

2

“WHAT’S ANTI-BLACKNESS GOT TO DO WIT IT?”

It’s not just about language or the way you talk.

Janel, Leadership Academy

Many of the youth I worked with at Leadership Academy, like Janel, depicted their experiences navigating and negotiating their racial and linguistic identities across multiple contexts in deeply complex and nuanced ways. On the one hand, as illustrated in chapter 3, many of the youth viewed Black Language as a vital linguistic resource in their communities and classrooms. Yet, many of the same youth shared stories of their experiences with what I am referring to as **Anti-Black Linguistic Racism** in these very same contexts. The youths’ experiences with Anti Black Linguistic Racism elucidate Michael Eric Dyson’s (2009) sentiments about the relationship between Black Language and Black humanity: “Every conversation about Black speech is a conversation about Black intelligence and ultimately Black humanity” (p. 1). The question that I want you to keep in mind as you read this chapter is: What is the relationship between anti Black racism and Black Language?

Anti Black Linguistic Racism describes the linguistic violence, persecution, dehumanization, and marginalization that Black Language speakers experience in schools and in everyday life. The Anti Black Linguistic Racism that the youth at Leadership Academy, as well as countless other Black people, experience and endure in communities and classrooms is not separate from the contemporary forms of anti Black racism and oppression they encounter as they navigate the world living within their Black bodies. Indeed, the marginalization, colonization, exploitation, policing, and stereotypes associated with Black Language is linked to a system of white supremacy that continues to support and maintain “the oppression, exploitation, and overall domination of all Black people” (hooks,

1992, p. 2) and other people of color. Thus, the policing of Black Language and literacies in schools is not separate from the ways in which Black bodies have historically been policed and surveilled in U.S. society, and the ubiquitous assault and murder of Black bodies is not independent of the symbolic linguistic violence and spirit murder that Black students experience daily in classrooms (Bryan, 2020; Johnson et al., 2017; Johnson, 2018; Love, 2019). This is important to note since linguistic racism and oppression, especially as experienced by Black people, tend to get overlooked or are undertheorized in broader critical race scholarship and pedagogies. Indeed, folks will argue until they are blue in the face about anti Black racism, but once language is brought into the equation, those same people will say “you have to use the master’s tool (or language) to dismantle the master’s house.” In the words of Audre Lorde (1984), “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house” (p. 1).

In this chapter, I offer Anti Black Linguistic Racism as a framework that explicitly names and richly captures the type of linguistic oppression that is uniquely experienced and endured by Black Language speakers. This framework also helps explain precisely how Anti Black Linguistic Racism gets normalized in and through our research, disciplinary discourses, curricular choices, pedagogical practices, and teacher attitudes, and it shows how damaging these decisions are on Black students’ language education and racial and linguistic identities. I then theorize and offer some framing ideas for what I am terming *Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy* as an approach that confronts Anti Black Linguistic Racism in teacher attitudes, curriculum and instruction, pedagogical approaches, disciplinary discourse, and research.

“If You Don’t Know Now Ya Know”: A Brief Breakdown of Black Language

Despite decades of research on Black Language, its survival since enslavement, and its linguistic imprint on the nation and globe (Smitherman, 2006), Black people and Black Language scholars keep having to remind y’all that it is a legit language. James Baldwin (1979) said it best in the *New York Times*, “If Black English isn’t a language, then tell me, what is?” From a purely linguistic stand point, like “every naturally used language, [Black Language] is systematic with regular rules at the lexical, phonological, and grammatical level” (Stanford University, 2002, p. 1). I take a close look at the history of Black Language and its features in chapters 4 and 5, but I offer an abbreviated breakdown here in order to contextualize Anti Black Linguistic Racism. As stated in chapter 1, Smitherman (2006) describes Black Language as:

a style of speaking English words with Black Flava—with Africanized semantic, grammatical, pronunciation, and rhetorical patterns. [Black Language] comes out of the experience of U.S. slave descendants. This shared

experience has resulted in common language practices in the Black community. The roots of African American speech lie in the counter language, the resistance discourse, that was created as a communication system unintelligible to speakers of the dominant master class.

(Smitherman, 2006, p. 3)

Black Language is the rhetoric of resistance embedded in the hashtag #BlackLivesMatter, which led to the birth of what some call the 21st century civil rights movement. It is the phonology and grammatical structure former president Barack Obama used when declining to accept change from a Black cashier by saying, "Nah, we straight." Black Language is the controversial words of wisdom that Michelle Obama shared at the 2016 Democratic National Convention, "When they go low, we go high." It is the blackness reflected in the style of speech that "woke" CNN political commentator and NPR political analyst Angela Rye unabashedly and unapologetically uses on national news to clap back and break down racial oppression *for the people in the back*. Black Language is the linguistic inventiveness and signification in the infamous three word response "Reclaiming My Time" that Congresswoman Maxine Waters used to drag U.S. Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, after he dodged her questions and spoke over her during a committee hearing in 2017. It is the rhetorical strategies that Tiana Smalls, a Black woman, used to prevent Border Patrol officers from illegally searching a greyhound bus and demanding that passengers show their documentation. Black Language is also the native language and rich linguistic resources that so many Black children bring into classrooms every day.

But let us not forget—Black Language is also the language that continuously gets appropriated, exploited, and colonized. Since I began my research on Black Language in 2008, I have collected numerous examples of **Black linguistic appropriation** and the ways Black Language and literacies have been capitalized on. Some of the recent examples include the 2017 Mountain Dew commercial that used rappers Fat Joe, Remy Ma, and French Montana's song *I'm All the Way Up*¹ to promote their product and Party City's 2018 commercial using rapper DMX's song *Party Up (Up In Here)*² to promote their unicorn party theme. MARS Incorporated also used the Black lexical slang item "cray cray" to personalize their snicker wrappers in 2015, and MTV culturally appropriated Black Language in an article written in 2016 by encouraging its mostly white viewers to stop using Black slang words that were popular in 2015 and start using new Black slang words in 2016.³ Trader Joe's capitalized on Black Language when the neighborhood grocer used "Oh, Snap" to advertise their asparagus. Many fashion designers have also capitalized on Black Language to create market messages to invite consumers to buy their products. I cannot tell you how many times I have walked into retail stores that sold tee shirts, mugs, hats, and pillows that have capitalized on and appropriated Black Language (see Figure 2.1). Jay Z said it best: "the mainstream done crossed over to us" (Alim & Smitherman, 2012,



FIGURE 2.1 Examples of Black Linguistic Appropriation

p. 361). Yet, as shown in chapter 3, in classrooms, Black Language is devalued and viewed as a symbol of linguistic and intellectual inferiority. So essentially what this says is: It is acceptable for Black Language to be used and capitalized on by non native Black Language speakers for marketing and for play, but it is unacceptable for Black kids to use it as a linguistic resource in school. This is unfortunate but unsurprising because Black Language is one of those features of Black culture that white America loves to hate, yet loves to take.⁴ This is why we need to be talkin' about Anti Black Linguistic Racism.

On Linguistic Racism

Several sociolinguists and language scholars have discussed, theorized, and analyzed how linguistic discrimination gets supported and maintained through institutional practices. For instance, Lippi Green (2012) very pointedly illustrates how

the process of language subordination is achieved through what she refers to as the *standard language ideology*:

The standard language ideology (SLI) is a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class.

