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Introduction

This unit is for a 12th grade International Issues seminar with a human rights focus. Students begin by analyzing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its relevance in the 21st century, as struggles for human rights persist. They continue by studying a human rights issue through the work of a human rights defender. They spend most of the second semester analyzing causes, effects, and solutions related to a specific human rights issue as their Senior Project in the Law Pathway at our high school.

However, direct instruction on topics that connect human rights issues in the present with the historical events that have shaped contemporary crises was missing. Thus, I added a unit that unpacked the connection between the history of U.S. involvement in Central America and the recent human rights violations of migrants and their families at the United States-Mexico border.

In order to build students’ background knowledge about the causes of this crisis and the reasons migrants left their home countries, students analyzed the impact of U.S. military, economic, and political interventions throughout the 20th century. They answered the question: To what extent is the United States responsible for the current migrant crisis? Students worked collaboratively to develop virtual museums that guided viewers through the history and impact of U.S. involvement in Central America and its connection to present-day human rights issues.

While this addressed the importance of making connections between human rights issues and the historical events that shaped them, the course still lacks what students need to deepen their understanding of power, racism, imperialism, and resistance. In addition, students need more practice analyzing primary sources from the voices of resistance who have talked back to empire.

These observations have helped me to research and design the unit that follows. Students will not only learn about the United States’ military, political, and economic interventions around the world; they will also learn about the ongoing and organized resistance to these actions. This unit will also focus on the contradictions implicit in the United States’ relationships with other nations. Just as contradictions exist between the ideals expressed in the founding documents and the enactment of racist policies against Black and Brown people in
the United States, contradictions exist with respect to the stated purposes and realities of U.S. interventionist policies. This unit will focus on these contradictions and use them as a tool for understanding the persistent and pernicious inequalities of power that result in current human rights abuses.

What Use is History? Whose Past Matters?

Paul A. Kramer’s article “History in a Time of Crisis” addresses these contradictions and inequalities of power. Kramer asks a crucial question: “What use is history in a time like this?” He focuses on three “particular knacks” of historians that serve us in “countering authoritarian politics.” Kramer asks, “What are historians good for?” He responds with three answers: “disrupting inevitabilities, digging out lost alternatives, and widening the horizons of empathy.” Framing the purpose of historians’ work with these skills breathes life into our work with teenagers. Developmentally speaking, it is the what ifs, the what could have been, and the why should we cares that hold appeal for students.

This approach leads to the creation of several questions to use in the International Issues classroom. To begin, what really was inevitable in the history of U.S. imperialism and international relations? Did the U.S. take charge of the Western Hemisphere with the Monroe Doctrine in 1823? To what extent did the United States have to intervene in the Spanish American War in the late 19th century? When did the United States become the world’s policeman? Does the world need a policeman? What kind of world would it be if mid-20th century land reforms in Central America were allowed to flourish? What political, economic, and foreign policy decisions could have led to the establishment of self-sufficient democracies around the world? And to bring these tools to the present human rights crisis: What if people didn’t have to leave their own countries to live in freedom and safety?

Kramer argues that “Authoritarian politics relies upon narratives of inevitability” and that “good historians know this is hooey.” These “fundamental, bedrock patterns...came out of somewhere...even as their architects offered assurances that they had always been there.” Peeling back these layers creates space to find something new (to us), specifically the voices of resistance. “Here our task is...rediscovery. What possibilities in the past have closed over? What emancipatory energies might lay trapped beneath layers of accumulating sediment?” What stands out is the potential strength of these lost possibilities. The dominant narrative justifies imperialist outcomes. The shift with this unit is the act of digging out with our ear to the ground. What if? What could have been? Why should we care?

Kramer asks questions that reach into the heart of our work: “Whose past matters? Which characters get speaking parts? Who is authorized to tell the story?” With these questions and counternarratives, students will analyze the voices of resistance to U.S. imperialism. Students will also examine examples of American racism globally and in the communities of people who found solidarity with anti-imperialist struggles throughout the world. The silencing of the victims of American racism is a tool to normalize and perpetuate white supremacy. The acceptance of this reality as inevitable further normalizes and perpetuates white supremacy. A focus on the voices of resistance pushes students to consider lost alternatives, question power dynamics, and situate themselves within a tradition of talking back to empire.
**Dominant Narratives vs. Counter Narratives**

The dominant narratives most often used to study international issues and human rights are rooted in assumptions that must be named in order to equip ourselves with the necessary tools for the work. In her book, *Race and the Making of American Political Science*, Jessica Blatt names these narratives. She demonstrates the role that race and white supremacy have played in the development of the field of political science, as well as the impact this knowledge production has had on policy making.

