2008 emphasis in original).

Examination is a focus in this chapter because the word itself holds many understandings - distinct and contradictory, relational and oppositional - to study. In educational institutions study is something that is done in preparation for examination. This institutional understanding and imposition of study, as well as examination, is done formally and informally through such measures and measurements as disciplining behavior and standardized testing, and structurally through grades and gradations. More discussion on informal understandings and mechanisms of the utility of study and ubiquitousness of examination will be in the Call to Order chapter. Here, formal examinations shape study as that which is done in preparation toward an end (e.g. the completion of a course) or as a necessary process of accumulation toward the continued progression of a greater

goal (e.g. passing a test to advance to a more difficult stage of examination). With either of these uses of study the effort is made for some beyond of study itself, where study is just the means to an end. Black study, on the other hand, undercommon study, heralds another end:

“...I'm also open to the idea that anybody who wants to come get some of what we do in black study is welcome to it, 'cause we got an endless supply, and it could heal the world - or kill the world and heal the Earth, which would be even better” (Moten, 2018b n.p.).

## 6

**POLICY**

“Policy says that those who plan have something wrong with them, something deeply – ontologically – wrong with them. This is the first thrust of policy as dispersed, deputised command” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 76).

“...we start from the premise that there is nothing wrong with people, and this allows us, we think, to be attuned to the ongoing planning, the study already under way, among people...” (Moten & Harney, 2015 n.p.).

Policy is the force that drives the regulative pursuits of fugitivity, planning, sociality and black study. Though generally materialized, deployed and articulated as such, policy here is not meant to indicate a specific policy (i.e. a school district’s truancy policy). Instead, it is something that seeks to fix/destroy what has been variously articulated in this thesis as undercommon sociality. Policy is that regulative drive forcefully enacted by policing.

School policies indicate extensions of pursuant policy that are particular for those institutional conditions but are not solely contained within them. This is in part because the enclosure of institutions are never total, nor are they entirely distinguishable in their aims and workings. These institutional interrelations make up the workings of the PIC and call out for a general abolition.

That policies are not contained in discrete institutions for specific contexts is also partly because the force of policy through which specific policies emerge, in seeking to fix those who won’t/can’t be fixed, necessarily seeps and seeks past the bounds of the enclosure, which is never secure, on the trail of the fugitive, the one who refuses to be one. Policy then is reactionary, even in its preemptive attempts to mitigate threats to projects of order, security, regulation, purpose, rationality,

differentiation. These projects of policy seem to be almost ubiquitous within, for instance, educational institutions which are simultaneously structured as settled and secure sites of learning (with well-intentioned/implemented policies), and sites in constant threat to corrosion and corruption (requiring new/reformed policies with stricter measures). But this seemingly expansive enforcement of policy is so because the patrolled, the fugitives who are sought, emanate from the boundaries and exceed imposed limits. It is this excess, the beyond of the settlement, in the surround, which turns the invasion and imposition of policy into something under threat and in need of securing. The risk, discussed throughout this chapter, is always there and thus, "State violence is framed as self-defense" (Stein, Hunt, Suša, Andreotti, 2017 n.p.).

For example, the risks described in the 1983 report titled *A Nation at Risk* (ANAR) (discussed below), and the many policies that were and continue to be influenced by the report (e.g. increased mandates of examination and discipline at national, state, and local levels) are framed as a matter of national defense. The risks described in ANAR (United States, 1983) are at once vague allusions to a declining national prominence in global competitiveness, and bold assertions of a "once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation" (p. 5). The risks to economic prosperity are put forward as risks to and because of a deterioration of "intellectual, moral, and spiritual strengths" of US citizens which "knit together the very fabric of our society" (ibid. p. 7). This is the spiritual strength of genocidal settler colonialism (Adams, 1995) and pedagogical processes of individuation. This is the fabric made by the institution and afterlife of slavery (Hartman, 2007), of lantern laws (Brown, 2015), and Disturbing Schools. This is the self-defense of policy.

Sett(l)ing themselves apart from the denizens of the undercommons, the policy makers, the police, the deputised are enforcers that pronounce others as incorrect, that patrol to fix others as others. But again, "incorrect as we are there's nothing wrong with us. We don't want to be correct and we won't be corrected" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 20).

## POLICY & RISK

This section elaborates on notions of risk, particularly students who are deemed at-risk and the satellite risks posed on and by these (disproportionately Black, Brown, American Indian, poor and/or disabled) students. The general understanding is that certain students are at-risk and need special support/measures in order to avoid negative consequences brought on by their inability or unwillingness to adequately mold themselves or be molded into institutional standards. What these students are at risk of and what is variously discussed in this thesis includes and is beyond the many recognized consequences of the STPP framework, including school pushout and criminalization both of which are disproportionately experienced by Black, Brown, American Indian, disabled, and/or poor students. Some risks beyond the framework in this chapter include individuation through a settler imagination in American Indian boarding schools, as well as the risk of Black, fugitive, disabled movement. So too do the risks these same students pose exceed the STPP framings in that their risk is before policy identifies it as such, before the deputies of policy identify them as having something wrong and in need of correction. Policy is reactionary, coming after the policed, the fugitive, the planner. The student at and as risk.

Again, this is literally everyone but here is immediately and overwhelmingly found in and around those who the STPP framework identifies as the vulnerable and underrepresented. To say it another way, the risk is on and in they who study but do not learn; who exhibit sociality outside and before the enclosure, even and especially while in its many claimed spaces; who have an underprivilege to blackness. The risk policy so ardently seeks out is locatable in a nonplace called the undercommons, out in the surround, in the fugitive public which is “beyond justice, beyond law, in bad country, in bad debt” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 64). Policy’s risk is all around.

But what is at risk and is defended? What means are experimented with, used and justified in this defense? In elaborating and experimenting with policy's multiple understandings and mobilizations as implemented in and around institutional sites of education as well as being a guiding force of the STPP, this chapter engages with external risks that, in one part justify further fortifications of enclosed spaces,<sup>72</sup> and in another part the expansion of policy's reach in seeking out the external risk. This chapter also engages with what policy identifies as internal risk, the enemy within, which justifies tougher and anticipatory measures of discipline and security, on the lookout for those students whose participation is too much, or too little.<sup>73</sup> Though the reasons for risk are massively different, policy does have it right when it recognizes itself as being fundamentally at risk by the before, ongoing, and after sociality of blackness. Policy's forever risk is a consequence of its own condition as regulator for the unregulated and unregulatable life.

#### A NATION AT RISK

Considering the external and internal threats, crises, and risks that the excessive (even and especially in their lack) deploy/imply, this section emphasizes some uses and rationales of educational standards/student standardization and the tracking of student/school/demographic attainment with the 1983 report commissioned during the Reagan administration, *A Nation at Risk* (ANAR). This report marked a particular, but not particularly new reorientation to the already and ongoing nation-building/settling project of the US. In it the student, as a future contributor to the American workforce, is given a heavy task in that the prosperity of the nation is said to depend on the prosperity of the student/worker. Heavy too is the task placed on all citizens to ensure the success of the education system in rebuilding it, its students and in turn the nation to its "once unchallenged

---

<sup>72</sup> See below in discussion with American Indian Boarding Schools, as well as above in the Study chapter.

<sup>73</sup> Referring back to the Fugitivity chapter and Sojoyner's provocation regarding refusal and disengagement (2017).

preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation” (1983 p. 5). Though a brief report, ANAR had and continues to have far reaching and long-lasting consequences on the US education system, itself a consequence emerging from a long trajectory of reform.

As the report states, “we must dedicate ourselves to the reform of our educational system for the benefit of all – old and young alike, affluent and poor, majority and minority” (ibid. p. 7). But not all are made to suffer these tasks and quell these risks equally. Some are made to suffer as the risks themselves, to be quelled, and threats to those who have always been threatened by policy’s reach, even in the guise of concern, occupy space in the report and subtly (if not overtly) guide the consequential actions/reforms after ANAR was published (whether to extend the threats or prevent them from fulfilment). One such reform was the increased emphasis on a national and state level of standardized testing (considered earlier with examination). The National Assessment of Educational Progress, which was founded in 1964 to nationally assess students in citizenship, science and writing, was reformed after ANAR to more efficiently and widely track and compare data of student achievement between states in the subjects of reading, mathematics, and science.

The report about the condition of US education gave significant focus to what was called a new era of international commerce and competition. One major concern/threat from the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the writers of ANAR, was that citizens would not “do what is right for their children and for the generations to come” (ibid. p. 6). Here doing what is right entails upholding vague notions of American prosperity (and thus futurity), fairness of opportunity to those willing to work for it and other dominant tropes that work to maintain order and find fault in any who do not properly and recognizably overcome narrowly understood images of adversity. These are values from unwritten/unofficial policies that both guide existing policy and are policed all the same. What is maintained, for instance, with narratives of overcoming poverty to become wealthy, regardless of the conditions under which that is achieved and achievable? And the risks described,

which imply threat to the risk and the risk takers, the one's deemed to be a risk (to themselves, to others, to fantasies of ontological security<sup>74</sup>), also comes with overt threat:

“The people of the United States need to know that individuals in our society who do not possess the levels of skill, literacy, and training essential to this new era will be effectively disenfranchised, not simply from the material rewards that accompany competent performance, but also from the chance to participate fully in our national life” (ibid., 1983 p. 7).

\* \* \*

ANAR marked a noticeable transition/acceleration in US education reform. The shift in policy terms to the self-management of risks, and the recommendations of the Commission, though nothing new, gestured towards what became ongoing policies and practices in public education that work to simultaneously curb and perpetuate risk. One recognizable acceleration that, at least in part, was a result of ANAR is educational Zero Tolerance. As written in the School-to-Prison Pipeline chapter, Zero Tolerance policies mandate predetermined punishment for misbehaving students, no matter the situational context (Aull IV, 2012). The prescriptive surveillance/punishment for misbehavior at the discretion of the enforcer was recommended as a means to best utilize time in schools:

“5. The burden on teachers for maintaining discipline should be reduced through the development of firm and fair codes of student conduct that are enforced consistently; and

---

<sup>74</sup> Stein, Hunt, Suša & Andreotti (2017) write of modern ontological security as fantasies “because the security and sovereignty that the house [that modernity built] promises for its inhabitants is made possible through various violences (exploitation, expropriation, displacement, dispossession, ecological destruction), which are constitutive of the house itself but projected outward as if they were external to it” (n.p.).



by considering alternative classrooms, programs, and schools to meet the needs of continually disruptive students.” (United States, 1983 p. 29-30).

The rise of educational reform, with ANAR and otherwise, is that they are new. The consequential disproportionate impact on disabled and/or students of color with the firm and fair codes that would be developed were already being mobilized, whether officially through various modes of policing (e.g. school policy; local, state or federal law), or unofficially through various modes of policing (e.g. social mechanisms of control). For example, Disturbing Schools policies (see the Fugitivity chapter) have been officially taken up in many states’ school disciplinary policies dating back to 1890 in Washington (Washington State Legislature). Though newly written at the time, Disturbing Schools was nothing new in logic or implementation, nor were the risks to the settlement new risks that now needed addressing. Schools demarcate one site of policy’s regulative force and thus have distinct - though not particularly unique to other sites of demarcation within the PIC - mobilizations of that force. Disturbing Schools is just one policy that, once written down and made official, was then used as a self-circulating guide for continued regulation/justification for what was and would be consequences for disturbing students. So too were the suggestions and pleas written within ANAR used to further (in that the concept of American prosperity and threats thereof are as old as and foundational to the concept of America itself) and legitimate (as they were data-driven, evidenced-based and made by educational experts) unofficial policies such as American exceptionalism as well as official policies such as the already-existing National Assessment of Educational Progress and the soon-to-exist policies under and as Zero Tolerance. ANAR made appeals to individual and national character, calling for national pride based in part on the idea of a good, just, and orderly school, which reciprocally feeds into the same ideas of the state. “[T]he school is the state” as Gabbard (2017) makes plain, and “The character of the state becomes equated with the character of the country and the character of ‘the people’...one of the principle aims of this ritual of schooling is the

formation of the individual's American identity founded upon the benevolent image of the state" (p. 48).

As a report framed "as much an open letter to the American people as it is a report to the Secretary of Education" (1983 p. 6), ANAR serves as a useful distinction between policy and policies. Policy signifying the force that drives regulative pursuits of everyday intellectual practices of fugitive, excessive living, and (un/official) policies as specific extensions, mobilizations, and material consequences of naturalized understandings of wholly illusory conceptions of right and wrong, good and bad. ANAR was not itself an official policy, but a majorly influential brief 36-page report. It was the task of then Secretary of Education Terrel Bell to identify problems of US education, done under order from President Reagan who stated that his administrations intention was to abolish the newly created (1979) Department of Education (Reagan Library, 1983; United Press International, 1985). After it was published, ANAR became widely influential for policy makers. Both the risks and recommendations of the Commission assembled by Bell were taken seriously by policy's deputies, either by rejecting the report's findings that the state of US education was in disrepair, or by accepting that there were possible measures to take to strengthen a waning American education. In a curious initial reading, Reagan reconfigured ANAR's findings and reform recommendations as instead calling for "an end to federal intrusion" which aligned with his administration's general strategy of ending government aid and promoting free-market capitalism (Reagan Library, 1983 n.p.). Addressing the report, he stated that his administration will "continue to work in the months ahead, for passage of tuition tax credits, vouchers, educational savings accounts, voluntary school prayer, and abolishing the department of education" (ibid.) – none of which were included in ANAR's recommendations (United States, 1983). It was only after the mainstream press promoted the report did agendas shift (The 74, 2018).

Despite new articulations that would come after ANAR was published (e.g. individual states produced reports on their conditions of education; policies reflecting the recommendations of ANAR

were introduced/used more frequently), policy's regulatory reach was nothing new. For instance, 1994's Gun-Free Schools Act is designated as a major force for what would later be articulated as/within the STPP framework. The Gun-Free Schools Act has in it many indications that the findings and recommendations in ANAR were heeded, particularly the resulting Zero Tolerance policies that profoundly impact conceptions of criminalization in the STPP framework. Critics of this 1994 Act mark it as a key moment in a new era of hyper-surveillance and over-implementation of strict and punitive school policies that criminalize student misbehavior and disproportionately push minority students out of classrooms and into juvenile and adult criminal justice systems (Aull IV, 2012; Sojoyner, 2013).

Policy reform is nothing new. It is literally a reforming of something that predates the revision. Here again is a moment asking for an open imagination beyond a teleological predating or before. The anoriginal, "not exactly before, rather a step ahead" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 53). An example comes with the newly reformed Disturbing Schools policy in South Carolina. As was elaborated in the School-to-Prison Pipeline Framework chapter, Disturbing Schools became highly and publicly criticized (and defended) in South Carolina, in the US and beyond after the policy was used in 2015 with the punishment of two Black, female high school students. One student was overtly, violently removed from her desk and handcuffed by a white, male School Resource Officer (SRO) after failing to comply with the commands of the teacher, then a school administrator, and finally the SRO. Since its initial enactment in 1919, the thousands of Disturbing Schools violations enforced each year in South Carolina alone never earned the policy such interest (through its opposition) until this incident. This was not a necessarily unique event amidst the countless other instances that occurred and were justified under Disturbing Schools, and so it was not because of the brutality of the event that gained it such widespread attention, but primarily because the second student filmed and shared some of the brutality through her cell phone (Ripley, 2016; South Carolina Legislature, 2010).

This was before she too was handcuffed and later charged with Disturbing Schools for filming the event and speaking out against the direct violence as it was happening.

Here again is a chance to highlight an underlying tension of this thesis, which is intentional and unavoidable given the conditions of duress we are all under, though others indescribably more so (Meiners, 2011). Though this Disturbing Schools reform in South Carolina has the potential to make some conditions of schooling conditionally less violent and threatening - a good thing that was hard-fought to achieve – the result for the educational system in which such violence was permitted was neither ideologically<sup>75</sup> nor materially<sup>76</sup> challenged (Critical Resistance, n.d.). This reform keeps the specific policy official, if amended, and it maintains and further concretizes the notion that schools and school policies are redeemable and, with practical reform measures, can become the places of safety and learning they either once were<sup>77</sup> or are meant to be for all students<sup>78</sup>. Further still, the reform and the notion of institutional schooling being reformable works to solidify that the regulative forces of policy are and should be in place and as they are. Writing about teaching as and against the carceral common sense of the schooling regime/prison regime nexus, Rodriguez (2010 p. 13) asks:

“How has the mundane institutionalized violence of the racist state become so normalized as to be generally beyond comment? What has made the prison and policing apparatus in its

---

<sup>75</sup> While some of the discussion resulting from the South Carolina Disturbing Schools event questioned whether SROs increase school safety, the individual SRO was fired and blamed (though not criminally prosecuted since his actions are ultimately state-sanctioned), and the resulting reform brought no challenge to policy’s forces in and as education. Another reading of the events leading up to and going beyond the reformed Disturbing Schools policy finds the media take-up and sensationalization of already sensational video images, along with the reactionary judicial proceedings around those immediately involved, bringing more people to (further) fundamentally question and abandon hope in schooling/policing.

<sup>76</sup> An example of a materially challenging effort would be removing SROs from public schools, or reducing the budget of school SROs which would mean reducing the budget and scale of policing.

<sup>77</sup> Described militaristically as an act of “unilateral educational disarmament,” the writers of ANAR (United States, 1983) assert that what was “unthinkable a generation ago has begun to occur – others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments” (p. 5).

<sup>78</sup> ANAR (United States, 1983) has in it the generalized, individualized assertion that “all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself” (p. 8).

current form appear to be so permanent, necessary, and immovable within the common sense of social change and historical transformation?"

These questions apply not (just) to specific policies and policy reforms (e.g. Disturbing Schools) but to policy as that which necessitates and facilitates the breaking up of a militant preservation of the undercommons, of black sociality, of fugitive study as a means of control (Harney & Moten, 2013). The violences captured on video and the resulting arrests/charges that led to the eventual reform of South Carolina's Disturbing Schools policy were only momentary glimpses into the everyday, mundane, ontologically necessary violences of the US schooling regime.

\* \* \*

The risks described in ANAR and consequently inscribed on students who would be labeled at-risk, exceed ideas and imperatives of "American prosperity, security, and civility" (1983 p. 5). The allusory risk is at the horizon and from all around, enemies at the gates and enemies from within. The idea that there is something (e.g. a nation, an individual self) requires that something's boundaries and maintenance, which necessitates the notion of that something being at risk, of corrosion and destruction whether by breach or by decay. With this, the risk is actually required (e.g. by what becomes the nation, by what seems like an individual self) and prompts questions about/questions understandings of security. This necessity for risk, then, is not something meant to be confronted further than an attribution that would be placed on or about a particular set of people who share similarities with each other, as well as enough/important dissimilarities with those whose interests work to keep people bound to and allow the perception of the continuation of those somethings (e.g. borders between geographies and bodies). The risk that would be found and policed in others is first directed toward the ones who are on patrol, the ones who would be one and would capture to

convince the more and less than of this. The deputies of policy's policing must first try and capture their own fugitivity so that they might then capture/fix others. As Harney & Moten describe...

“...policy must optimally allow for each policy deputy to take advantage of his opportunity and fix others as others, as those who have not just made an error in planning (or indeed an error by planning) but who are themselves in error” (2013 p. 78).

For policy, these opportunities determine the risk and create the techniques for the sifting and sorting of those (to be) suspected and targeted as risk(s), as error(s). Once determined, the attributed similarities and dissimilarities might necessitate measures of exclusion (Selman, 2017), quarantine (Erevelles, 2014), securitization (Nguyen, 2017), and/or reform (Gabbard, 2012; Sojoyner, 2017) that are so common in the consequences contained in and spilling out of STPP framework. The at-risk student was already being watched, singled out, targeted before being placed as risk and placed in alternative classrooms/schools. Displaced before being removed from the school. The attempts to capture/regulate are often made out to be correctional, to be beneficial for the sought/recipients who have something wrong with them.

“After the diagnosis that something is deeply wrong with the planners comes the prescription: help and correction. Policy will help. Policy will help with the plan and, even more, policy will correct the planners...Policy is correction, forcing itself with mechanical violence upon the incorrect, the uncorrected, the ones who do not know to seek their own correction” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 78).

What follows are considerations of Policy's (educational) correcting forces manifest as early American Indian boarding schools, where brutalities in the name of 'help and correction' become another way of describing settler colonial, state sanctioned violence as 'self-defense.' However, these correcting forces were not met without resistances.

## POLICY & BOARDING SCHOOLS

“By policy we mean not a particular policy, as in company policy or public policy, but rather policy as something in contradistinction to planning. By policy we mean a resistance to the commons from above, arrayed in the exclusive and exclusionary uniform/ity of imposed consensus, that both denies and at the very same time seeks to destroy the ongoing plans, the fugitive initiations, the black operations of the multitude” (Moten & Harney, 2010 n.p.).

Another articulation of the mobilizations of policy before and beyond the STPP framework, this section is a discussion of American Indian boarding schools and some of the various attempts that policy’s deputies made and make to create, secure, and perpetuate imaginings and the imaginable, specifically with school-aged American Indian children in the late 1800’s – early 1900’s. Boarding schools are not taken-up to exemplify predecessors of contemporary policies of inclusion and exclusion in US education, nor as past atrocities of a now-mostly-corrected (or less-violent) education system. Thinking with policy by way of its various mobilizations as policies, and the tensions therein, grants space for subtle yet important distinctions.

Policy (mobilized via policies and policy enforcers such as police or teachers) expands and evolves because in the quest for security (of a nation, of ideals and protocols of morals/behavior, of a self) there are expressions of refusal and fugitivity. These expressions bring about new modes of and rationales to capture and contain by their very existence in and inhabitation of insecure, unsettled, disinterested non-places. Harney & Moten (2013) write of these non-places as the surround, of which the settlement imposes itself and then finds itself surrounded (settler colonialism). Further, policy is mobilized in relation and reaction to the (expressions from the) ones described above as being underprivileged.

Fugitives are unintentional innovators of that which would seek to expel their sociality, hunt their gatherings, order their disorder which is before the binary oppositions which are mobilized to and thus are here before the impulse and need for corrections. What follows are engagements with what Jarrett Martineau (2015) names as a “decolonial politics of fugitive indigeneity” amidst, despite, because of, and/or refusing policy’s settler colonial manifestations. To reiterate an earlier discussion on fugitivity, the refusing of policy’s incessant imposition is felt in Sojoyner’s (2017) disengaged Black student. Different but not separate (da Silva, 2016), the above writing with fugitive blackness here is brought into discussion with fugitive indigeneity (Martineau & Ritskes, 2014). This section more explicitly introduces American Indian boarding schools as sites and ideologies of policy’s regulative, genocidal drive and, more importantly, as sites and systems that provoked and failed to fully quell and assimilate great resistance and refusal. In discussing and co-editing a special issue on “Indigenous Art, Aesthetics and Decolonial Struggle,” Martineau & Ritskes (ibid.) consider the creativity in “fugitive spaces of indigeneity” to be “in the critical ruptures where normative, colonial categories and binaries break down and are broken open” (p. III). These breaks cannot be contained nor mended in American Indian boarding school archives, especially when they contain attempts to document the apparent progress made by American Indian students, such as with the before and after photographs staged at The Carlisle Indian School, discussed below. In every ‘success’ story of a boarding school there are undocumented and misnamed refusals. Thus, the boarding school archives are filled with horror stories written as daily routines and class schedules; violence written as altruistic inclusion.

In the time around the first off-reservation boarding school<sup>79</sup> there was two general approaches/perspectives of US settlers regarding what was called “the Indian problem” (what to do with American Indian peoples and the rapidly expanding settlement of US territory). One was the advocacy of “outright physical extermination of Native peoples” and the other was to exterminate

---

<sup>79</sup> The Carlisle Indian School was opened in 1879 in Carlisle, Pennsylvania - founded by one of the “friends of the Indian” Army Captain Richard Henry Pratt.



American Indian culture through education – advocates of the latter were known as “friends of the Indian” who “advocated cultural rather than physical genocide” (Smith, 2009 p. 4). In other words, this cultural genocide was “erasure through rehabilitation” (Chacaby, 2018 p. 131) and highlights yet another attempt at fixing those who are said to have something wrong with them; those that are made to believe that they themselves are wrong (Harney & Moten, 2013). This friendly erasure is the prescription, the correction following policy’s diagnosis of the (Indian) problem.

The mobilizations of policy in, about, around and as boarding schools include what might be conceived of as material manifestations and consequences of settlement and enclosure (e.g. the capture through force of American Indian children to be schooled; the claiming, bordering and defending of sites designated for schools/military compounds and those within) and/which cannot be separated from what might be conceived of as immaterial consequences and justifications of the same (e.g. what and how best to teach American Indian children<sup>80</sup> in these boarding schools and for what purposes, be they assimilative, genocidal, inclusive, good-intentioned, etc.). But the hard boundaries of the material and immaterial are not actually so hard. Policy is not just enforced in the material claiming and defending of land and taking children, nor just in/through the immaterial enforcing and defending self-possession and teaching children. American Indian boarding schools discussed here in the late 1800’s – early 1900’s, and more-to-the-point the compulsory education and training therein, utilized and experimented with various assimilationist tactics to incorporate American Indians (made a large group/population rather than recognizing specific tribes, languages and traditions) in or at least to be made useful to the newly formed/forming standards of national living.

---

<sup>80</sup> This was done officially through national and state-wide texts such as Course of Study which, as written in the 1901 national version by then Superintendent of Indian Schools Elizabeth Reel, were “designed to give teachers a definite idea of the work that should be done in the schools to advance the pupils as speedily as possible to usefulness and citizenship” (p. 5).

The civilizing agenda of the schools included tactics such as changing American Indian students' names to more standard Anglo/biblical/white names (Booth, 2009), and creating off-reservation schools in order to separate the child from the influence of family/tribe/culture (Smith, 2010). An indication of the power exercised by these schools over their students was the control of student representation to the public. For instance, the first off-reservation boarding school, Carlisle Indian School, took before-and-after photographs as attempts to demonstrate the "absolute transformation of Indian students from 'savages' to 'civilized Americans'" (Katanski, 2006 p. 23). These photographs would first show the student as they arrived at the boarding school, often in native dress and posed informally. The after photo showed students visibly whiter, their hair cut, often dressed in military uniform and posed to depict "established conventions of middle-class portraiture, thus reinforcing the predominantly Anglo viewers' perception that a 'civilizing process was being documented'" (Margolis, 2004 p. 78). These photos were used to raise/secure funds from government officials and support from the general public for Carlisle's civilizing, Americanizing mission.

The fugitive in the Anglo imagination was captured and civilized in boarding schools, 'evidenced' in the before and after photographs. But Martineau & Ritskes (2014), in discussing fugitive Indigeneity and Indigenous art, write about "a fugitive aesthetic that, in its decolonial ruptural forms, refuses the struggle for better or more inclusion and recognition" (p. IV). The boarding school photographs were appeals for outside recognition (and support/funding) and, in a complicated but no less violent way, attempts to include the American Indian into whiteness. In certain ways these evidence's of assimilation were successful. After Carlisle over 350 boarding schools were founded across the US based on the Carlisle model (militarized assimilative education) (Vox, 2019). These boarding schools "were started to stamp out the Indian from the Indian," says Delaware/Shawnee/Peoria artist Ruthe Blalock Jones (n.d. n.p.), "to make us all into white people." Yet, the increase in boarding schools did not mean the fugitive was captured or the American Indian was deputized into whiteness. As Jones

makes clear of these boarding school efforts to whiten, “you know, it didn’t work” (ibid. n.p.). A prominent figure that echoes this sentiment is Ota Kte, later Luther Standing Bear<sup>81</sup>, a chief of the Oglala Lakota and student in the first graduating class at Carlisle. Standing Bear (1931) made his fugitivity apparent when reflecting on his life:

“I have tried to live a peaceful and happy life; tried to adapt myself and make readjustments to fit the white man’s mode of existence. But I was unsuccessful. I developed into a chronic disturber. I was a bad Indian...I remained a hostile, even a savage, if you please. And I still am. I am incurable” (n.p.).

