Educating for Democracy with and against Divisive Discourses: Presidential and Editorial Opening Remarks

Leslee Grey
Queens College/Citty University of New York
and
Greg Seals
College of Staten Island/City University of New York

Abstract: NYSFEA President Leslee Grey analyzes Michael Apple's description of right-wing politics as an amalgam of overlapping but disparate ideologies and his further observation that liberal politics needs to reconstruct its philosophical traditions. Analysis reveals several ideas for undoing damage done to educational policy/practice by the right and advancing democratic educational policies/practices endorsed by the left. Grey's co-editor, Greg Seals, discusses contributions to *Educational Abundance* 2024 in terms of Grey's strategic suggestions. Authors explore tailoring classroom instruction/school administration to student need/aspiration, transforming teacher authoritarianism into teacher authoritativeness, reconsidering knowledge as the right to justification, redefining democracy as active pursuit of peace, and reframing morality as enacted social harmony.

I appreciate the opportunity to kick off the 50th gathering of the New York State Foundations of Education Association (NYSFEA) with an exploration related to this year's conference theme, "Divisive Concepts and Critical Conversations." My interest in "divisive concepts" legislation has developed from my experiences teaching graduate-level courses in Social Studies curriculum theory. My students tend to be in the early stages of their careers, with the majority teaching US history. At the beginning and mid-point of each semester, I ask the class to submit topics they would like to see included in the course. Over the last two years (2023-2024), some version of "how to teach controversial topics" has dominated their requests. While this information is anecdotal, I have little doubt that in the current political climate, even in New York City-area schools, teachers are concerned and even fearful about teaching "authentic" US history. Teaching and learning have long been affected by top-down mandates and standardization measures that de-professionalize teachers and diminish their sense of autonomy when it comes to curricular choices (Ross et al., 2014). Nowhere is the ideological attack on education in the United States more evident than in the highly contested Social Studies curriculum; and at this particular moment, the stakes seem unusually high. Shiloah and Bohan (2023, p. 2) warn that current scrutiny of teachers may carry more serious consequences than in the past due to "standards, accountability, and legislation that could lead to penalties, job loss, and [in the most extreme states] possible imprisonment." Social Studies is where students learn about not only US history but also about sociological frameworks relating to race, class, gender, socioeconomic structures, political systems, and power relations. The field of Social Studies is also where teachers have historically experienced some freedom in the curricular materials they select for their lessons (Clark et al., 2021). The recent spate of "divisive concepts" legislation in the United States (for example, Florida's Stop W.O.K.E. Act of 2022, or Stop Wrongs to Our Kids and Employees Act, formerly known as the Individual Freedom Act) seeks to legislate conservative-leaning ideologies related to race, gender, sexuality, religion, and capitalism, as well as other social and political beliefs. This legislation affects all teachers and learners in all subject areas; however, due to the nature of the content matter, Social Studies and History education are particular targets.

Supporters of divisive concepts legislation claim that educational institutions have indoctrinated Americans into "woke" identity politics, which has led the nation to become less

unified and more polarized (Hornbeck & Malin, 2023). Divisive concepts laws purportedly aim to shield learners from feeling "discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of psychological distress" related to their *own* race or gender (Stop W.O.K.E. Act, HB 7, 2022). With the assumption that all education initiatives are rooted in conceptions of what it means to be a good citizen, moral person, and contributor to society (Berliner & Glass, 2014), divisive concepts legislation seeks to promote a sense of national unity by compelling Americans to see themselves as individuals rather than as members of contentious identity-based groups. These mandates quash teaching and learning about historical collective movements and possible participation in present-day, justice-oriented movements (Martell & Stevens, 2023).

