IS STRUCTURAL CHANGE "PRACTICAL"?
LATINO BOYS & IMAGINING OTHERWISE

Omar Davila Jr.
Santa Clara University

AUTHOR NOTE

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Omar Davila Jr., Child Studies Program, Santa Clara University, 500 El Camino Real, Santa Clara, CA, 95053.
E-mail: odavila@scu.edu

ABSTRACT

Most policy discussions around Latino boys aim to foster academic success without fully considering the way unequal outcomes are by design. The zero-sum nature of US education warrants a critical analysis and fundamental reimagining. I employ the lenses of critical social theory and critical discourse studies for a three-fold purpose: (1) examine the (im)possibilities of academic success, (2) examine how discourses of practicality are weaponized against efforts to enact structural change, and (3) engage the concept, imagining otherwise, in the field of education. Special attention is given to contemporary educational and political events to highlight the importance of going beyond "practicality," abolishing all processes that generate unequal outcomes, and reimagining the forthcoming world of education. I call for a serious interrogation of educational structures, delving into a more critical and imaginative realm.

*Keyword*s: Latino Boys, Political Discourse, Educational Inequality, Abolition

Introduction

Consider a fictitious scenario. All students from marginalized backgrounds become high-performing students—strong SAT scores, strong GPAs, and strong letters of recommendation. Even in a scenario where all students are classified as "high-performing," top universities would reach a saturation point and awards would only go to a select number of students. In essence, the U.S. education system is a zero-sum game, which guarantees a few winners and ensures the reproduction of inequality (Labaree, 2010). One need not delve into a wholly fictional realm to see similar results. Harris and Tienda (2012) studied the Top 10% law in Texas that guaranteed admission to their flagship campus for all students who graduated in the top 10% of their high school class. Two major findings were established: (1) many students did not apply, even when they graduated top of their class, and (2) if all students had applied, their flagship campus would

be forced to deny qualified students. In tandem, these examples reinforce the argument presented by Fischer and colleagues (1996)—education in the U.S. is inequality by design. Yet, most policy discussions about Latino boys (and other Students of Color) aim to increase academic outcomes without contesting the zero-sum nature of U.S. schooling.

Amid the present COVID-19 era, calls for reimagining education are widespread. For many, "returning to normal" is no longer a viable option, as financial crises put pressure on public institutions, limiting their available resources; as corporatization takes a stronger hold of our everyday life; and as some might argue, fascism is emerging via clandestine federal agents suppressing political mobilization, attacks on voting rights, and a myriad of other efforts designed to limit democratic processes. Still, others might argue that "returning to normal" means returning to substandard conditions that led to this social problem in the first place. Hence, the solution, I concur and argue, is to imagine otherwise. Here, I explore the obstacles that impinge on our ability to imagine otherwise, and in turn, what imagining otherwise requires of us. I pay special attention to Latino boys, as this demographic has garnered significant attention in both academic and political realms. Indeed, the rise of what Henry Giroux (2018) calls, "neoliberal authoritarianism," was initiated by political diatribes against "bad hombres" (Adame et al., 2017). It is precisely this political rhetoric—along with other racialized attacks—that led to an upward transfer of wealth, weakening of public institutions, and strengthening of the corporate sphere (Bonilla-Silva, 2018). In the academic realm, Latino boys received significant attention, as major political initiatives, such as President Obama's My Brother's Keeper and the ongoing California's Select Committee on the Status of Boys and Men of Color, provided strong incentives to study and improve the lives of Latino boys (Davila Jr., Berumen, & Baquedano-López, 2015; Saénz et al., 2016).

This commentary consists of three key sections and arguments: (1) *The (Im)possibilities of Academic Success*, highlighting the limits of increasing academic outcomes among Latino boys, (2) *Discourses of Practicality*, examining how these political discourses serve to reproduce structural arrangements, and (3) *Imagining Otherwise*, encouraging educational researchers to delve into a more critical and imaginative realm. I employ the lenses of critical social theory and critical discourse studies to examine my subject of inquiry. According to Zeus Leonardo (2009), critical social theory in education is an interdisciplinary framework, emanating from Paulo Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Critical social theory captures the way race (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; Haney-López, 2014), gender (Crenshaw, 2014; Hurtado & Sinha, 2016), and capitalism (Giroux, 2018; Kantor & Lowe, 2013) shape relations of power and the conditions students experience. In similar fashion, critical discourse studies examine the way logics and assumptions are embedded in discourse (Santa Ana, 2002); the way power dynamics shape language practices (Rosa, 2019); and, the way discourse serves as the main vehicle for ideology (Fairclough, 2013).