In American Indians, policy’s educational and curative forces found only people needing civilizing through the above mentioned means of ‘help and correction’ (Harney & Moten, 2013). The before and after photographs at Carlisle and other boarding schools attempted to document educational/civilizing successes, but the project was of correcting those who did not need it, who had nothing wrong with them (ibid.). One among many, Standing Bear wrote numerous books and articles about his life. The limited in quantity yet excessive in content accessible archives gesturing toward and recalling indigenous fugitivity (Martineau & Ritskes, 2014) story the affected but not ‘cured’ American Indians who experienced, suffered, struggled, resisted, refused, gained skills, lost traditional practices, died at and/or escaped boarding schools. What (and who) is not captured in these boarding school/STPP archives are just as important.

Along with the above-mentioned attempts to document/capture with different methods of coercion and control, American Indian boarding school newspapers were used in the civilizing missions of the ‘friends of the Indian’. Put forward as a way for boarding school students to express themselves journalistically, these newspapers were further extensions of the coercive measures implemented to

---

<sup>81</sup> Upon arrival at Carlisle, Ota Kte, son of Oglala Lakota Chief Standing Bear, was made to “choose a Christian name from the chalkboard, a name he couldn’t even read...That day, he became ‘Luther’ in the enemy’s language” (Estes, 2019 n.p.).

'evidence' the benefits of boarding school education. The Carlisle boarding school had *The Indian Helper* (1885), described its publishing practice as follows: "The INDIAN HELPER is PRINTED by Indian boys, but EDITED by The-man-on-the-band-stand, a person of another race and color" (p. 2, emphasis in original). Themselves used as testament to the successes of assimilative strategies as discussed further below, these newspapers were also extensions of the teaching act in that they were used to extend and justify violences of assimilation, (cultural, spiritual) genocide, policing, and individuation (discussed further in the Call to Order chapter) that have re-formed but not left the various manifestations of the teaching act today.

\* \* \*

"The hard materiality of the unreal convinces us that we are surrounded, that we must take possession of ourselves, correct ourselves, remain in the emergency, on a permanent footing, settled, determined, protecting nothing but an illusory right to what we do not have, which the settler takes for and as the commons" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 18).

Policy is an illusion, as is the stability and structure that policy's arrival demarcates. It is the mobilization of the regulative forces of policy through specific (official and unofficial) policies/policings, variously enforced by those deputized to correct others (Harney & Moten, 2013) that make the unreal seem so unquestionably real. It is the desire for semblances of stability, security, and structure, which some seek to maintain their closeness to, and others want to get closer to. In detailing how settler colonial feelings of being entitled to land, as well as certainties of superiority contribute to law, policy and ideology, Eva Mackey writes: "Even though they are 'fantasies,' they have powerful effects in the world" (2014 p. 242). But then there are the others who were never settled in "settler fantasies of certainty and entitlement" (ibid. p. 250); who saw the false materiality of policy coming (Harney & Moten, 2013), who heard the trumpeting of policy's

imminent appearance, who felt the cut of distinction and refuse what has been refused to them. Put another way, policy can be an attribute of/attribution to one of dominative power's ligaments, whiteness (Bey, 2019c) which, as discussed previously in the Fugitivity chapter, can here be described as another illusion.

Whiteness as the ideological purity that is fundamentally threatened by already existing modes of living. The settler and the settlement. The evolving technologies and justifications that seek to preemptively identify, diagnose, educate, incarcerate the antecedent named risk - where "colonialism is made to look like self-defense" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 17). Policy as whiteness' referent regulative force. Whiteness as policy's reference for correctional force.

The imposition of having a position, a relation, measuring against. Whiteness as "a violent way of inhabiting oneself racially" (Bey, 2019c p. 17) that is especially attributed to but not exclusive to white people. For example, the assimilative tactics to bring in American Indians to white civility, though always in a lower class as evidenced by boarding schools training students for a life of labor and servitude. These tactics imposed upon American Indians always centered whiteness. In the Course of Study texts (for an example not unlike the goals of some abolition societies discussed earlier in Fugitivity), there was put forward strategies and supporting justifications for bringing American Indians (who were "just starting on the road to civilization" [1901 p. 5]) closer to Whiteness (these civilized and civilizing forces). This was attempted, in part, by way of emphasizing the urge to bring American Indians into US citizenship and the expressed values thereof. In the 1921 Course of Study it was written that "Indian schools must train the Indian youth of both sexes to take upon themselves the duties and responsibilities of citizenship" (p. 1), and the initial way of doing so was to organize boarding schools and, while accounting for local conditions, implement standardized (pedagogical) practices and curriculum/courses throughout the nation. The citizenship that was being setup for American Indian youth was largely from the assumption and assertion that it was the benevolent duty of the white US citizenship to bring the American Indian out of barbarity and into

modernity and civilization. Here is one iteration of the project of education being variously imposed and understood as a necessary and altruistic undertaking.

Whiteness as an interrupting abutment to policy's correcting forces through correctional institutions like schools and prisons, through corrected and correcting interactions of institutions embedded in and expressed through selves. Policy as policing as the violent correcting threat of violence. Policy-in-the-head. Policy's deputies don't need a rank and a badge and a gun (though many have these things too).

Violences enacted through/on behalf of Whiteness, or feelings of superiority or entitlement to land (Mackey, 2014) are apparent in both the early texts of boarding school newspapers as well as in 1983's *A Nation at Risk* (ANAR). One article published in the monthly newspaper put out by the Carlisle Indian School, *The Morning Star*, was an article "Things to Be Remembered" (Woodworth, 1887). The article makes a plea for the "thorough merging and assimilating of all the races here" to support the "welfare of this land" and the "unity and strength" of the nation - it reads:

"The despised races, in particular, need to be thus fused and absorbed, in order that they may be inoculated and empowered with the spirit of the Republic to carry its freedom, its learning and light, to the lands in darkness" (ibid. p. 2).

The assertiveness of which the claimed natural resources belonged to what became the United States of America (and its white inhabitants), and the drive for the prosperity of the nation-building project, is evident in ANAR. Yet despite calls for unity and particular efforts for and means of uniting, there was and is still a separation (of whiteness) from (ideological, material) failures of past peoples (e.g. American Indians; those closest to blackness; the 'despised races'), also clear in ANAR, which is captured in part of the report's risk: "The time is long past when America's destiny was assured simply by an abundance of natural resources and inexhaustible human enthusiasm, and by our relative isolation from the malignant problems of older civilizations" (1983 p. 14). It would be too-

narrow a perception to believe or understand the driving logics and ideologies that imagined, carried out, managed, experimented with, and evolved American Indian boarding schools as relegated to the past. Through innumerable expressions and attempts, as conceptualized with the PIC, the iterations and reiterations of policy are always evolving, attempting to appear as ever-present. Yet policy's seeming ubiquity is felt only because of the efforts of policy makers and enforcers, through activities like law enforcement and teaching, are in pursuit of those existences and expressions that are simultaneously against policy and shaping policy (Harney & Moten, 2013) by their anoriginal lawlessness (Moten, 2007). As discussed earlier in the Genealogy chapter with Moten and thinking with the fugitive, "You don't ever 'get' escaped" because "what you're escaping from is always after you" (2016 n.p.). In a certain sense, what the fugitive is escaping, by way of inhabitation on the Earth, is policy.

#### POLICY & SURVEILLANCE

American Indian boarding schools were one method taken to ensure and seek assurance of national security. One of the tools for this effort implemented in American Indian boarding schools was the Course of Study texts. These texts outline, describe, justify, and insist on many aspects of formal education, specifically for American Indians, as a fundamental component of the ongoing settler colonial mission of the US and nation-building. The Course of Study texts were created as national and regional guides, and were "designed to give teachers a definite idea of the work that should be done in the schools to advance the pupils as speedily as possible to usefulness and citizenship" (Reel, 1901 p. 5). Including and exceeding logics and tactics of integration or assimilation, these texts referenced and in various ways guided an ongoing project of securing and substantiating a nation and a knowing which fundamentally entails "poverty, dispossession, criminality, premature death, cultural genocide" (Tuck and Yang, 2012).

The curriculum itself spread the goal of ontological security. The usefulness desired from pupils was for productive work during and after their time at the boarding school. There was an emphasis on teaching/instilling the values of “constructive work” on the part of the student, rather than “through the agency of books” which, as is written in the 1922 national Course of Study, gave educators “ample justification for the industrial and prevocational activities as a most important factor in the work of the schools” (Department of the Interior, p. 4). So too did pedagogical practices strive to impart values that are to be fundamental to citizenship and ideas of work ethic. The English language, for example, was taught in the curriculum, and taught through what I am referring to as pedagogical processes of individuation. In teaching English to beginners, part of the curriculum was “Teach *my*,” as outlined in the *Course of Study for the Pine Ridge Agency Day Schools of South Dakota, with plans and suggestions* (1910). “Teach *my*” was intended to “Teach in such a way as to denote ownership” (p. 10, emphasis in original). Perhaps a minor point to consider in such a massive undertaking of violences (e.g. youth being taken from their homes, forbidden to see their families or speak their own language, etc.), but this is ontological terror which necessarily functions along with material acts and attempts at (cultural) genocide. To forcibly teach possession, possessiveness, and to naturalize ownership, property, and individuation, concepts opposing a general belief of “communal ownership, which held that the land was for all people” (Southwest Indian Relief Council, n.d. n.p.), was the actual practice of discursively altruistic lessons. This communal ownership is not at all the understanding of ownership that was to be taught in boarding schools. What was to be made things/concepts previously communally understood/felt and now to be owned included “my face, my hair, my hat, my ear” etc. (Course of Study for the Pine Ridge Agency, 1910 p. 10).

And how were these ontological lessons to be examined? Prior to nationally implemented standardized testing and other official manifestations of student, teacher, school, and school district evaluations, American Indian boarding schools served as testing grounds for technologies of tracking and surveillance.



It needs to be noted that the education these students were to gain (named as “not only a privilege, but an obligation” of the citizen [Department of the Interior, 1922 p. 296]) included but was less about subjects such as English, mathematics, or science. Instead, curriculum emphasized two main points. First, morals and values that were to contribute to the project of citizenship, such as manners, laws, and the importance of family life, which is a legitimating extension of the project of nation-building. Second, what was deemed practical skills for the American Indian student (a gendered and gendering act), such as agriculture, carpentry, and housekeeping (ibid.) which literally was to contribute to the infrastructure of the nation-building project.

These values, knowledges, skills, and the adherence to them utilized various surveillance strategies. Well before there were police regularly patrolling school halls, or electronic ankle monitors attempting to track and control movement (Fugitivity chapter), American Indian boarding schools were sites of extreme control, coercion, and/or policing as pedagogical practices.

At the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, an off-reservation boarding school, the man-on-the-band-stand served as a panoptic, omnipresent force. The apparitional editor of *The Indian Helper* (the weekly paper for the school), the man-on-the-band-stand was the eyes, ears, judge and gossip of Carlisle. Interjecting his presence throughout the weekly paper, particularly in the column “What I Hear and See,” the man-on-the-band-stand made statements and told stories of the apparent happenings at the boarding school. Some of the statements would be almost comical if they were not discursive representations or proclamations of the immense violences they alluded to.

One example is the man-on-the-band-stand making statements about haircuts (e.g. “How much better and more intelligent the girls look with their bangs combed back” [The Indian Helper, 1885a p. 3]; “Bangs are not becoming to Indian girls, and they are not very stylish now, either” [The Indian Helper, 1885b p. 3]), which speaks to the immediate treatment American Indian youth would have to endure upon arrival at Carlisle. Their hair would be cut to Anglo-standards as part of (an

assimilative) policy, which was intended to physically and psychically wound the children, as their hair was “a symbol of strength, and dignity” (Utah History, 2016 n.p.), and thus had to be removed to educate them on and simultaneously work to support the ontological imposition of security through, in one sense, the imposition, restriction, and policing of circuits of movement (Lepecki, 2013). In discussing Ota Kte/Luther Standing Bear’s initiation at Carlisle, Nick Estes (2019) writes of the significance of hair for the Oglala Lakota, where cutting one’s hair meant grieving a death. “By taking his braids,” writes Estes, “Carlisle had shorn him of his physical and cultural identity. Ota Kte mourned the loss of himself” (n.p.)<sup>82</sup>.

In an effort to demonstrate the civilizing agenda of Carlisle (and apparent successes therein), these physical transformations were captured in before and after photographs of the students. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the before photos were of incoming students with long hair and non-European styled clothing “clearly representing the ‘wild Indians’ who supposedly lacked culture education, and even the rudiments of hygiene” (Katanski, 2016 p. 39). The after photos were of the same student(s) with haircuts and dressed in school uniforms which were styled after military uniforms (the uniforms of many tribes’ enemy, the invading US military [Abumrad & Krulwich, 2015]). This particular practice of policy is both a teaching act toward assimilation as well as for extinction (Adams, 1995). The dress codes enforced at Carlisle and other boarding schools, enactments and enforcements of a nation-building project, are still ongoing and evolving. Discussed in *Fugitivity* with school dress codes, the control, surveillance, and punishment around how student’s wear their hair (“my hair”) speaks to the before & beyond of the STPP framework. In an immediate sense, hair that is deemed in violation of a school’s dress code is subject to punishment - this is apparent with Black students. In *Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools* (2016),

---

<sup>82</sup> Despite the onslaught of brutalities in the name of education, progress, correction, and cure, Ota Kte/Luther Standing Bear became/remained a ‘chronic disturber,’ ‘a hostile,’ and ‘incurable.’

Morris writes of Black girls wearing natural hair and “being pushed out of school and criminalized” (p. 57) for doing so when their school dress code explicitly forbids (and polices) hairstyles.

What is important here beyond the immediate and recognizable horror being enacted and justified with these particular policies, is that the attempted control over (in these cases) American Indian and Black people, expressions and/or movements, are attempts at securing a general policy of what has earlier been discussed as whiteness. Elaborating that Black girls have long been scrutinized further than (but exemplified through) a dress code violation, Morris writes:

“The politicization (and vilification) of thick, curly, and kinky hair is an old one. Characterizations of kinky hair as unmanageable, wild, and ultimately “bad hair” are all signals (spoken and unspoken) that Black girls are inferior and unkempt when left in their natural state” (ibid. p. 92).

In American Indian boarding schools as in modern-day schools, there surely were many who thought and believed they were doing what was best for American Indians (e.g. calling themselves Indian Helpers). These well-intentioned actions and educations speak volumes to the violences based in and perpetuated by feelings and assurances of individuation and ontological security. In the Course of Study texts, for example, there are no explicit indications of ideologies based on the phrase from superintendent of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School Captain Pratt: “Kill the Indian in him, and save the man” (1892 n.p.). Instead, the carceral educations imposed upon American Indian students, such as cutting and styling their hair, were promoted and understood to be altruistic and/or pragmatic (and not acts of violence): “The boys should be compelled to keep their hair short. It will save time, trouble, and dirt” 1901 p. 196). These are instances and ideologies that created and justified pedagogical processes of individuation.

With fundamental political/economic motivations, and even more with “metaphysical or philosophical assumptions underlying policy,” Moten discusses how it seems like everything (e.g.

hopes, dreams, language, pleasures, pains) is organized around the feelings (and violences therein) of “these things called individual subjects” (2018, n.p.). He challenges a metaphysics in the world which always implies individuation, a lesson that was taught in American Indian boarding schools, for example, from Course of Study for the Pine Ridge Agency (1910):

“my face, my hair, my hat, my ear, my coat, my shirt, my knife, etc. Have pupil place hands on eye, hair, hat, coat, feet, etc. as he says it” (p. 10).

Property and ownership are conceptions that entail not just “a set of objects outside of oneself” such as land (settler colonization) and people (slavery), but also “with what it is to have a self, to be able to actually claim a normative and separable self” (Moten, 2018 n.p.). The latter feelings of individual subjecthood are enacted within systems of education, as Moten continues, “in ways that of course allow us to understand that that entire complex is inseparable from the complex that we think about in terms of punishment or incarceration...the very idea of rehabilitation” (ibid.). Here are further mobilizations and manifestations of the STPP framework within the PIC, which exposes the reach and impact of modes of punishment into realms of education which are usually understood as altruistic and essential (though prisons too are almost entirely accepted as not only necessary but as a societal good). In an immediate sense with American Indian boarding schools, the sites and actions of the schools and school officials served less as a starting point in the STPP framework and more as the end result.

Another example of the man-in-the-band-stand surveilling students and the preventative attempts to dissuade students from continuing unwanted behavior/enacting unruly desires was regarding students being caught writing home and/or receiving letters from home. In the November 13, 1885 issue of *The Indian Helper* the man-in-the-band-stand writes:

“Don’t be in hurry [sic] about going. Of course your mother loves you...but people cannot live on love. You must learn how to make a little MORE than your own bread and butter, if you would make your mother real comfortable. Tell her kindly to wait a while” [1885b p. 3]).

Some of the recorded reasons for keeping American Indian children away from their families, after having already separated them through coercion and force, was to try and more fully impose nationalistic, individuated, Anglo values, customs, and traditions (tactics of assimilation) onto boarding school students (and evidence these tactics, in part, through the circulation of *The Indian Helper* and other newspapers). Simultaneously, keeping these students away from their families also meant making every effort to keep them from their own cultures, traditions, languages, spiritual practices, wider communities and customs. So, surveillance over the students served many purposes. For instance, in seeking to reiterate and demonstrate a sense of total surveillance:

“Do you think the Man-on-the-band-stand has to wait to be told things? Oh, No! He can see with his own eyes, thank you. He saw that boy writing the letter to his people at home...the boy is ashamed now that he complained of the little work he is required to do, so we will not say anything more about it. Surely if he stops to think he must SEE that the work done here by our pupils does not begin to pay for all the benefits they receive both in and out of school” (*The Indian Helper*, 1885b p. 1, emphasis in original).

This excerpt emphasizes multiple tactics of surveillance and attempts to control the American Indian students at Carlisle. Surveilled by the-man-in-the-band-stand as far as writing home; surveilled about the amount of work required of them; this passage implies that the child was caught and punished (“the boy is ashamed now...so we will not say anything more about it” [ibid.]); it shows the forced labor these students were required to undertake; it blames the student caught writing home for not being grateful for his conditions. Speaking to the military tactics of then-Captain later-Colonel Pratt,

the superintendent of Carlisle, and potentially as an exemplary figure representing policy and the assimilative violences enacted as education:

“the Man on the Bandstand, who combined characteristics of God, Uncle Sam, and grandfather with those of prison officer, spy, and dirty old man, was created as an active component in Carlisle’s program, working to substitute *his* creed and code for values and beliefs the children had learned at home” (Trafzer, Keller & Sisquoc, 2006 p. 102).

The man-in-the-band-stand is a prominent but not isolated measure taken by Pratt and boarding school officials to physically, emotionally, and psychically control and manipulate the captives (students) at Carlisle. In the guise of being educational, or perhaps through the educational complex, Pratt’s administrative techniques were cultivated years earlier during his time as a military jailor (PIC). Imprisoning and overseeing some of the “worst offenders” of the “wild Indians” for 3 years starting in 1875, Pratt took it upon himself to “open wide the door of civilization” (p. 170) through entertainment (e.g. telling harrowing tales of his own war adventures against American Indians [p. 97-98]) and education (e.g. teaching labor skills, the English language along “the white man’s road” [p. 169]) (Pratt, 2003). The pedagogies and curriculums that began to develop and show (assimilative) success with the American Indian prisoners of war were brought to many school-aged American Indian’s in the nation’s first off-reservation boarding school only one year later in 1879 (Trafzer, Keller, & Sisquoc, 2006). As written in the Introduction to Pratt’s autobiography *Battlefield & Classroom*:

“Here was a laboratory for showing that wild Indians could be transformed into peaceful, enlightened citizens. In the brief three years before the prisoners were liberated, he [Pratt] accomplished enough to erase any doubts that may have lingered in his own mind and at the same time to convince others that the experiment should be enlarged and transferred to an environment more favorable than a prison afforded” (2003 p. xx).

This is a reversal and example of a prison-to-school pipeline. This was based on Pratt's belief that American Indians were not inherently, biologically inferior to whites. Instead, he believed that American Indians only needed equal opportunity for development in order to compete with whites. This reformist position upheld and mobilized white supremacy in a savior or overseer-type fashion, conceptualizing the role of white people as needing to pull up inferior peoples to Anglo standards. These standards included, for example, beauty (e.g. hair style; clothing), etiquette (e.g. how to behave in particular contexts), skills (e.g. narrow conceptions of how to cultivate the land), hygiene (e.g. specific understandings of cleanliness), knowledge (e.g. what one should know), and values (e.g. how one should feel). Further still, beyond standards of property upkeep (e.g. housekeeping and harvesting the land) were property as a concept itself (e.g. my hat; my land). Beyond standards of what one should do were conceptions of individuation and subjecthood and being one. These different values and standards for what constitutes a valuable and worthy life are not expansive openings and opportunities but violent narrowing's (in concept, manifestation, and securitization) of expression.

\* \* \*

The next section continues with aspects of the primary concern and task of this thesis, abolition. However, a process/movement/praxis that has been alluded to but not elaborated on in this thesis is decolonization, which is entangled in all imaginings of abolition. Decolonization, like abolition, is an undoing of what seems done (e.g. national borders; conceptions of property; relationships to land and each other; the self) and a building of what is to come (even if those futures are not yet known or imagined). Indeed, "there is no abolition without decolonization, there is no decolonization without abolition" (Miller & Miller, 2020 p. 383). Abolition and decolonization are different, but not separate (da Silva, 2016). As with abolition, decolonization takes many forms, and is imagined and

practiced many ways, most immediately in ways relating with, connecting to, taking back, and repatriating stolen, occupied, settled land – “*all of the land, and not just symbolically*” (Tuck & Yang, 2012 p. 7). Centering, starting with, and/or focusing on land, however, does not delimit the scope of decolonization (da Silva, 2018). So too, decolonization is not beholden to answering the predictable, deterministic, work fate oriented (Desideri & Harney, 2013) questions asking “*what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler?*” (Tuck & Yang, 2012 p. 35 emphasis in original).

Decolonization is increasingly emphasized in and around educational efforts away from the consequences of the STPP as well as measures of accountability and reform in higher education with calls to ‘decolonize the curriculum’ or ‘decolonize the classroom.’ These are largely (and familiarly) well intentioned and hard fought-for efforts that have the potential to change elements of student (and teacher) experiences. For instance, the impact of bringing diversity to a reading list to better reflect student expressions and experiences (GBH News, 2020) is nothing to be dismissed. Yet, these calls have the easy potential to turn decolonization into a metaphor (Tuck & Yang, 2012), bringing forward ways that decolonization becomes “an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation” when not involving “the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted” (p. 7). With this, ‘decolonizing the curriculum’ should be met with what Tiffany Lethabo King (2017), in describing decolonization and abolition, names as Native feminist refusal and Black feminist suspicion, which “alter and destabilize the ground on which discussion about identity and specifically the human unfold” (p. 162). Abolition and decolonization require a de- or pre-individualization which imagine and enact a before and otherwise from (land and people) as property. Movements to decenter whiteness in the classroom (e.g. Kawi, 2020; Kay, 2020; Marotta, n.d.) have great transformative potential and can be radical in their efforts. But why call it decolonizing when the land upon which the classroom is built remains unquestioned and unreturned?



Another concern with these calls to decolonize aspects of educational systems is that they are just that, aspects of a larger prison industrial complex, as has been variously considered with abolition as well as reformist attempts to undermine particular consequences described within the STPP framework. In a collaborative article written with Lindsay Miller (2020) for a special issue titled “Feminisms and Decolonising Psychology” (Macleod, Bhatia, & Liu, 2020) in the *Feminism & Psychology* journal, we ask not what would decolonization and abolition look like, feel like, or result in, but instead ask to what end must components of this world be decolonized:

“Can we decolonize the curriculum but keep the university? Can we decolonize the university but keep the occupied land the university was built on? Can we decolonize the land but keep the world as we know it?” (p. 385).

While these questions name the university (and in the context of this special issue part of our discussion was on the topic of decolonizing the psy curriculum), like *The Undercommons* (Harney & Moten, 2013), the university just happened to be temporarily where we were studying when writing the article. The university has particular resources which are not to be dismissed - actually they are to be plundered, resources leveraged for liberatory struggles (Indigenous Action Media, 2014), hospitalities abused (Harney & Moten, 2013). The various reasons why particular resources (monetary, intellectual, land/real estate, etc.) are associated with/accumulated in/exclusive to universities and/or sites of institutional education, what might be understood as regimes of accumulation (Boggs, Meyerhoff, Mitchell, & Schwartz-Weinstein, 2019), are connected immediately to settler colonialism and must also be grappled with. Though the university – “often considered a pillar of colonialism in monopolizing the production of knowledge” (Batz, 2019 p. 103)– is exclusionary, it is not exclusive to the study taking place despite a correctional, correcting impetus. There are many efforts, documented and not, of people creating, struggling with, figuring out, and experimenting with ways of being present together in study (which themselves are) alternative to

dominant sites, reasons for, and knowledges of institutional knowing<sup>83</sup>. These alternative modes of communing are most often initiated/sustained by those who most need an alternative (Moten, 2017b). As with the fugitive, ‘alternative’ here is another misnaming, as it seems in response to rather than an originally before and persisting despite attempted institutional expansions and enclosures. Decolonization and abolition are entangled, propelling this thesis especially in (what remain) open questions around efforts to decolonize the curriculum as they relate/support/bring generative tension to considerations of abolition pedagogies (final chapter). I feel it is important here to state that, while movements for/toward decolonization and abolition are constantly being engulfed and defanged (e.g. decolonizing the curriculum; #8CantWait, as discussed in the Study chapter), the study is ongoing, keeps moving, and the door remains open (Harney & Moten, 2013).

#### ABOLITION SOCIETIES

#### ABOLITIONIST SOCIALITY

#### ABOLISH SOCIETY

“We plan. We plan to stay, to stick and move. We plan to be communist about communism, to be unreconstructed about reconstruction, to be absolute about abolition, here, in that other, undercommon place, as that other, undercommon thing, that we preserve by inhabiting. Policy can’t see it, policy can’t read it, but it’s intelligible if you got a plan” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 82).

---

<sup>83</sup> Which include but are not limited to white supremacist, settler colonial, ableist, nationalistic, anti-Black, heteropatriarchal, liberal, hegemonic, carceral educations and understandings.

The getting-together of people to dismantle and destroy ways of living that are, by ontological necessity oppressive, exclusionary, violent, hierarchizing, and controlling based in separability - while simultaneously preserving, imagining and creating new ways of living that are precarious, in senseless bad debt<sup>84</sup>, entangled, affectable and are expressions of an anoriginary drive before and beyond humanist norms – has been going on and is ongoing. This getting-together of people can be and in this thesis has been called and described variously as black study, fugitive sociality, genealogical sabotage, self-defense before and beyond a self, and planning and preservation toward and enacting abolition. What to call this experimental undercommon sociality matters less than what this study allows - “In the end, it’s the new way of being together and thinking together that’s important, and not the tool, not the prop” (ibid. p. 106). The cohesion and study in the end which is without end can be felt emanating from anywhere, from nowhere, without and in no need of policy’s (official, state, archival) recognition. Yet attempts for recognition by way of legible, realistic agendas using the mechanisms (e.g. the logic; the language) of policy’s system(s) that create and maintain everyday violence, as well as appeals to institutions that seem stable and secure become the naturalized order for challenge and change even in progressive, alternative, radical attempts.

Articulating abolition as being without end, as the end without end in this sense makes abolition unrecognizable, illegible, and impossible. It also makes abolition unpalatable to institutions and institutional cooptation, as well as reformist counterinsurgencies (Rodriguez, 2020) by way of ‘possible,’ ‘reasonable’ reforms. This does not mean that abolition and abolitionists do not have, work toward, fight for, make mistakes, fail at, and achieve perceptible goals. Or that having impossible agendas, having a plan but not a strategy, consists of doing nothing - far from it. To reiterate, the abolition of policy’s violently reactive regulative forces has been going on, is and will continue to be ongoing. There is an immediate urgency for abolition:

---

<sup>84</sup> “which is to say it cannot be perceived by the senses of capital” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p.mm 66) and put into a register of (earning) credit and (paying) debt.

“...we refuse to ask for recognition and instead we want to take apart, dismantle, tear down the structure that, right now, limits our ability to find each other, to see beyond it and to access the places that we know lie outside its walls” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 6).