A growing body of research offers in-depth analyses of divisive concepts legislation proposed and/or passed in numerous states (Dee, 2022; Ellison, 2022; Russell-Brown, 2022; Salvador et al., 2023; Sheppard, 2023; Shiloh & Boham, 2023). An essential point this research brings into clear focus is divisive concepts legislation functions as part of a broader social and political movement that fosters hostility toward democracy and its processes and institutions, including education, which has been historically viewed an essential component of democracy (Beane & Apple, 1995; Dewey, 1916; Giroux, 1989; Gore, 1993; Gutmann, 1999; Nussbaum, 2010). To contextualize the present era of divisive discourse in education, I will begin this discussion by summarizing a few key ideas at the "core" of divisive concepts legislation. Then I will turn to a few prominent theorists — Dewey (1916), Habermas (1996), Freire (1996), and hooks (2014) — to glean an understanding of the relationship between education and democracy. In other words, I attempt to establish what democracy and education *should do* relative to one another, to develop a normative framework that can serve as a tool for comparing educational discourses and practices that support democracy as opposed to those that seek to undermine democracy. Ultimately, I am interested in critically exploring how ideological forces work on educational discourses. For example, in a related inquiry currently underway, I seek to understand how educational discourses are mobilized by the convergence of seemingly disparate ideologies as in the case of *The 1776 Report* (The President's 1776 Advisory Commission, January 18, 2021), the Trump administration's reactionary polemic against the orientation to critical race theory expressed in *The 1619 Project* (Hannah-Jones, 2021). These and other divisive educational discourses, broadly conceived to include conversations, organized movements, policies, and proposals, can be understood as working within an assemblage that I refer to as a "big rightist ideological tent" that aims to steer a collective national identity away from democratic ideals, processes, and institutions. For the present discussion, I will lean on the analysis offered in Apple's 2006 work, *Educating the Right Way*, which offers a framework for understanding how ideological forces intersect and compel support of divisive educational discourses and, particularly, divisive concepts legislation. The following section provides a brief introduction to some "core" ideas that undergird divisive concepts legislation.

Getting at the Core of Divisive Concepts Legislation

As of April, 2024, some 250 governmental bodies at the federal, state, and local levels introduced policies, bills, or executive orders to ban divisive concepts in publicly funded educational institutions (Lantz & Carter, 2024). Put simply, the legislation aims at prohibiting educators and related professionals from teaching or engaging in conversations involving ideas that are deemed productive of dissension. Although most of the legislation is aimed at primary and secondary education, several states have proposed similar laws for higher education. Some bans encompass not only classroom teaching but also professional development training such as

workshops related to sensitivity training, diversity, unconscious bias, and other topics viewed as influenced by critical race theory (Kelly, 2023). What these initiatives prescribe is often unclear, possibly by design to generate confusion and fear (Schoorman & Gatens, 2024). Lantz and Carter (2024) highlight characteristically vague phrasing of the proposals: Under some bills, educators may teach a topic on the "prohibited" list as long as they do not require students to "agree with" the topic; however, teachers who "err on the side of caution" may completely avoid concepts that are essential for understanding complex social phenomena (Lantz & Carter, 2024). Despite the opacity, it is widely understood that "non-dominant perspectives are under attack." Florida provides just one example that aims to prohibit the inclusion of "theories of systemic racism, sexism, oppression, and privilege" (SB 266). In some states, merely exposing learners to concepts such as gender fluidity is considered political indoctrination (Combs, 2024), a construction that (ironically) frames the banning of speech as preserving the First Amendment. This interpretation supports a negative conception of freedom, in other words, *freedom from* progressive or leftist indoctrination. Negative freedom has seemingly gained a stronger hold on divisive discourse than a positive conception of freedom (i.e., *freedom to* explore on one's own auspices ideas, interests, identities, subjectivities, and so forth). To establish what education in a democracy *should do*, the following section summarizes ideas offered by a few prominent theorists concerned with the relationship between education and democracy. Their ideas provide an entry into discerning between educational discourses and practices that aim to support democracy and educational discourses that seek to undermine democracy.

Education for Democracy; Democracy for Education

My analysis of the mutually-affecting relation between democracy and education is guided by the premise put forth by Dewey and likeminded thinkers that, in the United States, education is an essential and constituent feature of democracy (Brown, 2015; Dewey, 1916). Furthermore, a citizenry educated to critically explore, investigate, and question social domains is essential for democracy to flourish (Grey & Shudak, 2018). Knowledge is not the privilege of the few, but a fundamental right of all. Some key ideas may summarize this tradition of scholarship on the interconnectedness of democracy and education. As a starting point consider Dewey's (1916, p. 87) conception of the relation between democracy and education: "…a government resting upon popular suffrage cannot be successful unless those who elect and who obey their governors are educated. Since a democratic society repudiates the principle of external authority, it must find a substitute in voluntary disposition and interest; these can be created only by education."