Following the insights of Leonardo (2013), I embrace a dialogical framework that is less concerned with a single line of thought and more concerned with understanding inequality, structural forces, and ways to achieve our liberation. I draw from a content analysis of political discourse and an ethnographic study on high-performing Latino boys. This study took place in the Bay Area of Northern California, featuring a group of Latino boys (i.e., candidates for valedictorian and students who met UC-Eligibility) in their senior year of high school, as they applied to top universities across the U.S. I address the following questions: How is increasing academic success limited in our efforts to address structural inequality? How is inequality reproduced through discourses of practicality? And, how might we reimagine a world wherein Latino boys and other marginalized groups are free from inequality and injustice?

The (Im)possibilities of Academic Success

On December 31st 2018, while most students and academic personnel were preparing for the New Year, Mr. Rodriguez offered feedback to Junior, a candidate for valedictorian at Skyview High School, on his application to Stanford. Mr. Rodriguez noted the following:

> Junior…I read over your entire application and it was impressive. You present a strong political tone which some readers will greatly appreciate. You do a good job of masking the fact that you were not heavily involved in activities during your first years in HS. If I were a reader at Stanford, I would accept you in a heartbeat...but I'm not...and I worry that they might pass on you, especially because they already accepted a student from Skyview this year, and rarely do they admit two students from the same HS....
> On the west coast all top students funnel their ambitions into only one ivy-league-ish school, Stanford, and that is unfortunate, because the competition is ridiculously tight...My point is, you have a very strong template that you can use to apply to other excellent schools-so you should do so...and not put all your eggs into one private school…

In a gentle way, Mr. Rodriguez's note conveys to Junior how the education system works. Stated succinctly, the U.S. education system guarantees that there will only be a few winners. Yet, in most policy discussions about education, we often ask: Why does educational inequality persist? For a moment, I return to the fictitious scenario from my introduction: Imagine that all students from marginalized backgrounds become high-performing students. Even in this fictitious scenario, our educational structure is a zero-sum game, such that universities, like Stanford, would reach a saturation point, awards would only go to a select number of students, and so on. As forecasted by Mr. Rodriguez, Junior was rejected from Stanford three months later.

The zero-sum phenomenon is a central part of our ostensibly meritocratic education system. A system that assigns and determines distinction, admission, and academic success based on a set of socially constructed measures (Gonzalez & Núñez, 2014; López-Figueroa, 2016). At its core, the zero-sum phenomenon refers to how the academic success of some students necessitates the exclusion of others, in line with the scenarios presented above. In a society where race, class, and gender shape the foundations of cultural, educational, and governance structures (Collins & Bilge, 2016), it should come as no surprise that our meritocratic system legitimizes, values, and reproduces what bell hooks (2000) calls, "white-supremacist-capitalist-patriarchy." Countless studies show how dominant ideologies are reproduced via K-12 school curricula (Anyon, 1980; Bowles & Gintis, 2011; Leonardo, 2009), teacher-student relationships (Singh, 2020; Solomon, 2015), standardized testing (Dixon-Román, 2017; Fischer et al., 1996), college admissions (Karabel, 2006), and job hiring (Cerda-Jara et al., 2020; Haney & Hurtado, 1994). Often, the reproduction of privilege and subordination occurs through allegedly neutral or colorblind policies, such that, whiteness, masculinity, and high social class status need not be explicit for different outcomes to emerge based on group membership (Bedolla, 2010; Collins & Bilge, 2016). The ideology of merit and its corresponding system, therefore, individualizes a structural phenomenon to create the illusion of legitimacy and a deserving group of students, who should gain access to elite institutions and reach the upper echelons of U.S. society. Since prestige, distinction, and academic success in a hierarchical society cannot be universal, the zero-sum

phenomenon in education guarantees that only a few students will succeed while the majority of others are inevitably subject to exclusion and failure, with this framing of success.