(Lippi Green, 2012, p. 67)

The standard language ideology goes unquestioned in our institutions, particularly in schools, as a result of the disinformation and misrepresentation that get distributed about dominant languages and marginalized languages and dialects. Wiley's (2000) definition of linguistic hegemony is useful in showing how institutions are successful in convincing linguistically marginalized communities to buy into the supremacy of a language that is not their own:

Linguistic hegemony is achieved when dominant groups create a consensus by convincing others to accept their language norms and usage as standard or paradigmatic. Hegemony is ensured when they can convince those who fail to meet those standards to view their failure as being the result of the inadequacy of their own language.

(Wiley, 2000, p. 11)

Despite the persistence of linguistic hegemony, "linguistic science does not recognize any language or dialect as inherently superior or inferior to any other" (Lippi Green, 2012 p. 33).

Linguistic hegemony and the standard language ideology are useful frameworks in making sense of how language subordination works between dominant and marginalized groups; however, neither framework offers an explicit analysis of linguistic racism or the role that race plays in language subordination. Now make no mistake—I ain't saying that these linguists have not discussed these frameworks in relation to linguistically marginalized communities of color. For instance, Lippi Green (2012) keeps it real about the relationship between language and race when she states, "a standard language ideology ... attempts to justify rejection of the other because of race, ethnicity or other facets of identity that would otherwise be called racism" (p. 74), and Alim, Rickford, and Ball (2016) acknowledge that "the relationship between language, race, and culture has long been a topic of interest in linguistic anthropology" (p. 3). However, these affirmations are not explicit in many of our guiding frameworks, which could contribute to language scholars and literacy educators ignoring the relationship between language and race. Though this book centers Black Language, it is important to note that Anti Black Linguistic Racism is part of a larger system of

white linguistic and cultural hegemony that advances the needs, self interests, and racial privileges of whites at the expense of linguistically marginalized communities of color. No doubt, so called "standard" English is "the language of conquest and domination; in the United States, it is the mask which hides the loss of so many tongues, all those sounds of diverse, native communities we will never hear" (hooks, 1994, p. 168). Building on Delgado and Stefancic's (2017) definition of racism, I understand linguistic racism as any system or practice of discrimination, segregation, persecution, or mistreatment of language based on membership in a race or ethnic group. From a Critical Race Theory perspective, linguistic racism is normal and an everyday experience for most linguistically marginalized people of color living in the U.S. In fact, it is so normal that it is difficult to address because it is not acknowledged as a form of racism. And although linguistic racism is socially constructed, like racism, it is permanent and ubiquitous in U.S. society. That is, as long as racism is an issue, we'll always have linguistic racism, despite pedagogies that promise speaking White Mainstream English will save linguistically marginalized people of color.

Scholars in the emerging field of raciolinguistics (Alim, Rickford, & Ball, 2016; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Alim & Smitherman, 2012) argue that we need more explicit critical analytical tools that examine what it means to speak as a racialized subject, especially in hyperracial times. This is a salient point because without analyzing language through the lens of race and racism, we ignore how linguistic violence and racial violence go hand in hand. Furthermore, ignoring the relationship between language and race contributes to us missing the mark as far as examining language focused discrimination from an intersectional standpoint, which offers insight into how communities of color experience linguistic discrimination differently than white linguistically marginalized communities. For example, an indigenous child who communicates in an indigenous language, a Black child who communicates in Black Language, a Latinx child who communicates in Spanglish, and an Asian American child who communicates in Asian American English, will experience linguistic discrimination differently from a white child who communicates in Appalachian English. This is because children of color's experiences navigating and negotiating language will be impacted by the interlocking systems and structures of linguisticism, racism, and classism, which are interrelated and continuously shaping one another. Failing to theorize about language through the lens of race also contributes to us missing opportunities to critique, expand, and improve our theories of language and language pedagogies, which oftentimes perpetuate linguistic racism and uphold white linguistic supremacy.

Theorizing language through the lens of race provides insightful historical and political analyses of how linguistic racism has been institutionalized. For instance, despite anti discrimination laws that were passed and intended to make it no longer permissible to outright use race to legally discriminate in employment, housing, education, courts, and in everyday life (though it still goes down), new tactics have been crafted in support of racial exclusion and discrimination. Instead

of explicitly using the color of someone's skin, for example, more subtle approaches to racism, such as language focused racism, have been used to exclude and discriminate against linguistically and racially diverse groups. Lippi Green (2012) posits:

We do not, cannot under our laws ask a person to change the color of their skin, her religion, her gender, her sexual identity, but we regularly demand of people that they suppress or deny the most effective way they have of situating themselves socially in the world.

(Lippi Green, 2012, p. 66)

Indeed, there are no explicit laws in the U.S. that make it illegal to use one's language as justification for discrimination and exclusion, and therefore, "language and accent have become an acceptable excuse to publicly turn away, to refuse to recognize the other or acknowledge their rights" (Lippi Green, 2012, p. 67). For example, Black Language "has become an even more important vehicle in the denial of access to resources to Blacks, particularly in housing" (Alim & Smitherman, 2012, p. 54). And although there is no official language in the U.S., there is a long and well documented history of institutionalized linguistic racism via English Only policies that have marginalized and disenfranchised Spanish speaking populations (Anzaldúa, 1987; Lippi Green, 2012). Following the 2016 election of Donald Trump, there has been an increase in linguistic racism toward Spanish speaking populations. During his campaign, Trump was noted as saying "This is a country where we speak English, not Spanish." In May 2018, Aaron Schlossberg, a Manhattan attorney, was videoed insulting staff at a New York deli and threatening to call Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) because the workers were speaking in Spanish, not English. These contemporary forms of linguistic racism further reveal why it is important "to ask and answer critical questions about the relations between language, race, and power" (Alim, Rickford, & Ball, 2016, p. 3).

Although raciolinguistics and other frameworks that theorize language and race are critical and necessary for a general analysis of linguistic racism, we also need frameworks that offer explicit "more detailed, nuanced, historicized, and embodied theorizations [of each linguistically marginalized communities of color racial and linguistic] conditions under specific formations of racial oppression" (Dumas & ross, 2016, p. 417). Pertaining to Black Language speakers, Baugh (2000) argues that "substantial linguistic evidence indicates that slave descendants of African origin should not be equated with US immigrants" (p. 37). Building on this point, he also states:

When compared to the linguistic circumstances of United States immigrants who hailed from Italy, Germany, France, Poland, Sweden, Russia, Japan, China, Korea, Mexico, Brazil, and countless other countries, slaves never had

the luxury of being able to speak to others using their native language once they were brought to America—again, against their free will. Secondly, but crucially from a linguistic point of view, it was illegal to teach slaves to read and write. Thus, in addition to the linguistic isolation that resulted from being captured in Africa and prevention from interacting with others who shared a common African language, once sold in America slaves were intentionally denied access to literacy by law. Traditional immigrants had the advantage—and it is a clear advantage—to speak their native language with others who also immigrated from their heritage country. The vast majority of immigrants who chose to come to the United States were allowed to attend school, where they were introduced to academic varieties of English.

(Baugh, 2015, p. 293)

So not only were enslaved Africans racially segregated, they were linguistically segregated too. Essentially, Baugh is arguing that Black Language is the linguistic consequence of slavery from which linguistic racism toward Black people was born. This historical linguistic record of Black Language illustrates how a general theory of linguistic racism is inadequate in its ability to fully interrogate anti blackness in and through language. Thus, we need frameworks that interrogate and examine the specific linguistic oppressions experienced by linguistically marginalized communities of color and account for the critical distinctions between their linguistic histories, heritages, experiences, circumstances, and relationships to white supremacy. My hope with *Anti Black Linguistic Racism* is that it will move us beyond general theories of linguistic racism and offer a Black theorization of linguistic racism that is necessary to examine how Black people, specifically Black students, experience linguistic oppression in an anti Black, white supremacist education system and society.