Abolition demands, enacts and imagines the impossible. Expressed in the sociality of the illegal congregation. In and with the informal, unformal study, in abnormal articulation, by those committed to black study, indebted, “Mutual debt, debt unpayable, debt unbounded, debt unconsolidated, debt to each other in a study group, to others in a nurses’ room, to others in a barber shop, to others in a squat, a dump, a woods, a bed, an embrace” (Harney & Moten, 2013. p. 67-68). As with abolition, “the obligations of an abolitionist have no end. That what we are obliged to abolish is without end within the world as we know it, and thus includes the obligation to end the world as we know it” (Miller & Miller, 2017 n.p.). These impossible plans are especially so when what is possible are reinstatiations, restatements, and/or reforms of the violence of the world as we know it (da Silva, 2019; Miller & Miller, 2020). This plan happening right now exceeds the confines of a life, a generation, a definition, an idea.

“...it’s important for us to think forward and to imagine future history in a way that is not restrained by our own lifetimes. Oftentimes people say, well, if it takes that long, I’ll be dead. So what? Everybody dies, right? And if people who were involved in the struggle against slavery—I’m thinking about people like Frederick Douglass, or Ida B. Wells in the struggle against lynching—if they had that very narrow individualistic sense of their own contributions, where would we be today? And so we have to learn how to imagine the future in terms that are not restricted to our own lifetimes” (Davis, 2016 p. 116).

Discussed specifically below are groups of people who came together as abolition and anti-slavery societies. The imaginaries of these societies in abolishing the institution of slavery in the US reveal particular connections and, because of their formal structure and principle reasonings,

disconnections with and from slavery. Anti-slavery and abolition societies serve as useful examples of the difficulties discussed variously throughout this thesis with working within the confines (e.g. the logic; the language) of policy; in accepting policy even and especially when being against/working to change specific institutions within and extensions of the forces of policy. They also show similarities with organizations framing, opposing and working to reform elements of the STPP.

### POLICY & ABOLITION SOCIETIES

In 1775 the first meeting of the Society for the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage took place in a Philadelphia, PA tavern. Initially consisting of mostly Quaker men, the society worked to assist and intervene in cases where free and/or formerly enslaved but freed Black and American Indian people were wrongly/illegally enslaved; those “that might have Legal Claime [sic] to Freedom and were deprived thereof” (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 2018 p. 4). In 1784 the society extended its focus and with this regrouping was renamed the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and for the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage. Though there are credited anti-slavery actions predating it, such as in 1688 with four German Quakers documented protesting slavery in Germantown, PA<sup>85</sup>, this Pennsylvania society, usually referred to as the Pennsylvania Abolition Society (PAS), is the oldest recorded abolition society in the US. Many other societies in Pennsylvania, the surrounding states and beyond would emerge during the time of legal slavery, such as the American Anti-Slavery Society and local chapter the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, both founded in 1833.

---

<sup>85</sup> Ahead of the abolitionist movement that would emerge and spread out of Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania Quakers banned slave trading in the 1750’s (Newman, n.d.), in 1776 “dealt with and disowned” all members who “continued to hold slaves,” and in 1781 became “entirely clear of holding slaves” (Needles, 1848 p. 13).

Among these societies were various and sometimes conflicting aims and approaches to justify/fulfill those aims. Of the different aims, the PAS's constitution added "An Act for the gradual Abolition of Slavery" in 1787 (Preamble, §1), while in 1833 the American Anti-Slavery Society called for slavery's "immediate abandonment, without expatriation" (Article 2). The 1787 PAS constitution added this act under then-PAS president Benjamin Franklin which reflected the state of Pennsylvania's Gradual Abolition of Slavery Act (1780). The PAS based the decision to support the gradual rather than immediate abolition of slavery in part because it "would allow white society to acclimate to black freedom while also allowing bondpeople a long prelude to liberty" (Newman, n.d. n.p.). This acclimation was partially based in the belief that free Black people, in order to become full and successful contributing citizens and members of society, needed educating. This was an attempted education into the dominant, white(-supremacist) society and demonstrates another attempt to ensure the maintenance of settler life as it was, strengthening policy, continuing whiteness with the addition/integration of Black people not (entirely) as property to control through overt demonstrations, threats, laws and other everyday means of material, psychological violent force and domination, but as citizens to (properly) include (which is not an equal inclusion) and control through more covert and naturalized forms and forces of policy. On the history of what police do/policing does, Rodriguez (2017) discusses the experimenting of

"not just fatal police power but the everyday force, the everyday physiological violence, by which I also mean emotional, affective, psychological, and other forms of violence which might not write themselves on your skin but write themselves on your body, on your soul"  
(n.p.)

This push for educating legally free/d Black people in Pennsylvania (and other northern states) was akin to the assimilationist attempts of American Indian board schools - it was a different kind of violence sought with this education, using and instilling policy's more covert regulating forces rather than the overtly horrific violences instilled and inflicted upon enslaved Black people who would seek

an education (e.g. reading and writing). This long prelude from Pennsylvania abolitionists also made exceptions in their abolition for “delegates in congress from the other American states, foreign ministers and consuls, and persons passing through or sojourning in this state, and not becoming resident therein; and seamen employed in ships not belonging to any inhabitant of this state, nor employed in any ship owned by any such inhabitant” (1787 Preamble, §10).

The abolition of legal slavery alone could never, and in most cases with abolitionists and abolition societies, was never intended to be toward a foundational destroying, imagining and building new (i.e. abolishing) or even addressing the white-supremacist structures of every social institution (Martinot & Sexton). Beyond too-simple explanations of humanist empathy and altruism or apologist dismissals of the anti-blackness of policy makers, citizens, and abolitionists<sup>86</sup>, one reason for social and political leaders pursuing the gradual end to slavery and the education/training of free Black people was because of the fear of an uneducated and unskilled US citizenship (Hartman, 1997). This is a different fear than what guided the prevailing suppression of the education of the enslaved, which brought anti-literacy laws and enactments of great violences in order to try and maintain the society as it was.

Regarding labor, which is perhaps the most obvious explanation for slavery: “Many white landowners opposed black schooling on economic grounds because they believed that reading, writing, and arithmetic would make black workers discontented with unskilled and semiskilled farm labor: (Anderson, 1988 p. 96). Some abolitionists responded to this fear by promoting the immediate end to slavery as a way to increase labor power: “by infusing motives into their breasts, would make

---

<sup>86</sup> For instance, as a founding father of the US and a Philadelphia Abolition Society president, Benjamin Franklin enslaved people, even while the society he was president of wrote on and worked for the gradual ending of slavery in the US. Franklin was and remains a prominent figure, and his role as perpetrator and beneficiary of slavery is often justified as a norm (e.g. “Like most citizens of his time Benjamin Franklin owned slaves...” [“Benjamin Franklin Historical Society”, n.d. n.p.]), or dismissed (e.g. “it is important to take in account that slavery was a norm of the eighteenth century and Franklin, being the busy man that he was, needed assistance in the print shop” [Shah, 2013 n.p.]) by the shaping of his contributions to the founding of the nation (e.g. “Franklin as a slave owner defames the virtuous, humanitarian image” [ibid.]).

them doubly valuable to the masters as free laborers” (American Anti-Slavery Society, 1833 n.p.). This appeal to proponents and/or beneficiaries of slave labor highlights the contradictory, disorienting moves exhibited/required of those attempts at making significant change to expressions and extensions of policy. Appealing to the hearts, minds, and pocketbooks of those who through great force created and maintained slavery (which always includes particular, colonial framings of race, gender, sexuality, ability, etc.) was one of many tactics used by abolitionists that worked to maintain if not improve the “exclusive and exclusionary uniform/ity of imposed consensus” (Moten & Harney, 2010 n.p.) variously mobilized through policy’s fixed, fixing, dominative power. The end of slavery was sought, not the end of the world.

\* \* \*

“...with policy what you’re often dealing with is somebody whose presumption is that they know the problem” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 123).

Labor was not the only reason and justification for slavery. Labor was one explanation that is graspable and comprehensible and can be recognized (and so comparisons to then and now not looking the same can demonstrate our supposed progress). Though discussion of slave labor emphasizes some of the complexities of abolition, it also gets at some seemingly contradictory expressions of abolitionists. Members of abolition and anti-slavery societies, with the primary purpose of fighting and ending slavery, also existed in a world based in and as expressions of anti-blackness (Wilderson III, 2002). Abolitionists attempted various approaches to their efforts, some of which were overtly anti-black and many more were less-so in part because of the structuring as reform.



“Under slavery, the whip rather than incentive, coercion rather than consent, and fear rather than reasoned self-interest had motivated their labor; now it was considered imperative to cultivate rational, servile, and self-interested conduct in order to remake the formerly enslaved into free laborers” (Hartman, 1997 p. 127).

“the violence that we register as unjust or inhumane — the laceration of the whip, the canine patrol, exclusionary procedures, disenfranchisement, anti-literacy laws, and routinized humiliation and invasion, for example — are ways a metaphysical organization of existence (antebellum politics) contends with black as nothing” (Warren, 2018 p. 49).

The American Anti-Slavery Society’s call for the immediate abolition of slavery differed from the calls for gradual abolition mainly because of a heightened recognition of the immediate urgency of ending slavery. But this immediacy was still within and enacting policy’s regulating, domineering force, alternatively articulated as whiteness. By appealing to the “consciences, hearts, and interests of the people” the society attempted to end what was promoted to be a state-sanctioned institution “contrary to the principles of natural justice, of our republican form of government, and of the Christian religion” (American Anti-Slavery Society, 1835 n.p.). These appeals to the goodness of individuals based on the merits and attributes of what were lauded as inherently good (or at least reformable) laws and declarations (“all men are created equal” etc.) were also appeals to maintain the (fantasies of) ontological security dependent on the conditions that made possible settler colonialism and its particular, fundamental articulations through slavery as a simultaneous manifestation and condition of a foundational (to the human, the nation, the world) anti-blackness. These conditions included and exceeded the direct, recognizable physical and psychological violence that slavery conjures and that is easily abhorred. These appeals to maintain the nation (conceptually and materially) put forward ideas of slavery as that which could realistically be ended while maintaining the order and bettering the direction of the nation.

While the leaders in PAS generally held higher social/political/class positions (e.g. US founding fathers Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin Rush) than other abolition and anti-slavery societies, whether seeking the immediate or gradual abolition of slavery abolitionists sought an “end to the evil without uprooting the social order or their own wealth and domestic comforts” (Stauffer, 2012 p. 68).

This section and chapter importantly concludes with a reiteration of the necessity for abolition and abolitionist imaginaries and approaches to the conditions of the world that go beyond immediate, reactive, and recuperative positions, efforts, and teachings. The tensions of and between abolitionists grants a lot of important and difficult considerations to the content and extent of abolitionist aims/aims of abolitionists. An abolitionist such as William Lloyd Garrison (and the Garrisonian’s) was polarizing and rebuked in large part because of his fierce and direct language and approach to abolition. Even in Northern free states critics called Garrisonian approaches to immediate emancipation unrealistic. Yet as Olson writes in *Abolition of White Democracy* (2004): “The Garrisonians made the case for radicalness over respectability, principle over expedience, militancy over discipline, and volume over toned-down talk” (p. 137). Following the Garrisonians efforts, here is a good moment for considering volume. If the Garrisonians were loud, using ‘radicalness over respectability,’ then John Brown’s commitment to ending slavery caused the world to rumble.

John Brown is most known for leading a raid on the federal arsenal at Harper’s Ferry, Virginia in 1859. With 21 others, including fugitive slaves like Shields Green, free Blacks, college students, and three of his own sons (American Experience, 2000), Brown intended to distribute guns to slaves for their rebellion (History With No Chaser, 2019). Describing his attitude toward abolishing slavery, Frederick Douglass, a friend of Brown’s, said that “Brown denounced slavery in language fierce and bitter,” which is similar to Garrison, but what distinguishes the two is that Brown “thought that slaveholders had forfeited their right to live” (American Experience, 2000 n.p.). Indeed, as a pacifist

Garrison criticized Brown and insisted on non-violence. This did not thwart Brown's conviction, who understood himself as an instrument of God (Stauffer & Trodd, 2005).

Something they had in common, neither Garrison nor Brown thought legislative reform or appeals policy makers were of any use. Described by Douglas (1881), "legislative enactments were to [Brown's] mind mere cobwebs - the pompous emptiness of human pride - the pitiful outbreathings of human nothingness" (n.p.). While Olson (2004) considers Garrisonians and 'the radicals' to be synonymous, there were clear divides between Garrisonians and abolitionists like Brown (who was not "an aberrant lone wolf" but "the product of the abolition movement" [Sinha, 2016 n.p.]), who thought Garrison's talk of non-violence, peace, and persuasion to be "milk and water abolitionism" (American Experience, n.d.). Brown was absolute about abolition (Harney & Moten, 2013). He understood slavery as war, even being known as a meteor of war (Stauffer & Trodd, 2005), and gave no quarter to slavery's immediate beneficiaries and defenders. As Douglas (1881) described Brown years after his death:

"in his eye a slave-holding community could not be peaceable, but was, in the nature of the case, in one incessant state of war. To him such a community was not more sacred than a band of robbers: it was the right of any one to assault it by day or night. He saw no hope that slavery would ever be abolished by moral or political means" (n.p.).

Brown was devoted to ending the institution of slavery, which is another way of saying the abolition of whiteness. Taking lives before and during the Harper's Ferry raid (AmericanExperiencePBS, 2013), and putting his own life and the lives of his sons on the line was not a question, it was divine providence, it was a "sanguinary conclusion" (Armstrong, 2000, track 17). John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry proved unsuccessful in bringing about an armed slave rebellion. Ten of the raiders were killed, including two of Brown's sons. Brown and seven others were captured, tried for murder, treason, and inciting slave insurrection, then hanged (Stauffer & Trodd, 2005). The details are storied

and widely written about and are included here less to retell and more to provoke. If abolition, as I propose throughout this thesis, is impossible, then failure is inevitable. Brown's was a glorious failure. The rumble transformed the world and marks a pivotal movement among other rumbles toward the end of the world as we know it. John Brown's life, and his willingness to give his life to the abolition of slavery, is not a story about one man and his meteoric fortitude, but a contribution to the long, brilliant history of abolition and life by other means.

“[T]he question is, Did John Brown fail? He certainly did fail to get out of Harper's Ferry before being beaten down by United States soldiers; he did fail to save his own life, and to lead a liberating army into the mountains of Virginia. But he did not go to Harper's Ferry to save his life. The true question is, Did John Brown draw his sword against slavery and thereby lose his life in vain? and to this I answer ten thousand times. No! No man fails, or can fail who so grandly gives himself and all he has to a righteous cause” (Douglass, 1881 n.p.).

## 7

### CALL TO ORDER

This chapter has probably been the most difficult to write. In considering the call to order I understand there is an imperative to do something different in and with my writing. This imperative has been felt throughout this entire thesis process, but perhaps no point has been so apparent as this one. In describing the call to order, and in better understanding different iterations and expressions (subtle, overt, indiscernible, familiar) of and from the call to order, I have questioned and hesitated with my writing more than ever. I have been tripping myself up with questions and doubts.

I am trying to get out of my own way.

I understand the call to order as a structuring of language/behavior/thought that limits, regulates, and initiates expression into various particularities of the order of the world. I also understand the call to order to be recognizable through overt demonstrations of power and force, as well as unrecognizable through common, informal gestures. Both porous polarities of recognizable and unrecognizable are largely undisputed and so naturalized as to not provoke any alternative considerations or questioning. If anything does get questioned, however, it is the method(s) in which the call was ordered.

I have found difficulty in discussing the call to order without writing a sentence which includes “the call to order is...” and in placing the call to order in relation to something else that it is not in order to describe it. Yet I feel that this is part of the doing something different that is required of this work. My intention, which often feels like both all I have as well as everything I could need, is to refuse rephrasing and repurposing overt and overtly violent/forceful examples of the call to order and the consequences thereof. My intention is to write of the violence that is hidden or excused in relation to more direct and shocking acts that are a part of the call to order, or that are justified as being the way it is and must be (it being anything from pedagogical practices, to formalized instruction, to sentence structure, to police conduct, to understandings and mobilizations of justice, to the world).

My intention is to write of instances of the call to order which are naturalized components of institutional education and everyday living, and to move with this intention in experimental ways that might offer imaginings different than (though not separate from) policy's regulating gesture, the call to order. My intention is to write of refusals that are misrecognized as deviant and disturbing behaviors. Misrecognized refusal is important to engage with because, with Tuck & Yang (2014a): "Refusal shifts the gaze from the violated body to the violating instruments" (p. 241).

With this project on the STPP framework and abolition I am not necessarily attempting to dispose of the order of a sentence, paragraph, chapter, or thesis. I am working toward conjuring the radical potential of the sentence, or perhaps myself as the writer being conjured by the sentence that needs to be written (which importantly, if subtly, questions authorship and self-determination<sup>87</sup>). Part of this practice includes writing in a more recognizable, standardized way. Another part of this experiment is to refuse the normal sentence. Precarious, both are toward and thus enacting the radical potential of the available tools in which to continue and join black study. The point of intention is key here in indicating and questioning what is it that the order and ordering (of a sentence, of a chapter) can be utilized for. I am limited by the tools I have (e.g. language, sentences, chapters) insofar as the tools are limited in what they can be used for (e.g. description, legibility, ordering). But the experiment and what I've struggled with in this chapter particularly is that the tools need not be as confined or confining as I imagine them (e.g. with the dialectical thesis, anthesis, synthesis formulation; with clear, well-defined and easily understandable terms). Though engaging in an accredited academic PhD process does presuppose certain requirements/restrictions, this intention is less a concept for me to consider and enact for a potential reader and more for

---

<sup>87</sup> My thinking here is based on collaborations (workshops, conversations and conference papers) with Lindsay Miller, as written about in Miller & Miller (2020), in which we are thinking with da Silva's work with Black feminist poethics which, in part, experiments with the material of difference without the principle of separability (2016). This collaborative piece was published in a special issue on "Feminisms and Decolonising Psychology" where we asked, among other questions: "Is decolonization possible in this world?" and "Can psychology be decolonized but the world remain?" (Miller & Miller, 2020 p. 382). With the radical potential of any tool we are also thinking with Barad (2015).

myself to move with and through, articulating the work while and as an unraveling. What I think is important is not the successful completion of a degree or the proper adherence to expectations, but the excessive and ongoing work that this project contributes to. This thesis is a process and a project of study. The culminating degree is a speculative act to support and be in service of the project of more study (Harney & Moten, 2013).

“If you’ve really got to do something, and it’s really important, you don’t give a shit where the tools come from. You get the tools wherever you can find them and then you deal with the consequences that attend those tools as you work with them. You don’t reject tools out of hand just because they come from this or that place” (Moten, 2017 n.p.).

In thinking specifically with the call to order in and as an act of education, and in working to write and imagine before and beyond the STPP framework, in this chapter I am guided by considerations of what could be/are the obligations of an abolitionist (Rodriguez, 2010; Miller & Miller, 2017) when refusing the call to order (Halberstam, 2013; Tuck & Yang, 2014b). Mundane acts of a violent call to order for this chapter include writing on police in schools/SROs, their critiques, and the critical push to replace their roles (which include law enforcement, disciplinarian, counselor, and confidant) with more teachers, counselors, restorative justice programs and self-improvement initiatives, as well as professional efforts to better know the child/student. This is all to say that we cannot just abolish one thing and expect fundamental transformation and change without abolishing everything. To try and articulate a demand of anarchy and abolition: What do we do (and keep doing) when what is necessary is also impossible?

#### SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS

As discussed earlier, in and around the STPP framework are issues of police officers, commonly with the title School Resource Officers (SROs) in schools. A primary argument regarding SROs is around the question of what the role of the police should be in schools. Some that are fighting the effects of the STPP want the police reach and rule to be limited (e.g. clearer roles and objectives of police in schools [Virginia Legal Aid Society, 2015]), while some question whether police officers should be stationed/have a regular presence in schools at all (e.g. Dignity in Schools, 2017; 8toAbolition, 2020). Both points cite the overreach of police, the threatening environment they create, and the prison-like atmosphere of the schools the SROs contribute to. Some want the police in schools as protectors and role-models rather than contribute as disciplinarians. These are people and organizations that, as Vitale (2017) writes, largely believe “the problem is not that there are agents of formal state control in schools, it’s that they sometimes act improperly and abuse that all-important authority” (p. 68). Other more extreme efforts are to get SROs and police officers out of schools entirely, replaced with more counselors, coaches, and teachers to fulfil the role model position. Various expressed, understood, enacted, and experimented with throughout the long and continuing history of abolition, police/SROs will always - even with the best of intentions within the best possible circumstances and clearly defined job duties - be weaponized mobilizations of what has come to be conceptualized as the PIC, and embodied representations of the coercive, controlling, inhibitory extensions of policy.

To continue with the impossibility of the police and policing with abolitionist imaginings of the end of the world as we know it (da Silva, 2014), Vitale writes in *The End of Policing*:

“The nature of police is to be a force for order and control. Even when they attempt to be positive mentors, it is always backed up by the punitive and coercive capacities that distinguish them from teachers and counselors” (2017 p. 74).



While making clear the implicit role of SROs, with this distinction, however, Vitale leaves an expansive opening for the bestowing of these policing powers (however less overtly violent), into counselors, coaches, and teachers if and when SROs are out of the picture. This is not to be ungenerous, but the way the argument is formulated, there is too much space for the redistribution and recuperation of policing via carceral educations/educators. In *The End of Policing*, Vitale (2017) offers multiple examples of replacing police with better-suited and more appropriately trained professionals. And in the years since its release Vitale has addressed certain weaknesses of the book, one being the title. During the third seminar of the Abolition Democracy 13/13 series (Columbia Center for Contemporary Critical Thought, 2020), Vitale (2020) says that the book should have been called *The End of Police* instead of *Policing* because it does not go far enough to critique the far reaches of systems of policing that are not carried out by armed police officers.

In alignment with Vitale but pushing more specifics with considerations to what if any presence police could have in schools, The Dignity in Schools Campaign promotes Counselors not Cops (2017). Discussed below, the Campaign calls for no permanent police in schools and proposes that once SROs/police are out, there must be strict criteria for any school official to call and/or involve the police when it comes to school/student matters. Though this approach still finds its goals within a world that accepts the police, this is a radical reconfiguring not just of how schools increasingly operate (as sites of learning with the ever-present threat/reality of coercion, punishment, and violence legally justified with almost no recourse), but with how education is approached more generally. With SROs increasingly being stationed in schools, and with strict Zero Tolerance policies allowing for and even mandating police involvement in any number of matters (e.g. school districts being required to have certain policies/relations with police in order to continue receiving federal funding [Improving America's Schools Act, 1994 [Nguyen, 2013]; the 'broad and overly vague' language and mobilizations of Disturbing Schools [Kenny v Wilson, 2016; South Carolina Legislature, 2010]). Propelled by Critical Resistance's guide to considering "Reformist reforms vs. abolitionist

steps in policing” (n.d.), removing police from schools (“Reduce the scale of policing”) and putting that money into other resources (“reduce funding to police”) is working toward abolitionist imaginaries.

The tensions are still present, however. As with Vitale finding worth in counselors, teachers, and coaches rather than police, the Dignity in Schools Campaign encourages counselors to monitor halls and entrances rather than cops. Again, while having unarmed counselors surveilling and enforcing policy will likely be less overtly threatening or directly violent than with police, this is ultimately violence reformed. Vitale and others are not wrong in finding more potential benefit with counselors over cops. This potential, however, is not tapped into when counselors remain a regular carceral presence/with roles being to monitor and correct for (mis)behavior (e.g. being stationed in school halls instead of cops; working to counsel students to better fit into a prechoreographed movement/expression). With this, perhaps movements like #CounselorsNotCops focus too much on the police and miss insidious manifestations and/or underestimate the presence and violence of policing in positions held by counselors, teachers, coaches, etc.

The reasons police are in schools, as with their roles, also vary. Some proponents of SROs assert that the mere presence of a uniformed police officer serves to deter potential criminal acts. Having a consistent and uniformed officer (rather than an undercover or plainclothes officer) present is also touted as establishing better trusting relationships for students toward the police. ‘Proactive’ crime prevention is another purpose for having police in schools. With a similar logic to broken windows-type policing, the idea is to catch minor crimes (and the criminals committing them) before they eventually escalate into major crimes (and criminals). Rose (1985) details how educational issues of children that would become defined as difficult have been and continue to be conceptualized, researched, and molded. What are generally common understandings of difficult, troubled, at-risk students is neither universal nor age-old, and the early emphasis on pinpointing disturbing behaviors

of children in schools were less about preventing the disruption of class-time and more about larger societal fears of deviancy and/or criminality.

The methods and justifications evolve, catching and correcting aberrations early was and remains a primary tenet for educational institutions. The warning signs for would-be delinquent children were not criminal acts, but minor, aberrant acts that were probable to lead to criminal ones. This gets at the risk that students pose to school order, to societal norms, to laws and regulations that schools (in part, along with the police) are intended to establish and maintain through and in conjunction with an array of institutions and tactics. With the more modern implementation and ongoing establishing of police officers in schools, the minor offences that were warning signs of future major offences; what were behaviors and actions for correction/discipline from school officials (i.e. teachers, counselors) are increasingly becoming criminal acts. What is understood to be disturbing, as well as the justifications for disciplining and/or excluding disturbing students has changed/evolved to largely be about seat-time (time students spend in a classroom rather than the various sites of and ways students can be excluded from standard classroom learning) (Rodriguez, 2013). With this emphasis/concern, issues are framed to be about maintaining classroom order and the integrity of what are to be the inherently positive elements of education, and not (as clearly) about the risk to wider societal and national order.

#### MOVEMENT OUT OF ORDER

“To move wrong or not to move is sabotage” (Harney & Moten, n.d. p. 6).

Critics of the educational mechanisms that create and sustain the STPP cite what is perceived to be an increased criminalization of student misbehavior (e.g. creating/expanding a student’s criminal record rather than school disciplinary record). To be sure, this criminalization has overt and long-

lasting implications that extend beyond the walls of and years spent in institutions of formal education (of which I have intended to bring into this thesis throughout). However, the policing of student movement (e.g. patrolling for minor offences with the reasoning of thwarting eventual major ones) occurs with or without a sworn officer of the law. A major example taken up by opponents<sup>88</sup> of the STPP who cite a new or increased criminalization of youth in schools as a primary contributing factor to the pipeline comes from 2014 in the state of Virginia. In this example, a sixth-grade student was charged with criminal disorderly conduct by the school resource officer after kicking a trashcan.

This incident gained a significant amount of attention in the media (somewhat surprisingly in that there was no corresponding cellphone or security camera footage) in part because the student was already being reprimanded by a teacher for kicking the trashcan before the SRO intervened and formally criminalized the action and student. The teacher was less-formally and with less immediate/obvious outcomes performing their own form of criminalization by catching this minor departure in expected student conduct. This provides an obvious example of recognizable misbehavior (e.g. kicking a trashcan - never mind any contributing circumstances around the outburst) being disciplined in-school that was already handled without and had no immediate need for police involvement. A primary point cited as a contributing factor to the STPP is the criminalization of behaviors/actions by students that were either previously handled in-school by school officials and thus not necessarily contributing to a police record<sup>89</sup>, or that are said to be normal child and adolescent behavior and thus in need of guidance and directing rather than being heightened to criminal acts (Nance, 2015). These different arguments with as many proposed

---

<sup>88</sup> Not that there are proponents of a school-to-prison pipeline, necessarily, but there are many who want and welcome police in schools and deny any ill effect. There are also many who dismiss claims of there being any cop involvement in a school-to-prison pipeline and asserting the opposite, that police support students and prevent criminalization (KGW News, 2018).

<sup>89</sup> A school district in Pennsylvania was found to be having SROs review disciplinary write-ups of students “for a broad range of minor incidents, including ones in which the police were not involved or called” to then file charges (such as disorderly conduct) against the student (Jordan, 2016 n.p.)

solutions have especially become prominent due to the increasing and increasingly rationalized presence of police in schools and with it the normalization of criminalization as a discourse and consequence.

Being found guilty of disorderly conduct in Virginia as a juvenile holds various consequences such as “court-ordered programs and treatment; probation with mandatory conditions; curfew; monetary fines; community service” and in rare cases “placement in foster care or confinement in a juvenile detention facility” (Woolard, Deane & Ellis, 2019 p. 3). Another factor as to why this specific instance gained media attention was because the 11-year-old is a Black male who is autistic<sup>90</sup>. The disproportionate amount of times Black and/or disabled student movement is perceived as necessary or official, documented<sup>91</sup> punishment (from both schools and police) is a key argument used to highlight school and police injustices in the fight against the STPP (Wald & Losen, 2003b).