Still, a substantive body of research on Latino boys sought to examine ways of increasing academic outcomes (Davila Jr. et al., 2015; Conchas, 2006; Fergus et al., 2014; Harper & Associates, 2014; Hurtado & Sinha, 2016; Saénz & Ponjuan, 2011). Increasing student outcomes offers better social and economic opportunities, the argument goes. There are several issues are with that assumption, however: (1) academic success, as stated above, is a zero-sum game and not accessible universally; (2) academic success is socially constructed and requires mastery of knowledge created by and for dominant groups (e.g., standardized testing, K-12 school curricula, etc.); and (3) even among "high-performing" students from marginalized backgrounds, many experience a range of obstacles that impinge on their academic potential. Consider the following examples: Fabian, another high-performing Latino boy at Skyview High, withheld his follow-up essay after being waitlisted at UC Berkeley due to a lack of academic support; Salvador, who was hoping to attend UC Berkeley's college tour was discouraged from attending, because his teacher said, "there was no point," and that UC Berkeley would deny him, although he was later waitlisted; and, Anthony, whose older brother attended UC Berkeley, shared during an interview that his brother dropped out due to financial pressures. It is important to note that all these students identified as "low-income," and previous research has shown that even when poor and rich students demonstrate the same academic preparedness, poor students are less likely to graduate from college (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Certainly, there were success stories, such as Luis and Junior, who were both candidates for valedictorian and received admission to UC Berkeley with strong financial packages. My reason for highlighting the former examples, however, is to illustrate the way structural obstacles, at times, override students' academic success.

Furthermore, researchers argue that education and criminalization are intimately connected (Conchas & Vigil, 2012; Hurtado & Sinha, 2016; Fergus et al., 2014; Mireles-Rios et al., 2020; Rios, 2011). This entanglement is often referred to as the "school-to-prison pipeline." Rios and Galicia (2013) argue that "some marginalized Latino youths are no longer 'learning to labor' but rather 'preparing for prison'" (p. 62). Hurtado and Sinha's (2016) study is particularly important here, as they interviewed Latino men at some of the nation's most prestigious universities, many of whom were completing their master's and doctoral programs. Strikingly, however, many of these Latino men reported experiencing similar levels of criminalization that are reported among Latino boys and young men, who are not high-performing students (see Rios, 2011). The racialization of Latino men as criminals (or "bad hombres") persists despite their academic achievements. In accordance, Cerda-Jara, Elster, and Harding (2020) examined whether a college education among formerly incarcerated men would improve their job prospects. Two major findings are pertinent herein: (1) overall callback rate was 50% lower for college educated men with criminal records versus college educated men without a record, and (2) whether a bachelor's degree was earned before or after the criminal record had no impact on the number of callbacks. Among Latino men specifically, 9% received callbacks if they had a clean record and a BA; 5% received callbacks if they had a record before their BA; and, 6% if they had a record after their BA. Their findings provide evidence that a college education does not counteract the stigma of a criminal record (Cerda-Jara et al., 2020), in support of my earlier argument that academic success does not buffer Latino men from the social conditions that render them criminal.

Another area to consider is the nexus between academic success and ideological structures. Given that merit is socially constructed by dominant groups, one should expect high-performing students to become susceptible to reproducing ideologies of privilege and subordination. In a

previous article, I wrote the following: "On the surface, one would assume that achieving high levels of education is only positive for our communities, but what happens when those people advance the very political and corporate interests that hurt us?" (Davila Jr., 2019, p. 5). I offer the examples of former Mexican President Felipe Calderon, a Harvard alum, who perpetuated government corruption, advanced U.S. corporate interests under the guise of free trade, and furthered the exploitation of Mexican workers (Ackerman, 2019; Fernández-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Harvey, 2007), as well as President Barack Obama, also a Harvard alum, who proceeded to support charter schools, public-private partnerships, and increased corporate influence (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; Kantor & Lowe, 2013). Moreover, other studies have documented how President Obama employed racial narratives to advance My Brother's Keeper, including: (a) adhering to individual-level narratives about academic success (Dumas, 2016), (b) placing blame on family structures (Crenshaw, 2014), and (c) opposition to "big government" (Haney-López, 2014), in favor of a much weaker, less comprehensive form of support—corporate philanthropy (Giridharadas, 2018).