"It's Not Just About Language Or The Way You Talk": Why We Need a Theory of Language That Centers Anti-Blackness

I opened this chapter with a message from Janel, one of the Black girls I worked with at Leadership Academy. During an interview about her experiences speaking Black Language, Janel explained, "it's not just about language or the way you talk." What I learned from working with Janel and many of the Black students I have come to know through my teaching and research was that many of the encounters they had when using Black Language reflected anti blackness; however, they did not have the precise language to name what they were experiencing, and for a long time, neither did I. While many of the students suspected that their language was oftentimes disregarded due to them being Black, they had a difficult time trying to explain and make sense of how one could experience racism through their language. Their confusion about the relationship between language and race points to the necessity of an Antiracist Black Language

Pedagogy that provides students with space to examine how language, race, white supremacy, and anti blackness intersect and how they can work against Anti Black Linguistic Racism. I will return to my framework of Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy later in this chapter, but before doing so, I want to discuss how BlackCrit informs my understanding of Anti Black Linguistic Racism and why this framework is needed to inform our theories of language.

In the field of education, Dumas and ross (2016) developed BlackCrit, a the orization of Black critical theory, as a framework that helps us more precisely examine how Black children are marginalized, disdained, and disregarded in schools and educational spaces. In particular, the authors maintain that:

BlackCrit in education promises to help us more incisively analyze how social and education policy are informed by antiblackness, and serve as forms of anti Black violence, and following from this, how these policies facilitate and legitimize Black suffering in the everyday life of schools.

(Dumas & ross, 2016, p. 419)

Like other racialized crits (TribalCrit, LatCrit, and AsianCrit), BlackCrit proliferated in response to Ladson Billing's and Tate's (1995) explication of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in education. As a general theory of racism, CRT functions as an important tool that helps analyze race and racism and critique white supremacy, but it does not precisely name or adequately address the racial oppressions of specific racialized groups (Dumas & ross, 2016). Though CRT is often perceived as a Black critical theory and an analytical tool that is applicable and limited to Black people, Dumas and ross (2016) explains that "it is not a theorization of blackness or even the Black condition; it is a theory of race, or more precisely, racism" (p. 416). Hence, BlackCrit is necessary to confront:

the specificity of anti Blackness, as a social construction, as an embodied lived experience of social suffering and resistance, and perhaps most importantly, as an antagonism, in which the Black is despised thing in itself in opposition to all that is pure, humane, and white.

(Dumas & ross, 2016, pp. 416–417)

In relation to Black Language, BlackCrit helps to show how the linguistic violence, persecution, dehumanization, and marginalization that Black Language speakers experience in schools and in everyday life are informed by anti Blackness.

In their theorization of BlackCrit, Dumas and ross note that addressing anti blackness is different than addressing racism and white supremacy. I want to underscore this point, specifically as it pertains to language education. Much of the language education that students receive in their K 12 and postsecondary education is based on white supremacist values. That is, White Mainstream English (white linguistic and cultural values) is used as the gold standard in which all

students are expected to meet. The concept of *Whiteness* is important in understanding the silent and invisible ways in which White Mainstream English serves as the unstated norm in our classrooms (Pimentel, 2011). Alim and Smitherman (2012) break this down in the passage below:

Whites can exercise power through overt (obvious) and covert (hidden) racist practices. The fact that it is the language and communicative norms of those in power, in any society, that tend to be labeled as “standard”, “official”, “normal”, “appropriate”, “respectful”, and so on, often goes unrecognized, particularly by the members of the dominating group. In our case, White Mainstream English and White ways of speaking become the invisible—or better, inaudible—norms of what educators and uncritical scholars like to call academic English, the language of school, the language of power, or communicating in academic settings.

(Alim & Smitherman, 2012, p. 171)

Elsewhere (Baker Bell, 2017) I've written about how the ubiquity of whiteness in schools erroneously positions White Mainstream English speaking students as academically prepared to achieve because their cultural ways of being, their language, their literacies, their histories, their values, and their knowledges are privileged in classrooms. From this assumption, linguistically marginalized students of color are falsely positioned as linguistically inadequate because their language practices do not reflect White Mainstream English.

Certainly, a critique of white supremacy and linguistic racism within language education is important and timely in order to illustrate how our education system privileges and caters to whites at the expense of people of color; however, this critique alone does not fully explain how our language education contributes to “the debasement of black humanity, utter indifference to black suffering, and the denial of Black people’s right to exist” (Jeffries as cited in Baker Bell, Jones Stanbrough, & Everett, 2017). What I am referring to as Anti Black Linguistic Racism is more than an examination of white linguistic hegemony and how it informs Black students’ language education. As Jeffries (2014) explains, “the ‘anti’ in ‘anti Blackness’ is the denial of Black people’s right to life” (p. 1). With this in mind, Anti Black Linguistic Racism more accurately captures the dehumanization that Black Language speakers endure when using their language across multiple contexts, including classrooms, and it details the ways that anti Blackness in language education positions Black Language speaking students as linguistically, intellectually, and morally inferior (Alim & Smitherman, 2012).

Examples of Anti Black Linguistic Racism includes, but is not limited to, teachers rejecting and not preserving the rich linguistic resources that Black students bring with them to classrooms. It is when Black witnesses, like Rachel Jeantel, have their testimonies disregarded or viewed as insufficient in the criminal justice system due to their use of Black Language (Baugh & King, 2016). It consists of

teachers entering classrooms with little to no knowledge about the linguistic and cultural practices their Black students bring with them into classrooms. It includes teachers silencing, correcting, and policing students when they communicate in Black Language. Anti Black Linguistic Racism is denying Black students the right to use their native language as a linguistic resource in their language and literacy learning. It is insisting that Black students code switch to avoid discrimination, which essentially penalizes Black students for the existence of Anti Black Linguistic Racism. It involves teachers believing that there is something inherently wrong with Black Language, and therefore, it must be eradicated. It is requiring Black students to reject their language and culture to acquire White Mainstream English. It is research about Black Language that is disembodied from Black students' lived experiences and how they navigate the world in their Black bodies. As I will illustrate in chapter 3, Anti Black Linguistic Racism names the dehumanization Black students at Leadership Academy experienced when using Black Language in school. In Table 2.1, I highlight other examples of Anti Black Linguistic Racism and how it gets normalized in and through teacher attitudes, our curriculum and instruction, our pedagogical approaches to language, and through our research and disciplinary discourses.

The Impact of Anti-Black Linguistic Racism on Black Students

It goes without saying that Anti Black Linguistic Racism is dangerous and harmful to Black students and their language education, but the harm goes beyond education. Richardson (2004) argues that when "Black students [are] taught to hate Black speech, [it] indirectly [teaches] them to hate themselves" (p. 161). This is the dehumanization that *Linguistic Justice* is concerned with and the problem that Anti Black Linguistic Racism helps to name in an effort to show how Black children are marginalized, disdained, and disregarded in schools and educational spaces in and through their language. While my research at Leadership Academy taught me that Black students find creative ways to resist anti blackness and Anti Black Linguistic Racism, it also revealed how the students internalized anti Black messages about their language and the consequences this had on their sense of self and identity. An anti Black Language education not only contributes to Black students despising their mother tongue, but it also causes them to see themselves through a white gaze—"a way of looking and seeing the world that negates [their] value" (hooks, 1992, p. 3). Charity Hudley and Mallison (2014) contend that "speakers who face microaggressions, prejudice, and discrimination also react with internalization, a process whereby members of a stigmatized group accept negative messages about their self worth" (p. 65).