A further reason for the media attention was because days after the SRO filed a disorderly conduct charge against the student for kicking a trashcan, a second misdemeanor disorderly conduct charge, along with a felony charge was filed on the student by the same SRO. The new charge was assaulting a police officer, a felony offence that, if found guilty, will stay on a person’s criminal record for life (not to mention whatever immediate legal recourse is taken). This felony charge of the 11-year-old was another clear example of a law enforcer acting in a way that is easy to admonish, disavow, and blame (e.g. demonstrate disapproval of the individual officer or the law that permits/requires the officer to act as he did). Reacting to more extreme and obvious instances, while important, can so often do the work of dismissing the everyday instances that are less horrific and/or outrageous.

---

<sup>90</sup> In the 2015 report “Virginia tops nation in sending kids to cops, courts: Where does your state rank?” (Ferris, 2015a), US data from 2011-12 academic year found that 38.3% of criminal referrals in Virginia were of Black students, who only consisted of 23.9% of all students. In the same study, 30.1% of criminal referrals in Virginia schools were of disabled students, while only 14.3% of all Virginia students in 2011-12 were disabled/had a disability diagnosis.

<sup>91</sup> Documented because not all states are required to keep record of disciplinary actions taken. In many states that are required to collect the data for amount, the reasons for exclusion and/or referral to the juvenile justice system are not required to be specified (Ferris, 2015a).

The extreme steps taken by the SRO was because the student tried to leave class and join his fellow classmates who had all already been dismissed - waiting last to be dismissed was a new classroom rule that only applied to this student (Ferriss, 2016) - more officially demonstrating the ongoing criminalization of the student. The sixth-grader resisted and tried to break free after the SRO physically restrained him, and that movement constituted/justified enough of a reason for the police officer to push to the floor, handcuff, arrest, and take the student to juvenile court with misdemeanor and felony charges against him (the struggle to break free from the SROs restraint constituted an assault on a police officer). The student wanted to be with his classmates. He reached out, moved toward a sociality that is impermissible to schooling and state order, schooling as state order. He was not called (by anyone with state-sanctioned and supported authority, which always at least implies the threat of force) and yet he moved. He was out of order, in violation and subject to violation justified by and as a mechanism of the state.

“The pathologization of autistic movement indicates the extent to which the unruly kinesthetic symptomologies of autistic embodiment have been interpreted as evidence of a degraded or impaired capacity to exercise rational agency and moral autonomy” (Hilton, 2017 p. 228).

The threat that the fugitive student poses is not simply of disruption to the learning process. The threat of an unfixed fugitivity, of the mere existence and movement of those underprivileged one's who are more and less than one (Moten, 2013; 2015) is a threat to whiteness' ontological security (Stein, Hunt, Suša, & Andreotti, 2017). And here the punishment is itself part of the learning process – a lesson for the student who is not to get into trouble again (an order made by the presiding judge over this particular case in Virginia [Ferriss, 2016]); a clear lesson “that he needed to start controlling himself or that eventually they would start controlling him” (a statement by the judge retold by the sixth-grade student's mother [Ferriss, 2015b n.p.]). The imposed restriction of movement was to be for the student's own good. But when someone is unable or unwilling to 'properly' respond to the

call to order, corrective steps must be taken. And when the unruly student already represents “unruly kinesthetic symptomologies” (Hilton, 2017) then the suspected risk is heightened and confirmed. This was also a somewhat more subtle lesson for all other students should they not heed the call to order. It is also a lesson and simultaneous demonstration of force for the state in its (seemingly) ever-present and expanding reach.

In a somewhat indirect way this expanding reach might also be demonstrated in a reform (a predictable reaction/result to this case); in a seeming lessening of state power or function. The reform informs the creators and enforcers of policy of what demonstrations of power do not register as permissible and spark public outcry, and what actions remain valid under the scope of (school, national, ontological) security. Yet what outcome of public outcry could ever begin to attend to, let alone abolish the everyday horrors enacted by policing (which always extends beyond those who carry a gun and a badge)? by teaching (which always extends beyond those at the front of a classroom)?

“It’s not about taking the streets; it’s about how, and about what, we take to the streets”

(Harney & Moten, n.d. p. 23).

While the state-supported unfolding’s of this series of events in Virginia should be entirely contested, there is still much that is left unnoticed and accepted with the outlined critiques. In this Virginia case, an outcome celebrated by some was in updating and better defining the role and reach of SROs for the school district. Agendas were pushed that sought to limit the scope of available arrestable students to only those aged 13 and older (Crowe, 2015). Taken at face-value this seems like a positive outcome in that it should limit the scope of policing in school. However and predictably, this outcome was an especially weak one in that it was established in the Virginia School-Law Enforcement Partnership Model Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 2015) which is a document that is intended to “foster

relations of mutual respect and understanding in order to build a positive and safe school environment” (p. 1) between schools and police departments. Rather than any actual restriction of what makes up the act of policing and what is a part of a police officer’s job (be it in schools or not)<sup>92</sup>, the MOU serves as a general guide - or more precisely an accompaniment to the School and Law Enforcement Partnership Guide – to what SROs idealistically should do. Another example of vague language that is open to the interpretation of policy’s deputies (e.g. “All responses to school misconduct should be reasonable, consistent and fair...” [Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 2017 p. 1]), the MOU and the Partnership Guide serve as little more than words of good faith that might quickly be dismissed when considering the primary role of a school resource officer is not to teach or mentor, but to police; to uphold and represent the law. And there are many laws in place (e.g. Disorderly Conduct; Disturbing Schools; assaulting a police officer) that are shown over and over again to be used by and useful to official agents of the state when making judgements about what constitutes a legally punishable offense, and justifications for state-sanctioned actions.

In creating my STPP archive for this project I have recognized and come to expect one of two framings of events when the law is directly involved/directing a situation. The shaping of how an event unfolded and the handling of any ensuing pushback/criticism is either:

1) That the individual actions of the individuals involved are criticized. Recall in the South Carolina disturbing school’s case that the two female students were faced with criminal charges and, after cellphone footage gained media attention, the SROs actions were publicly rebuked, and the SRO was fired. Yet, the SRO faced no criminal charges because as horrific as the actions caught on video were, they were all legally prohibited.

---

<sup>92</sup> Here is another example of a reformist reform that does nothing to actually “reduce tools/tactics/technology police have at their disposal” or “reduce the scale of policing” (Critical Resistance, n.d. n.p.).



2) The police officer/SRO is given the full support of the police force; that the officer in fact did nothing wrong and instead necessarily acted according to the law whether or not the actions are perceived by non-law enforcers as excessive and unconscionable (McLaughlin, 2014). The Virginia case fell into place here: “the officer's supervisor reviewed the incident the day of the arrest and found no violation of law or police department policy” (“Lynchburg City Schools” n.p.).

It needs to be noted here that a legal indictment, a guilty verdict, and a punishment under the law as is understood and mobilized now is not ultimately a part of an abolitionist plan. With this, jailing police officers, as rare an occurrence as it is, still works to uphold the societal call to order which, as outlined by Critical Resistance (n.d.) promotes ideas “that prosecution and prison serve real justice” and upholds the “false distinction between ‘good police’ (who keep us safe), and ‘bad police’ (who are unusual cases)” (n.p.).

Two years after changing schools, multiple court dates, interviews, articles, studies, petitions<sup>93</sup> and reforms (some attempted, some approved) the state of Virginia eventually dropped the felony charge on the student in this highly followed case. But when considering the particular circumstances of this one case, it really is not remarkable. What distinguishes it from the thousands of other cases like it (and similar events that go undocumented) is that it gained public attention and the charges against the student were dropped.

## POLICING (AS) THREAT

---

<sup>93</sup> A petition through [change.org](https://change.org) collected over 150,000 signatures for the student’s case to be dismissed (Dix, 2015a).

“The nature of police is to be a force for order and control. Even when they attempt to be positive mentors, it is always backed up by the punitive and coercive capacities that distinguish them from teachers and counselors” (Vitale, 2018 p. 74).

Police officers pose an obvious example of initiates and initiators of the call to order. Though much of official policing is a demonstration of policy’s regulatory force, the call to order of which the police come to represent is also a general act of mundane violence in the attempted ordering of the disorderly/informal. It is violence beyond physical harm, though the call to order includes direct violence and/or the threat of direct violence. With the police, the threat is always there. With police officers increasingly present if not stationed in schools (SROs), students in turn are increasingly under direct threat. Though this applies to all, for many students the threat of direct violence has always been there and apparent in more than just law enforcement officials - including teachers, administrators, coaches and counselors. This chapter is an engagement with mundane violences of the call to order in education that rarely if ever register within the STPP framework (and critiques thereof), as well as with what gets hidden and/or excused with demonstrations of and reactions to the overtly violent in the call to order. Furthermore, in this chapter I am considering refusals of the call to order and explicitly experimenting with expressing that abolition cannot be confined to only one thing.

Far beyond a conversation about an individual who is a student and an individual who has the job of school resource officer, this highlighted example in Virginia is a part of a “genocidal instrumentalization in the state’s defense” (Harney & Moten n.d. p. 22). Black movement, disabled movement, queer, disruptive, off, troubling, monstrous, demonic, fugitive movement is always under threat for the threats it poses. Often the most immediate and perhaps most obvious threat, portrayed/enacted as defense, to undercommon sociality and study is from police.

From an abolitionist perspective, the role and figure of the police officer as it has been and is now can never not fundamentally be a threat and/or an enforcer of regulative order. The order of the world, expressed through specific laws, policies, and norms are upheld by any means an individual police officer, trained and supported by various state agents, agencies and forces, uses and, if questioned/challenged, justifies. These uses and justifications of force and law are of course contested. Increasingly, police/SROs are primary points of critique/outrage when it comes to the effects encapsulated within the STPP framework. And while it is often socially appropriate to criticize and have an opinion about individual officers abusing their authority/abusing children (though never without defense and debate), the available reactions seem to be limited to gradations of minor reforms. In the Virginia case, updating the language of and suggestions for SROs within the MOU between the schools and the police was recognized as a success in safeguarding more students from having official encounters with the police even though it bore no legal restriction or concrete change. Critiques of this outcome, calling for more out of the MOU, also remained within reactionary gradations of minor reform.

In a statement released by the Virginia Legal Aid Society (VLAS) who represented the sixth-grade student during his trials, though pleased with the MOU they felt the outcome should have gone further, in part by requiring specific training for SROs. The VLAS hoped for SROs to be “trained in the needs of and accommodations” of disabled students as well as “appropriate de-escalation and restraint techniques” (2015 n.p.) As good intentioned as this desired well-trained SRO is, it is a hope that promotes (however subtly) ideas that police have a role in dispensing a particular brand of protection to schools as well as in establishing/furthering friendly/familiar relations for students. In *The End Of Policing*, Alex Vitale (2017) writes that when police are intended to be mentors rather than teachers, coaches and counselors, “The implicit goal is to establish the importance and legitimacy of the police in the eyes of the students” (p. 68). This police-as-mentor role is and has been promoted for decades by many as key to what police are meant to be in schools (e.g. Kupchik

& Bracy, 2009; Dix, 2015b; Merkwae, 2015; McKenna, Martinez-Prather & Bowman, 2016).

Mentorship is one of three core points within the National Association of School Resource Officers, Inc. training program: “The purpose of a successful SRO program is to ‘bridge the gap’ between law enforcement and youth. This purpose is best accomplished by using the TRIAD model: Law Enforcement (LEO), Teacher (Guest speaker), and Informal Counselor (Mentor)” (Canady, 2018 p. 5).

I consider the VLAS statement to be a plea for more of the same rather than an effort for any substantial change. It is not based on any fundamental critique of policing, but continues the narrative that “better training would ensure that we can rely on police for safety, and that instances of police harm and violence occur because of lack of training” (Critical Resistance, n.d. n.p.). There are various fundamental certainties that school reformers are assuming actually exist which do not seem to be considered when bringing in objections and alternatives to police violence in schools.

Setting the goal to have police officers as role models offers nothing transformative to schools or schooling or to those being schooled. What it offers are more means of initiation into permitted and controlled circuits of movement (Harney & Moten, 2013; Lepecki, 2013). Police officers as mentors more than policy enforcers is an idealistic attempt to somewhat restrict the power of the police (something that they hate) to overtly discipline students, instead leaving that to teachers and administrators. It is idealistic because SROs are first and foremost sworn law enforcement agents that are to abide by, represent, and enforce federal, state, and/or local laws (Kupchik & Bracy, 2009; Virginia Department of Criminal Justice, 2017). As has been discussed with Disturbing Schools laws (Fugitivity and Policy chapters) and Disorderly Conduct (this chapter), what constitutes illegal activity can be almost entirely arbitrary and decided at the discretion of the police officer. This is how young children are criminalized for kicking a trash can (Ferriss, 2015b) and arrested for videotaping an officer’s (brutal) displays of law enforcement (Ripley, 2016).

## REFORMING VIOLENCE

As stated above, there are attempts at improving schools and confronting the consequences of the STPP framework regarding SROs further than wanting better and more specific training to deal with school-aged children's behaviors, and beyond hopes for the use of better judgement by SROs. Some are doing the radical work of getting police out of schools altogether (e.g. #PoliceFreeSchools and #DefundThePolice as discussed in the School-to-Prison Pipeline chapter). At its best, this work challenges rather than reinforces ideas that police increase safety and, when efforts are successful, limits the scale of policing. Part of the major difficulties faced with organized efforts to remove police from schools is indicated in the breadth of official law enforcement positions in schools as highlighted in the Dignity in Schools campaign:

“We are calling for removal of any law enforcement personnel assigned to be present on a regular basis in schools, including sworn officers (and unsworn if they are armed security), municipal police officers, school police officers, school resource officers (SROs), sheriff's deputies, parole and probation officers, tribal officers, truancy officers, ICE officers or other immigration officials and armed security guards” (2017 p. 2).

With these non-reformist reform efforts which both limits the presence of police and offers fundamental challenges to notions of policing (Critical Resistance, n.d.) come great tensions. These are plans that are difficult to promote and even more difficult to achieve, in part because of the ubiquity of policing in seemingly every institution (e.g. school; nation; family), and there are more attempts being made than successful campaigns that get police out of schools. Some tensions I perceive with these efforts are in the alternatives to police presence that are put forward. For instance, Counselors not Cops from the Dignity in Schools Campaign puts forward straightforward reasons on the importance of preventing police from being placed in schools currently without, and for removing the role of police in schools that have assigned SROs already. The Campaign also offers

many resources for organizing against police in schools. The organizing resources are for individuals and communities, and the aims are toward policy makers (Dignity in Schools, 2016; 2017).

Making a case that funds/resources/material and emotional investment in law enforcement should be redistributed to school support staff offers a generative starting point for abolition. The tensions that come with the Dignity in Schools reports, as well as generally with the idea of #CounselorsNotCops, has been variously discussed throughout this thesis. A specific point that brings out a perhaps less recognizable call to order comes with the potential implementation of this redistribution. The Campaign proposes placing school support staff like Community Intervention Workers in the halls and entrances rather than police officers. This is both a way to lessen the implications/threats of direct violence that come by way of the police, and a change that could disguise the coercive forces that, despite one's best intentions, are implicit in roles and figures that control the circuits of movement (Lepecki, 2013). Yet, some of the reasoning for having Community Intervention Workers stationed at entrances/monitoring the school halls is the same given by proponents of SROs: personnel who know the student body well, and who can preempt issues before they occur or escalate. Those who want counselors (e.g. Dignity in Schools) and those who want cops (e.g. National Association of School Resource Officers) appeal to the public, policy makers, politicians, and students with the same rationale.

This is all in discussion with stationed, permanent, and patrolling police officers in schools. The official role of police also includes guest speakers in assemblies and classrooms, running class and school-wide programs like Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.)<sup>94</sup>, as well as performing unannounced drug sweeps that all place officers in schools in impermanent ways. This

---

<sup>94</sup> This drug prevention/anti-drug program consists of a series of in-class lessons led by police officers starting as early as pre-kindergarten (3 or 4 years old) until 12<sup>th</sup> grade which is the end of compulsory education. D.A.R.E. began in 1983 as a partnership between the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Unified School District, and after being tested on predominantly Black schools in Southern California (Sojoyner, 2013), is now in every US state and in over 50 other countries (D.A.R.E., 2020), and serves as another example of the connections of education and police/prisons.

impermanence in a physical way still does the work of trying to make permanent police and policing in affective ways, which furthers the project of ontological security through means of imposing individuation, framing desire, instilling limits of imagination, etc.

The debates around #CounselorsNotCops demonstrate an important tension and underlying component to a carceral education. There is a clear difference in a student being confronted or even greeted every school day by a uniformed, likely armed<sup>95</sup> police officer and an unarmed school counselor. The implications of threat and likelihood of a violent encounter, so the argument goes, will be lessened with the switching of cops for counselors. What might be deemed misbehavior and the immediate consequences thereof will also be lessened.

However, there is also *not* a clear difference with a student being confronted by a counselor or the police. This is evident with past and present violences experienced by disabled/crip, neurodivergent/mad, queer, Black, Brown, and/or American Indian students (some of which have been considered in this thesis). Following Christina Sharpe (2016), care must be radically rethought, different from definitions and understandings imposed by policy and normalized. This need is highlighted when recognizing that state-sanctioned care is distributed through carceral techniques and technologies including American Indian boarding schools (Policy chapter); anti-literacy laws in ante-bellum US (Warren, 2018); chemical constraint and psychiatric coercion (Fabris & Aubrecht, 2014); and other sites/technologies of care and rehabilitation often presented as and/or assumed to be alternatives to incarceration (Taylor, 2020). These unexpected spaces of confinement (Adams and

---

<sup>95</sup> The SROs will be armed if they are a sworn law enforcement officer. There are SROs that are not official law enforcers, but the numbers are unknown because “SROs are not required to register with any national database, nor are police departments required to report how many of their officers work as SROs, nor are school systems required to report how many SROs they use (National Association of School Resource Officers, n.d. n.p.).

Erevelles, 2017) are justified as keeping the segregated/isolated/confined students safe (Erevelles, 2020)<sup>96</sup>.

If I am going to mention the Medical Industrial Complex (MIC) (Raffo, Taneja, & Page, n.d.) and the incredible work being done in the healing justice movement (HJM)<sup>97</sup> at all in this thesis, which I recognize I have not up until this point (as the MIC and HJM go beyond the scope of this thesis), this is the place. The MIC and the PIC, though (somewhat) different in foci, are inextricably intertwined and this needs to be named, especially in the context of #CounselorsNotCops – as the school houses these complexes, among others, and can even be considered an assemblage of complexes. As discussed in the Genealogy chapter, I recognize healing justice along with disability justice (mentioned earlier), to be abolitionist projects that are attempting to know at the limits of justice (da Silva, 2013b) – neither finding justice in nor seeking justice from institutions and institutional definitions/deployments.

The controlling of circuits of movement within a school system that is an integral part of the PIC/MIC will always be coercive and, although different, will be violent. Enforcing a school dress code policy influenced/directed by standards of beauty which are all tied up with racist, sexist, heteropatriarchal, ableist, nationalistic norms and impositions by surveilling for non-compliance is a process of teaching/counseling students to value certain expressions and have a narrowed imagination of desires.

Fraser and Lambie (2015) discuss constraints in institutional education that “reshape students’ learning desires and narrow the horizons of possibility of what higher education can be” and

---

<sup>96</sup> Here I have cited Dorian Taylor and Nirmala Erevelles, 2 of 6 featured presenters who spoke at the “Grounding Movements in Disability Justice” webinar (Gibson, 2020). The other amazing speakers were Azza Altiraifi, Cyree Jarelle Johnson, Dustin Gibson, and Talila A. Lewis.

<sup>97</sup> For various resources on the HJM see: *Bad Ass Visionary Healers*, n.d. and the Fireweed Collective n.d. For the history of the HJM see *Care Work: Dreaming Disability Justice* (Piepzna-Samarasinha, 2018), particularly chapter 5, “Sick and Crazy Healer: A Not-So-Brief Personal History of the Healing Justice Movement.”



consider the queering of desire so as to question norms and in doing so, create possibilities as “a method of dreaming, naming and being otherwise in the world” (64). Though their focus is within their own context of teaching in higher education, the reshaping/narrowing of ways to be and express in the world occur in, before, and beyond all phases and settings of institutional education. So too can the work of queering desire as a critical pedagogy take place in and outside of designated sites of higher education. Fraser and Lamble offer ‘queer conversation’ as a means of striving, in part, to make space for “the pleasures of learning even when this involves risks and dangers” (ibid. p. 73), and to break down the binary between teacher and student to transform classroom dynamics, manifest as expressions of the call to order. The typical classroom is structured in a very specific way, silently teaching power dynamics that separate student and teacher, as well as isolating student from student.

More insidious than a teacher silencing a class (either with orders to unruly students or without a word to students who know what is expected of them and comply), Harney expresses a foundational mobilization of the call to order: “In education the very first lesson is individuation in time and space” (2017 n.p.). As was considered in Policy regarding pedagogical processes of individuation in American Indian boarding schools, the lesson of an individuated self along one trajectory of time in relation to one experience of space does the work of fundamentally regulating how one is to experience themselves and the world – primarily as a self, separate from what comes to be known as others, and what gets distinguished as one’s environment and demarcations of property (e.g. my hand; my hat; my land). The pedagogical processes of individuation are oppositional to educations expressed through the persistent fugitivity of study. In the lesson of “individuation in time and space,” “[k]ids are taught they cannot wander, and they are taught they cannot gather” (ibid. n.p.).

With wandering, the teaching can start with students being told they cannot leave and/or being stopped from leaving school/class/a situation for any reason - whether something that would be deemed reasonable (e.g. going to the bathroom), or because of something potentially unreasonable (e.g. being bored). The outcome of this lesson against wandering is to instill signals the student should adhere to almost automatically. Never mind the reasoning for the command, the signal (e.g. a bell sounding the start of the school day; a teacher clearing their throat to silence a class) is to be recognized and reacted to immediately “according to a more or less artificial, prearranged code” or policy (Foucault, 1975 p. 166). Time and space are to be fixed, as is one’s position (as one). This lesson is both before and embedded in later lessons, like learning to read and write through examples of property and possession exemplified with American Indian boarding schools (e.g. Teach my [*Course of Study for the Pine Ridge Agency Day Schools of South Dakota, with plans and suggestions, 1910*]). Another example that (perhaps unwittingly) maintains the lesson of individuation is with people/organizations rallying against the criminalizing effects/efforts conceptualized in the STPP framework, who want and see value in students maintaining their presence in classrooms (seat-time). As in the Fugitivity chapter, the desire to prevent out-of-school suspensions, expulsions and/or dropouts, while well-intentioned, is premised on the baseline notion that schools are safe places of learning<sup>98</sup>; that teachers are mediators of valuable knowledge and skills<sup>99</sup>; that institutional education is worthwhile<sup>100</sup>; that without an education or credentials young people will face greater challenges in the world. Each of these notions have been examined, challenged, and/or discredited in this thesis through engagement with various elements in the

---

<sup>98</sup> Various demonstrated throughout this thesis, school safety is generally put forward as something done through increased policing presence/tactics. As Rodriguez makes clear: “Students, teachers, and administrators of all kinds have come to conceptualize ‘freedom,’ ‘safety,’ and ‘peace’ as a relatively direct outcome of state-conducted domestic war (wars on crime, drugs, gangs, immigrants, terror, etc.), legitimated police violence, and large-scale, punitive imprisonment” (2013 p. 7).

<sup>99</sup> While this can be true with teachers working to refuse the call to order, “teaching is no longer separable from the work of policing, juridical discipline, and state-crafted punishment” (Rodriguez, 2013 p. 8)

<sup>100</sup> As Omowale (2013) states, the primary concern of those wanting better for students should be with creating an education that is meaningful rather than maintaining institutional education and finding ways to prevent dropouts.

ongoing history of education in the US. The latter point, however, of greater challenges for un/undereducated people has not been discredited – instead, the world that would create, police, and be maintained by these challenges has.

Being taught they cannot wander does not mean the lesson is always learned and integrated. Harney formulates the refusal of individuation as perversion, as our perversions - and the pedagogical processes of individuation would be attempts at straightening. The straightening or correcting mechanisms of schooling are themselves based on perversion. As with the fugitive, the perverse, the off, the dropout, the outlaw, the delinquent, the incapable, the unwilling, the denizens of the undercommons are already around, in what would become the surround, before and beyond the correcting forces (e.g. laws and police to enforce; curriculums for teachers to impart) which became the unthought norms. The delinquent is a figure who shows up often, representing perversions from the norm and serving as a justification for their own state-sanctioned violations. Even and especially the very threat of delinquency is reason enough for increased surveillance for and correction of minor perversions, whether as indicators of future and greater deviancies, or as ways to try and understand (through creating new and/or legitimating medical/psychological disciplines and institutions) the apparent roots of “mental disease or defect in other forms of socially undesirable behavior” (Rose, 1985 p. 163). The call to order teaches obedience while at the same time detecting for the disobedient.

A recognizable perversion mobilized as wandering is with the earlier example in this chapter of the Black, autistic sixth-grade student in Virginia. Recall that the felony charge of assaulting a police officer came after being physically restrained for refusing to stay behind in his seat while all his classmates were given permission to leave the classroom. The student’s unregulated desire for and movement toward sociality, along with his previous encounters with the SRO, made him a target for corrections. In the case of many this correcting force is punitive and retaliatory, even when justified

as necessary and/or in the student's best interest. He wandered so as to gather, and both are only to be done with permission from those in positions of authority.

Similar to fugitive movement, autistic wandering is often understood/explained as the leaving of unwanted stimulus/situations. Conversely, autistic wandering, also referred to as elopement, is understood/explained as a going toward a desired stimulus. Whether or not either was true of the sixth-grade student in Virginia, his treatment does illuminate ways elopement is understood and dealt with institutionally. Either elopement is confronted preemptively, as with creating the rule of just this student staying behind after class has ended so as to regulate his movement, or handled punitively, as with the enforcement of this rule which brought verbal discipline from his teacher, physical restraint from the SRO, warnings and punishment from the judge, and longer, potentially unknown consequences resulting from the policing of a movement refusing to be called to order.

Another difficult<sup>101</sup> example is with Kevin and Avonte's Law, which is indicative of the drive for more and more laws and surveillance measures to control the circuits of movement in unregulated expressions. This law is named after two autistic boys, Kevin Curtis Wills and Avonte Oquendo, who each tragically died after wandering - in 2008 at age 9 Kevin wandered from his home, Avonte from school in 2014 at age 14 (Autism Speaks, 2020). In the years after their deaths, there were many calls for increased protections to prevent future wandering and the harm/death that could meet other autistic individuals of any age. These calls came most notably from autism organizations, who sought legislative solutions (e.g. the National Autism Association worked with a US senator in drafting the legislation that would become law [Fournier, 2018]).

In 2016 Kevin and Avonte's Law was passed, initially allocating 2 million dollars available to fund initiatives to prevent the potential dangers of wandering. The law is part of an amended Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, and the funds are directed to be for (but not to)

---

<sup>101</sup> Difficult because the tragedy of the situation itself, and difficult because of the consequential institutional reactions which were to increase policing as if a form of care.

people with “developmental disabilities, such as autism, who, due to their condition, wander from safe environments<sup>102</sup>” (Kevin and Avonte’s Law of 2016, n.p.). Being within the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, it is no surprise that the focus on Kevin and Avonte’s Law would be directed toward funding and promoting tactics of policing. Indeed, regarding granting funding, there is explicit preference given to law enforcement agencies that partner with non-profit organizations, allotting money to these agencies and organizations, in part, to implement the tracking of disabled students. Not unlike the ankle monitors Skinny and Jazzy were ordered to wear as part of their sentences (Fugitivity chapter), the electronic monitoring devices used here function in similar ways: as enhanced attempts to surveil those whose movements (e.g. elopement; repetitive rocking) do not conform to the prechoreographed circuits of movement expected of them.