Many of the dominant narratives that are discussed in this unit have historical connections to the late 19th and early 20th century when the United States applied the concept of Manifest Destiny to the world. Blatt demonstrates that global Manifest Destiny is rooted in white supremacy and racism, or a “Jim Crow theory of race relations.” For example, in the 1880s, the founders of the first two doctoral programs in politics in the United States, taught that Anglo-Saxons “created, and were fit to enjoy, democratic institutions.” Blatt addresses the dominant narrative that fails to recognize the role that race has played and offers the alternative “that race thinking shaped U.S. political science at its origins far more profoundly than has previously been recognized. From the late nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, scholars of politics defined and continually reoriented their intellectual work in response to changing scientific notions of race and to the political imperatives of the racial order at home and abroad.” This early scholarship set the tone for decades of academic work that claimed colorblindness was at its core. However, the implications of such scholarship have reverberated into the “political science mainstream” and have “failed to view racial oppression and hierarchy as problems that fell within its bailiwick.” In addition, “the explicit disciplinary racism...signaled a deeply racialized worldview that helped to give form and content to the practice of political science at its origins.” Blatt makes the divide between the dominant narrative and counter narrative clear by naming the racist influences on the study of political science since its inception.

The second dominant narrative transitions from the colorblindness of political science to the assumed impartiality of contemporary human rights discourse. Imperial powers like the United States, Great Britain, and France drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the 1940s. Dominant narratives celebrate the post war accomplishments of these nations without taking into account inequalities of power, as well as these nations’ complicity and abuse of human rights. One of the problems with this dominant assumption is that the universal codification of human rights puts almost all of the onus on individuals to secure these rights rather than on the need for systems to change in order to realize the statement that “All human beings are born free and equal.” The counter narrative acknowledges the imperialist motivations of the nations who led the creation of the UDHR. In addition, the counter narrative questions the impact that colorblindness and impartiality have on the study of human rights, international issues, and the law.

Third, we should question the assumption that the boundaries, borders, and laws of contemporary nation-states are the foremost solution to issues related to democracy, migration, and trade. This unit will present a counter narrative that questions the reliance on the rules and tools of nation-states and rethink the white supremacy, violence, and racism associated with nationalistic attitudes and practices.

Fourth, we should question the dominant narrative that justifies militarization and war as useful tools to ensure the security of the United States and the rest of the world, as well as the use of militarization and war to protect the interests and profits of multinational corporations and the U.S. capitalist system. Blatt addresses this dominant narrative that connects imperialism and capitalism:
In its simplest form, conventional wisdom on the issue boiled down to the following propositions: (1) racial and economic forces compelled the great powers to seek new markets and new resources; (2) those resources and markets could be found among “backward” peoples; (3) backward peoples could not efficiently develop those resources or the market organization to consume the ever-increasing bounty of the modern economy; and, therefore, (4) the great powers had a responsibility to the world to develop its resources, and a responsibility to their own people to see that the benefits of doing so accrued to them and not to their rivals.8

Not only are war and imperialism used to protect the profits of multinational corporations, they are also the result of the racist dominant narrative that claims colonized people are incapable of developing resources themselves. This unit will draw attention to these intersections, investigate the white supremacist underpinnings of this narrative, and center peacemaking and socialist economic reforms as more relevant means to global security, improved human welfare, and increased democratic participation around the world.

Dominant Narrative
The study of international politics is colorblind, race neutral, and impartial
Human rights are universal; individuals have the capacity to access these rights as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
Boundaries, borders, and nation states are tools to promote democracy, migration, and trade
Militarization, war, and capitalism are the most useful tools to ensure global security and protect the interests of multinational corporations
Economic investment in war and the military is necessary to ensure global security; this investment should be prioritized over social programs
Civilized nations determine how and when other nations are ready for self-government

Counter Narrative
Race, race thinking, and white supremacy have influenced the study of international politics since its inception
Imperialist nations with their own human rights violations drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; systems need to change before human rights are universal
Boundaries, borders, and nation states are tools to promote nationalism, white supremacy, and violence
Peacemaking and socialist economic reforms are the most useful tools to protect human rights and democratic participation
Divest from the military industrial complex and invest in social programs; there is enough money to meet people’s needs and protect human rights
The civilized/uncivilized dichotomy is rooted in white supremacy; self-determination is a human right; mutual cooperation over violent intervention

Also associated with this dominant narrative and counter narrative is the lack of understanding and transparency about how much public money is available to invest in social programs, peacemaking, and economic reforms. The dominant approach assumes that as much money as possible must be invested in the military in the name of patriotism and national security; and that there isn’t enough money to provide for the general welfare, namely education, healthcare, and housing. The counter narrative disrupts that assumption, reminding us of the wealth invested in the war machine and that the opportunity to meet people’s needs exists once the collective decision is made to prioritize it.