For Dewey (1916), democracy requires education that fosters the habits and dispositions necessary for active participation in democratic processes, which include critical thinking, open-mindedness, and collaborative problem-solving. In a democracy, relationships between leaders and citizens (and, *mutatis mutandis*, between teachers and students) must be built on shared decision-making and trust. Likewise, for Habermas (1996), education that prepares citizens to engage in rational discourse and democratic deliberation fosters the conditions for participatory democracy. However, deliberation, dialogue, and conversation in itself does not guarantee that all voices will be included or heard equally (Biesta, 2009). Educators in the critical camp point out that much of US schooling remains characterized by external power and traditional hierarchies, wherein teaching is didactic, and learning is characterized by passive acceptance and recall. For Freire (1996) and hooks (2014), education should empower marginalized communities, challenge oppressive structures, and promote critical consciousness so that individuals may work toward a more democratic, just, and equitable society. Education in a

diverse and pluralistic society should enable individuals to engage in inquiry, dialogue, and deliberation, even when (and perhaps *especially* when) those processes produce disagreements or divisions. It is important to note that none of these theorists support upholding conventions such as "external authority" for the sake of preserving tradition or maintaining the status quo. Education policies, practices, and discourses that prohibit the utterance of an idea simply because the idea *could* question traditional understandings inhibit the types of inquiry, dialogue, and collective problem-solving that are essential to democracy. To extend this line of thinking, when divisive concepts legislation prohibits teachers and learners from participating in educational processes that are foundational to and necessary for "thick" versions of democracy (Crowley & Apple, 2010), these legislative initiatives and the public discourses that surround them deny opportunity for engaging in democracy as a way of living together.

The recent spate of legislation in the US regarding "divisive concepts" serves as an entry point into understanding the political and ideological discourses shaping not only the direction of public education but also, on a larger level, the direction of democracy itself. The concepts deemed divisive challenge national narratives (myths) of equality, meritocracy, and American exceptionalism. Boler's (et al., 2024, p. 15) analysis of social media platforms finds that policy discourses function as "performance spaces for the melodramatic staging of identity politics and narratives of nationhood, race, and justice." For those who have traditionally benefitted from the production and circulation of national myths, concepts that disrupt power (or even bring a sense of discomfort to certainty regarding traditional opinion) are *divisive*. Importantly, the power-disrupting ideas are not simply "controversial," which could imply there are multiple perspectives or sides to an issue worthy of debate and reconciliation into more adequate ideas. Instead, as Boler and colleagues (p. 15) posit, policy initiatives are presented in "ritualized affective discourses [that] constitute the basic script for polarization and partisan debate." Leaving no room for mediation among competing conceptions, "divisive" is the more immediate construct, as it implies ideas are dividing a nation that would otherwise be united. When concepts and frameworks that reveal structural or systemic inequalities are constructed as always-already "divisive"; rightist rhetoric names and frames the problem and fosters hostility towards trying to work things out together. Manufacturing mutual hostility serves the purpose of garnering support for radically conservative and anti-democratic state-level education reforms. At first glance, these discourses may appear easy targets to ridicule or dismiss. When strategically mobilized to steer US education in anti-democratic directions, however, they cannot be ignored. I now turn to a discussion of Apple's (2006) analysis of right-wing politics, which I find essential for understanding the ways in which rightist ideologies converge under a "big tent" to steer educational discourses.

An Assembly of Rightist Ideologies

My understanding of ideologically divisive discourses leans heavily on Apple's (2006, p. 49) analysis of "conservative modernization," signaled by an alliance of right-leaning political factions and their efforts to reform US education. In *Educating the Right Way*, Apple analyzes the intersection of three rightist ideological factions steering the US: neoconservatism, neoliberalism, and authoritarian populism. I will briefly summarize these three strands, focusing on their intersectional perspectives on society and schooling. Apple's concept of conservative modernization includes a fourth strand, "the professional and managerial middle class" (p. 48). This strand doesn't necessarily share the ideologies of the other three, but it possesses the technical expertise needed to implement discourses and policies supported by the other strands