Taken together, these findings remind us that merit, academic success, and the zero-sum phenomenon, deserve critical scrutiny. Here, one can witness how the current educational structure guarantees inequality and how Men of Color, who climb the social ladder, at times, take on positions that reproduce unequal structures and dominant ideologies. Importantly, I put forth that *diversifying an unequal structure does not eliminate the fact that our structure is unequal*. In a critical discourse analysis, Lim (2014) demonstrates how neoliberal logics are embedded in educational curricula. Lim's (2014) analysis of *Thinking Skills* reveals how it:

> privileges utility over empathy, and logic over intuition; it deals with abstract, intellectual principles while neglecting or downplaying the emotions; it is aggressive and confrontational rather than collegial and collaborative; and that is individualistic and prizes personal autonomy over community and relationship. (p. 65)

This study reminds us that the underlying logics of academic success—competition, individualism, and dominance—are firmly rooted in European notions of masculinity (hooks, 2000). Academic success, then, becomes intimately connected to the reproduction of masculinity and whiteness (Collins & Bilge, 2016).

Discourses of Practicality

The field of education is widely recognized as an "applied" field, where researchers examine and identify *practical* applications to support schools, teachers, and students. It is assumed that knowledge generated will aim to increase student outcomes and reduce disparities vis-à-vis race, gender, and social class. Funding for research and requests to engage in research, especially in K-12 schools, are typically accepted or rejected based on *practical* contributions. Practicality is central to the work we do. Considering the insights of Tuck and Yang (2018), however, we must ask the following questions: What does justice want? How is our focus on "practicality" limited? And, does justice necessitate that we consider, engage, and imagine what is otherwise deemed "impractical"?

The COVID-19 era sparked battles on several fronts: policing, healthcare, and certainly, education. Teachers and administrators were tasked with paramount duties, from developing online curricula to implementing safety measures for their students—often with few resources,

especially among public school personnel. These times and crises remind us how all aspects of human life, including healthcare, employment, and policing, are intimately connected and shape students' academic trajectories (Noguera, 2011). In response, educators are calling for ways to reimagine schools, and activists are calling for efforts to defund the police and redirect tax-payer money to public resources, including education. Political opposition to defunding the police has come from both Democrats and Republicans. Yet, the impact of a redistribution of public monies would benefit Black and Latino boys immensely. The Sentencing Project (2013) found that one of three Black boys and one of six Latino boys born in 2013 can expect to spend time in prison.

From defunding the police to reopening public schools, *discourses of practicality* are central to the reproduction of inequality and business-as-usual. Using this phrase, I refer to discourses that (1) obfuscate, shut down, or dilute calls for social justice, and/or (2) reproduce social conditions by framing actions that run counter to the status quo as illogical or unrealistic. For contemporary examples, consider the following political statements:

> Donald J. Trump (2020) - "I disagree with @CDCgov on their very tough & expensive guidelines for opening schools. While they want them open, they are asking schools to do very **impractical** [emphasis added] things. I will be meeting with them!!!"

> Evans and Ellenbogen (2020) in the *Tampa Bay Times* - "Gualtieri, one of [Florida's] most influential law enforcement leaders, has called the police abolition movement 'dangerous' and '**unrealistic**.'"

> Harris (2020) in *Democrat & Chronicle* - "Adding to those concerns with an **impractical** suggestion like defunding the police is irresponsible and misguided. Our energies can be better spent on developing true police reform not chasing foolish ideas."

> Gutman (2020) in the *Seattle Times* - "[Sue Rahr, a former King County sheriff and the executive director of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission] thinks it's '**unrealistic** and inappropriate' to ask officers to respond to dangerous situations without firearms."

In each case, discourses of practicality serve not as conclusions drawn from evaluative efforts, but rather, as declaratives and rejections of otherwise possibilities.

In the first case, Trump seeks to reopen public schools and create the impression of business-as-usual by endangering the lives of students and school personnel. In the second and third, top law enforcement leaders dismiss the idea of police abolition by calling into question its practicality. Last, in the fourth, the executive director of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission declares that police must respond with firearms by framing efforts to disarm as impossible. Parallels exist in other arenas. One must only consider Medicare-for-All and calls to abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement (or "ICE"). In the case of Medicare-for-All, Sarlin (2019) for *NBC News* reported, "Joe Biden and other Democratic presidential candidates…have decried it as **unrealistic** and overly disruptive." For the latter, abolishing ICE, *The Atlantic* (2018) reported, "One Democratic Senate staffer, who requested anonymity to speak candidly, called the movement 'a waste of time…**Realistically**, ICE is not going to be abolished.'"