These tracking devices are meant to be distinct in use from the punitive devices. Primarily, they are not mandated as a punishment but are to be worn voluntarily “for the purpose of preventing injury or death to the person equipped with the device” (LiveViewGPS, 2018 n.p.). Both the intentions behind the technology and the voluntary tracking raise complicated and important questions about policing, coercion, and consent. While aspects of these have been discussed throughout in this thesis, these un/under-discussed tensions need to be named, as they are present in these words (if not just underneath). Consent is a particularly complicated point, even focusing just on US education. Consent immediately brings up histories of scientifically determining autonomy and the right of self-determination based on measuring/measures of intelligence, morality, and worth. These are still-unfolding histories of mobilizations of policy through supremacist ideologies and forces such as settler colonial violence (extreme and mundane) of which educational institutions are more than complicit in maintaining/naturalizing. These institutions and institutional teachings are based on anti-blackness, racism, ableism, sanism, classism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia and the subjugation of would-be deviants, misfits, and fugitives. This includes the juridical, relational, and

---

<sup>102</sup> Safe environments imply children’s homes and schools, but this is already too large of an assertion.

personal policing of perversions, of perverse wanderings, that are taught/enforced in educational institutions.

There are a great many things explicit and implicit in this thesis and specifically within this discussion of the call to order as a contribution to the effects recognized in the STPP framework and as a gesture of its excess. Some of these, which have contributed to the materialization, imagination, and naturalization of education as we know it include slavery, the Indian Removal Act, broken treaties between the US government and recognized American Indian tribes, the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment as the abolition of slavery with the exception of incarceration, convict leasing, Black codes and Jim Crow laws, ugly laws, child labor laws, loitering laws, curfews, and laws against 'cross-dressing.' Each of these points are hugely complicated. For instance, entangled points around American Indian recognition by the US government (e.g. tribal; individual) and the legacies of settler colonialism include assimilation/integration (e.g. American Indian boarding schools), questions of citizenship, classifications and measurements of race (e.g. blood quantum [Tuck, 2016; Wilbur & Keene, 2019]), and perhaps most notably, with land, claims/rights to the land, the creation of reservations, and the allotment thereof (e.g. the Dawes Act in 1887).

With all of these horrors there are refusals and resistances. Every measure taken toward domination and attempt at preserving (an illusory) ontological security (e.g. the guarding of a national border; the testing of intelligence and development based on rigid criteria) is founded on an already-present presence of refusal, and hides/suppresses movements of resistance/movement that resists (e.g. Samudzi & Anderson, 2018; Shirley & Stafford, 2015), or turn the resistance into a violence that must be quelled – where again, “colonialism is made to look like self-defense” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 17).

Kevin and Avonte's Law is a part of the long history of altruistic endeavors of people in positions of power (by which I mean positions that are backed by a force) helping others who, from the position

of those in power, need their help because they lack their own. An obvious example is the 'friends of the Indian' promoting education for assimilation in American Indian boarding schools. The movement of boarding school students was heavily patrolled, and attempts to prevent student's from running away were great. For instance, residents who lived near federal American Indian boarding schools were often rewarded for capturing fugitive students, and at least one school, the Chilocco Indian School in Oklahoma, arranged a standing bounty for runaway students with the local police department (Heard Museum, n.d.). This connection between altruistic (educational) endeavors and various other policing institutions is evident in and continues with the specifics of Kevin and Avonte's Law, which gives preference to law enforcement agencies and non-profit organizations that do work to support disabled people. These kinds of supports are for rather than with or by disabled people, with money and resources going toward programs and organizations that are more often than not led and guided by non-disabled people (e.g. allies). This is a long and ongoing critique of charitable organizations and specifically with autism, parent-led efforts that do not involve autistic and/or disabled people themselves other than as recipients of outside support. This critique emphasizes standard understandings of disability as deficit and in need of (particular forms of) support to create and maintain a normal life (normal in a very narrow framing). This is emphasized in writing on the crippledscholar blog (Sauder, 2015, np) about the expectations on and felt in disabled people to become non-disabled, or at least strive to their "closest approximation" (2015 n.p.).

This cure-focused engagement with disability is the same carceral focus that would imagine surveillance via tracking devices for autistic people, increased police presence, schools being locked while in session, or gates around school perimeters. The emphasis on cure when it comes to disability and disabled people is carceral in that it seeks to isolate and contain wandering expressions: wandering as in the leaving of purported safe spaces, with one's physical appearance/mobility, as well as intellectual and behavioral wandering, all of which may or may not

be recognized as a disability within the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The categorization of being disabled under IDEA can bring with it certain legal protections (e.g. “free appropriate public education...through an appropriately developed [Individualized Education Program] IEP that is based on the individual needs of the child [U.S. Department of Education, n.d. n.p.]), as well as increased social stigma and exclusion in unexpected spaces of confinement (Adams & Erevelles, 2017). As Garland-Thomson (2006) writes: “This ideology of cure is not isolated in medical texts or charity campaigns, but in fact permeates the entire cultural conversation about disability and illness” (p. 264). Attesting to the efforts of non-disabled people to help and support disabled people, President and Chief Executive Officer of Autism Society Scott Badesch said after renewal of the law in 2018: “Kevin and Avonte’s Law will infuse necessary funding to states to train first responders and help families supporting people with autism or other disabilities who tend to wander, sometimes resulting in death or injuries” (Clerkley, 2018). The language used to promote and celebrate this law is specific, and while it is not my ultimate intention to condemn the well-intentioned, it is important to consider these intentions and efforts in the wider context of education and specifically special education.

“A perceived diminishment in the capacity to control the movement of one’s own body in space provides an important justification for stripping disabled subjects of their autonomy through surveillance, social control, and other restrictive disciplinary measures” (Hilton, 229).

Students are to go, not go, and remain where they are told. They must adhere to the call to order or else suffer the consequences. As has been discussed throughout this thesis, these consequences include, for example, ankle monitors, physical violence, threats of violence, a criminal record, suspension/expulsion/exclusion, and alternative measures through restorative justice programs. These have been justified as attempts to prevent other issues, like self-harm and death (e.g. Kevin and Avonte’s Law), but also less-extreme issues such as disturbing the learning process (e.g.



Disturbing Schools in Policy), or failing to be called to order (e.g. Sojoyner's disengaged Black student in Fugitivity). As the perversion of wandering (fugitive movement) is a threat policy's enforcers must criminalize and/or extinguish, so too is the impermissible movement of idleness, loitering, and stagnancy, described below, of gathering.

## GATHERING

"Kids are taught they cannot wander, and they are taught they cannot gather. By gather I mean as with the prisoners they cannot retain what society calls perversion, indistinct, experimental and blurring forms of senses and porous bodies being together" (Harney, 2017b n.p.).

Harney & Moten (2013) write of hapticality as "the feel that no individual can stand, and no state can abide" (p. 98). Hapticality is a gathering of senses, a perverse gathering that is an unwillingness and/or an inability to be one (as in one person, one expression). This inattentiveness is a fugitive refusal to conform to the prechoreographed circuits of movement (Lepecki, 2013), to self-determination (da Silva, 2009), to heeding/distributing the call to order.

As was previously discussed, those who would become students in American Indian boarding schools (by force, coercion, or otherwise), for instance, were taught that they were one via many brutal pedagogical actions. A striking example of the lessons against gathering was forbidding the students to speak their native languages. Off-reservation boarding schools like Carlisle (Policy chapter) had the advantage with these measures because they brought together students from different tribes with different languages. Primarily, the students were farther away from and often forbidden or persuaded not to communicate with their families, communities, and culture than on-reservation boarding schools. In *Education for Extinction* (1995) Adams writes: "In 1879, for instance, Pratt

[Carlisle's Superintendent] was able to assign students speaking nine different languages to a single dormitory" (p. 142).

Yet these attempts are always provoked by and met with various resistances and refusals. The boarding schools were no exception. Former students attest to ways they found to commune, like Frank Mitchell, a student of the Fort Defiance boarding school: "We did not talk much English; most of the time we talked Navajo, our own language, to one another" (ibid.). Although the (violent, horrific, genocidal) efforts were extended to "Kill the Indian in him, and save the man" (Pratt, 1892 n.p.) as somehow in the best interest of American Indians, the assimilative tactics were never total.

The maintaining and even extending (through blending with other tribes' as well as Christian) of cultures under duress (and in Carlisle, the watchful eye of the man-in-the-bandstand) is an example of a perverse gathering. The conditions under which the gatherings formed and unformed are examples of the straightening measures taken to correct and integrate the perceived perversions<sup>103</sup>. These carceral educations establish and maintain schools as correctional institutions. The mandated attendance and teachings therein contribute to (but are not solely responsible for) the naturalization of individuation and the taken for granted-ness of separability (Desideri & da Silva, 2015).

"Hapticality acknowledges the difference between the living and the dead, but not their separation" (Harney & Moten, 2018 n.p.).

Gathering is a practice of what da Silva (2016) calls difference without separability. This is an immeasurable utterance which might otherwise be imagined as a haptic materialism beneath materialism (Harney, 2018). Put another way, Moten discusses difference without separability when he says: "What I'm talking about is not connectedness, which assumes discreet bodies that then will

---

<sup>103</sup> Perhaps these are perversions we want to claim - like Mairs' swagger (1986) in the face of pity and normative expectations by claiming and proclaiming to be a cripple. Whether or not this is an expression against, despite, or otherwise in recognition of the dominating correctional forces and enforcers, gathering's hapticality has been constituted as a threat to the fantasies of ontological security (Stein, Hunt, Suša, Andreotti, 2017).

be connected. It's sort of prior to that formulation" (2014, n.p.). This prior gestures toward an original lawlessness (Moten, 2007) of gathering (which is why it is the first lesson taught to students).

"What if, instead of the Ordered World, we imaged each existent (human and more-than-human) not as separate forms relating through the mediation of forces, but rather as singular expressions of each and every other existent as well as of the entangled whole in/as which they exist?" (da Silva, 2016 p. 59).

To attend to separability other than as a given can be immensely difficult. Aside from more apparent difficulties (apparently) such as air being air and not earth, me being me and not you, there is the threat of danger that accompanies any glimpse or trace of an otherwise of separability. Black sociality is an otherwise. So too is gathering, or study. These haptic expressions and experiences of difference without separability are followed, pathologized, researched, marked, surveilled, suspended, expelled. They are made to live under impossible conditions of material, psychic, spiritual horror and brutality and the ever-present insecurity of life, manifest through whiteness, policy, and the ontological condition of separability (Desideri & da Silva, 2015).

Refusing the call to order is to gather in undifferentiated sociality, in haptic dance, where your success is mine, where my struggle is shared, where working and planning and studying and moving together is a speculative practice (Harney & Moten, 2013) and not a strategy (Desideri & Harney, 2013). This obliterates, or at least shrugs off the notion and necessity of possession, property, ownership, and an individuated self with all the violent constrictions, separations, and associations that are required. Less an unfettering movement of a self that had been restricted, violated, and subject to violence and injustice, and more an abandoning of the ideas and/or feelings that there ever was a self that was separate from other self's to begin with.

“It feels like there are these things called individual subjects walking around, it feels like I’m one, you know? It seems like everything is organized around that feeling. My language is organized around that feeling. A lot of my hopes and dreams are organized around that feeling. My pleasures, my pains, it seems like that, but maybe it’s not really like that, ok?...And it turns out that we have a history of the thinking through of this problem. We share a history. We are embedded and entangled in a history of the ongoing study of this question” (Moten, 2019 n.p.).

Engaging with this shared study away from fantasies of ontological security (Stein, Hunt, Suša, & Andreotti, 2017) based on individuated subjecthood and the ontological condition of separability (Desideri & da Silva, 2015) might be one way to accept, as Moten has called it, the gift of blackness. Blackness as in “that quotidian practice of refusal, the middle finger to reconciliation” (Bey, 2019c p. 26); as in “The anoriginary drive and the insistences it calls into being and moves through, that criminality that brings the law online” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 47); as in “that which relates to the undoing or unraveling of every social bond” (Sexton, 2017 n.p.). And accepting this gift requires that unraveling. It requires giving up “the idea of a normative conception of subjecthood and citizenship” (Moten, 2014, n.p.). Both wandering and gathering are refusals of these conceptions.

Wandering and gathering are refusals of the call to order, the call which includes mundane acceptances of predetermined parameters. These can take form in the most taken for granted, assumptive understandings - something as seemingly ubiquitous and unquestionable as separability, or as simple as determining what is/is not considered music and based on that, knowing when a song starts/stops and further, in knowing when a song is about to start (i.e. with a conductor raising the baton [Halberstam, 2013]) and behaving accordingly. Refusals are also exhibited in movements such as “walking or swinging or singing or laughing or playing or watching television or sleeping or breathing” (ross, 2020 n.p.). These mundane movements are all activities which have brought brutality and death to those closest to and with an underprivilege to blackness.

The call to order is issued in schools through SROs, through teachers, through police, through other students. And the point is to have the call to order be so obvious, be so ingrained that one orders oneself (cop-in-the-head). The imposition of situational and positional policed circuits of movement are with students when they “go back to their neighborhoods where the police instruct on conduct, where Chipotle and Burger King instruct on conduct” (Harney, 2017b), where to gather is forbidden (didn’t you learn anything in school?!).

From an abolitionist perspective, getting cops out of schools (e.g. #CounselorsNotCops) is a fantastic idea and it should not just stop with schools (e.g. #DefundThePolice). But for an environment to be transformed fundamentally it needs to do more than just be rid of what are the most overt manifestations of regulation, force, and policing. It is no solution or prefiguring the future we want to live in now (Gossett, 2011) by placing the call for policing more squarely on the shoulders of others who are not sworn agents of law enforcement (for instance, calls for community policing). The duties of policing are already on the shoulders of teachers and counselors, so emphasizing police violence so often works to mitigate the violence required of others who don’t happen to carry a gun and have a police badge.

“Denied their own forms of both gathering and wandering, they are educated” (Harney, Full Stop pt 2, n.p.).

## 8

**ABOLITION PEDAGOGIES**

“Demands should be radical in the sense of getting to the root(s) of problems we are trying to address. Embrace radicalism over re-form (particularly reformist reforms)” (Kaba, 2019 n.p.).

Throughout this thesis I have attempted to express the importance of staying with rather than reacting to and re-forming the violences conceptually captured within the STPP framework. These efforts were made primarily by pivoting my engagements on examples and instances of institutional mechanisms that piece together the conceptual framework of the STPP framework; of overt violences and recognizable violations within schooling; of everyday teaching/policing practices that are either justified as necessary or so fundamental to the order of the world that they go unquestioned. All of these contribute to strengthening and further embedding particular expressions of limited and limiting concepts in mundane thoughts/actions that include and are beyond what comes to be defined as teaching and learning. This carcerality of imagination, of what is thinkable, of what is safe to express in a given context and at all, works in part by demonstrating the brutal effects on those deemed unable and/or unwilling to properly respond to the call to order. Policy’s regulative means of control also work in more insidious ways to make these orderings and knowledges felt on levels beyond the physical and recognizable.

This carcerality has facilitated and required many different approaches and means of engaging with the material that formed my STPP archive. This also required experimenting with an abundance of ways to try and express both what are hidden in and consisting of everyday understandings and practices of schooling, as well as their resistances and refusals. These expressions and discussions needed attempts that did not immediately play into registers of description toward understanding.

In part, this is because entertaining feelings of comprehension of a graspable problem seems to lead to the well-travelled path of reaction toward recognizable reformist strategies.

Here describes some of the difficulties/struggles in trying to engage and express this work in different ways, in struggling to be a conduit more than a conductor. As much as there are horrors that propel and shape how I engage and express this study, so too are there joys, revolts, and refusals. And it has been my intention to keep and stay with the tensions between and within them throughout this study. Moving with this movement, here I expand a quote engaged with earlier in this thesis from Fred Moten:

“I love all the beautiful stuff we’ve made under constraint, but I’m pretty sure I would love all the beautiful stuff we’d make out from under constraint better. But there’s no way to get to that, except through this. We can’t go around this. We gotta fight through this...But what it also means, by the same token is, anybody who thinks that they can understand how terrible the terror has been without understanding how beautiful the beauty has been against the grain of that terror is wrong. There is no calculus of the terror that can make a proper calculation without reference to that which resists it. It’s just not possible.” (2016, n.p.).

Fighting in and through a carceral society that adapts strategies of control in reaction to an original lawlessness otherwise called blackness (Harney & Moten, 2013; Moten, 2007) necessitates improvisational negotiations of dismantling those impulses that limit movement and movements, along with building/expanding the ways that we already are and have been planning, studying, imagining, communing before and beyond the disastrous, oppressive attempts of whiteness through such tropes as self-control, discipline, and protection. As discussed earlier in *Fugitivity*, the adaptive regulation of policy is not proactive (Paik, 2020; Sojoyner, 2017) in that the regulative ordering of “every social motif” (Martinot & Sexton, 2003) always comes after, is always

trailing behind and thus seems to be chasing the outlaw who was actually already practicing what would later be deemed and made incomprehensible to the sensibilities and sensitivities of whiteness. Thus, the existing fugitivity moving in and through constraint is through necessity itself adaptive and improvisational. These qualities are supportive to abolition pedagogies as an imagining and building of a wholly transformed education in a wholly transformed world while within and toward the end of the world as we know it in its current order, which is another way of saying the end of whiteness.

Abolition pedagogies as a term, concept, tool, orientation, and praxis is an amalgamation of study with and for the undercommons and/as undercommoners. Any excessive engagement with abolition pedagogies directly emerges from my study with Lindsay Miller, who attended to the radical potential offered in such an imagining. Cultivated through our collaborative conference presentations (e.g. Miller & Miller, 2017), facilitated workshops (e.g. Miller & Miller, 2018), co-authored publications (Miller & Miller, 2020), unpublished articles, conversations, notes, and dreams, abolition pedagogies requires everything of they who pick up and run with it, and offers even more.

#### POSSIBILITIES & OBLIGATIONS

“Politics proposes to make us better, but we were good already in the mutual debt that can never be made good. We owe it to each other to falsify the institution, to make politics incorrect, to give the lie to our own determination. We owe each other the indeterminate. We owe each other everything.

“An abdication of political responsibility? OK. Whatever. We’re just anti-politically romantic about actually existing social life. We aren’t responsible for politics. We are the general



antagonism to politics looming outside every attempt to politicise, every imposition of self-governance, every sovereign decision and its degraded miniature, every emergent state and home sweet home. We are disruption and consent to disruption. We preserve upheaval. Sent to fulfill by abolishing, to renew by unsettling, to open the enclosure whose immeasurable venality is inversely proportionate to its actual area, we got politics surrounded. We cannot represent ourselves. We can't be represented" (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 20).

Abolition pedagogies decenter, subvert, and study carceral educations. Abolition pedagogies demark efforts away from and alternatives to schooling in the world as we know it, toward and therefore within and a part of the unknown and unknowable. Carceral educations and the complex ways schooling and education restrict and regulate movement (some of which have been brought up in this thesis) are not pivot points from which abolition pedagogies respond, critique, and rebel against. Abolition pedagogies study carceral educations insofar as a means of recognizing particular conditions of duress. The study is, in part, to collectively recognize how we are (unequally but nonetheless) complicit in maintaining, enforcing, and internalizing these conditions, and to reorganize anew around an anoriginal fugitive practice of sociality. This study need not perform or result in necessarily any particular way that would generally be within a register of acceptable and recognizable scholarly study, just as abolition pedagogies are not exclusively intended to be conceptualized or practiced within educational institutions.

"We get together to fight. And what are we fighting for? We're fighting to maintain our capacity to get together. I just think it's really important that we organize ourselves in relation to ourselves, before we organize ourselves in relation to them" (Moten, 2018, n.p.).

Discussed primarily in the chapter with the same name, study is the occasion and creation of more opportunities for people to study. It is circulatory in that sense, senseless to the productive

imperative of institutions which claim and teach study as formulaic toward an outcome. Moten's above quote speaks to the importance of building and expanding the capacity for study under duress. Put differently, Angela Davis writes:

“What we manage to do each time we win a victory is not so much to secure change once and for all, but rather to create new terrains for struggle” (2016 p. 21).

Working before and beyond the STPP framework, this thesis has emphasized resistances and refusals amidst and despite the carcerality in/as schooling. It has been a difficult and intentional move to decenter the violent (practices of) institutions, not least because of the presumed permanency and accepted separability of institutions within the PIC. With this, abolition pedagogies are situated in but not exclusive to educational contexts. Phrased slightly differently than abolition pedagogies, Stein (2019b) details a pedagogy of abolition as “alive, collective, and indeterminate” (n.p.) and thus cannot be folded into a discipline, definition, or confined to a particular location or institution (e.g. the school). Neither can abolition pedagogies be promoted to or claimed as the exclusive approach by professionals or experts (e.g. teachers; pedagogues).

In studying with and for the excesses and radical potentials of the STPP framework, I am steeped in schools and schooling, police and policing, policy, carcerality, violence, and the various reformist efforts to maintain, if not slightly reimagine, the order of the world. But the STPP archive of this thesis includes the heuristics therein as a point of departure, with suspicion as a starting point in compiling and engaging with the material. This suspicion extends to my own reactions to the archival material. I am immersed in the education systems that pushes out/bars, for example, disabled students from standard classrooms and into more apparent sites and systems of carcerality. These sites include and exceed “special education classrooms, alternative schools, asylums, and segregated residential institutions” (Erevelles, 2014 p. 84). While some of these are more apparently sites and systems of segregation and carcerality, Adams & Erevelles (2017) make clear that schools and other institutions

which are understood and promoted as caring themselves can be unexpected spaces of confinement.

Being suspicious of reactions is not the same as dismissing them. Being immersed in an immediately violent archive does not mean that brutalities are all I engage with in this project. The force, funding, support, institutional connections, propaganda, embodiment, and internalization of policing is immense, and often seems omnipresent (e.g. materially; psychically; in public spaces and intimate settings) while simultaneously being expressed as if within isolated institutions (e.g. the police; the prison; the family; the corporation) and incidents (e.g. a poorly worded law with Disturbing Schools; a corrupt judge<sup>104</sup>; the persistent excuse of the ‘bad apple’ police officer). To be sure, sitting down to write and edit this section I am yet again reminded of the horror that the police manifest and are manifestations of. Walter Wallace Jr. was murdered by two Philadelphia police officers yesterday, not far from where I sit as I write this. I could hear the persistent whirl of the helicopters early this morning [all through the day and late into the night], I could see them out the window [and overhead], circling for hours. This has nothing and everything to do with the STPP. This is before and beyond the STPP. Wallace Jr. was<sup>105</sup> a disabled Black man whose family called for an ambulance and the police arrived first. The (police and news media) helicopter surveillance of the gathering that is happening in the wake of this life lost from police murder is before and beyond the STPP. The expanding and evolving technologies of surveillance<sup>106</sup> are before and beyond the STPP. This is an

---

<sup>104</sup> The excess of this STPP archive includes the ‘kids-for-cash’ scheme. In brief, two Pennsylvania judges were caught and convicted of taking bribes from juvenile detention center developers to sentence juveniles to those centers. One judge received over \$1 million and in turn incarcerated about 4,000 youth (Peralta, 2011).

<sup>105</sup> Though this ‘was’ is past tense, it indicates an insufficiency of language rather than a marker of someone who was but is no longer.

<sup>106</sup> For example, police body cameras which were/are pushed for by reformers as an attempted tool for the oversight of the police. But by giving more money and putting more faith in police departments, body cameras are primarily another surveillance mechanism of the police. Another example comes from Homeland Security remotely piloted surveillance planes, deployed over Philadelphia and other major cities for “law enforcement purposes” which are to provide “timely,” “cost effective,” “persistent, omnipresent, and discreet surveillance capabilities” where other surveillance measures lack (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2018 pp. 2-3).

event that is more than just this event amidst the catastrophe this thesis has named whiteness, policy, policing, and the measures taken to uphold the fantasy of ontological security...

“a fantasy that shoots real bullets” (Harney & Moten, 2017 n.p.).

But also, overwhelming are the resistances, refusals, fugitive movements, abolitionist dreams, wanderings, gatherings, and other enactments and imaginings of what could be conceptualized within/toward/as abolition pedagogies. Summarizing a point that I have returned to throughout the process of this thesis when the connections between schools and other institutions within the PIC became overwhelming to the point of incapacitating despair, Rodriguez (2010) writes that “the imagination of the possible and the practical is *shaped but not limited* by the specific material and institutional conditions within which one lives” (p. 14, emphasis in original). The STPP framework names schools and prisons as the primary conditions from which to attack (reform), of which this archive was saturated. Those who are working to change certain conditions of schooling and incarceration for the better (potentially less violent) generally do not expand beyond the site of the school, nor from policy as the only path to change.

“To reform a system is to adjust isolated aspects of its operation in order to protect that system from total collapse, whether by internal or external forces. Such adjustments usually rest on the fundamental assumption that these systems must remain intact — even as they consistently produce asymmetrical misery, suffering, premature death, and violent life conditions for certain people and places” (Rodriguez, 2020 n.p.).

Continuing with Rodriguez, abolition pedagogies are but one way of expressing and imagining learning/communing/study that are shaped by but not limited to the particular and expansive conditions of duress exacerbated by institutions/whiteness/policing in and beyond the site of the school. Without limiting abolition pedagogies to schools, neither is this chapter intended to name and claim actions and inactions as abolition pedagogies where there was no allusion made. A quick

read of a rebellious action in a classroom, like writing on your desk with an erasable marker as with Alexa Gonzalez, could claim that as an example of an abolition pedagogy refusing property. Or removing police from schools – many approach/coopt these radical efforts into conciliatory reforms by calling for police/SROs to be replaced with other school officials. These effectively serve the order(ing) of policing and are thus, as Rodriguez pointedly articulates, contributing to a counter-insurgency tactic that does the work of preventing systemic change. He writes:

“Reformism defers, avoids, and even criminalizes peoples’ efforts to catalyze fundamental change to an existing order, often through dogmatic and simplistic mandates of “nonviolence,” incrementalism, and compliance” (Rodriguez, *ibid.*).

These examples and this thesis consider and provoke, offer and gesture to what abolition pedagogies could be, starting in and exceeding the educational contexts. Reformist agendas are only a point of discussion here because of the persistence and prominence in this work before and beyond the STPP. This gets to an improvisational, “situated, contingent and constantly changing” praxis (Allen & Goddard, 2017 n.p.) that would be a part of indeterminate abolition pedagogies. Ideas of what might contribute to dismantling the institutions and definitions of education must remain unfixed in the multiple meanings of the word. Fugitive movements that have become markers for disruption and disturbance (and signs of future/underlying disorder) are sites for change. The anoriginal fugitivity that would become material for carceral orderings of the school and the world are not inherently expressions, gestures, and modes of learning and living that need fixing. This is premised on the basic understanding that “there is nothing wrong with us” (Harney & Moten, 2013).

Green & Bey’s conversing on “those side-eyes saturated with subversive meaning” (2017 p. 451) from the Fugitivity chapter is just one example that can be and be read as a gesture of abolition pedagogies. This as a refusal to accept and commit to the mundane assertions and assumptions that

piece together the illusory stability and security of a determined self, world, and future (da Silva, 2007; Desideri & Harney, 2013).

“The hard materiality of the unreal convinces us that we are surrounded, that we must take possession of ourselves, correct ourselves, remain in the emergency, on a permanent footing, settled, determined, protecting nothing but an illusory right to what we do not have...” (Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 18).

Imagined in a classroom from one student to another, this flickered, side-eyed example can be recognized as a form of pedagogical praxis that utterly dismisses whatever epistemological assumptions are being presented (e.g. that which is being taught in school; that which is required to be known) while simultaneously posing an ontological challenge (threat) to what basis that which is being presented is formed (e.g. that schooling itself has any worth to the fugitive, the abolitionist, the disinterested, the at-risk). Those side-eyes are enactments of obliteration as much as opportunity for newness into and as an unknown, and can thus be considered abolitionist. But more than whether something is abolitionist or not, or conceivable as part of abolition pedagogies, it is the abolitionist work, the pedagogical focus of any engagement that is the point. Call it something else or nothing at all, that part doesn't matter as much as doing the work and engaging in the deep traditions of abolition. And this abolitionist work is not the same as a job. And this abolitionist work is not the same as 'my work.' And this abolitionist work is not the 'work fate' Desideri & Harney (2013) describe, which is strategy, which is settlement, which is self-determination.