and it relies on the other strands to maintain its socioeconomic position. Neoliberal views are driven by the belief that the free market is the best, most efficient/effective way to sort out all matters, public and private, including education (Brown, 2015; Rose, 1996). Neoconservatism, on the other hand, is influenced by a romanticized nostalgia, a view of the past when religious and moral truths were predetermined ("back when" there was less cultural diversity, only two genders, and the man-led nuclear family was the main unit of society). In a neoconservative view, schools are to create patriotic citizens and to assimilate the newly immigrated into American values, customs, language, religion and other cultural realms. State educational standards exist to ensure the correct stories and values are learned. The last strand is authoritarian populism. Authoritarian populists are (p. 9) "religious fundamentalists and conservative evangelicals who want a return to (their) God in all of our institutions." Authoritarian populists view public schooling as reflecting the evils of a Godless society; they believe they are under attack, as "their traditions are disrespected [and] the very basis of their understanding of the world is threatened" (p. 134). Authoritarian populists share some commonalities with neoconservatives such as embracing traditional, heteronormative gender roles; however, unlike neoconservatives, who support a weak state, authoritarian populists support a strong state that will enforce their moral views. For this triptych, truth provides certainty in an uncertain world: for neoconservatism, all men are created equal; for authoritarian populism, power is bestowed by God; and for neoliberalism, market forces provide freedom and choice to individuals, who make rational, informed decisions that are rewarded by meritocratic processes.

Apple's (2006) framework reveals how the ideologies of neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and authoritarian populism formed an alliance over shared support of standardization in education, which diminished teachers' autonomy and professional decision-making. For these groups, public school is a microcosm for everything that's wrong with society: Diversity and inclusion initiatives unfairly stack the deck toward women and minorities, and the feminization of the teaching profession weakens masculinity. Emphasizing social and emotional learning and referring to students by their preferred names and pronouns are viewed as taking authority away from parents. In a neoliberal framing, standardization is a way to ensure accountability so that schools can be ranked, and informed parents can make the best choices for their children. Even parents who consider themselves liberal-leaning tend to make schooling decisions based on what's good for their own children rather than what's good for society or democracy.

Concluding Thoughts

Published at the dawn of G.W. Bush's first presidential term, Apple's (2006/first edition, 2002) analysis remains timely and relevant for understanding the current landscape of education reform in which the interests of seemingly disparate groups intersect to produce and mobilize divisive discourses that play into cultural fears. That state-run schools seek to control students' thinking, indoctrinate students, and otherwise quash independent thinking is but one discourse that the right has spun from ideas that were previously considered left-leaning. For example, prominent critics on the left such as Postman (1996), Giroux (1984), and Apple and Beane (1995) warned of the indoctrinating practices of traditional schooling. Furthermore, recent calls to "drain the swamp" by electing leaders who have no previous experience in public service, coupled with performances such as the recent vitriol toward Anthony Fauci's stance on vaccinations, indicate the right appears to have adopted a dismissive view of expert knowledge that could very well have been borrowed from a Foucauldian critique of power. Likewise, a postmodern construct of truth has morphed into the current "post-truth" era (Nelson, 2019, p.

77), in which appeals to belief and emotion are more influential than a call for facts and objectivity

This analysis is not intended to compress right-leaning forces into a homogeneous group; the converging strands in Apple's analysis demonstrate diversity of thought as well as shared thought, which is why I find the "big rightist ideological tent" to be an apt metaphor for this assemblage. Apple (2006, p. 133) points out that the right has "been successful in part because they have taken the rhetoric of what they see as hegemonic liberalism and recast around their own core concerns," circulating a notion of "common sense" that resonates with "people's understandings of their real material and cultural lives" (p. 226). This is not to suggest that the left and right share no common educational concerns. To be sure, individuals on the left are just as concerned as those on the right about school violence, social mobility, and their own children's educational success. For Apple (p. 201), "the task is to disentangle the elements of good sense evident in these concerns from the selfish and antipublic agenda that has been pushing concerned parents and community members into the arms of the conservative restoration." Apple suggests that because the right shares some educational concerns with the left, the left may have the opportunity to reappropriate these conversations, beginning with listening more carefully to the concerns of parents and families. But Apple's ideas offer many more options for (re)constructive democratic inquiry in and about education. Conceptualizing the right as a braided coalition of ideologies points out places where the braids can show potential for unravelling. Neoliberal market values rest uneasily beside the values of their political bedfellows, neoconservative nostalgia and authoritarian populist religiosity. As Thompson (2016) notes, issues surrounding invitro fertilization, considered a form of abortion from a religious authoritarian perspective and from the neoliberal perspective as a lucrative business opportunity, have caught the right between a Rock (of Ages) and a hard (market)place. Authoritarian and conservative wishes for a strong state work against neoliberal desire for a market free from government interference. In addition, Apple implies the need for self-criticality from the left, as liberals rethink the meanings of their own attacks on tradition in ways that more completely propose positive, flexible plans for new ways of living with each other and understanding and responding to the diversities among us.