Discourses of practicality quickly emerged to shut down these proposals by members of Congress, who frequently vote in favor of status-quo, neoliberal policies (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; Harvey, 2007). In effect, these discourses operate to constrict the realm of possibilities (Wodak & Meyer, 2015), frame business-as-usual as an inevitable future (Fairclough, 2013), and as Althusser (2006) might argue, interpellate the subject into a dominant ideology. Scholars in the field of critical discourse studies show us how discourse is never neutral (Rosa, 2019; Santa Ana, 2002), and instead, operates as the main vehicle for ideology (Fairclough, 2013). Discourses of practicality in the field of education limit our realm of possibilities, constrict our imagination, and cast the current structure of education as an inevitable future or as "common sense" (à la Gramsci, 2000). Discourse, as a structural process, socializes us to develop ways of being and ways of thinking that often unknowingly shape what counts as rational, pragmatic, and by extension, reproduces social structures (Haney-López, 2014; Santa Ana, 2002). Importantly, discourses of practicality within the context of social justice and political mobilization cannot be products of logical or scientific reasoning, as these demands are pointing to a future that is yet to come, a future that does not exist yet. In the words of Angel D'Angelo, who founded *Restorative Justice Coalition* after the killing of Jesus Cervantes in 2017, "Everything's always impossible until it happens" (Evans & Ellenbogen, 2020).

Imagining Otherwise

In the edited chapter, "Against Prisons and the Pipeline to them," Crystal Laura (2018) writes, "I cannot, for the life of me, figure out why it is sometimes easier for us to see an impending end to the world itself than it is to see a world without prisons" (p. 19). Laura proceeds to argue that access to information is not the problem. Indeed, we have access to information now, more than ever. It is not that people fail to understand the catastrophic impact of prisons on Communities of Color. Instead, Laura argues it is our inability, as a society, to *imagine* what that world looks like—our inability to imagine abolition. In writing about abolition, and specifically, abolition democracy, Angela Davis (2005) writes that any institution that inflicts violence and suffering (e.g., prisons, enhanced interrogation facilities, etc.) must be abolished for democracy to emerge. In other words, no effort to reform these institutions will eliminate their complicity in marginalization. We must, therefore, abolish and imagine otherwise.

The question remains: How might we reimagine education to serve a more transformative end? I argue, in alignment with Ashon Crawley (2014), that it begins by disrupting normativity and exploring the unlimited possibilities that exist beyond our current structure. Imagining otherwise in education, like Davis' (2005) notion of abolition democracy, entails the elimination of all processes, logics, and technologies in education that sustain inequality, such as standardized testing (Fischer et al., 1996), selective enrollment (Meiners, 2010), competition (Lim, 2014), and tracking (Oakes, 1985). Imagining otherwise entails that we segue into a more loving and harmonious world, where learning is a communal act; where learning is rooted in notions of sustainability; and, where learning promotes a critical uptake of democracy. Following the insights of other critical scholars (Crawley, 2014; Harney & Moten, 2013; Laura, 2018; Shange, 2019), imagining otherwise—within the context of this paper—refers to (1) abolishing oppressive institutions, (2) rejecting discourses of practicality, and (3) delving into areas that are otherwise deemed impractical, unrealistic, and impossible.

Imagining otherwise begins with abolition, and specifically, the abolition of a society that inflicts or *may* inflict pain and suffering (Harney & Moten, 2013). In line with this argument, Angela Davis (2005) describes abolition democracy as, "the abolition of institutions that advance

the dominance of any one group over any other" (p. 14). Abolition, then, is a means to an end, a road to democracy that is to come. Davis draws from Du Bois' (2017) notion of abolition democracy, such that it is not primarily nor merely a negative process of destruction, but also building and creating new institutions. Several caveats emerge, however. As Jack Halberstam reminds us, "We cannot say what new structures will replace the ones we live with yet, because once we have torn shit down, we will inevitably see more and see differently and feel a new sense of wanting and being and becoming" (as cited in Harney & Moten, 2013, p.6). I can, therefore, only present what I yearn now: sustainability, love, and democracy. A transformative education would, then, center itself around and build from these principles. A glimpse into history may give us hints.

In the book, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality,* Manuel and Posluns (1974) argued that technologies mediate our relationship with nature. It is symbolic, then, that most Indigenous technologies were and are related to food, clothing, housing, and medicine. These innovations exemplify Indigenous values and the way principles of sustainability and relation to land, guided how Indigenous societies were and continue to be organized; as opposed to Europeans, who at the time of Columbus, had innovated mostly along the lines of transportation and instruments of war (e.g., ships, wagons, steelware, certain breeds of horses, and guns). Most importantly, Manuel and Posluns (1974) argue that Indigenous "gifts" were available to anyone who needed them, including Europeans.