I write more about this in chapter 3, but I want to briefly highlight the ways this internalization of white supremacist values and anti blackness was evident in the first activity I had the students at Leadership Academy complete. I asked them to read samples of Black Language and White Mainstream English and draw images of who

TABLE 2.1 How Anti Black Linguistic Racism is Perpetuated in Education

Teacher Attitudes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Assumptions that Black students are linguistically, morally, and intellectually inferior because they communicate in Black Language.● Belief that there is something inherently wrong with Black Language and its speakers.● Belief that Black students' language practices reflect incompetence and a lack of intelligence.● Belief that Black students must eradicate Black Language to succeed in school and life. <p>Examples of teacher attitudes about Black Language which reflects Anti Black Linguistic Racism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● <i>"Although he speaks in a non-eloquent way, he is really smart."</i> teacher from previous study● <i>"My assumption about people who speak this way [Black Language] is that they are from a lower-class and are uneducated"</i> from a teacher at a Black Language workshop● <i>"I cringe when I hear my students speak like that! It brings out the grammar nazi that lives in me."</i> a teacher from a Black Language workshop
Curriculum/Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Black Language is not acknowledged in the curriculum or in the study of language as a valid, rule based linguistic system.● Black students are not formally taught the rules of their own language in schools.● Black Language is ignored or taught uncritically when engaging Black Literature (<i>Tears of a Tiger, The Hate U Give, Their Eyes Were Watching GOD</i>, etc.) or literary texts that encompass Black Language speaking characters (<i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i>). <p>Examples of teachers describing their instruction of Black Language which reflects Anti Black Linguistic Racism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● <i>"One of the goals this year was to get kids to stop sayin ... he was, she was"</i> teacher from Alim & Smitherman (2012) study (p. 172)● <i>"More than a few of my students would turn [in] papers with AAL [African American Language]littered throughout. I would constantly correct their grammar while talking in class [and] make them read aloud so they could get used to hearing the correct ways to speak and write. I think it gave them a reference. It also got me to stop embarrassing people in front of the class."</i> teacher from a previous study● <i>"I get that people from different cultures and backgrounds communicate differently with each other, but I also understand that my students will enter a land where they will be judged based on their language. Whether this is fair or not, as their teacher, isn't it my job to prepare my Black students to communicate in 'standard English' so that they don't get discriminated against?"</i> teacher from a previous study

(Continued)

TABLE 2.1 (Cont.)

Pedagogy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● <i>“I would correct the students and try to get them to speak the ‘right way’; can the child know when to speak correctly and be able to show that with academic writing” preservice teacher from previous study</i>● <i>“I would probably tell them to try and focus on talking more appropriately; use school language to talk in class and save the slang for lunch and outside of school; I would correct if they wrote like this and try to help them talk properly” preservice teacher from previous study</i>● Code-Switching Approach: a color evasiveness approach that teaches students to use language to fit the time, place, audience, and communicative purpose, which is usually only with friends and at home in the case of Black Language. It promotes the use of one dialect, register, accent, or language variety over another, depending on social or cultural context, to project a specific identity. The end goal of this approach is to get Black students to use White Mainstream English. Anti Black Linguistic Racism occurs when Black students are uncritically taught to code switch without learning the social cultural factors that inform the social positioning of Black Language and White Mainstream English.● Contrastive Analysis: an approach usually taught from a color evasiveness perspective in conjunction with codes switching. It teaches students about the differences and similarities between languages using the formality of the situation (i.e. use White Mainstream English in formal contexts and Black Language in formal contexts). Anti Black Linguistic Racism is the assumption in this approach that Black Language does not have formal and informal registers. This approach creates a linguistic hierarchy that positions White Mainstream English as linguistically superior to Black Language and other linguistically marginalized languages.
Research/Disciplinary Discourse	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Research on Black Language that ignores the role that white linguistic hegemony, linguistic racism, and anti blackness play in educational linguistic research.● Research on Black Language that does not examine Black Language as an embodied experience of blackness or divorces Black Language from its relationship to the Black experience and Black culture.● Research that ignores scholarship by Black Language scholars whose research agenda is also informed by their lived experiences as speakers of Black Language.

they imagined to be communicating in both languages. For the most part, the students drew images of Black people to reflect Black Language and white people to represent White Mainstream English. This is to be expected; however, what was troublesome was that the images and descriptions the students drew and wrote conveyed conceptions of blackness through the white imagination. For instance, most of the students described the speakers they drew to reflect Black Language as "bad," "ghetto," "thugs," and "trouble" all while describing White Mainstream speakers as "good," "proper," and "respectful." Fanon's (1952) theory of epidermalization suggests that Black children have been taught since early childhood to see themselves through the white imagination; that is, they have been unconsciously trained to correlate blackness with wrongness and whiteness with rightness.

Others have written about how Black students internalize Anti Black Linguistic Racism and the impact it has on their language education and their linguistic, racial, and intellectual identities. In her article "Nobody means more to me than you and the future of Willie Jordan," Jordan (1988) describes a scenario where Black students in her undergraduate course, "In Search of the Invisible Black woman," reacted negatively to Alice Walker's written version of Black Language in her novel, *The Color Purple*. She states:

Several students dumped on the book. Just about unanimously, their criticisms targeted the language. I listened to what they wanted to say and silently marveled at the similarities between their casual speech patterns and Alice Walker's written version of Black English. Here was a negative Black reaction to a prize winning accomplishment of Black literature that White readers across the country had selected as a best seller. Black rejection was aimed at the one irreducibly Black element of Walker's work: the language—Celie's Black English.

(Jordan, 1988, p. 125)

The students' reactions to Walker's use of Black Language in *The Color Purple* illustrates how deeply ingrained Anti Black Linguistic Racism is in Black Language speaking students. In this example, the students' internalization of Anti Black Linguistic Racism contributed to their feelings of linguistic and cultural shame. According to Smitherman (1977), "an individual's language is intricately bound up with his or her sense of identity and group consciousness" (p. 171). All social groups want their group's identity to be positive; therefore, when an individual belongs to a group with a negative identification, their first impulse is to dissociate themselves from that group (Bedolla, 2003). Jordan argues that Black Language speakers:

either hide our original word habits, or we completely surrender our own voice, hoping to please those who will never respect anyone different from themselves: Black English is not exactly a linguistic buffalo, but we should understand its status as an endangered species, as a perishing, irreplaceable

system of community intelligence, or we should expect its extinction, and, along with that, the extinguishing of much that constitutes our own proud, and singular, identity.

(Jordan, 1988, p. 123)

Jordan's statement highlights the interconnection between Black Language and Black identity. Therefore, when Black students experience Anti Black Linguistic Racism, it is not only an attempt to eradicate their group's language, it is also an attempt to eradicate their identity, community intelligence, theories of reality, and centuries of Black survival philosophies. In other words, to eradicate Black Language is to eradicate Black people's ways of knowing, interpreting, surviving, being, and resisting in the world.

In their 2008 study on language attitudes among Black boys, Kirkland and Jackson reveal how students in their mentoring program displayed internalized Anti Black Linguistic Racism after engaging in contrastive analysis instruction. This was illustrated in the ways the students retained and sometimes reinforced negative attitudes about Black Language in and through the drawings they were asked to create to portray their language attitudes. Similar to the students at Leadership Academy, the boys in the mentoring program depicted Black Language speakers with "criminal characteristics" and associated them with "violence," "drugs," and a "lack of education"; yet, they characterized White Mainstream English speakers as "successful," "accomplished," "calm," and wearing "suits and ties." Kirkland and Jackson (2008) concluded that:

The students were, however, implicitly struggling with relationships between [Black Language] and [White Mainstream English] and the various and very different ways the languages constituted their identities. Although it was never explicitly dealt with in class, we noticed the students were struggling with how the languages positioned them in the world ...