A final dominant narrative articulates that only some nations and races are capable or deserving of self-determination and democratic government. Blatt describes the “leading scholars active in the American Political Science Association” and their belief “that the ‘darker races,’ both at home and abroad, would most likely require a semipermanent subordinate status appropriate to each group’s degree of evolutionary progress.” While defenders of this narrative would argue that the United States is a selfless arbiter of democracy working to promote democracy in places that have not yet been exposed to Enlightenment ideals,
the counter narrative addresses the white supremacist influences on U.S. foreign policy. The dominant narrative is connected to white supremacist thinking that creates a civilized-noncivilized dichotomy where civilized nations deserve democracy and must teach noncivilized nations how to establish it (if and when they are ready).

Two men who led the development of the political science field operated with this narrative of the supremacy of the civilized. Henry Jones Ford, president of the APSA, justified imperialism on the grounds that it was the consequence of “supremacy” and that “the rise of empire appears to have the constancy of natural law.” This justification compels political and military leaders in the United States to use imperialist violence as the leading scholars give it their blessing. Blatt also quotes Bernard Moses, who founded the UCLA Political Science Department in 1903. Just as Ford used white supremacist thinking to justify colonization, Moses recommended the use of “physical force” because “to smite the barbarian with a heavy hand is sometimes the surest way to liberalize his mind.” This logic used to defend militaristic intervention is rooted in the dominant narrative that erases the agency of people of color. It also sets up the need for non-military colonialist interventions because of the racist assumption that indigenous people are not capable of governing themselves. Moses acknowledges Native American genocide, the consequence of colonialism and expansion in North America, when he recommends policy in other parts of the world. Blatt quotes him: “However, as even Moses acknowledged, whereas in the continental United States it had been ‘expected that the aboriginal inhabitants would disappear,’ in the Caribbean, Pacific, and African colonies, this ‘could not be presumed,’ and thus ‘they could not be ignored.’” The foundation for this racist and violent international policy is the racist and violent policies of the United States affecting, and disappearing, indigenous people and people of color in the Americas.

**Origins of Intervention: The Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary**

During the end of his address to Congress in 1823, President James Monroe included a few paragraphs that would become the “cornerstone of American foreign policy.” In this address, Monroe’s administration sent a message to European imperial powers warning them against interfering in the Western Hemisphere, specifically in newly independent Latin American nations and potential U.S. territories. In the address Monroe states, “We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.” This diplomatic message also contained economic motivations as the United States sought to limit European economic expansion and increase its own trade and influence in the region. Monroe’s speech made it clear that the U.S. would prioritize its role in managing the region’s affairs when he stated, “As a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.” What stands out about this early 19th century policy is how it links the economic interests of the United States with its peace and security, thus setting the stage for economic justifications of future American militarism and expansion. This dominant assumption has been written into U.S. foreign policy for almost two centuries. The United States, through the Doctrine, expresses a paternalistic contradiction in its claim to favor political autonomy of newly independent states while simultaneously asserting its military and economic strength against European imperial powers.
Fast forward to the dawn of the 20th century and Theodore Roosevelt’s decision to double down on Monroe’s policy. Whereas the Department of State’s Office of the Historian describes the Monroe Doctrine as “essentially passive” because “it asked that Europeans not increase their influence or recolonize any part of the Western Hemisphere,” the Roosevelt Corollary resulted from “a more confident United States [who] was willing to take on the role of regional policeman.” Not only were the nations of the Western Hemisphere not open to European powers for colonization as stated under the Monroe Doctrine, Roosevelt used his message to Congress in 1904 to assert a more militarized presence and give the U.S. the power to intervene in the economic and political matters of other sovereign nations. Roosevelt’s policy is rooted in the dominant narrative of the existence of “civilized” nations and the preeminence of their obligation to save “uncivilized” nations from themselves. In the Corollary he states, "Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power."

Classroom Focus: Maps, Predictions, and Conversations

In this International Issues class, with a focus on racism, imperialism, capitalism, and white supremacy, it is necessary to consider the actions of the United States and the impact on communities around the globe. Establishing historical context by teaching students about the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary is necessary. Students can study the motivations for these policy decisions and then put excerpts of the primary sources in conversation with additional sources that represent the “roads not taken.”