Harney and Moten (2013) put forth the notion of the undercommons, wherein critical projects, abolition, and radical possibilities are imagined and take place. According to Harney and Moten (2013), the undercommons are open to anyone: "the door swings open for refuge even though it may let in police agents and destruction" (p. 38). Therein, however, lies the possibility of the refugee, for whom we did this work. It also reminds us that radical work is always contested terrain, and at times, a dangerous endeavor. Returning to the notion of abolition, Harney and Moten (2013) state in conversation with each other:

> Moten: "I don't believe that what has happened in general is reparable...It can't be repaired. The only thing we can do is tear shit down completely and build something new" (p. 152).

> Harney: "For me, abolition is both about a kind of acknowledgement that, as Fred says, there's no repairing or paying back the debt...there's a whole history of debt that is not a history of debt, which doesn't need to be forgiven, but needs to become activated as a principle of social life" (p. 154).

> Moten: "Whereas, what Stefano is talking about, I think and I concur, is an abolition of credit, of the system of credit, which is to say, maybe it's an abolition of accounting" (p. 154).

I quote their interaction at great length, for it exemplifies the transactional essence of capitalist society. Everything is tracked, accounted, and labeled accordingly, which shares important parallels with education, where students are also tracked, accounted, and labeled, in preparation for the economy (Bowles & Gintis, 2011) or in preparation for prison (Rios & Galicia, 2013). In addition, Harney and Moten give us a glimpse into what is needed for abolition to transpire. Moving away from capitalism's transactional essence, they push us to think in a more

critical way, such that we should be responsive to each other's needs unequivocally and unconditionally, regardless of debts paid or how many debts exist. Likewise, a critical interpretation of a future educational space would not be based on ideologies of transaction nor efficiency, but rather, sustainability, love, and democracy, wherein our sole commitment is to care for—not keep track of—in order to support, come together, and educate.

Conclusion

Drawing from critical social theory and critical discourse studies, the impetus for this commentary is three-fold. *First*, I highlight the (im)possibilities of academic success to encourage researchers to go beyond increasing student outcomes and take seriously the structure of education and its zero-sum nature. *Second*, I examine *discourses of practicality* to show how these discourses often serve to obstruct calls for social justice, and by extension, reproduce social conditions. And *third*, I engage the concept *imagining otherwise* to delve into a more critical and imaginative realm, thereby encouraging researchers to go beyond what is deemed practical, abolish the zero-sum phenomenon, and imagine a transformative education rooted in love, sustainability, and a critical uptake of democracy. Latino boys receive special attention herein, as this demographic has become a central target in the rise of neoliberal authoritarianism, while simultaneously, Latino boys represent a major topic of discussion in recent educational scholarship. The implications of this work, however, go far beyond Latino boys. Discourses of practicality affect all marginalized groups, and imagining otherwise promotes unique opportunities to dream about abolition and liberation from anti-Blackness, colonization, patriarchy, and other oppressive structures.

In education, it is crucial to consider ways of abolishing the zero-sum phenomenon and reimagining the future of education—free from its structural, "meritocratic" constraints. It is also important to remember: the success of a few students necessitates the exclusion of others, such as college admission to elite universities, successful completion of university "weeder" courses, and high scores on standardized tests. These meritocratic technologies operate under the guise of identifying the most talented students and generate unequal outcomes by design. One should, therefore, deploy critical scrutiny against calls to raise academic success when they fail to contest the structure that maintains and reproduces unequal outcomes. A fundamental change in the way we conceptualize education, therefore, is a fruitful avenue to transforming social conditions for Latino boys and other marginalized youth.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, E. F. (2019). Neoliberalism and corruption in Mexico: A wolf in sheep's clothing. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 51(2), 174-179. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714839.2019.1617485

Adame, D., Aguiar, A., Armenta, C., Bartelheim, J., Ceja, L., Cerón, K., Chamu, J., Contreras, N., Corral, F., De Anda, I., De La Torre, J., Dealba, V., Del Real Viramontes, M., Escobar, E., Esquivel, O., Figueroa, S., Garcia, J., Garcia, L., Gaytan, O., … Torres, E. (2017). The President's intent: Preliminary findings of a critical discourse analysis of trump's speeches and tweets from the date of his candidacy to mid-September 2017. César E. Chávez Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies, University of California, Los Angeles. https://www.thepresidentsintent.com/full-report

Althusser, L. (2006). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, 9(1), 86-98.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 67-92. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748016200106

Bedolla, L. G. (2010). Good ideas are not enough: Considering the politics underlying students' postsecondary transitions. *Journal of Education for Students placed at risk, 15*(1-2), 9-26.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (2011). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Haymarket Books.