(Kirkland & Jackson, 2008, p. 140)

Kirkland and Jackson's study teaches us that any instruction that emphasizes the importance of White Mainstream English over all other linguistic forms is especially dangerous for Black students, and other linguistically marginalized students of color, as it communicates to them that being Black and speaking in Black Language are insufficient. One of the students in the study illustrates the consequences of these kinds of messages in his comment about language and success: "If I want to get a good job and be something in life, I gotta learn to talk White" (p. 142). The student's remark underscores Richardson's (2004) thinking that Black students are taught to hate their language which indirectly teaches them to hate themselves. The students in this study also illustrate the ways in which Black students are trained to view their language, identity, and culture through a white gaze in ways that negates their value, sense of self, and worth.

In a similar study, Kinloch (2010) examined two Black male students' perceptions of Black Language in their struggles to acquire academic success. The two undergraduate students in this study, Khaleeq and Phillip, are grappling with the idea of using White Mainstream English for academic success but also maintaining their identities as Black Language speakers. Like the student in Kirkland and Jackson's (2008) study, Khaleeq and Phillip have internalized messages that suggest that they must speak White Mainstream English "to get a job," "become successful," "move up in the world, to not have to struggle as much, and to move out of [their] family's housing development unit and 'into a house'" (p. 120). Yet, they are struggling with how they can achieve this at the same time of maintaining their blackness. For instance, Kinloch (2010) states:

As much as Phillip is aware of how he fixes his language, he is just as aware of the dilemma that such fixing involves. He battles with not wanting to fix his Black English because, he says, "that would mean something is wrong with me, yet ... I want to be successful in life." His success, much like Khaleeq's, depends on not abandoning his cultural practices, language, and history of struggle. Nevertheless, he does not want to abandon the opportunities that can derive from knowing "standard English."

(Kinloch, 2010, p. 121)

The language education that Phillip and Khaleeq received has caused them to develop what Smitherman refers to as linguistic push pull—a linguistic interpretation of Dubois' theory of double consciousness. Smitherman coined the term linguistic push pull in the 1970s to characterize the ambivalence Black Language speakers feel about speaking Black Language; that is, "Black folk loving, embracing, using Black Talk, while simultaneously rejecting and hating on it" (Smitherman, 2006, p. 6). For Phillip and Khaleeq, their ambivalence comes from an anti Black and culturally irrelevant language education that teaches them that they have to eradicate their culture and language to achieve upward mobility.

In her book *Vernacular Insurrections: Race, Black Protest, and the New Century in Composition Literacies Studies*, Kynard (2013) includes a teaching interlude about one of her Black Language speaking students, Sherrie, who was an outspoken advocate for speaking "proper English." In the interlude, Kynard shares how Sherrie had accepted a racialized linguistic inferiority or what I am referring to as internalized Anti Black Linguistic Racism, in and through her writing.

Sherrie would routinely do things in her weekly, informal journals assignments such as write two verb forms for the subjects of EACH of her sentences and circle one of them. The "answer" that she circled was usually "wrong." I had never seen anything like it: every noun had two verbs in parentheses, making her writing look like a handout from an elementary

school grammar workbook. When I asked Sherrie what all this circling was about, she told me that when she writes, she can't decide which verb form to choose so she puts both in brackets and goes back afterward to circle one.

(Kynard, 2013, p. 107)

As Kynard describes in her interlude, there are consequences for providing Black Language speaking students like Sherrie with a language education that cuts them completely off from Black Language and offers a narrow view of White Mainstream English. In Sherrie's case, this form of Anti Black Linguistic Racism had halted her writing and caused her to produce hypercorrection and experience writing anxiety that directly affected how she behaved in class (Charity Hudley & Mallinson, 2014). According to Charity Hudley and Mallinson (2014), hypercorrection occurs when speakers (or in Sherrie's case, writers) internalize the message that others view their language as wrong, therefore, they strive to use the standardized language so perfectly that they overarticulate in ways that miss the target of the perceived standard language in an effort to replace the seemingly incorrect language patterns (p. 64). Beyond the hypercorrection that she produced in her writing, Sherrie described her experiences in her English classes akin to child abuse: "You walk on eggshells, timid, and nervous, because any little mistake will set things off and get you punished" (Kynard, 2013, p. 108). Sherrie's comment speaks to how many Black Language speaking students experience classrooms as violent and dehumanizing spaces and how our traditional language education perpetuates linguistic and racial violence.

As illustrated in each of the above examples, when Black students' language practices are suppressed or they begin to absorb anti Black messages that imply that their language is deficient, wrong, or unintelligent, this can cause them to develop a linguistic double consciousness or negative attitudes about themselves and their linguistic, racial, cultural, and intellectual identities. South African linguist revolutionary Neville Alexander said it best:

Being able to use the language(s) one has the best command of in any situation is an empowering factor and, conversely, not being able to do so is necessarily disempowering. The self esteem, self confidence, potential creativity and spontaneity that come with being able to use the language(s) that has or have shaped one from early childhood ... is the foundation of all democratic politics and institutions. To be denied the use of these languages is the very meaning of oppression.

(qtd in Smitherman, 2017)

As Charity Hudley and Mallinson (2014) pointed out, this form of internalized racism can contribute to students losing "confidence in the learning process, their own abilities, their educators, and school in general" (p. 33).

Approaches to Language Education for Black Students: Toward an Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy

The Anti Black Linguistic Racism that Black students experience and internalize when using Black Language in school is the product of their language education. Kynard (2013) argues that Black students learn to monitor their linguistic expressions based on how they have been treated and trained to view themselves in language arts classrooms (p. 109). Since the 1960s, language scholars have recognized that traditional ways of approaching language education in schools are anti Black and uphold white linguistic hegemony. As argued by Labov (1970), deficit theories and pedagogies are extremely dangerous to the language education of Black students as they divert attention from the real defects of the educational system to imaginary defects of the child. In the section below, I describe two approaches that are commonly practiced in language arts classrooms: *eradicationist language pedagogies* and *respectability language pedagogies*. In contrast to these approaches, I offer *Antiracist Black Language Pedagogies* as a way forward.

Eradicationist Language Pedagogies

Teachers' failure to acknowledge the rich linguistic resources that Black students bring with them to classrooms has led to deficit approaches such as *eradicationist language pedagogies*, which work to eradicate Black Language from Black students' linguistic repertoires. Under this model, Black students' language practices are

TABLE 2.2 Approaches to Language Pedagogy

Eradicationist Language Pedagogies

Under this approach, Black Language is not acknowledged as a language and gets treated as linguistically, morally, and intellectually inferior. The goal of this approach is to eradicate Black Language from students' linguistic repertoires and replace it with White Mainstream English. Anti Black Linguistic Racism is embedded in this approach as Black Language gets interpreted as a defect of the child rather than a defect of the educational system's response to it (Labov, 1970).

Respectability Language Pedagogies

Under this approach, Black Language is acknowledged as a language that should be valued, affirmed, and respected. However, the end goal of this approach is to simply use Black Language as a bridge to learn White Mainstream English. This approach perpetuates anti blackness as it adheres to politics of respectability, surrenders to whiteness, and does not challenge Anti Black Linguistic Racism.

Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy

Black Language is placed at the center of this approach to critically interrogate white linguistic hegemony and Anti Black Linguistic Racism. The end goal of this approach is to dismantle Anti Black Linguistic Racism and students' internalization of it, help Black students develop agency, take a critical stance, and make political choices (Kynard, 2007) that support them in employing Black Language "for the purposes of various sorts of freedom" (Richardson, 2004, p. 163).

viewed as deficient, and the goal is to correct what is presumed to be the deficiency and replace it with what is believed to be the better language, White Mainstream English (Paris, 2012). Anti Black Linguistic Racism is embedded in eradicationist language pedagogies as these approaches deliberately deny Black students the right to use their native language as a linguistic resource during their language and literacy learning and attempts to annihilate Black linguistic and cultural norms. Smitherman (2017) reminds us that "when the language of instruction is not the student's home language, and students are silenced because they aren't allowed to use the language they know best, they are disadvantaged from the Git Go" (p. 8). Though eradicationist approaches have been problematized in the scholarly literature, the students at Leadership Academy reminded me that this approach is still practiced in some language arts classrooms today.

Respectability Language Pedagogies

Recognizing the damage that deficit and eradicationist language pedagogies do to Black students, some language teachers and scholars turned to pedagogical approaches that seek to validate, affirm, and respect Black Language by using it as a bridge to teach White Mainstream English. I refer to these approaches as *respectability language pedagogies* (Baker Bell, 2017). Building on Higginbotham's (1993) theory of "politics of respectability," respectability language pedagogies refer to approaches that view racially and linguistically marginalized students' language practices as valid and equal yet instruct these students to use White Mainstream English to avoid the negative stereotypes that are associated with their linguistic and racial backgrounds by appearing "respectable." Respectability pedagogies perpetuate anti blackness as they do not fully accept or celebrate Black Language, and they teach Black students to respond to racism by adhering to white hegemonic standards of what it means to be "respectable" instead of teaching them to challenge, interrogate, and resist Anti Black Linguistic Racism.

The most pervasive respectability language pedagogy that is used in language arts classrooms is the code switching approach (Wheeler & Swords, 2006, 2010). As mentioned in Table 2.2, the code switching approach requires racially and linguistically marginalized students to switch from the linguistic system of the language or dialect they are most familiar with to White Mainstream English. During classroom instruction, these students are taught to use language to fit the time, place, audience, and communicative purpose, and it promotes the use of one dialect, register, accent, or language variety over another, depending on social or cultural context, to project a specific identity. White Mainstream English tends to be promoted as the acceptable language to use most of the time, in most places, for most audiences, communicative purposes, and in most social and cultural contexts. I write more about code switching and Black Language politics in chapter 4, but I want to briefly point out how code switching pedagogies

promote politics of respectability and uphold color evasiveness⁵ ideologies (Annamma, Jackson, & Morrison, 2017). This approach essentially posits that teachers should treat Black students' linguistic practices as equally as possible but should encourage them to code switch to White Mainstream English to avoid discrimination. The problem with this approach, as applied in most classrooms, is that it encourages students to code switch without any regard to their racial realities or the role that Anti Black Linguistic Racism plays in why they are being asked to "code" their language in the first place. If our language arts instruction consisted of providing Black students with the critical linguistic tools to decode the notion of code switching, they would find that this approach is asking them to do more than switch their language. Rather, they are being asked to switch their language, their cultural ways of being and knowing, their community, and their blackness in favor of a white middle class identity.

Still, some believe that Black students must code switch to be successful in school and life. While I am not denying that some Black Language speakers have not experienced temporary success by way of code switching, I am questioning what gets lost or sacrificed in the process. What is really achieved? Who is privileged with making decisions about who has to code switch to be successful and who does not? I have heard teachers use exceptionalism discourse with Black students by telling them that they can be the next "successful" or "rich" Black person (e.g. Barack Obama, Michelle Obama, Oprah, etc.) if they speak White Mainstream English. First of all, stop telling Black kids that they can be the next such and such and let them be the first version of themselves. Second, do we ever tell white students to code switch so they can be the next Steve Jobs, Ellen DeGeneres, or Donald Trump? No, we do not! This is just downright racist. Also, stop playing like Oprah, Barack, Michelle, and nem don't speak Black Language. I have also heard teachers promise Black children that code switching will help them get into college and earn a college degree. Ok! So give up your culture and your language in favor of achieving, at best, a house, a car, and a whole lot of college debt? Why would Black people want to give up parts of their identity and culture for this dull level of success? Everyone should be questioning this. My point is that we can't be out here using these mediocre and problematic measures of success that only legitimates a white status quo "American Dream, white picket fence" way of living that is tethered to the death of blackness and Black Language.

It is also important to interrogate code switching in light of our current racial and political climate. In many classrooms, Black students are encouraged to code switch as a strategy for survival; however, the students at Leadership Academy contested this belief. They questioned how code switching to White Mainstream English could be a form of survival or self protection when Black people are being discriminated against and killed based on the color of their skin (Baker Bell, 2017). My work at Leadership Academy happened at the same time that George Zimmerman was on trial for the murder of Trayvon Martin. The students pointed out how Trayvon used White Mainstream English when he said "What are you following me for?" and that

did not protect him from being murdered. The students' critical questioning of code switching as a tool for survival in the face of racial violence cannot be ignored. There are indeed repetitive instances of Black people communicating in White Mainstream English and still having had acts of racial violence committed against them. I think about how code switching or White Mainstream English did not protect Michael Brown who said, "I don't have a gun! Stop shooting!" before he was gunned down by police officer Darren Wilson. I think about Eric Garner who repeated the words "I cannot breathe" 11 times before he died after he was put in a chokehold by New York police officer Daniel Pantaleo. The students' thinking about Trayvon Martin also reminds me of Renisha McBride who communicated in White Mainstream English when she said "I just need to go home" to Theodore Wafer before he shot and killed her when she knocked on his door for help after getting into a car accident. I think about John Crawford who said "It is not real!" to police officers about an unpackaged BB/pellet air rifle he picked up and was holding in a Walmart store before police officers shot and killed him. I also think about Atatiana Jefferson, Aiyana Stanley Jones, Tamir Rice, and countless other Black children and adults who were victims of racial violence before they could utter a word. These instances are clear reminders that code switching into White Mainstream English will not save Black people and cannot solve racial or linguistic injustice, and we cannot pretend that it will.

The students at Leadership Academy compelled me to critically interrogate the relationship between language, racial violence, and language arts instruction: If using White Mainstream English cannot protect Black people from losing their lives, why are we telling Black children that code switching is a strategy for survival? Black students understand that while they can switch their language, they cannot switch the color of their skin (Baker Bell, 2017). At the end of the day, even if Black students choose to project a white middle class identity through language, it is nearly impossible for them to separate their language from their racial positioning in society (Flores & Rosa, 2015). We must be honest about this in our language instruction. We cannot continue to push respectability language pedagogies that require Black students to project a white middle class identity to avoid anti blackness, especially when they are growing up amidst Black liberation movements like the Black Lives Matter movement, which stands against respectability politics and anti blackness. To do so is essentially encouraging Black students to accept dominant narratives that help maintain "traditions of white privilege and Black oppression" (Richardson, 2004, p. 160).