Papers appearing in this year's NYSFEA journal, *Educational Abundance* 2024, show scholars and researchers at work exploiting for democratic purposes the interstices Apple identifies in the patchwork of right-wing ideologies. Tim Monreal and Iman Lathan (p. 91) move us away from essentialized conceptions of race, ethnicity, etc., and towards understanding of these attributions as part of lived experience in social context. Robert Niewiadomski, Ruoyi Zhang, and Jianing Li (p. 101) look at relations between cultural capital of students and students' occupational aspirations as a way of adapting schooling to address students' life chances. And Rupam Saran (p. 107) describes successful mentoring of students enrolled in a class at the same time they are facing familial, financial, and health crises.

Perhaps teacher authoritativeness provides an acceptable alternative to teacher authoritarianism. Vicki Dagostino-Kalniz' (p. 80) insistence that learning via sharing of ideas in democratic discussion instead of remembering ideas presented in Fascist environments of dictation is the surest way to student mastery of curriculum resonates with Greg Seals and Mark Garrison's (p. 65) argument that fluency is preferrable to competency when learning curriculum material. Anne Shields and Madhu Narayanan (p. 48) and Holly Marcolina (p. 21) discuss, respectively, the *je ne sais quoi* teachers bring to lesson planning and to extra-curricular

activities. Amanda M. Kingston and colleagues at Syracuse University (p. 36) relate their experiences teaching preservice teachers how to assess student effort in ways motivating students to learn rather than preventing students from trying. Lori-Ann Newman's (p. 57) proposal that US and world history curriculum focus on societal issues yet to be resolved may interest middle class social managers, who make social policies work in the day-to-day world, as a means of making their jobs easier by creating social conditions more effortlessly manageable than those currently imposed from the right. All these activities contribute powerfully to a shared sense of individuality among students.

Finally, panelists discussing Dale Snauwaert's *Teaching Peace as a Matter of Justice* offer reconsideration of foundational principles on the left. Janet Gerson (p.122) explores the idea of peace as the positive presence of justice rather than the absence of violence and finds a synonymity between democracy and the peaceful society. Greg Seals (p. 133 reconsiders what it means to be moral at school and beyond in terms of production of social harmony sung together by voices sometimes tuned to dissonant pitches. Jeffery Warnke (p. 128) takes on post-truth by arguing that knowledge entails a right to justification, a right that may be exercised in a variety of ways — from the personal to the polemical to the purely rational — each with its own consequences and costs to what may be said to be true and what may be said to be known.

May you find of interest and of use these contributions to the ongoing conversation about divisive concepts and ways to turn seemingly unbridgeable divisions to discursive democratic advantage. On the Association's Golden Anniversary (and the journal's 4th — it's Flower Anniversary) the authors celebrate the NYSFEA tradition of finding Social Foundations of Education endemic to construction of high-quality education for all. The final meeting place for discussion designed to overcome divisiveness in patterns of schooling may be the point at which we come to understand that what's good for kids considered as students is also, like it or not, what's good for democratic society.

References

Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "Right" Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*. Taylor & Francis.

Beane, J. A., & Apple, M. W. (1995). *Democratic Schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berliner, D. C., & Glass, G. V. (2014). *50 Myths and Lies that Threaten America's Public Schools: The Real Crisis in Education*. Teachers College Press.

Biesta, G. (2009). Sporadic Democracy: Education, Democracy, and the Question of Inclusion. In M. S. Katz, S. Verducci, & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Education, Democracy, and the Moral Life* (pp. 101–112). Springer Netherlands.

Boler, M., Kweon, Y.-J., & Threasaigh, M. N. (2024). Digital Affect Culture and the Logics of Melodrama: Online Polarization and the January 6 Capitol Riots through the Lens of Genre and Affective Discourse Analysis. *Social Media + Society*, *10*(1), 1–18.