Cerda-Jara, M. Elster, A. & Harding, D. J. (2020). *Criminal record stigma in college-educated labor market. Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, University of California, Berkeley*.   https://irle.berkeley.edu/files/2020/05/Harding_Jara-Cerda-Elster-brief.pdf

Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons.

Conchas, G. Q. (2006). *The color of success: Race and high-achieving urban youth*. Teachers College Press.

Conchas, G. Q., & Vigil, J. D. (2012). *Streetsmart schoolsmart: Urban poverty and the education of adolescent boys*. Teachers College Press.

Crawley, A. (2014, December 6). Between 4'52". The normal school: A literary magazine. https://www.thenormalschool.com/blog/2017/11/28/between-452-by-ashon-crawley

Crenshaw, K. (2014). The girls Obama forgot. *The New York Times*.   http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/30/opinion/Kimberl-Williams-Crenshaw-My-Brothers- Keeper-Ignores-Young-Black-Women.html?_r=0

Davis, A. Y. (2005). *Abolition democracy: Beyond empire, prisons, and torture*. Seven Stories Press.

Davila Jr., O. (2019). When Academic Success Is Insufficient. *Urban Education*, 1-6.

Davila Jr., O., Berumen, J., Baquedano-López, P., (2015). Fostering academic success among latino men in higher education. Retrieved from https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/content/qt4h4768np/qt4h4768np.pdf

Dixon-Román, E. J. (2017). *Inheriting possibility: Social reproduction and quantification in education*. University of Minnesota Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2017). *Black Reconstruction in America: Toward a history of the part which black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America, 1860-1880*. Routledge.

Dumas, M. J. (2016). My brother as "problem": Neoliberal governmentality and interventions for black young men and boys. *Educational Policy, 30*(1), 94-113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616487

Evans, J., & Ellenbogen, R. (2020, June 19). How 'defund the police' went mainstream, and what that means. Tampa Bay Times. https://www.tampabay.com/news/2020/06/19/how-defund-the-police-went-mainstream-and-what-that-means/

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The study of language*. Routledge.

Fergus, E., Noguera, P., & Martin, M. (2014). *Schooling for resilience: Improving the life trajectory of Black and Latino boys*. Harvard Education Press.

Fernández-Kelly, P., & Massey, D. S. (2007). Borders for whom? The role of NAFTA in Mexico-US migration. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*(1), 98-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716206297449

Fischer, C. S., Hout, M., Jankowski, M. S., Lucas, S. R., Swidler, A., & Voss, K. (1996). *Inequality by design: Cracking the bell curve myth*. Princeton University Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder & Herder.

Giridharadas, A. (2018). *Winners take all: The elite charade of changing the world*. Vintage.

Giroux, H. A. (2018). *American nightmare: Facing the challenge of fascism*. City Lights Books.

Godfrey, E. (2018, July 11). What "abolish ICE" actually means. The Atlantic. https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/07/what-abolish-ice-actually-means/564752/

Gonzales, L. D., & Núñez, A. M. (2014). The ranking regime and the production of knowledge: Implications for academia. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 22*(31), 1-24.

Gramsci, A. (2000). *The Antonio Gramsci reader: Selected writings 1916-1935*. New York University Press.

Gringlas, S. (2020, June 8). Biden opposes defunding police, campaign says. NPR. https://www.npr.org/sections/live-updates-protests-for-racial-justice/2020/06/08/872376757/biden-opposes-defunding-police-campaign-says

Gutman, D. (2020, June 15). If Seattle police's budget is cut in half, as protesters want, what should happen next? Seattle Times. https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/protesters-want-to-cut-seattle-polices-budget-by-half-what-does-that-look-like/

Haney, C., & Hurtado, A. (1994). The jurisprudence of race and meritocracy. *Law and Human Behavior, 18*(3), 223-248.

Haney-López, I. (2014). *Dog whistle politics: How coded racial appeals have reinvented racism and wrecked the middle class*. Oxford University Press.

Harney, S., & Moten, F. (2013). *The Undercommons: Fugitive planning and Black study*. Autonomedia.

Harper, S. R., & Associates. (2014). Succeeding in the city: A report from the new york city black and Latino male high school achievement study. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education.