Toward an Antiracist Black Language Education and Pedagogy

In contrast to language pedagogies and research that either attribute Anti Black Linguistic Racism to presumed deficiencies of Black students' language practices, culture, behavior attitudes, families, or communities (King, 2005) or

respond to Anti Black Linguistic Racism by upholding white linguistic and cultural norms, I am forwarding Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy as a transformative approach to Black Language education. To be clear, a transformative approach to the language education of Black students cannot acquiesce to whiteness or side step anti blackness. These approaches are not transformative nor are they antiracist. Within an Antiracist Black Language education framework, I understand antiracism in terms of its relationship to challenging anti blackness in theory, research, and practice. In particular, Nehrez's thinking about decolonization is important and necessary in making sense of what a transformative antiracist language education should entail:

Decolonization ... continues to be an act of confrontation with a hegemonic system of thought; it is hence a process of considerable historical and cultural liberation. As such, decolonization becomes the contestation of all dominant forms and structures, whether they be linguistic, discursive, or ideological. Moreover, decolonization comes to be understood as an act of exorcism for both the colonized and the colonizer.

(qtd. in hooks, 1992, p. 1)

In addition to Nehrez's wisdom, I want to underscore a salient point that Dumas and ross (2016) make in their theory of BlackCrit: "only a critical theorization of blackness confronts the specificity of anti Blackness" (p. 416). As far as language education, this suggests that an Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy must (1) center blackness; (2) confront white linguistic and cultural hegemony; and (3) contest anti blackness.

Though I am advocating for a transformative approach to Black Language education, I want to briefly situate my vision of Antiracist Black Language education within a larger context of radical Black intellectuals to illustrate how I am reclaiming and reconnecting with the ideas and recommendations that have already been put forth within the Black Language research tradition. Our ancestors and elders have always called out imperialist, racist, discriminatory approaches to language education that perpetuated Anti Black Linguistic Racism and caused harm to Black students. Woodson (1933) is one of the earliest Black Language pioneers who interrogated the prevalence of anti blackness in Black students' language education. He argued:

In the study of language in school pupils were made to scoff at the Negro dialect as some peculiar possession of the Negro which they should despise rather than directed to study the background of this language as a broken down African tongue—in short to understand their own linguistic history, which is certainly more important for them than the study of French Phonetics or Historical Spanish Grammar.

(Woodson, 1933, p. 10)

Fanon (1952) examined the intersections between language, race, and culture and described how the hegemony embedded in this relationship produces an inferiority complex in Black people. He reminds us that "to speak a language is to appropriate its world and culture" (p. 21); thus, communicating in White Mainstream English is "appropriating the white world" (p. 19). Bailey (1968), who was the first Black woman linguist, argued that there was a need for drastic revisions in language arts curriculum. She called for instructional strategies that exploited the differences between Black Language and White Mainstream English. In 1981, Morrison called out how Black students are met with Anti Black Linguistic Racism in schools:

It is terrible to think that a child with five different present tenses comes to school to be faced with books that are less than his own language. And then to be told things about his language, which is him, that are sometimes permanently damaging ... This is a really cruel fallout with racism.

(qtd in Rickford & Rickford, 2000)

Smitherman argued that "we have kids in the inner cities who are verbal geniuses, but we call them deficient in school and attempt to eradicate a part of their identity" (cited in Sealey Ruiz, 2005). Building on Woodson's wisdom, Smitherman (2006) recommends that Black students' language education should consist of the study of "African American Language—its systematic properties, its history, the connection between AAL and African American life and culture" (p. 142).

Gilyard (1991) cautioned of the psychic costs Black students pay when acquiring White Mainstream English. He argued that "a pedagogy is only successful if it makes knowledge or skill achievable while at the same time allowing students to maintain their own sense of identity" (p. 11). Richardson (2004) pushed for an African American centered approach, which seeks to:

explicate the production of African American knowledge or epistemology in order that we may develop appropriate language and literacy pedagogies to accelerate the literacy education of Black (and all) students ... in this way, then, African American centered education seeks to accelerate the learning of students of African descent by conscientizing them to their language, learning, and literacy traditions that are relevant to them, exploiting this knowledge in their acquisition of other discourses.

(Richardson, 2004, pp. 160–161)

The abovementioned Black intellectuals make it clear that linguistic and racial justice for Black students are not rooted in anti Black Language pedagogies that cater to whiteness, but in terms of the complete and total overthrow of racist, colonial practices so that antiracist language pedagogies might begin to be imagined, developed, and implemented. It is in this line of thinking that I imagine an

Antiracist Black Language education. In the section below, I outline ten framing ideas that are part of a broader educational movement that advocates for linguistic, racial, and educational justice for Black students.

Ten Framing Idea For an Antiracist Black Language Education and Pedagogy

1. critically interrogates white linguistic hegemony and Anti Black Linguistic Racism.
2. names and works to dismantle the normalization of Anti Black Linguistic Racism in our research, disciplinary discourses curriculum choices, pedagogical practices, and teacher attitudes.
3. intentionally and unapologetically places the linguistic, cultural, racial, intellectual, and self confidence needs of Black students at the center of their language education.
4. is informed by the Black Language research tradition and is situated at the intersection of theory and practice.
5. rejects the myth that the same language (White Mainstream English) and language education that have been used to oppress Black students can empower them.
6. acknowledges that Black Language is connected to Black people's ways of knowing, interpreting, resisting, and surviving in the world (Richardson, 2004; Sanchez, 2007).
7. involves Black Linguistic Consciousness raising that helps Black students heal and overcome internalized Anti Black Linguistic Racism, develop agency, take a critical stance, and make political choices (Kynard, 2007) that support them in employing Black Language "for the purposes of various sorts of freedom" (Richardson, 2004, p. 163).
8. provides Black students with critical literacies and competencies to name, investigate, and dismantle white linguistic hegemony and Anti Black Linguistic Racism.
9. conscientizes Black students the historical, cultural, political, and racial underpinnings of Black Language.
10. relies on Black Language oral and literary traditions to build Black students' linguistic flexibility and creativity skills. Provide students with opportunities to experiment, practice, and play with Black Language use, rhetoric, cadence, style, and inventiveness, which is necessary to use language effectively in a multilingual, multicultural world.

It is pivotal that the above ideas are embodied in any transformative approach that seeks to dismantle Anti Black Linguistic Racism and students' internalization of it. In the next section, I briefly describe the praxis of these framing ideas by sharing seven Black Language Artifacts that emerged from the Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy that I used to engage students at Leadership Academy in critical conversations. The pedagogy consisted of several critical inquiry based learning experiences that provided the

students at Leadership Academy with an opportunity to learn Black Language, learn through Black Language, and learn about Black Language (Halliday, 1993) while simultaneously dismantling Anti Black Linguistic Racism.

Antiracist Black Language Pedagogy

Black Language Artifact 1: Black Language & Identity

For this artifact, students examine the intersection of language, culture, and identity within the Black community.

Black Language Artifact 2: Language, History, & Culture

For this artifact, students will participate in a language study that examines the historical, cultural, and political underpinnings of Black Language.

Black Language Artifact 3: Study of the Grammatical and Rhetorical Features of Black Language Black Language

For this artifact, students will examine the structural and discourse features of Black Language.

Black Language Artifact 4: Language & Power

For this artifact, students will investigate the intersection of language and power.

Black Language Artifact 5: Language & Racial Positioning in Society

For this artifact, students examine the intersections between language and race. They will also be provided with opportunities to investigate the relationship between language and anti blackness as one way of understanding linguistic racism.

Black Language Artifact 6: Language, Agency, & Action

For this artifact, students will develop agency, take a critical stance, and make political choices that support them in employing Black Language for the purposes of various sorts of freedom, including dismantling Anti Black Linguistic Racism.