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. MIT Press.

Clark, C. H., Schmeichel, M., & Garrett, H. J. (2021). How Social Studies Teachers Choose News Resources for Current Events Instruction. *Harvard Educational Review*, *91*(1), 5–37.

Crowley, C. B., & Apple, M. W. (2010). Critical Democracy in Teacher Education. *Tep Vol 22-N4*, 450.

Dee, J. (2022). *Do bans on teaching "divisive concepts" interfere with students' right to know?* aaup.org. https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Dee_JAF13.pdf

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. McMillan.

Ellison, S. (2022). Crisis, Mutant Neoliberalism, & Critical Education Policy Analysis. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, *20*(2). http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/20-2-5.pdf

Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogy of the oppressed (revised). *New York: Continuum*. http://www.academia.edu/download/34621170/EDST_565_Freire__Illich__and_Liberation_Theology.pdf

Giroux, H. (1989). *Schooling for Democracy: Critical Pedagogy in the Modern Age*. Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (1984). *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling*. Temple University Press.

Gore, J. (1993). *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. Routledge.

Grey, L., & Shudak, N. (2018). Interrogating Discursive Data: How News Media Narratives Assemble Truths About the Teaching Profession. *Educational Studies*, *54*(5), 536–552.

Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic Education*. Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J., & Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. MIT Press.

Hannah-Jones, N. (2021). *The 1619 Project: A New Origin Story*. Random House USA.

Combs, B.H. (6 June 2024). A Georgia Law Restricts What Educators Say in the Classroom—But I Refuse to Be Silent. *Ms.* https://msmagazine.com/2024/06/06/georgia-law-restricts-classroom-race-dei-black-history-divisive-concepts/

hooks, B. (2014). *Teaching to transgress*. Routledge.

Hornbeck, D., & Malin, J. R. (2023). Demobilizing knowledge in American schools: censoring critical perspectives. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *10*(1), 1–13.

Kelly, L. B. (2023). What Do So-Called Critical Race Theory Bans Say? *Educational Researcher* , *52*(4), 248–250.

Lantz, P. M., & Carter, E. (2024, April 24). *State Bans on "Divisive Concepts" in Public Higher Education: Implications for Population Health*. Milbank Memorial Fund. https://www.milbank.org/quarterly/opinions/state-bans-on-divisive-concepts-in-public-higher-education-implications-for-population-health/

Martell, C. C., & Stevens, K. M. (2023). Teaching movements in history: Understanding collective action, intersectionality, and justice in the past. *The History Teacher*, *56*(3), 343–366.

Nelson, P. M. (Dis)orderly Potential: Ways Forward in "Post-truth" Social Studies. *JCT: Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*,34 (3) 2019 Special issue: 76-89.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.

Postman, N. (1996). *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*. Vintage Books.

Ross, E. W., Mathison, S., & Vinson, K. D. (2014). Social studies curriculum and teaching in the era of standardization. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 25–49). State University of New York Press.

Russell-Brown, K. (2022). "The stop WOKE act": HB 7, race, and Florida's 21st century anti-literacy campaign. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4219891

Salvador, K., Bohn, A., & Martin, A. (2023). Divisive concepts laws and music education: PK-20 music educators' perceptions and discourses. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 1–17.

Schoorman, D., & Gatens, R. (2024). Understanding Florida's HB7: A policy of intimidation by confusion. *Educational Policy.* https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048241235405

Sheppard, M. (2023). Legislating whiteness: an emotion discourse analysis of divisive concepts legislation. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 1–19.

Shiloh, M.J. and Boham, C.H. (2023). "As American as Apple Pie": Attacks on the Teaching of History and Social Science, from Social Reconstructionist Opposition to Divisive Concepts Legislation. *Journal of Philosophy & History of Education*, 1.

Rose, N. (1996). Governing "advanced" liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne, & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 37–64). Routledge.

Stitzlein, S. M. (2022). Divisive Concepts in Classrooms: A Call to Inquiry. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *41*(6), 595–612.

The President's 1776 Advisory Commission. (January 18, 2021) *The 1776 Report*: https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-Presidents-Advisory-1776-Commission-Final-Report.pdf

Thompson, C. (2016). IVF global histories, USA: Between rock and a marketplace," *Reproductive Biomedicine & Society Online* 2(June), 128-135.