This abolitionist work is the fate work (ibid.) that diminishes the need for self-defense. Distinguishing the job from the work, Moten & Harney (2020b) ask: “How do we keep the job from taking play out of work and work out of play?” (n.p.). This distinction between the work and the job provoke considerations not so much about how to prevent the pedagogue and/or institution from making a job of abolition pedagogies. Instead, what is questioned creates a need for engagement with finding

and being present with more play in our abolitionist work and more abolition in how we play. The open-door policy of abolitionist impossibilities and the obligations thereof consider, but are not consumed by nor responding to, the potential and ongoing efforts of policy-driven destruction.

Abolition pedagogies are aspirational. So too is the imagining of them in this chapter/thesis. No matter what it is called, if abolition pedagogies have anything to offer, they should be an occasion, concept, and opening for communing. To push further, the intention of the communing is what is important and importantly what makes it a communing and not, for instance, an organizing of individuals into a community. The intention with experiments of abolition pedagogies is to bring about the end of the world as we know it (e.g. da Silva, 2014; 2019; Green & Bey, 2017; Miller & Miller, 2020). The intention is itself a contribution to this task. And there is no formula for taking up this monumental task. No one way to understand the world and why it needs ending. No right way to risk one's comfort and stability, tenuous as that might be, to fall (further) into uncertainty. This contributes to the impossibility and also to the openness – open to potentially worse harm, continued destruction and cooptation; open to brilliant new imaginings and ways of being that are beyond unsustainable relations and individuated identities; open and vulnerable beyond calculated risks or knowing that what is being attempted will have a desirous outcome. This is an openness that does not assume “any particular form or practice” (Stein, 2019b n.p.) nor adhere to “narrow instrumentalist frameworks and normalize certain kinds of teaching practices, expectations and outcomes” (Fraser & Lambie, 2015 p. 64).

A hodgepodge of efforts, here looking to Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti's artistic experimenting, abolition pedagogies can have the “potential to re-orient logos/logic in order to make room for the ineffable” (2016 p. 80). With this, Andreotti describes and is a conduit of “story telling, metaphors and poetry to introduce an argument that is not self-evident and does not produce a single normative claim for the way forward” (ibid), acknowledging and offering those engaging with the work to hold (literally) and be present with responses to what is being read, to be taught by what is

provoked. Here as above is where suspicion of provoked feelings/reactions can be generative in engaging with a text/an event differently. As I edit/write this section now 2 days after Walter Wallace Jr. was murdered by police in Philadelphia, PA. there is now a city-wide curfew enacted for 9:00pm. Allowing and being present with feelings of anger, of hurt, of fear, what does this curfew have to teach me? Thinking back to the Fugitivity chapter, I recognize this as another attempt to prevent communing, to police gathering, to prevent and brutalize gathering further by deeming it wandering (by gathering where and when not permitted). With and for abolition of this world...

“...we hear something in [the cacophony] that reminds us that our desire for harmony is arbitrary and in another world, harmony would sound incomprehensible. Listening to cacophony and noise tells us that there is a wild beyond to the structures we inhabit and that inhabit us” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 7).

The helicopter whirl, the police orders over a loudspeaker, a text-message from the city informing about the 9:00pm curfew – these are not cacophonous noises (try as they might). These are the sounds of law and order, the call to order, the sounds of policy spoken through demands to disperse. The cries and rally cries, the chanting and grieving and demanding abolition reach to and create in the practicing of it, new worlds.

#### CALLING OUT FOR ABOLITION

To be a bit more direct: part of imagining abolition pedagogies is to enact pedagogical practices which are committed to abolition (Miller & Miller, 2020; Rodriguez, 2010; ross, 2020; Stovall, 2018). This poses a generally difficult consideration when taking into account the well-established, institutional values and purposes of education (not to abolish or even end social regimes, but to expand and improve their various, interconnected encroachments on the lives of educators and the



educated alike) and the specificities in which these values are assigned (e.g. mandatory high-stakes testing which requires teaching-to-the-test as discussed in the Study chapter). A pedagogical commitment to abolition might be even more of a difficult concept to grasp and enact when engaging with the obligations of an abolitionist. Abolition is a commitment that has no end. It is the commitment to contribute to work that has been happening before being born and that will continue, whose fruits might not be better known within a lifetime (Davis, 2016). What is demanded is simultaneously without precedent (the end of the world as we know it) and is lived in instances and expressions here and now.

“Embrace the obligation that accompanies the term abolition – a complex, dynamic, and deeply historical shorthand, if you will – in the work of constantly remaking sociality, politics, ecology, place, and (human) being against the duress that some call dehumanization, others name colonialism, and still others identify as slavery and incarceration” (Rodriguez, 2019a, p. 1577).

While part of this study is to explore known, accepted, and enacted mundane violences of education as it is, this is just the basis for experimenting with different ways of engaging and living and creating. A focus has been on education and the school that instills, reproduces, archives, legitimizes, but can never contain the leaky, the excessive, the more and less than one (Moten, 2014). It is the excessive glimpsed in the deviant movements, in the refusals and study that is the point. The focus is not meant to single out an educational system that is horrible and read it only as that. Nor is it to consider resistances as dislocated from the violences being resisted. Instead, following Andreotti (2016), Desideri & Harney (2013), and Moten (2016), it is to be present with multiple fates and multiple readings of the horror and the beauty. Writing on reform and refusal, I read Ruth Wilson Gilmore’s (2020) words as a haptic description of multiple presences: “Things are difficult everywhere at the same time there’s promise – sometimes in the same churn, sometimes not” (personal communication, November 3, 2020). Gilmore’s words have me churned, twisted,

disoriented, messed up, fired up, encouraged, and supported – themes of this thesis process and that might describe some of the requirements and offerings and presences of abolition pedagogies.

Thinking with Harney's article "Abolition and the General Intellect" (n.d.), the horror and the beauty churning throughout this thesis call out for abolition. The prisoner without interests (ibid.) calls out for abolition. The student with no interests ("Interest the students!" [Harney & Moten, 2013 p. 67]) calls out for abolition. Black fugitive refusal and disengagement (Sojoyner, 2017) is a call for abolition. Put another way, students refusing the indications of/refusing to be indicators that they (individually, demographically, etc.) need to be called to order are not (just) an abandoning imposed responsibilities and indeed what one is supposed to be interested in (be it the subject material to be learned, or the investment in a particular framing of order). That would center policy and policy's regulating gesture, the call to order. Instead, these are active and already existing calls for and imaginings of abolition, which is a destructive/negative process and simultaneously constructive/positive (and thus blurs the distinctions between). Placed within the contexts of this thesis before and beyond the STPP framework and aligning with much of Rodriguez's work (e.g. 2010; 2019a), these are pedagogical imperatives and are mobilized (and so too pursued) in and as black study.

## INTENTIONS

"The moment you set an intention of doing something you assume that in a way you are already doing that very thing, you just have to find out how. This also means that there is no right or wrong way of doing something, a more or less valid practice in principle, you can just experiment with them, but with no claim of truth or attachment to its results, visible and invisible ones. Thus to set an intention is to open up a space for practices that can be

generative of different and multiple future or fates in the present” (Desideri & Harney, 2013 p. 161).

“We cannot mobilize around, and actualize, the radically different world in which we wish to live until we refuse the one we have been given. The refusal is where it’s at; the refusal, which is to say a kind of inoculation of flesh against the supposed weightiness of normative physical and discursive structures, is the site of daring to exist otherwise” (Bey, 2019c p. 106).

Fighting to live in the world as it is while imagining and living instances of the worlds we want and that might not be currently imaginable, out from under the constraints enacted and necessitated by illusions of ontological security, is itself an impossible task. Yet this impossibility happens in moments of communing, in motions of refusal, and existences which improvise with what can conceptually be called study, planning, sociality, of which the focus is not on the perils of educational imperatives but nonetheless recognizes and grapples with those structures of policy and our various investments in them, all-the-while prefiguring desires for unknown expressions. The unknowns are difficult to imagine and describe when abolition pedagogies that we want are not necessarily anything we don’t already have. What is needed of the already here is to figure out ways to be free from constraints of/and carceral logics that variously assert epistemological and ontological certainties which circularly shape and structure the imaginable. Put another way, if schooling contributes to the naturalization of certain expressions (e.g. creating and maintaining progressions of development that fall within limited framings; solidifying definitions of and distinctions between mundane concepts like good and bad, praiseworthy and punishable, desirable and detrimental) abolition pedagogies must work to “refuse the choice as offered” (Halberstam, 2013 p. 8). This reiterates the necessity for experimenting when making “demands that go beyond response or reaction” (Ben-Moshe, Gossett, Mitchell, & Stanley, 2015 p. 279).

I have considered distinctions of refusal from resistance in this thesis, generally perceiving resistance as more of a response to and against particular violences. Resistance as a concept and what it conjures is understood in many ways and can be redefined, yet resistance different from refusal (which has less to do with ‘them’) can still be a stage for sociality (“we get together to fight” [Moten, 2019]) - people who share common constraints getting together with the intention to find (more) ways of getting together, to study, to become undone by each other.

“By become undone, I mean it really has to fuck us up in our core and make us relentless about seeking out and making alternatives possible” (King, 2015 p. 65).

Tiffany Lethabo King’s words here are a reason why genealogy is ran with in this thesis – it is a way that opens/is open to many ways (multiple presents). And it has been my consequence exceeding expectations to get fucked up about the before and beyond of this thesis. This was not an unintended consequence, but the process of this work and myself with it has transformed so much. This is part of the unbearable precarity of intention da Silva points out (2017a) with being affectable. On genealogy, Ben-Moshe writes that the process “encourages us to question what we took for granted before, and begs us to be what we have not been before” (2011, p. 123).

More than offerings as openings for communing, abolition pedagogies should help to loosen the grip and ultimately for people to let go of fictive semblances of (self, national, ontological) security fundamentally premised on and sustained by disproportionate suffering of but not limited to educators and the educated alike.

“A pedagogy of abolition invites people to move from a sense of disillusionment with harmful promises, toward disenchantment with those promises, and ultimately disinvestment from them. This would not necessarily entail removing ourselves from a situation by searching for a place that’s not compromised, which doesn’t exist, but rather

starting from and staying with the fact that complexity and complicity is the constitutive situation of our lives” (Stein, 2019b n.p.).

This letting go is a process that entails an acceptance and redefinition of being wounded (Desideri & Harney, 2013), of getting fucked up in our core (King, 2015). Part of how the end of the world as we know it (da Silva, 2014) feels so impossible is because the world that we want and need to end is reactive and adaptive to our attempts and has always been repositioning itself after-the-fact, (making attempts at) capturing, evolving, and absorbing resistances and alternatives into policy’s forces.

These adaptive technologies of the world as we know it are only partially reasons why abolition is without end. These seemingly ubiquitous, way-of-the-world attempts to capture keep brutally, violently, genocidally getting in our way (and thus policing our circuits of movement [Lepecki, 2013]). But that way is not and has never been the only way. So, we plan.

## REFERENCES

- #8CantWait (n.d.). #8CantWait: A Project by Campaign Zero. Available at: <https://8cantwait.org/>
- #8ToAbolition (2020). #8ToAbolition, How To Use. Available at: <https://www.8toabolition.com/>
- 8toAbolition (2020). *8 to Abolition*. Available at: <https://www.8toabolition.com/why>
- abc7NY (2010). Queens student arrested for doodling on desk. *abc7NY*. Available at: <https://abc7ny.com/archive/7259715/>
- Abu-Jamal, M. (2000). The Industry of Fear. *Social Justice*, 27(3).
- Abumrad, J. & Krulwich, R. (Producers) (2015, January 29). Ghosts of Football Past [Audio podcast episode]. Radiolab. WNCY Studios. <https://www.wnycstudios.org/podcasts/radiolab>
- Adams, D. L. & Erevelles, N. (2016). Dis-Locating Practices: Matter Out of (White) Place. In Connor, D., Ferri, B. & Annamma, S.A. (Eds.), *DisCrit: Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education* (pp. 131-144). Teachers College Press.
- Adams, D. L. & Erevelles, N. (2017). Unexpected spaces of confinement: Aversive technologies, intellectual disability, and “bare life.” *Punishment & Society*, 19(3), 348-365.

- Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. University Press of Kansas.
- Adams, R. & Duggan, K. (2020). More than 500 complaints filed regarding police misconduct at George Floyd protests. amNY. Available at: <https://www.amny.com/news/more-than-500-complaints-filed-regarding-police-misconduct-at-george-floyd-protests/>
- Addington, L. A. (2009). Cops and Cameras: Public School Security as a Policy Response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(10), 1426-1446.
- Advancement Project (2000). *Opportunities Suspended: The Devastating Consequences of Zero Tolerance and School Discipline*. Advancement Project.
- Advancement Project (2005). *Education on Lockdown: The Schoolhouse to Jailhouse Track*. Advancement Project.
- Advancement Project (2010). *Test, Punish, and Push Out: How "Zero Tolerance" and High-Stakes Testing Funnel Youth Into the School-To-Prison Pipeline*. Advancement Project.
- Advancement Project (2020). *We Came to Learn: A Call to Action for Police-Free Schools*. Advancement Project.
- Advancement Project (n.d.). *Mapping the Schoolhouse to Jailhouse Track: Action Kit*. Advancement Project.
- Aho, T., Ben-Moshe, L., & Hilton, L. J. (2017). Mad Futures: Affect/Theory/Violence. *American Quarterly*, 69(2), 291-302.
- Alexander, M. (2013). *Schools and the New Jim Crow: An Interview With Michelle Alexander*. Truth Out. Available at: <https://truthout.org/articles/schools-and-the-new-jim-crow-an-interview-with-michelle-alexander/>
- Allen, A. & Goddard, R. (2017). *Education and Philosophy: An Introduction*. Sage.
- Allen, A. (2014). *Benign violence: education in and beyond the age of reason*. Palgrave Macmillan

American Anti-Slavery Society (1833). The constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

American Civil Liberties Union (2016). ACLU Challenges South Carolina 'Disturbing Schools' Law. ACLU.

Available at: <https://www.aclu.org/press-releases/aclu-challenges-south-carolina-disturbing-schools-law>

American Civil Liberties Union (2017, March 16). *Kenny v. Wilson*. ACLU. Retrieved from:

<https://www.aclu.org/cases/kenny-v-wilson>

American Experience (n.d.). *The Abolitionists: John Brown Gathers His Arsenal* [Video file]. PBS. Available at:

<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/the-abolitionists-john-brown-gathers-his-arsenal/>

American Experience (2000). *John Brown's Holy War*. PBS. Available at:

<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/films/brown/>

AmericanExperiencePBS (2013, January 22). *The Abolitionists, Part 3, Chapter 1* [Video file]. Available at:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MILN\\_17KH6M](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MILN_17KH6M)

American Psychiatric Association (2012). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5<sup>th</sup> edition).

American Psychiatric Publishing. Washington, DC.

Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Black in the South, 1860\*1935*. The University of North Carolina Press.

Andreotti, V. (2016). (re)imagining education as an un-coercive re-arrangement of desires. *Other Education*, 5(1), 79-88.

Andreotti, V., Stein, S., Ahenakew, C. & Hunt, D. (2015). Mapping interpretations of decolonization in the context of higher education. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 4(1), 21-40.

Annamma, S. (2018). *The Pedagogy of Pathologization: Dis/abled Girls of Color in the School-prison Nexus*. Routledge.



- Annamma, S.A., Connor, D. & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(1), 1-31.
- Anspach, R. (2017). Disabled Youth Are More at Risk of Being Incarcerated. Teen Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/why-disabled-youth-are-more-at-risk-of-being-incarcerated>
- Archbold, C.A. (2012). *Policing: A Text/Reader*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Armstrong, T. (2000). Meteor of War [Recorded by Rancid]. On Rancid (5) [Compact disk]. Epitaph Records.
- Au, W., Christensen, L., Hagopian, J., Karp, S., Levine, D., Miller, L., Peterson, B., Sanchez, A., Yonamine, M. (Eds.) (2012). The School-To-Prison Pipeline [Special Issue]. *Rethinking Schools*, 26(2).
- Aull IV, E. H. (2012). Zero Tolerance, Frivolous Juvenile Court Referrals, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline: Using Arbitration as a Screening-Out Method to Help Plug the Pipeline. *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 27(1), 179-206.
- Autism Speaks (February 24, 2020). Kevin and Avonte's Law. Autism Speaks. Available at: <https://www.autismspeaks.org/kevin-and-avontes-law>
- Ayers, W. & Dohrn B. (2000). Resisting Zero Tolerance. *Rethinking Schools*, 14(3).
- Bad Ass Visionary Healers (n.d.). Healing Justice Resources. Available at: <https://badassvisionaryhealers.wordpress.com/healing-justice-resources/>
- Barad, K. (2015). Transmaterialities: Trans\*/Matter/Relations and Queer Political Imaginings. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 20(2-3), 387-422.
- Batz, G. (2019). The Ixil University and the Decolonization of Knowledge. In Tuhiwai, S., Tuck, E., & Yang, K.W, *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. Routledge.

- Baynton, D. (2001). Disability and the Justification of Inequality in American History. In Longmore, P. K. & Umansky, L. (Eds.) (2001). *The New Disability History: American Perspectives* (pp. 33-57). New York University Press.
- Bell, C. (2006). Introducing White Disability Studies: A Modest Proposal. In Davis, L. (Ed.) (2006) *The Disability Studies Reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 275-282). Routledge.
- Bell, C. (Ed.) (2011). *Blackness and Disability: Critical Examinations and Cultural Interventions*. Michigan State University Press.
- Ben-Moshe, L. (2011). *Genealogies of Resistance to Incarceration: Abolition Politics within Deinstitutionalization and Anti-Prison Activism in the US*. Dissertation.
- Ben-Moshe, L. (2013). The Tension Between Abolition and Reform. In Nagel, M. E. & Nocella II, A. J. (Eds.) (2013). *The End of Prisons: Reflections from the Decarceration Movement* (pp. 83-92). Rodopi.
- Ben-Moshe, L. (2014). Prisons as the “New Asylums”. *Asylum* 21(4).
- Ben-Moshe, L. (2017). Why prisons are not “The New Asylums”. *Punishment & Society*, 19(3), 16-19.
- Ben-Moshe, L., Chapman, C., & Carey, A.C. (Eds.) (2014). *Disability Incarcerated: Imprisonment and Disability in the United States and Canada*. Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Ben-Moshe, L., Gossett, C., Mitchell, N., & Stanley, E. (2015). Critical Theory, Queer Resistance, and the Ends of Capture. In Adelsberg, G., Guenther, L., & Zeman, S. (Eds.) (2015). *Death and Other Penalties: Philosophy in a Time of Mass Incarceration* (pp. 266-295). Fordham University Press.
- “Benjamin Franklin Historical Society” (n.d.). Slavery and the Abolition Society. Available at: <http://www.benjamin-franklin-history.org/slavery-abolition-society/>
- Bern, P. & The Sins Invalid Family (2016). 10 Principles of Disability Justice. In Sins Invalid, *Skin, Tooth, and Bone: The Basis of Movement is Our People: A Disability Justice Primer* (pp. 16-22).

- Berne, P. (2016). Disability Justice – A Working Draft by Patty Berne, Executive Director of Sins Invalid, Supported by Stacey Milbern, Aurora Levins Morales and David Langstaff. In Sins Invalid, *Skin, Tooth, and Bone: The Basis of Movement is Our People: A Disability Justice Primer* (pp. 9-15).
- Berne, P., Langstaff, D. & Morales, A. L. (2016). Disability Liberated. In Sins Invalid, *Skin, Tooth, and Bone: The Basis of Movement is Our People: A Disability Justice Primer* (55-61).
- Bey, M. & Gumbs, A. P. (2017). A Spillage of the Fugitive Variety. *Social Text Online*. Available at: <https://socialtextjournal.org/a-spillage-of-the-fugitive-variety/>
- Bey, M. (2016a). I Like My Coffee Black: Fugitive Blackness (With Gratitude to Fred Moten). Available at: <https://medium.com/the-coffeelicious/i-like-my-coffee-black-fugitive-blackness-with-gratitude-to-fred-moten-600523d4507a>
- Bey, M. (2016b). The Smog of Blind Flies: Blackness and Respectability. *darkmatter: in the ruins of imperial culture*. Available at: <http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2016/11/16/the-smog-of-blind-flies-blackness-and-respectability/>
- Bey, M. (2019a, March 6). *10/13, The Undercommons* [Video file]. Columbia Center for Contemporary Critical Thought. Available at: <http://blogs.law.columbia.edu/praxis1313/10-13/>
- Bey, M. (2019b). Black Fugitivity Un/Gendered. *The Black Scholar*, 49(1), 55-62.
- Bey, M. (2019c). *Them goon gules: fugitive essays on radical Black feminism*. The University of Arizona Press.
- Bey, M. (2020). *Anarcho-Blackness: Notes Toward a Black Anarchism*. AK Press.
- Black Lives Matter - Toronto [BLM\_TO]. (2017, October 16). SROs in Toronto Schools- A Timeline. #NoMoreSROs #BlackLivesMatter #EducationNotIncarceration [Tweet]. Retrieved from: [https://twitter.com/BLM\\_TO/status/919994474310316033?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etwembed%7Ctwterm%5E919994474310316033&ref\\_url=https%3A%2F%2Fnowtoronto.com%2Fnews%2Fthe-toronto-school-board-votes-to-end-cops-in-schools-progra%2F](https://twitter.com/BLM_TO/status/919994474310316033?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etwembed%7Ctwterm%5E919994474310316033&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fnowtoronto.com%2Fnews%2Fthe-toronto-school-board-votes-to-end-cops-in-schools-progra%2F)

- Boal, A. (2002). *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) (A. Jackson, Trans.). Routledge.
- Boal, A. & Epstein, S. (1990). The Cop in the Head: Three Hypotheses. *The MIT Press*, 34(3), 35-42.
- Boggs, A., Meyerhoff, E., Mitchell, N., & Schwartz-Weinstein, Z. (2019). Abolitionist University Studies: An Invitation. Abolition University. Available: <https://abolition.university/invitation/>
- Bone, K. M. (2017). Trapped behind the glass: crip theory and disability identity. *Disability & Society*, 32(9), 1297-1314.
- Booth, T. T. (2009). Cheaper Than Bullets: American Indian Boarding Schools and Assimilation Policy, 1890-1930. Native American Symposium and Film Festival: Images, Imaginations, and Beyond. Durant, Oklahoma, November.
- Brown, S. (2015). *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Duke University Press.
- Bruno v City of New York, 10 CV 0210 (RRM)(SMG) (Eastern District NY. 2013).
- Bryan, N. (2018). Shaking the *bad boys*: troubling the criminalization of black boys' childhood play, hegemonic white masculinity and femininity, and the *school playground-to-prison pipeline*. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, published online: 30 August 2018.
- Bukhari-Alston, S. (2003). Coming of Age: A Black Revolutionary, 1979. In James, J. (Ed.), *Imprisoned Intellectuals: America's Political Prisoners Write on Life, Liberation, and Rebellion* (pp. 125-134). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Burman, E. (2017). Fanon's other children: psychopolitical and pedagogical implications. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 20(1), 42-56.
- Cahill, C., Gutierrez, L. A., & Cerecer, D. A. Q. (2016). A dialectic of dreams and dispossession: The school-to-sweatshop pipeline. *cultural geographies*, 23(1), 121-137.

- Callahan, M. (2017). *Insurgent Learning and Convivial Research*: Universidad de la Tierra, Califas. ArtsEverywhere. Available at: <https://artseverywhere.ca/2017/01/26/insurgent-learning-convivial-research-universidad-de-la-tierra-califas/>
- Campt, T. (2014). *Black Feminist Futures and the Practice of Fugitivity* [Video File]. Available at: <http://bcrw.barnard.edu/videos/tina-campt-black-feminist-futures-and-the-practice-of-fugitivity/>
- Canady, M. (2018). Standards and Best Practices for School Resource Officer Programs. *The National Association of School Resource Officers, Inc.*
- Castaldi, M., Flaherty, J., Gerber, J., Masters, A., Mease, J., Mitchell, N. & Shehk M. (2015). Letter from the Editors. *The Abolitionist*, 24.
- Chacaby, M. O. (2018). (The Missing Chapter) On Being Missing: From Indian Problem to Indian Problematic. In Anderson, K., Campbell, M., & Belcourt, C. (Eds.), *Keetsahnak: Our Missing and Murdered Indigenous Sisters*. The University of Alberta Press.
- Chauhan, P., Tomascak, S., Hood, Q. O., Cuevas, C., Lu, O., & Bond, E. (2019). *Tracking Suspensions in New York City Public Schools, 2006-2017*. Available at: <https://www.atlanticphilanthropies.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/DOE-Final-Report-2019.pdf>
- Chen, S. (2010). Girl's arrest for doodling raises concerns about zero tolerance. *CNN*. Available at: <https://www.cnn.com/2010/CRIME/02/18/new.york.doodle.arrest/index.html>
- Children's Defense Fund (2007). *American's Crade to Prison Pipeline: A Report of the Children's Defense Fund*.
- Clare, E. (1999). *Exile and Pride: Disability, Queerness, and Liberation*. Duke University Press.
- Clerkley, C. (March 23). Autism Society Applauds Passage of Kevin and Avonte's Law. Autism Society. Available at: <https://www.autism-society.org/news/kevin-and-avontes-law-signed-into-law/>

Columbia Center for Contemporary Critical Thought (2020). Abolition Democracy 13/13. Available at:

<http://blogs.law.columbia.edu/abolition1313/>

Connor, D., Ferri, B. & Annamma, S.A. (Eds.) (2016). *DisCrit: Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education*. Teachers College Press.

Correia, D. & Wall, T. (2018). *Police: A Field Guide*. Verso.

*Course of study for the Pine Ridge Agency day schools of South Dakota, with plans and suggestions* (1910).  
Daily Journal.

*Course of Study: The Indian Schools of the United States. Industrial and Literary* (1901). Government Printing Office.

Critical Exposure (n.d.). About us. Retrieved from: <https://criticalexposure.org/about-us>

Critical Exposure (2014). Retrieved from: <https://www.criticalexposure.org/gallery/sSchool-to-Prison-Pipeline>

Critical Resistance (n.d.). Reformist reforms vs. abolitionist steps in policing. Available at:

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59ead8f9692ebee25b72f17f/t/5b65cd58758d46d34254f22c/1533398363539/CR\\_NoCops\\_reform\\_vs\\_abolition\\_CRside.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59ead8f9692ebee25b72f17f/t/5b65cd58758d46d34254f22c/1533398363539/CR_NoCops_reform_vs_abolition_CRside.pdf)

Critical Resistance (2004). The Abolitionist Toolkit. Critical Resistance. Available at:

<http://criticalresistance.org/resources/the-abolitionist-toolkit/>

Critical Resistance (2008). *Abolition Now! Ten Years of Strategy and Struggle Against the Prison Industrial Complex*. AK Press.

Critical Resistance (2015, January 6). *Do Black Lives Matter? Robin D.G. Kelley and Fred Moten in Conversation* [Video File]. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/116111740>

Critical Resistance (2018). Abolitionist Responses to Jail Expansion and Reform. Critical Resistance. Available at: <http://criticalresistance.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/jail-reform-chart.pdf>

Crowe, S. (2015). Lynchburg City Schools updates SRO policy. Available at:

<https://wset.com/news/local/lynchburg-city-schools-updates-sro-policy>

Curiel-Allen, T. (2017). I Was Locked Up at 18 – This Is My Advice to Help Others Survive the System. Teen

Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/i-was-locked-up-at-18-this-is-my-advice>

D.A.R.E. (2020). The History of D.A.R.E. Available at: <https://dare.org/history/>

da Silva, D.F. (2007). *Toward a Global Idea of Race*. University of Minnesota Press.

da Silva, D.F. (2013a). [Review on book cover]. In Harney, S. & Moten, F., *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & black study*. Minor Compositions Press.

da Silva, D. F. (2013b). To Be Announced: Radical Praxis or Knowing at the Limits of Justice. *Social Text*, 114(31), 43-62.

da Silva, D. F. (2014). Toward a Black Feminist Poethics: The Quest(ion) of Blackness Toward the End of the World. *The Black Scholar*, 44(2), 81-97.

da Silva, D. F. (2016). On Difference without Separability."32nd Bienal de São Paulo—Incerteza Viva". Edited by Jochen Volz and Júlia Rebouças. São Paulo: Fundação Bienal de São Paulo, 2016.).

da Silva, D.F. (2017a, May 2). Virtuality [Audio file]. Retrieved from:

<http://www.theforeshore.org/2017/05/01/session-14/>

da Silva, D.F. (2017b, April 11). Speculations on a Transformative Theory of Justice. The Online Journal of

Contour Biennale. Available at: <http://hearings.contour8.be/2017/04/11/speculations-transformative-theory-justice/>

da Silva, D.F. (2018). In the Raw. e-flux, 93. Available at: <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/93/215795/in-the-raw/>

da Silva, D.F. (2019). AN END TO "THIS" WORLD: DENISE FERREIRA DA SILVA INTERVIEWED BY SUSANNE LEEB AND KERSTIN STAKEMEIER. *Texte Zur Kunst*. Available at:

<https://www.textezurkunst.de/articles/interview-ferreira-da-silva/>

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Evaluating 'No Child Left Behind': The problems and promises of Bush's education policy. *The Nation*, Education Reform Feature. Available at:

<https://www.thenation.com/article/evaluating-no-child-left-behind/>

Davis, A.Y. (2003). *Are Prisons Obsolete?* Seven Stories Press.