Black Language Artifact 7: Imagining a Language of Solidarity

For this artifact, students will develop a critical linguistic awareness and interrogate how other linguistically and racially diverse communities experience racial and linguistic violence and are impacted and are affected by linguistic racism.

I expand on these Black Language Artifacts in chapters 3 and 4, and I provide ethnographic snapshots that illustrate how the students at Leadership Academy engaged and interacted with each learning experience that these Black Language Artifacts provided. Some aspects of the artifacts were expanded, deepened, and redesigned following my research at Leadership Academy based on the lessons that I learned from the youth.

Notes

- 1 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MDM6KZbrVg>
- 2 <https://www.ispot.tv/ad/ddJl/party-city-unicorn-party-song-by-dmx>
- 3 <http://www.mtv.com/news/2720889/teen-slang-2016/>
- 4 Alim & Smitherman (2012) discuss this love-hate relationship on p. 25.
- 5 Following the work of Annamma, Jackson, and Morrison (2017), I use color evasiveness in place of colorblindness. Color evasiveness is a racial ideology that describes the act of denying the significance of race. Color evasiveness also resists using colorblind ideologies because they position people with disabilities as problematic and use disabilities as a metaphor for weakness and limitations.

References

- Alim, H. S., & Smitherman, G. (2012). *Articulate While Black: Barack Obama, Language, and Race in the U.S.* Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., & Ball, A. (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Annamma, S. A., Jackson, D. D., & Morrison, D. (2017). Conceptualizing color evasiveness: using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 2(20), 147–162.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: La frontera.* San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.
- Bailey, B. (1968). Some aspects of the impact of linguistics on language teaching in disadvantaged communities. In A. L. Davis (Ed.), *On the Dialects of Children* (pp. 570–578). Champaign Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Baker Bell, A. (2017). "I can switch my language, but I can't switch my skin": What teachers must understand about linguistic racism. In E. Moore, Jr., A. Michael, & M. W. Penick Parks (Eds.), *The Guide for White Women Who Teach Black boys* (pp. 97–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Baker Bell, A., Jones Stanbrough, R., & Everett, S. (2017). The stories they tell: Mainstream media, pedagogies of healing, and critical media literacy. *English Education*, 49(2), 130–152.
- Baldwin, J. (1979, July 29). If Black English isn't a language, then tell me, what is? *New York Times*. Retrieved September 26, 2008, from www.nytimes.com
- Baugh, J. (2000). *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic Pride and Racial Prejudice.* Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Baugh, J. (2015). Use and misuse of speech diagnostics for African American students. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9, 291–307.
- Baugh, J. R., & King, S. (2016). Language and linguistics on trial: Hearing Rachel Jeantel (and other vernacular speakers) in courtroom and beyond. *Language*, 92(4), 944–988.

- Bedolla, G. J. (2003). The identity paradox: Latino language, politics and selective dis-
sociation. *Latino Studies*, 1(2), 264-283.
- Bryan, N. (2020). Remembering Tamir Rice and other Black boy victims: Imagining Black
PlayCrit literacies inside and outside of urban literacy education. *Urban Education*. Advance
online publication: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0042085920902250>
- Charity Hudley, M., & Mallinson, C. (2014). *We Do Language. English Language Variation
in the Secondary English Classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York, NY:
New York University Press.
- Dumas, M., & ross, k. m. (2016). "Be real Black for me": Imagining blackcrit in education.
Urban Education, 51(4), 415-442.
- Dyson, M. E. (2009). A president preacher from anaphora to epistrophe. *The Sydney Morning
Herald*. Retrieved November 27, 2019, from https://www.smh.com.au/national/a-president-preacher-from-anaphora-to-epistrophe-20090119_gdta9b.html
- Fanon, F. (1952). *The Black Man and Language*. In *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York:
Grove Press.
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and
language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Gilyard, K. (1991). *Voices of the Self: A Study of Language Competence*. Detroit: Wayne State UP.
- Higginbotham, B. E. (1993). Righteous discontent: The women's movement in the black
Baptist church, 1880-1920. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language based theory of learning. *Linguistics and
Education*, 5(2), 93-116.
- hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching to transgress: education as the practice of freedom*. New York:
Routledge.
- Jeffries, M. (2014, November 28). Ferguson must force us to face anti Blackness. *Boston Globe*.
Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2014/11/28/ferguson-must-force-face-anti-blackness/pKVMpGxwUYpMDyHRWPln2M/story.html>
- Johnson, L. L. (2018). "Where do we go from here?": Toward a critical race English
education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 53, 104-124.
- Johnson, L. L., Jackson, J., Stovall, D., & Baszile, D. T. (2017). "Loving Blackness to Death": (Re)
Imagining ELA classrooms in a time of racial chaos. *English Journal*, 106(4), 60-66.
- Jordan, J. (1988). Nobody mean more to me than you and the future life of Willie Jordan.
Moving Towards Home: Political Essays (pp. 175-189). London: Virago.
- King, E. J. (2005). *Black Education: A Transformative Research and Action Agenda for the New
Century*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kinloch, V. (2010). To not be a traitor of Black English: Youth perceptions of language
rights in an urban context. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 103-141.
- Kirkland, D. E., & Jackson, A. (2008). Beyond the silence: Instructional approaches and
students' attitudes. In J. Scott, D. Y. Straker, & L. Katz (Eds.), *Affirming students' right to
their own language: Bridging educational policies and language/language arts teaching practices*
(pp. 160-180). Urbana, IL: NCTE/LEA.
- Kynard, C. (2007). "I want to be African": In search of a Black radical tradition/African
American Vernacularized Paradigm for "students' right to their own language. *College
English*, 69, 360-390.
- Kynard, C. (2013). *Vernacular Insurrections: Black Protest, and the New Century in Composition-
Literacies Studies*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Labov, W. (1970). The logic of non standard English. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Report of the Twentieth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics Studies* (pp. 1 43). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ladson Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *The Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47 68.
- Lippi Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Orde, A. (1984). "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (pp. 110 114). Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Love, B. (2019). *We Want to Do More Than Survive: Abolitionist Teaching and the Pursuit of Educational Freedom*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93 97.
- Pimentel, C. (2011). The color of language: The racialized educational trajectory of an emerging bilingual student. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 10(4), 335 353.
- Richardson, E. (2004). Coming from the heart: African American students, literacy stories, and rhetorical education. In E. Richardson & R. Jackson (Eds.), *African American Rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 155 169). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rickford, J. R., & Rickford, R. J. (2000). *Spoken Soul: The Story of Black English*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Sanchez, S. (2007). Sounds bouncin off paper: Black language memories and meditations. In S. Alim & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Talkin Black Talk: Language, Education and Social Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sealey Ruiz, Y. (2005). Spoken soul. The language of Black imagination and reality. *The Educational Forum*, 70, 37 46.
- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (This version of the book is no longer available in print. The current version is published by Wayne State University Press.)
- Smitherman, G. (2006). *Word from the Mother: Language and African Americans*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smitherman, G. (2017). Raciolinguistics, "mis education," and language arts teaching in the 21st century. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, 32(2), 4 12.
- Stanford University. (2002). *Linguistics 73: How Linguists Approach the Study of Language and Dialect*. Stanford, CA: John Rickford.
- Wheeler, R. S., & Swords, R. (2006). *Code Switching: Teaching Standard English in Urban Classrooms*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Wheeler, R. S., & Swords, R. (2010). *Code-Switching lessons: Grammar Strategies for Linguistically Diverse Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: firsthand Heinemann.
- Wiley, T. G. (2000). Language planning and policy. In S.L. McKay & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 103 147). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The Mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Traffic Output Publication.