Harris, A. L., & Tienda, M. (2012). Hispanics in higher education and the Texas top 10% law. *Race and Social Problems, 4*(1), 57-67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-012-9065-7

Harris, W. (2020, June 26). Essay: Defunding the police an impractical, misguided suggestion. Democrat & Chronicle. https://www.democratandchronicle.com/story/opinion/guest-column/2020/06/26/essay-defunding-police-impractical-misguided-suggestion/3265095001/

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Pluto Press.

Hurtado, A., & Sinha, M. (2016). *Beyond machismo: Intersectional Latino masculinities*. University of Texas Press.

Kantor, H., & Lowe, R. (2013). Educationalizing the welfare state and privatizing education: The evolution of social policy since The New Deal. In P. Carter & K. Welner (Eds.), *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 25-39). Oxford University Press.

Karabel, J. (2006). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Labaree, D. F. (2010). *Someone has to fail: The zero-sum game of public schooling*. Harvard University Press.

Laura, C. T. (2018). Against prisons and the pipeline to them. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Toward what justice? Describing diverse dreams of justice in education* (29-45). Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education.* Teachers College Press.

Lim, L. (2014). Ideology, rationality and reproduction in education: A critical discourse analysis. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*(1), 61-76. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.739467

López-Figueroa, J. (2016). The geography of academic support: A framework to understand latino male perceptions and practices in higher education. In V.B. Sáenz, L. Ponjuán, & J. López-Figueroa (Eds.), *Ensuring the success of latino males in higher education* (pp. 43-59). Stylus.

Manuel, G., & Posluns, M. (1974). *The fourth world: An Indian reality*. Free Press.

Meiners, E. R. (2010). *Right to be hostile: Schools, prisons, and the making of public enemies*. Routledge.

Mireles-Rios, R., Rios, V. M., Auldridge-Reveles, T., Monroy, M., & Castro, I. (2020). "I was pushed out of school": Social and emotional approaches to a youth promotion program. *Journal of Leadership, Equity, and Research*, 6(1), 1-21.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). The condition of education 2015. Washington DC: US Department of Education. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015144.pdf

Noguera, P. A. (2011). A broader and bolder approach uses education to break the cycle of poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93 (3), 8-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109300303

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track*. Yale University Press.

Rios, V. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino boys*. New York University Press.

Rios, V., & Galicia, M. G. (2013). Smoking guns or smoke and mirrors?: Schools and the policing of Latino boys. *Journal of the Association of Mexican American Educators, 7*(3), 54-66.

Rosa, J. (2019). *Looking like a language, sounding like a race*. Oxford University Press.

Saénz, V. B., & Ponjuan, L. (2011). Men of color: Ensuring the academic success of Latino males in higher education. The Institute for Higher Education Policy. http://www.ihep.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/pubs/brief_men_of_color_latinos.pdf

Saénz, V. B., Ponjuán, L., & López-Figueroa, J. (2016). *Ensuring the success of Latino males in higher education: A national imperative*. Stylus Publishing.

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. University of Texas Press.

Sarlin, B. (2019, July 17). Bernie Sanders hits back at 'medicare for all' critics in speech. NBC News. https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/bernie-sanders-hits-back-medicare-all-critics-speech-n1031021

Shange, S. (2019). *Progressive dystopia: Abolition, anti-blackness, and schooling in San Francisco*. Duke University Press.

Singh, M. V. (2020). Resisting the neoliberal role model: Latino male mentors' perspectives on the intersectional politics of role modeling. *American Educational Research Journal.* https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831220954861.

Solomon, B. J. (2015). On being maladjusted to injustice. *Explore*, 18, 14-17.

The Sentencing Project. (2013). Report of the sentencing project to the United Nations human rights committee: Regarding racial disparities in the United States criminal justice system. The Sentencing Project. https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Race-and-Justice-Shadow-Report-ICCPR.pdf

Trump, D. J. [@realdonaldtrump]. (2020, July 8). I disagree with @CDCgov on their very tough & expensive guidelines for opening schools. While they want them open, they [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1280857657365200902?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1280857657365200902%7Ctwgr%5E&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Flegacy.npr.org%2Ftemplates%2Fpreview%2FtwitterPreview.php%3FtweetId%3D1280857657365200902hideMedia%3Dtrue

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (Eds.). (2018). *Toward what justice?: Describing diverse dreams of justice in education*. Routledge.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies*. Sage.