Davis, A. Y. (2016). *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement*. Haymarket Books.

Davis, A. Y. (2020). *Sunday school: Unlock Us, Abolition in Our Lifetime*. Dream Defenders. Retrieved from:

[https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?v=615123319385564&ref=watch\\_permalink](https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?v=615123319385564&ref=watch_permalink)

Dee, B. (2010). Sent Down the Drain: Zero Tolerance & the School to Prison Pipeline. *Suspension Stories*.

Available at: <https://www.suspensionstories.com/art/sent-down-the-drain-comic/>

Delsol, R. & Shiner, M. (Eds.) (2015). *Stop and Search: The Anatomy of a Police Power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Department of Education (2018). South Carolina Compilation of School Discipline Laws and Regulations.

Available at: <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/sites/default/files/discipline-compendium/South%20Carolina%20School%20Discipline%20Laws%20and%20Regulations.pdf>

Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs (1922). *Course of Study for United States Indian Schools*.

Government Printing Office.

Desideri, V. & da Silva, D.F. (2015). A Conversation Between Valentina Desideri and Denise Ferreira da Silva.

A Studio in Hand-Reading: Charlotte Wolff. Available at: <http://handreadingstudio.org/?p=359>

Desideri, V. & Harney, S. (2013). Fate work: A conversation. *ephemera: theory & politics in organization*,

13(1), 159-176.



Dignity in Schools (2016, September). A Resource Guide on Counselors Not Cops: Supplemental Materials for DSC Policy Recommendations on Ending the Regular Presence of Law Enforcement in Schools. Dignity in Schools Campaign.

Dignity in Schools (2017). Counselors not Cops: Ending the Regular Presence of Law Enforcement in Schools. Dignity in Schools Campaign.

Dillard, C. (2018). The School-to-Deportation Pipeline: As immigration enforcement becomes more aggressive, schools have become increasingly risky places for undocumented students. *Teaching Tolerance*, 60.

Dillon, S. (2018). *Fugitive life: the queer politics of the prison state*. Duke University Press.

Dilts, A. (n.d.). Abolitionist\_Genealogy/ies: Insurgency as Critique and Critique as Insurgency. Available at: <https://www.sss.ias.edu/sites/sss.ias.edu/files/pdfs/Critique/dilts-critique-chapter-precis.pdf>

Dilts, A. (2017). Toward Abolitionist Genealogy. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 55, 51-77.

DiLulio, J. (1995, November 27). The Coming of the Super-Predators. Washington Examiner.

Dix, K. (2015a, August 30). Petition asks for charges to be dropped against Linkhorne Middle School student with autism. *Richmond Times-Dispatch*. Available at: [https://www.richmond.com/news/petition-asks-for-charges-to-be-dropped-against-linkhorne-middle/article\\_f5b4a9b2-b55a-5379-994b-42ced62982ce.html](https://www.richmond.com/news/petition-asks-for-charges-to-be-dropped-against-linkhorne-middle/article_f5b4a9b2-b55a-5379-994b-42ced62982ce.html)

Dix, K. (2015b, September 7). Virginia Legal Aid Society: Agreement between Lynchburg police and schools falls short. *Richmond Times-Dispatch*. Available at: [https://www.newsadvance.com/news/local/virginia-legal-aid-society-agreement-between-lynchburg-police-and-schools/article\\_6e866088-55cc-11e5-af2f-23c753232200.html](https://www.newsadvance.com/news/local/virginia-legal-aid-society-agreement-between-lynchburg-police-and-schools/article_6e866088-55cc-11e5-af2f-23c753232200.html)

Douglas, F. (1881, May 30). John Brown: An Address by Frederick Douglass. The Fourteenth Anniversary of Storer College, Harper's Ferry, West Virginia. Available at:

<http://www.wvculture.org/history/jbexhibit/bbspr05-0032.html>

Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2014). *An Indigenous People's History of the United States*. Beacon Press.

Ed-Data (2020). Los Angeles County, Students Suspended for Defiance Only by Race/Ethnicity. Available at:

<http://www.ed-data.org/county/Los-Angeles>

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Pub. L. No. 98-211, 97 Stat. 1412 (1983).

English, N. (2020). #8CantWait – The 8 policies that have the power to reduce police violence 72%. Front

Page Live. Available at: <https://www.frontpagelive.com/2020/06/04/8cantwait-the-8-policies-that-have-the-power-to-reduce-police-violence/>

Estes, N. (2019). The U.S. stole generations of Indigenous children to open the West. High Country News.

Available at: <https://www.hcn.org/issues/51.17/indigenous-affairs-the-us-stole-generations-of-indigenous-children-to-open-the-west>

Erevelles, N. & Minear, A. (2010). Unspeakable Offenses: Untangling Race and Disability Discourses of Intersectionality. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 4(2), 127-146.

Erevelles, N. (2012). "What...[thought] cannot bear to know": Crippin' the Limits of "Thinkability." *Review of Disability Studies: An International Journal*, 8(3), 35-44.

Erevelles, N. (2014). Crippin' Jim Crow: Disability, Dis-Location, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. In Ben-Moshe, L., Chapman, C., & Carey, A.C. (Eds.). *Disability Incarcerated: Imprisonment and Disability in the United States and Canada* (81-99). Palgrave Macmillan US.

Erevelles, N. (2020, April 23). Grounding Movements in Disability Justice [Video File]. Dustin P. Gibson.

Available at: <https://www.dustingibson.com/offerings/groundingmovementsindj>

- Fabris, E. & Aubrecht, K. (2014). Chemical Constraint: Experiences of Psychiatric Coercion, Restraint, and Detention as Carceratory Techniques. In Ben-Moshe, L., Chapman, C., & Carey, A.C. (Eds.). *Disability Incarcerated: Imprisonment and Disability in the United States and Canada* (pp. 185-200). Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Fasching-Varner, K. J., Martin, L. L., Mitchell, R. W., & Bennett-Haron, K. P. (Eds.) (2014). Breaking the Pipeline: Understanding, Examining, and Dismantling the School-to-Prison Pipeline [Special Issue]. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(4).
- Ferriss, S. (2015a). The school-to-court pipeline: Where does your state rank? Reveal: The Center for Investigative Reporting. Available at: <https://www.revealnews.org/article/the-school-to-court-pipeline-where-does-your-state-rank/>
- Ferriss, S. (2015b). Update: How kicking a trash can became criminal for a 6<sup>th</sup> grader. *PRI*. Available at: <https://www.pri.org/stories/2015-04-10/how-kicking-trash-can-became-criminal-6th-grader>
- Ferriss, S. (2016). Virginia drops felony charges against sixth-grade boy with autism. Available at: <https://www.revealnews.org/article/virginia-drops-felony-charges-against-sixth-grade-boy-with-autism/>
- Fireweed Collective (n.d.). Our Framework. Available at: <https://fireweedcollective.org/our-framework/>
- Fontaine, C. Culp, A., & Crano, R. (2012). Claire Fontaine: Giving shape to painful things. *Radical Philosophy*, 175, 43-52.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In Bouchard, D.F. (Ed.). *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault* (pp. 139-164). Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76* (D. Macey, Trans.). Picador.

- Foucault, M. (1998). Structuralism and Post-Structuralism. In Faubion, J. D. (Ed.), *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. The New Press.
- Fournier, W. (March 23, 2018). Kevin and Avonte's Law Has Passed. National Autism Association. Available at: <http://nationalautismassociation.org/kevin-avontes-law-has-passed/>
- Fraser, J. & Lambie, S. (2015). Queer desires and critical pedagogies in higher education: Reflections on the transformative potential of non-normative learning desires in the classroom. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship*, 7/8, 61-77.
- Freedom, Inc. [AboutFreedomInc]. (2020, June 16). Our young people and the community liberated the street in front of the Madison School District Doyle Administration Building. We demand #PoliceFreeSchools #DefendBlackLife #Defund Police #FreeEmAll #CommunityControl [Tweet]. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/AboutFreedomInc/status/1273075542498123782>
- Gabbard, D. (2012). Updating the Anarchist Forecast for Social Justice in Our Compulsory Schools. In Haworth, R. H. (Ed.), *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education* (pp. 32-46). PM Press.
- Gabbard, D. (2017). Don't Act, Just Think! In Haworth, R.H. & Elmore, J.M. (Eds.), *Out of the Ruins: The Emergence of Radical Informal Learning Spaces* (pp. 35-55). PM Press.
- Galvin-Almmanza, E. (2019). California Gang Laws Are Normalized Racism. The Appeal. Available at: <https://theappeal.org/drakeo-california-gang-laws-racism/>
- Garland-Thomson, R. (2006). Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory. In Davis, L.J. (Ed.), *The Disability Studies Reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Routledge.
- Garrison, W.L. (1831, January 1). *The Liberator*, p. 1. Retrieved from: <http://fair-use.org/the-liberator/1831/01/01/the-liberator-01-01.pdf>

GBH News (2020, August 5). *Decolonizing the U.S. School Curriculum* [Video file]. GBH News. Available at:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s05lr\\_lfnmw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s05lr_lfnmw)

Gibson, D. P. (2020, April 23). *Grounding Movements in Disability Justice*. Dustin P. Gibson. Available at:

<https://www.dustinpgibson.com/offerings/groundingmovementsindi>

Gilmore, R.W. (2008). *Forgotten Places and the Seeds of Grassroots Planning*. In Hale, C.R. & Calhoun, C. (Eds.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (pp. 31-61). University of California Press.

Gilmore, R. W. (2017a). *When the Prison Industrial Complex Masquerades as Social Welfare* [Video File].

Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0uoA8EWyKk>

Gilmore, R.W. (2017b). *Abolition Geography and the Problem of Innocence*. In Johnson, G.T. & Lubin, A.

2017. *Futures of Black Radicalism*. Verso

Gonsoulin, S., Zablocki, M. & Leone, P.E. (2012). *Safe Schools, Staff Development, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline*. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 35(4), 309-319.

Gonzalez, A. (2010) [Graffiti]. Junior High School 190, Forest Hills, NY.

Gordon, A. (2017). *TDSB votes down police presence in high schools*. The Star Edition. Available at:

[https://www.thestar.com/yourtoronto/education/2017/11/22/tdsb-votes-down-police-presence-in-high-schools.html?li\\_source=LI&li\\_medium=star\\_web\\_ymbii](https://www.thestar.com/yourtoronto/education/2017/11/22/tdsb-votes-down-police-presence-in-high-schools.html?li_source=LI&li_medium=star_web_ymbii)

Gossett, C. (2011). *Abolitionist Imaginings: A Conversation with Bo Brown, Reina Gossett, and Dylan*

Rodriguez. In Stanley, E. A. & Smith, N. (Eds.), *Captive Genders: Trans Embodiment and the Prison Industrial Complex*. AK Press.

Gossett, C. [autotheoryqueen]. (2017, December 9). all of our theories and analyses of violence have gotta be abolitionist, otherwise they get co-opted by state and academic violence/ violence of the state and academia [Tweet]. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/autotheoryqueen>

Gradual Abolition of Slavery Act, 5<sup>th</sup> Pennsylvania General Assembly (1780).

Green, K.M. & Bey, M. (2017). Where Black Feminist Thought and Trans\* Feminism Meet: A Conversation.

*Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society*, 19(4), 438-454.

Halberstam, J. (2013). The Wild Beyond: With and for the Undercommons. In Harney, S. & Moten, F., *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & black study* pp. 2-13). Minor Compositions Press.

Halberstam, J. (2019, March 6). *10/13, The Undercommons* [Video file]. Columbia Center for Contemporary Critical Thought. Available at: <http://blogs.law.columbia.edu/praxis1313/10-13/>

Halkovic, A. (2014). Redefining Possible: Re-Visioning the Prison-to-College Pipeline. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 494-512.

Harcourt, B. E. (2001). *Illusion of Order: The False Promise of Broken Windows Policing*. Harvard University Press.

Harney, S. (n.d.). Abolition and the General Intellect. Available at: [http://www.generation-online.org/c/fc\\_rent13.htm](http://www.generation-online.org/c/fc_rent13.htm)

Harney, S. (2017a). Stefano Harney Interview (part 1) by Michael Schapira & Jesse Montgomery. *Full Stop Quarterly*. Available at: <http://www.full-stop.net/2017/08/08/interviews/michael-schapira-and-jesse-montgomery/stefano-harney-part-1/>

Harney, S. (2017b). Stefano Harney Interview (part 2) by Michael Schapira & Jesse Montgomery. *Full Stop Quarterly*. Available at: <http://www.full-stop.net/2017/08/10/interviews/michael-schapira-and-jesse-montgomery/stefano-harney-part-2/>

Harney, S. (2018). Logistics Genealogies: A Dialogue with Stefano Harney By Niccolò Cuppini and Mattia Frapporti. *Social Text*, 36(3), 95-110.

Harney, S. (2020). "Give Away Your Home, Constantly" – Fred Moten and Stefano Harney Revisit The Undercommons In A Time of Pandemic And Rebellion (part 2) [Audio File]. Millennials Are Killing

Capitalism. Available at: <https://millennialsarekillingcapitalism.libsyn.com/give-away-your-home-constantly-fred-moten-and-stefano-harney>

Harney, S. & Moten, F. (2013). *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & black study*. Minor Compositions Press.

Harney, S. & Moten, F. (2016). Leave Our Mikes Alone. Available at: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/53a0503be4b0a429a2614e8b/t/59d81c2eedaed84653048f0d/1507335215476/Harney-Moten.pdf>

Harney, S. & Moten, F. (2017). *Propositions for Non-Fascist Living* [Video File]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZxZir6POGb0>

Harney, S. & Moten, F. (2018). Conversación Los Abajocomunes: Stefano Harney and Fred Moten in conversation on the occasion of the Spanish translation of *The Undercommons* by Yollotl Gómez Alvarado, Juan Pablo Anaya, Luciano Concheiro, Cristina Rivera Garza and Aline Hernández. *The New Inquiry*. Available at: <https://thenewinquiry.com/conversacion-los-abajocomunes/>

Harney, S., Moten, F. & Bousquet, M. (2008). On Study: A Roundtable Discussion with Marc Bousquet, Stefano Harney, and Fred Moten. *Polygraph*, 21.

Hartman, S.V. (1997). *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. Oxford University Press.

Hartman, S. (2007). *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Hartman, S. (2008). Venus in Two Acts. *small axe: a caribbean journal of criticism*, 12(2), 1-14.

Hartman, S. (2019). *Wayward Lives: Intimate Histories of Social Upheaval*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Hartman, S. (2020). Interviews: Saidiya Hartman. Artforum. Available at:

[https://www.artforum.com/interviews/saidiya-hartman-83579?fbclid=IwAR1X5htmjGu6hLruRimq0kv3pc4lee-0nvcYTfZnplyu2oYnu7\\_aix4GEaw](https://www.artforum.com/interviews/saidiya-hartman-83579?fbclid=IwAR1X5htmjGu6hLruRimq0kv3pc4lee-0nvcYTfZnplyu2oYnu7_aix4GEaw)

Haworth, R. H. (Ed.) *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*. PM Press.

Hayward, E. & Gossett, C. (2017). IMPOSSIBILITY OF THAT. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 22(2), 15-24.

Heard Museum (n.d.). *Away From Home: American Indian Boarding School Stories*. Available at:

<https://heard.org/boardingschool/health/>

Heckert, J. (2014, May 17). *Jamie Heckert - What is Anarchist Studies?* [Video File]. Retrieved from:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wHR5bEqhVQE>

Hedva, J. (2016). Sick Woman Theory. *Mask Magazine*, The Not Again Issue #24. Available at:

<http://maskmagazine.com/not-again>

Heitzeg, N. A. (2009). Education or Incarceration: Zero Tolerance Policies and the School to Prison Pipeline.

*Forum on Public Policy Online*, 2009(2), 1-21.

Heitzeg, N. A. (2014). Criminalizing Education: Zero Tolerance Policies, Police in the Hallways, and the School to Prison Pipeline. St. Catherine University. Available at:

[https://www.hamline.edu/uploadedFiles/Hamline\\_WWW/HSE/Documents/criminalizing-education-zero-tolerance-police.pdf](https://www.hamline.edu/uploadedFiles/Hamline_WWW/HSE/Documents/criminalizing-education-zero-tolerance-police.pdf)

Herzing, R. (2016). The Magical Life of Broken Windows. In Camp & Heatherton (Eds.) 2016. *Policing the Planet: Why the Policing Crisis Led to Black Lives Matter*. Verso.

Hilton, L. J. (2017). Avonte's Law: Autism, Wandering, and the Racial Surveillance of Neurological Difference. *African American Review*, 50(2), 221-235.



Hinger, S. (2018). South Carolina Legislature Repeals Racist ‘Disturbing School’ Law for Students. ACLU.

Available at: <https://www.aclu.org/blog/racial-justice/race-and-inequality-education/south-carolina-legislature-repeals-racist>

Historic la Mott (n.d.). The Abolitionists of Pennsylvania. Available at: <https://historic-lamott-pa.com/the-abolitionists-in-pennsylvania/>

Historical Society of Pennsylvania (2018). *Pennsylvania Abolition Society papers* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Available at: [http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/pacscl/ead.pdf?id=PACSCCL\\_HSP\\_PAS0490](http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/pacscl/ead.pdf?id=PACSCCL_HSP_PAS0490)

History With No Chaser (2019, June 26). *John Brown was baddest white man who ever lived. Pt 1 (“Slavery will only end in bloodshed”)* [Video file]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ibkbKX0nbjk>

Ho, K., 2007. Structural violence as a human rights violation. Available at: <http://projects.essex.ac.uk/ehrr/V4N2/ho.pdf>

Hook, D. (2007). *Foucault, Psychology and the Analytics of Power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Houchins, D. E. & Shippen, M. E. (Eds.) (2012). The School-to-Prison Pipeline: The Pathway To Modern Institutionalization [Special Issue]. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 35(4), 265-270.

Howell, A. (2018). Forget “militarization”: race, disability and the “martial politics” of the police and the university. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 20(2), 117-136.

Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994, H.R. 6, 103<sup>rd</sup> Congress (1994).

INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (2007). *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: beyond the non-profit industrial complex*. South End Press.

Indigenous Action Media (2014, March 2). *Accomplices Not Allies: Abolishing the Ally Industrial Complex, An Indigenous Perspective & Provocation* (Version 2) [Zine]. Available at:

<https://www.indigenouaction.org/zines/>

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 20 (2004).

It's About Time (n.d.). *Oakland Community School – 1977* [Video File]. Available at:

[http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/Media/Media\\_index.html](http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/Media/Media_index.html)

Jackson, G.L. (1972). *Blood in my Eye*. Random House.

Johnk, L. & Khan, S.A. (2019). "Crippling the Fuck Out:" A Queer Crip Mad Manifesta Against the Medical Industrial Complex. *feral feminisms*, 9, 26-38.

Jones, R.B. (n.d.). *Away From Home: American Indian Boarding School Stories*. Available at:

<https://heard.org/boardingschool/reforms-and-changes/>

Jordan, H. (2016, October 5). It Is Time to Get Real About School Policing. *ACLU*. Available at:

<https://www.aclu.org/blog/racial-justice/race-and-inequality-education/it-time-get-real-about-school-policing>

Kaba, M. (2017). How the School-to-Prison Pipeline Works: And why black girls are particularly at risk. *Teen Vogue*, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/how-the-school-to-prison-pipeline-works>

Kaba, M. (2018). Forward. In Samudzi, Z. & Anderson, W.C., *As Black as Resistance: Finding the Conditions for Liberation*. AK Press.

Kaba, M. [prisonculture] (2019, September 27). Demands should be radical in the sense of getting to the root(s) of problems we are trying to address. Embrace radicalism over re-form (particularly reformist reforms [Tweet]. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/prisonculture>

Kaba, M. [prisonculture] (2020, November 8). It's a call to divest from policing and to fund the commons.

That's a common sense and moderate demand. [Tweet]. Retrieved from:

<https://twitter.com/prisonculture>

Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist, Queer, Crip*. Indiana University Press, Indiana.

Kasprisin, L. (2013). The School-to-Prison Pipeline: A Civil Rights and a Civil Liberty Issue [Special Issue].

Journal of Educational Controversy: an Interdisciplinary Journal of Ideas, 7(1).

Katanski, A. V. (2006). *Learning to Write "Indian": The Boarding-School Experience and American Indian Literature*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Kawi, T. (2020, August 3). Decolonizing Our Classrooms Starts With Us. PBS. Available at:

<https://www.pbs.org/education/blog/decolonizing-our-classrooms-starts-with-us>

Kay, J. (2020, September 17). Decolonize the classroom: These teens want to dismantle America's racist

history curriculum. Mic. Available at: [https://www.mic.com/p/decolonize-the-classroom-these-](https://www.mic.com/p/decolonize-the-classroom-these-teens-want-to-dismantle-americas-racist-history-curriculum-33875061)

[teens-want-to-dismantle-americas-racist-history-curriculum-33875061](https://www.mic.com/p/decolonize-the-classroom-these-teens-want-to-dismantle-americas-racist-history-curriculum-33875061)

Kelling, G. L. & Bratton, W. J. (2015). Why We Need Broken Windows Policing. City Journal. Available at:

<https://www.city-journal.org/html/why-we-need-broken-windows-policing-13696.html>

Kelling, G. L. & Wilson, J. Q. (1982). Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety. The Atlantic.

Available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>

Kenny v Wilson, 2:16-cv-2794-CWH (Charleston Division, SC. 2016).

Kevin and Avonte's Law of 2016, H.R. 4919, 114<sup>th</sup> Congress 2D Session (2018).

KGW News (2018, March 30). *Straight Talk: 'School to prison pipeline'* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z5yGztpresA>

- Kim, C. Y., Losen, D. J., & Hewitt, D. T. (2010). *The School-to-Prison Pipeline: Structuring Legal Reform*. New York University Press.
- King, T.L. (2015). Interview with Dr. Tiffany Lethabo King: Dr. Tiffany Lethabo King in conversation with Feral Feminisms' Guest Editors. *Feral Feminisms*, 4, 64-68.
- King, T.L. (2017). Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 3(1), 162-185.
- Klein, R. (2018). The Other Side Of School Safety: Students Are Getting Tasered And Beaten By Police. HuffPost. Available at: [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/school-safety-students-police-abuse\\_n\\_5b746a4ce4b0df9b093b8d6a](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/school-safety-students-police-abuse_n_5b746a4ce4b0df9b093b8d6a)
- Knefel, M. (2017). Youth Incarceration in the United States, by the Numbers: Black kids are overrepresented behind bars in the United States. Teen Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/youth-incarceration-in-the-united-states-by-the-numbers>
- Kupchik, A. & Bracy, N.L. (2009). To Protect, Serve, and Mentor? Police Officers in Public Schools. In Monahan, T. & Torres, R.D. (Eds.), *Schools Under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education*. Rutgers University Press.
- Lemire, J. (2015, November 22). New York City's schools debate removing metal detectors. Los Angeles Times.
- Lepecki, A. (2013). Choreopolice and Choreopolitics: or, the task of the dancer. *TDR: The Drama Review*. 57(4), 13-27.
- LiveViewGPS (2018). Kevin and Avonte's Law Helps Address Wandering of Autistic Children. LiveViewGPS: Tracking You Can Trust. Available at: <https://www.liveviewgps.com/blog/kevin-avontes-law-helps-address-wandering-autistic-children/>

“Lynchburg City Schools Issues Statement Regarding Criminal Charges for 11-Year-Old-Boy” (2015, April 16).

ABC 13 News. Available at: <https://wset.com/archive/lynchburg-city-schools-offers-statement-regarding-charges-for-11-year-old-boy>

Mackey, E. (2014). Unsettling Expectations: (Un)certainty, Settler States of Feeling, Law, and Decoloniation.

*Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 2(29), 235-252.

Macleod, C. I., Bhatia, S., & Liu, W. (2020). Feminisms and decolonizing psychology: Possibilities and challenges [Special Issue]. *Feminism & Psychology*, 30(3).

Mairs, N. (1986). On Being a Cripple. Arizona Board of Regents.

Margolis, E. (2004). Looking at discipline, looking at labour: photographic representations of Indian boarding schools. *Visual Studies*, 19(1), 72-96.

Marotta, S. (n.d.). De-colonizing Classrooms: What image does a Eurocentric classroom conjure up for Indigenous students? Emerging Indigenous Voices. Available at:

<https://emergingindigenousvoices.ca/project/decolonizing-classrooms/>

Martineau, J. (2015). *Creative Combat: Indigenous Art, Resurgence, and Decolonization*. Dissertation.

Martineau, J. & Ritskes, E. (2014). Fugitive indigeneity: Reclaiming the terrain of decolonial struggle through Indigenous art. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(1), I-XII.

Martinot, S. (2014). The Need to Abolish the Prison System: an ethical indictment. Author.

Martinot, S. & Sexton, J. (2003). The Avant-Garde of White Supremacy. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 9(2), 169-181.

McKenna, J.M., Martinez-Prather, K. & Bowman, S.W. (2016). The Roles of School-Based Law Enforcement Officers and How These Roles Are Established: A Qualitative Study. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 27(4), 420-443.

McLaughlin, E. C. (2014). Texas student tased by police exits coma, enters rehabilitation, attorney says. *CNN*.

Available at: <https://www.cnn.com/2014/01/31/us/texas-taser-high-school-student-coma/>

McNamara, B. (2017). How Incarceration Impacts LGBTQ Youth's Mental Health. *Teen Vogue*, Kids

Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/how-incarceration-impacts-lgbtq-youths-mental-health>

McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability*. New York University Press.

MediaJustice (2019). Challenging E-Carceration in California. #NoDigitalPrisons. Available at:

<https://medium.com/nodigitalprisons/challenging-e-carceration-in-california-167fa04704e2>

Meiners, E. (2007). *Right to be Hostile: Schools, Prisons and the Making of Public Enemies*. Routledge.

Meiners, E. R. (2011). Ending the School-to-Prison Pipeline/Building Abolition Futures. *The Urban Review*, 43(4).

Meiners, E. (2016). *For the children? : protecting innocence in a carceral state*. University of Minnesota.

Meiners, E. R. & Winn, M. T. (Eds.) (2010). Education and Incarceration [Special Issue]. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(3).

Merkwae, A. (2015). Schooling the Police: Race, Disability, and the Conduct of School Resource Officers.

*Michigan Journal of Race and Law*, 21(1), 147-181.

Milbern, S. (2017). *My Body Doesn't Oppress Me, Society Does, Patty Bern and Stacey Milbern* [Video File].

Barnard Center for Research on Women. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7r0MiGWQY2g>

Millei Z. J. (2005). The Discourse of Control: Disruption and Foucault in an Early Childhood Classroom.

*Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 6(2), 128-139.

- Miller, L. (2018). FRACTAL THINKING AND MATHEMATICAL MONSTERS: Madness, Excess and Radical Exteriority. Public talk for The Feminist Science and Technology Studies Initiative and Five College Women's Studies Research Center, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA, March 2018.
- Miller, L. & Miller, M. (2018). Praxivist Imaginaries: Abolition Pedagogies and Objections to the Curricular Object. 4th Critical Ethnic Studies Association Conference, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 2018.
- Miller, L. L. & Miller, M. J. (2019). Praxivist imaginaries of decolonization: Can the psy be decolonized in the world as we know it? *Feminism & Psychology*, 30(3), 381-390.
- Miller, M. (2018). Detailing radical attempts & imagining impossible agendas. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 26(4), 647-650.
- Miller, M. & Miller, L. (2017). Carceral Educations: Schools, Prisons, Police and the Obligations of an Abolitionist. 2nd International Conference for Carceral Geography, Abolitionism and Ethical Research Panel Session, University of Birmingham, Geography Department, Birmingham, UK, December 2017.
- Mingus, M., (2011). Changing the Framework: Disability Justice. Available at:  
<https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2011/02/12/changing-the-framework-disability-justice/>
- Mingus, M. (2014). Reflection Toward Practice: Some Questions on Disability Justice. In Wood, C. (Ed.). *Criptiques* (pp. 107-114). May Day Publishing.
- Mitropoulos, A. (2012). *Contract and Contagion: From Biopolitics to Oikonomia*. Minor Compositions Press.
- Moore Jr., L. F. (2012). Krip-Hop Nation is More Than Music. *Wordgathering: A Journal of Disability Poetry*, 6(2).
- Morales, M. (2020). Protesters in New York Detail alleged police abuse at demonstrations. CNN. Available at:  
<https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/18/us/ny-attorney-general-letitia-james-townhall/>
- Morris, M.W. (2018). *Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools*. The New Press.

Moten, F. (2004). "WORDS DON'T GO THERE" An Interview with Fred Moten by Charles Henry Rowell.

*Callaloo*, 27(4), 953-966.

Moten, F. (2007). Black Optimism/Black Operation. Unpublished paper on file with the author.

Moten, F. (2007). TASTE DISSONANCE FLAVOR ESCAPE: Preface for a solo by Miles Davis. *Women &*

*Performance: a journal of feminist theory*, 17(2), 217–246.

Moten, F. (2007a). Black Optimism/Black Operation. Unpublished paper on file with the author.

Moten, F. (2013). *Arika Episode 4: Freedom is a Constant Struggle* [Video File]. Available at:

<http://arika.org.uk/archive/items/episode-4-freedom-constant-struggle/fred-moten-chat>

Moten, F. (2013). Blackness and Nothingness (Mysticism in the Flesh). *The South Atlantic Quarterly*,

112 (4), 737-780.

Moten, F. (2013). *Fred Moten & Barry Esson at Episode 4: Freedom is a Constant Struggle* [Video File].

Retrieved from: <http://arika.org.uk/archive/items/episode-4-freedom-constant-struggle/fred-moten-chat>

Moten, F. (2014). *Wyklad prof. Freda Motena: Performans i "czarnosc"* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://vimeo.com/100330139>

Moten, F. (2015). Feel, to Feel More, to Feel More Than. In (Bouthiller, R., Reich, M. L., & Collins, E. H. (Eds.)

*How to Remain Human* (pp. 59-61). Museum of Contemporary Art.

Moten, F. (2015). Interview with Poet Fred Moten. *South Journal*. Available at:

<https://southjournal.org/fred-moten/>

Moten, F. (2016, October 5). *The Black Outdoors: Fred Moten & Saidiya Harman at Duke University* [Video

File]. Retrieved from: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t\\_tUZ6dybrc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t_tUZ6dybrc)



Moten, F. (2016, September 3). *Undercommon Weave – The Infrastructure Summit* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://vimeo.com/231061810>

Moten, F. (2017). *Scenes at 20: Oct 6<sup>th</sup>* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dJ1EDweOfB8>

Moten, F. (2017a). *Black and Blur*. Duke University Press.

Moten, F. (2017b). *lyric communicability* [Video File]. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/210810210>

Moten, F. (2018, December 2). *A Conversation with Fred Moten* [Video File]. Retrieved from:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l6b5N\\_u7Ebs&t=2890s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l6b5N_u7Ebs&t=2890s)

Moten, F. (2018a). *Stolen Life*. Duke University Press.

Moten, F. (2018b). *The Gift of Corruption* [Video File]. Society for the Humanities. Available at:

<https://vimeo.com/261854255>

Moten, F. & Harney, S. (2010). Policy and Planning. *darkmatter Journal*, 7. Available at:

<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2010/04/19/policy-and-planning/>

Moten, F. & Harney, S. (2015). The Alternative is at Hand. *Chronic*. Available at:

<https://chimurengachronic.co.za/the-alternative-is-at-hand/>

Moten, F. & Harney, S. (2020a). Give Away Your Home, Constantly – Fred Moten and Stefano Harney Revisit

The Undercommons In A Time of Pandemic And Rebellion (part 2) [Audio File]. Millennials Are Killing

Capitalism. Available at: <https://millennialsarekillingcapitalism.libsyn.com/give-away-your-home->

[constantly-fred-moten-and-stefano-harney](https://millennialsarekillingcapitalism.libsyn.com/give-away-your-home-constantly-fred-moten-and-stefano-harney)

Moten, F. & Harney, S. (2020b). the university: last words. Available at:

[https://www.academia.edu/43580248/The\\_university\\_last\\_words\\_fred\\_moten\\_and\\_stefano\\_harne](https://www.academia.edu/43580248/The_university_last_words_fred_moten_and_stefano_harne)

[y](#)

Musu-Gillette, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., Kemp, J., Diliberti, M., and Oudekerk, B.A. (2018). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2017*. National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund (2005). Dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline. Available at: [https://dev.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Dismantling\\_the\\_School\\_to\\_Prison\\_Pipeline.pdf?\\_ga=2.221632016.927705638.1548172756-1751517539.1548172756](https://dev.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Dismantling_the_School_to_Prison_Pipeline.pdf?_ga=2.221632016.927705638.1548172756-1751517539.1548172756)

Nance, J. P. (2015). Students, Police, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Washington University Law Review*, 93 (4), 919-987.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (1966). *Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children*. Washington, DC.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (2020). NAEP History and Innovation. Institute of Education Sciences. Available at: <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/timeline.aspx>

National Association of School Resource Officers (n.d.). General Frequently Asked Questions. Available at: <https://nasro.org/faq>

National Center for Homeless Education (2020). Federal Data Summary: School Years 2015-16 through 2017-18: Education for Homeless Children and Youth. Greensboro, NC.

National Council on Disability (2015). Breaking the School-to-Prison Pipeline for Students with Disabilities. National Council on Disability.

Native Land Digital (n.d.). <https://native-land.ca>

Needles, E. (1848). *An Historical Memoir of the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery; The Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage, and for Improving the Condition of the African Race*. Merrihew and Thompson, Printers.

Newman, R. S. (n.d.). The PAS and American Abolitionism: A Century of Activism from the American Revolutionary Era to the Civil War. Available at: [https://hsp.org/history-online/digital-history-projects/pennsylvania-abolition-society-papers/the-pas-and-american-abolitionism-a-century-of-activism-from-the-american-revolutionary-era-to-the-c#\\_ednref6](https://hsp.org/history-online/digital-history-projects/pennsylvania-abolition-society-papers/the-pas-and-american-abolitionism-a-century-of-activism-from-the-american-revolutionary-era-to-the-c#_ednref6)

Nguyen, N. (2013). Scripting “Safe” Schools: Mapping Urban Education and Zero Tolerance During the Long War. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 35(4), 277-297.

Nguyen, N. (2017). From school militarization to school securitization: national security finds its place in schools. *Critical Studies in Education*, 58(1), 52-68.

No Child Left Behind of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Nocella II, A. J., Parmar, P., & Stovall, D. (Eds.) (2014). *From Education to Incarceration: Dismantling the School-to-Prison Pipeline*. Peter Lang.

NYCLU (2005). Arrested Bronx Guild HS Principal, Student and School Aide to Appear in Court. ACLU of New York. Available at: <https://www.nyclu.org/en/press-releases/arrested-bronx-guild-hs-principal-student-and-school-aide-appear-court>

NYCLU (2019). Town Hall: Rochester. ACLU of New York. Available at: <https://www.nyclu.org/en/events/town-hall-rochester?fbclid=IwAR2CCutR3fYntQGnuGnTXRa1M0PvHKF1nhYpY9LHEgCjsGh4kiFSnWan3ul>

Olson, J. (2004). *The abolition of white democracy*. University of Minnesota Press.

Omowale, Y. (2013). *Beyond the School to Prison Pipeline: Radical Perspectives on Criminalization & State*

*Violence Across State Institutions* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mcX3KXTCLQg>

Paik, A. N. (2020). Public Thinker: A. Naomi Paik on a Future Without Rights, Interview by Dylan Rodriguez.

*Public Books*. Available at: <https://www.publicbooks.org/public-thinker-a-naomi-paik-on-a-future-without-rights/>

Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery (1787). The constitution of the Pennsylvania

Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in

Bondage. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/constitutionofpe1788penn/mode/2up?q=owner>

Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in

Bondage, Constitution (1787). Preamble, Section 1.

Peralta, E. (2011). Pa. Judge Sentenced To 28 Years In Massive Juvenile Justice Bribery Scandal. *NPR*.

Available at: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2011/08/11/139536686/pa-judge-sentenced-to-28-years-in-massive-juvenile-justice-bribery-scandal?sc=tw&cc=share?sc=tw&cc=share>

Perec, G. (1973). Approaches to What? In Highmore, B. (ed) (1973). *The Everyday Life Reader*. Routledge.

Petersen, E. B., & Millei, Z. (Eds.) (2016). *Interrupting the Psy-Disciplines in Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Pickens, T. A. (Ed.) (2017). Special Issue: Blackness & Disability. *African American Review*, 20(2).

Piepzna-Samarasinha, L. L. (2018). *Care Work: Dreaming Disability Justice*. Arsenal Pulp Press.

Poon, L. (2020). The Racist History of Curfews in America. Bloomberg CityLab. Available at:

[https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-18/the-racist-history-of-curfews-in-america?fbclid=IwAR2ROzMq8jaCjWHclVgjq0oHDtTntzbagr8bnhODEFIR7yZ2YamPDC\\_KmA](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-18/the-racist-history-of-curfews-in-america?fbclid=IwAR2ROzMq8jaCjWHclVgjq0oHDtTntzbagr8bnhODEFIR7yZ2YamPDC_KmA)

Pratt, R.H. (1892). "Kill the Indian, and Save the Man": Capt. Richard H. Pratt on the Education of Native

Americans. History Matters. Available at: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/4929/>

Pratt, R.H. (2003). *Battlefield & Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Price, M. (2015). The Bodymind Problem and the Possibilities of Pain. *Hypatia*, 30(1), 268-284.

Quinn, T. & Meiners, E. (2009). *Flaunt It! Queers Organizing for Public Education and Justice*. Peter Lang.

Raffo, S., Taneja, A., & Page, C. (n.d.). The Medical Industrial Complex/MIC. Available at:

<https://carapage.co/the-medical-industrial-complex-mic/>

Ralph, K. (2018). A School Resource Officer Allegedly Tackled a 14-Year-Old Black Girl in North Carolina, and Her Community Is Outraged. Teen Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at:

<https://www.teenvogue.com/story/school-resource-officer-allegedly-tackled-14-year-old-black-girl-community-outraged>

Reagan Library (1983, April 26). *President Reagan's Receiving the Commission on Excellence in Education Report on April 26, 1983* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pQzdyhSDhuM>

Reel, E. (1901). Course of Study for Indian Schools. In *Course of Study: The Indian Schools of the United States. Industrial and Literary* (pp. 5-6). Government Printing Office.

Reichard, R. (2017). Why Having Police in Schools May Be a Risk For Undocumented Students: Have you heard of the school-to-deportation pipeline? Teen Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at:

<https://www.teenvogue.com/story/why-having-police-in-schools-may-be-a-risk-for-undocumented-students>

Ripley, A. (2016). How America Outlawed Adolescence: At least 22 states make it a crime to disturb school in ways that teenagers are wired to do. Why did this happen? The Atlantic. Available at:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/11/how-america-outlawed-adolescence/501149/>

Rodriguez, D. (2006). *Forced Passages: Imprisoned Radical Intellectuals and the U.S. Prison Regime*.

University of Minnesota Press.

Rodriguez, D. (2008). Warfare and the Terms of Engagement. In *Critical Resistance*, Critical Resistance, 2008.

*Abolition Now! Ten Years of Strategy and Struggle Against the Prison Industrial Complex* (91-102). AK

Press.

Rodriguez, D. (2010). The disorientation of the teaching act: Abolition as a pedagogical position. *Radical*

*Teacher*, 88(1), 7-19.

Rodriguez, D. (2013). *Beyond the School to Prison Pipeline: Radical Perspectives on Criminalization & State*

*Violence Across State Institutions* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mcX3KXTCLQg>

Rodriguez, D. (2017a). *Abolition is Our Obligation* [Video File]. Available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JXFO4Hcw9HQ>

Rodriguez, D. (2017b). *It's Not Police Brutality: Critical Resistance, Breaking Down the Prison Industrial*

*Complex* [Video File]. Available at:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\\_continue=3&v=yIEUT2BvvtM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=3&v=yIEUT2BvvtM)

Rodriguez, D. (2019a). Abolition as Praxis of Human Being: A Forward. *Harvard Law Review*, 132(6), 1575-

1612.

Rodriguez, D. (2019b). Insult/Internal Debate/Echo. *Propter Nos*, 3, 125-131.

Rodriguez, D. (2020). Reformism Isn't Liberation, It's Counterinsurgency. *Level*. Available at:

<https://level.medium.com/reformism-isnt-liberation-it-s-counterinsurgency-7ea0a1ce11eb>

Roman, I. (2018). The Curfew Myth. The Marshall Project. Available at:

<https://www.themarshallproject.org/2018/07/31/the-curfew-myth>

Rose, N. (1985). *The Psychological Complex: Psychology, Politics and Society in England 1869-1939*.

Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rose, N. (1998). *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*.

Princeton University Press.

Ross, C. J. (2017). "Bitch," Go Directly to Jail: Student Speech and Entry into the School-to-Prison Pipeline.

*GWU Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 2016-11*.

ross, k.m. (2020). Funneling Our Children From Classrooms to Cages Ends Now. *Level*. Available at:

<https://level.medium.com/funneling-our-children-from-classrooms-to-cages-ends-now-1b22669c9dd7>

Sam. T.K. (2017). I'm on Probation and It's Like Another Form of Incarceration. Teen Vogue, Kids

Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/parole-incarceration-week-kids-incarcerated>

Samudzi, Z. & Anderson, W.C. (2018). *As Black as Resistance: Finding the Conditions for Liberation*. AK Press.

Sandahl, C. (2003). Queering the Crip or Crippling the Queer? Intersections of Queer and Crip Identities in

Solo Autobiographical Performance. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 9(1), 25-56.

Sauder, K. (2015). Fighting my internalization of the hierarchy of disability. *crippledscholar*. Available at:

<https://crippledscholar.com/2015/08/23/fighting-my-internalization-of-the-hierarchy-of-disability/>

Scannell, R. J. (2016). Broken Windows, Broken Code. *Real Life Magazine*. Available at:

<https://reallifemag.com/broken-windows-broken-code/>

Schermele, Z. (2020). Over-Policing In Schools Is an Issue Black Students Have Been Fighting for Years. Teen

Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/students-push-police-out-of-schools>

Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973 29 U.S.C. § 701 (1973).

- Selman, K. J. (2017). Imprisoning 'Those' Kids: Neoliberal Logics and the Disciplinary Alternative School. *Youth Justice* 17(3), 231-231.
- Sexton, J. (2007). Racial Profiling and the Societies of Control. In James, J. (Ed.), *Warfare in the American Homeland: Policing and Prison in a Penal Democracy*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sexton, J. (2017). On Black Negativity, or The Affirming of Notion. Jared Sexton, Interviewed by Daniel Colucciello Barber. *Society + Space*. Available at: <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/on-black-negativity-or-the-affirmation-of-nothing>
- Shah, M. (2013). Benjamin Franklin and Slavery. Available at: [http://www.personal.psu.edu/cjm5/blogs/benjamin franklin then and now/2013/04/benjamin-franklin-and-slavery.html#\\_ednref12](http://www.personal.psu.edu/cjm5/blogs/benjamin franklin then and now/2013/04/benjamin-franklin-and-slavery.html#_ednref12)
- Sharpe, C. (2016). *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Duke University Press.
- Shirley, N. & Stafford, S. (2015). *Dixie Be Damned: 300 Years of Insurrection in the American South*. AK Press.
- Sinha, M. (2016). *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. Yale University Press.
- Sins Invalid (2016). *Skin, Tooth, and Bone: The Basis of Movement is Our People: A Disability Justice Primer*.
- Skiba, R., Rausch, M. K. & Ritter, S. (2004). Children Left Behind: Series Summary and Recommendations. *Education Policy Briefs*, 2(4), 1-4.
- Skiba, R., Simmons, A., Staudinger, L., Dow, G. & Feggins, R. (2003). Consistent Removal: Contributions of School Discipline to the School-to-Prison Pipeline. presented at School-to-Prison Pipeline Research Conference, Boston, MA, May 16-17, 2003.
- Smith M.D. (2020, June 8). *Defund the Police: Linda Sarsour & Mychal Denzel Smith on What Meaningful Change Would Look Like* [Video File]. Democracy Now! Retrieved at: <https://www.democracynow.org/shows/2020/6/8?fbclid=IwAR3vVx11ky3dkPdNAbpd4htCtcNZWd1VzAfbOirOXcU32LRnInv9-OsrRtE>



- Smith, A. (2009). *Indigenous Peoples and Boarding Schools: A comparative study*. United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.
- Sojoyner, D. M. (2013). Black radicals make for bad citizens: Undoing the myth of the school to prison pipeline. *Berkeley Review of Education* 4(2), 241-263.
- Sojoyner, D. M. (2016). *First Strike: Educational Enclosures in Black Los Angeles*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Sojoyner, D. M. (2017). Another Life is Possible: Black Fugitivity and Enclosed Places. *Cultural Anthropology*, 32(4), 514-536.
- South Carolina Legislature (2010). Section 16-17-420 Disturbing Schools; summary court jurisdiction.
- Southwest Indian Relief Council (n.d.). History & Culture: Boarding Schools. Southwest Indian Relief Council. Available at: [http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=swirc\\_hist\\_boardingschools](http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=swirc_hist_boardingschools)
- Spade, D. (2020). Solidarity Not Charity: Mutual Aid for Mobilization and Survival. *Social Text* 142, 38(1), 131-151.
- Spillers, H. & Gumbs, A. P. (2017). *Spill: Black Feminist Fugitivity in Conversation and Performance* [Video File]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ui-EZQ1BTfE>
- Standing Bear, L. (1931). The Tragedy of the Sioux. *The American Mercury*, November. Available at: <https://gutenberg.ca/ebooks/standingbearl-tragedyofthesioux/standingbearl-tragedyofthesioux-00-h.html>
- Stanley, E. (2011). Fugitive Flesh: Gender Self-Determination, Queer Abolition, and Trans Resistance. In Stanley, E. A. & Smith, N. (Eds.), *Captive Genders: Trans Embodiment and the Prison Industrial Complex* (1-14). AK Press.

Stauffer, J. & Trodd Z. (2005). Meteor of War: The John Brown Cycle. In Taylor, A. & Herrington, E. (Eds.), *The Afterlife of John Brown*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Stein, S. (2019a). Abolitionist Work's Psycho-affective Dimensions and Pedagogical Challenges. Available at: <https://abolition.university/2019/09/13/sharon-stein/>

Stein, S. (2019b). *Untitled conference paper* [Video File]. Whose Crisis? Whose University? Abolitionist Study & Global Higher Education, Duke University, Durham, NC, October 11, 2019. Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/1384456288290818/videos/504014700158670>

Stein, S., Hunt, D., Suša, R. & Andreotti, V. (2017). The Educational Challenge of Unraveling the Fantasies of Ontological Security. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 11(2).

Stovall, D. (2018). Are We Ready for 'School' Abolition?: Thoughts and Practices of Radical Imaginary in Education. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 17(1), 51-61.

Tamboukou, M., 1999. Writing Genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 20(2).

Taylor, D. (2020, April 23). Grounding Movements in Disability Justice [Video File]. Dustin P. Gibson. Available at: <https://www.dustingibson.com/offers/groundingmovementsindj>

Tebo, M. G. (2000). Zero tolerance, zero sense. *ABA Journal*, 86, 40-46.

Teen Vogue (2017). Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/tag/kids-incarcerated>

The 74 (2018). *35 Years After 'A Nation at Risk': 36 Pages that Bent the Arc of Education* [Video File]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WAtult36PJM>

The Indian Helper (1885a, October 16). *The Indian Helper: For the Carlisle Indian Boys and Girls*, 10(1).

The Indian Helper (1885b, November 13). *The Indian Helper: For the Carlisle Indian Boys and Girls*, 14(1).

The Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations (1976, April 23). The FBI's Covert Action Program to Destroy the Black Panther Party. Supplementary Detailed Staff Reports of Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans, Book III, Final Report.

Thompson, V. (2017). The Hashtagversary of #DisabilityTooWhite. Available at:

<http://rampyourvoice.com/2017/05/18/the-hashtagversary-of-disabilitytoowhite/>

Tourmaline [tourmaliine]. (2020, June 7). When we say abolish police. We also mean the cop in your head and in your heart. [Tweet]. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/tourmaliine>

Trafzer, C.E., Keller, J.A., & Sisquoc L. (Eds.) (2006). *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. University of Nebraska Press.

Tuck, E. (2016, July 25). Red and Black DNA, Blood, Kinship and Organizing with Kim Tallbear (episode 4)

[Audio podcast episode]. The Henceforward. Available at:

<http://www.thehenceforward.com/episodes/2016/7/25/episode-3-red-and-black-dna-blood-kinship-and-organizing-with-kim-tallbear>

Tuck, E. & Yang, W. K. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.

Tuck, E. & Yang W. K. (2014a). R-words: Refusing Research. In Paris, D. & Winn, M. T. (Eds.) (2014).

*Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquire with youth and communities*. SAGE Publications.

Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2014b). Unbecoming Claims: Pedagogies of Refusal in Qualitative Research.

*Quantitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 811-818.

Tyson, R. [rtyson82] (2020, June 19). Police departments with a well-documented history of killing Black people are bragging about how they already adhere to #8CantWait, which just shows the weakness of those reforms and why the only path forward is to #DefundThePolice [Tweet]. Retrieved from:

<https://twitter.com/rtyson82>

U.S. Department of Education (n.d.). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Available at:

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea>

U.S. Department of Education (2008). *A Nation Accountable: Twenty-five Years After A Nation at Risk*, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (2014). Civil Rights Data Collection: Data Snapshot (School Discipline). Available at: <https://ocrdata.ed.gov/downloads/crdc-school-discipline-snapshot.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (2016). 2013-2014 Civil Rights Data Collection: A First Look. Available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/2013-14-first-look.pdf>

U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2018, April 6). Privacy Impact Assessment Update for the Aircraft Systems DHS/CBP/PIA-018(a). Available at: <https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/privacy-pia-cbp018a-aircraftsystems-april2018.pdf>

U.S. Department of Justice (1996). Curfew: An Answer to Juvenile Delinquency and Victimization? Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Uhlmann, N. (2018). 5 Reasons Why Activists Are Calling for the Abolition of ICE. Teen Vogue, Kids Incarcerated Series. Available at: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/5-reasons-activists-calling-abolition-ice>

United Press International (1985, January 29). Education Dept. Won't Be Abolished: Reagan Backs Down, Citing Little Support for Killing Agency. *Los Angeles Times*. Available at: <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1985-01-29-mn-13948-story.html>

United States (1965). Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. H. R. 2362, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Pub. L. 89-10. Reports, bills, debate and act.

United States Constitution. Article IV, Section 2.

United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform: A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education, US Department of Education*. Washington, D.C.: The Commission.

Utah History (2016, February 16). *Unspoken: America's native American Boarding Schools* [Video File]. PBS. Available at: <https://www.pbs.org/video/unspoken-americas-native-american-boarding-schools-oobt1r/>

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (2015). Memorandum of Understanding Between the Lynchburg City Schools and the City of Lynchburg Police Department. Available at: <https://bloximages.newyork1.vip.townnews.com/newsadvance.com/content/tncms/assets/v3/editorial/e/ae/eae4369c-562a-11e5-beac-43abea449643/55eede5a7d077.pdf>

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (2017). Virginia School-Law Enforcement Partnership Model Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Available at: <https://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/sites/dcjs.virginia.gov/files/publications/law-enforcement/virginia-school-law-enforcement-partnership-model-memorandum-understanding.pdf>

Virginia Legal Aid Society (2015). VLAS Statement on Moon-Robinson Case & LCS Memorandum of Understanding. Available at: <http://vlas.org/vlas-statement-on-moon-robinson-case-lcs-memorandum-of-understanding/>

Vitale, A. (2017). *The End of Policing*. Verso.

Vitale, A. (2020, October 30). *Abolition 3/13: Abolish the Police* [Video File]. Available at: <http://blogs.law.columbia.edu/abolition1313/3-13-abolish-the-police/>

Vox (2019, October 14). *How the US stole thousands of Native American children* [Video file]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UGqWRyBCHhw>

- Wagner, B. (2009). *Disturbing the Peace: Black Culture and the Police Power after Slavery*. Harvard University Press.
- Wald, J. & Losen, D. (2003a). Defining and Redirecting a School-to-Prison Pipeline: Framing Paper for the School-to-Prison Pipeline Research Conference, presented at School-to-Prison Pipeline Research Conference, Boston, MA, May 16-17, 2003.
- Wald, J. & Losen, D. (2003b). [Special Issue] Deconstructing the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *New Directions For Student Leadership*, 2003(99).
- Walia, H. (2013). *Undoing Border Imperialism*. AK Press/Institute for Anarchist Studies.
- Wang, J. (2012). Against Innocence: Race, Gender, and the Politics of Safety. *LIES: A Journal of Materialist Feminism*, 1.
- Wang, J. (2018). *Carceral Capitalism*. Semiotext(e).
- Ward, J. (2007). *Genealogy and its Shadows: Reading Nietzsche with Deleuze, Foucault and Derrida*. Thesis.
- Warren, C. (2017). Onticide: Afro-pessimism, Gay Nigger #1, and Surplus Violence. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 23(3), 391-418.
- Warren, C. L. (2018). *Ontological Terror: Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation*. Duke University Press.
- Washington State Legislature (1890). Section 87-383; Session Laws, 1889-90.
- Washington, A. & Henfield, M. (Eds.) (2018). School to Prison Pipeline [Special Issue]. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 17(4).
- Watts, A. (2020). School resource officer in Arkansas 'relieved of duty' following apparent chokehold. CNN. Available at: <https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/11/us/arkansas-school-resource-officer-apparent-chokehold/index.html>

- Watts, I. E. & Erevelles, N. (2004). These deadly times: Reconceptualizing school violence by using critical race theory and disability studies. *American Educational Research Journal* 41, 271–299.
- Wilbur, M. & Keene, A. (2019, October 8). Beyond Blood Quantum (episode 10) [Audio podcast episode]. All My Relations Podcast. Available at:  
<https://www.allmyrelationspodcast.com/podcast/episode/49fcb76f/ep-10-beyond-blood-quantum>
- Wilderson III, F. B. (2002). The Prison Slave as Hegemony's (Silent) Scandal. *Social Justice: A Journal of Crime, Conflict, and World Order*, 30(2), 18-27.
- Willett, C. & Thompson, J. (2015). Restorative Practices as an Attack on the Prison Industrial Complex. *The Abolitionist*, 24, 7-8.
- Williams, K. (2015). *Our Enemies in Blue: Police and Power in America* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). AK Press.
- Woods, C. (1998). *Development Arrested: The Blues and Plantation Power in the Mississippi Delta*. Verso.
- Woodworth, C. L. (1887, July). Things to be Remembered. *The Morning Star*, 10(8).
- Woolard, A., Deane, R. & Ellis, S. (2019). Decriminalizing Childhood: Ending School-Based Arrest for Disorderly Conduct. Charlottesville: Legal Aid Justice Center.
- Wozolek, B., Wootton, L., & Demlow, A. (2016). The School-to-Coffin Pipeline: Queer Youth, Suicide, and Living the In-Between. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 17(5), 392-398.
- Wun, C. (2014). The Anti-Black Order of No Child Left Behind: Using Lacanian psychoanalysis and critical race theory to examine NCLB. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46(5), 462-474.
- Yang, K. W. (2009). Focus on Policy: Discipline or Punish? Some Suggestions for School Policy and Teacher Practice. *Language Arts*, 87(1), 49-61.