Students should first review the chronology and geography of the 19th century revolutions and independence movements in Central and South America. Students can use these maps to create a two columned chart of countries that declared independence before and after 1823 to highlight the significance of the Monroe Doctrine’s date, while also documenting their questions as they compare and contrast the maps. Students should also have an opportunity to review maps that document the pre-Columbian period in order to reinforce the counter narrative that questions the role of borders, boundaries, and nation states in the discussion of international issues. By using these maps as a foundation to critique U.S. policy decisions, students can uncover the trapped emancipatory energies and consider the lost alternatives altered by colonization, war, and imperialism.

Before students engage with the documents, they should work in small groups to predict the motivations for these two presidential policies. To support this, teachers can provide brief descriptions taken from the Department of State and Library of Congress websites found above. Questions to guide student discussion are: Why would the United States tell European nations they are no longer allowed to intervene in the Western Hemisphere? Why would the United States give itself the power to intervene in economic and political matters of other nations in the Western Hemisphere? Equipped with their own predictions, as well as important background knowledge, students can analyze excerpts from the primary sources while continuing to consider motivations, causes, and effects.

Once students have developed this content knowledge, they will be ready to put the sources into conversation.
with the voices who talk back to empire. The first is José Martí, a Cuban poet, writer, orator, statesman, and revolutionary philosopher. Roberto González Echevarría describes the world Martí envisioned: “A free Cuba ruled by love and justice, free of prejudice and oppression, exempt from arbitrary rule by military leaders, in harmonious commerce with the rest of the world, and enjoying absolute self-determination.” By including Martí’s writing in the discussion of the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary, students will be able to disrupt the inevitability of imperialism and consider new possibilities for international relations, peacemaking, and self-determination.

Martí’s essay, *Nuestra America*, was published in 1891; the same time the Cuban Revolutionary Party was forming. Martí references the need for a collective response to the imperialist encroachment of the United States into the Americas: “The trees must form ranks to keep the giant with seven-league boots from passing! It is the time of mobilization, of marching together, and we must go forward in close ranks, like silver in the veins of the Andes.” Students will be drawn to the references to the natural world including trees and silver in the Andes. Connections to environmental justice and the impact of imperialism on the natural resources and the climate can be useful here. In *Nuestra America*, Martí continues his critique:

> The scorn of our formidable neighbor, who does not know us, is Our America's greatest danger. And since the day of the visit is near it is imperative that our neighbor knows us, and soon, so that it will not scorn us. Through ignorance it might even come to lay hands on us. Once it does know us, it will remove its hands out of respect.

The assumption Martí expresses runs counter to the dominant narrative of U.S. imperialism and militarism disguised as diplomacy and support for democracy. Students can discuss the counter narrative that comes through clearly in Martí’s work.

Martí’s writing also represents the connection between anti-militarist and socialist counter narratives. Not only does Martí critique late 19th century U.S. imperialism, he critiques the unequal distribution of wealth in the United States during the same period. Martí wrote about class warfare in Chicago in 1886: “This republic in its excessive worship of wealth, has fallen, without any of the restraints of tradition, into the inequality, injustice and violence of the monarchies.” By describing the counter narrative expressed in this text selection, students will practice making connections between anti-imperialist and socialist traditions.

The second voice of resistance to put into conversation with the Monroe Doctrine, the Roosevelt Corollary, and José Martí is from CISPES, the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador, an organization founded in the United States in 1980 who continue their work today. Their Mission Statement reads: “We are a grassroots organization dedicated to supporting the Salvadoran people's struggle for self-determination and social and economic justice. The alternative that they are building—an alternative based upon democratic and socialist ideals—is an example to all people who seek a world free of domination and exploitation.” Students can describe how the CISPES Mission Statement echoes the ideas of José Martí while also being a direct response to the two presidential policies. In addition, students can explore the lost alternatives contained in CISPES’ three basic goals:

1. To end U.S. economic, political and military intervention in El Salvador and by extension Central America, the Caribbean, and all of the Americas. In the current context we work to end U.S.-imposed global economic policies that devastate local cultures and economies, specifically in El Salvador.
2. To give political and material support to the grassroots movement in El Salvador for self-determination, economic democracy and social justice. The groups we strive to support and collaborate with include labor, women’s, youth, LGBT and other grassroots organizations. We stand in solidarity with the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN), as we have since our founding, because of its central role in building a new, egalitarian society.

3. To help build a broad-based progressive U.S. social movement and an international, working-class led movement for economic and social justice.

Students can make connections between these goals and their previous work on human rights and the UDHR. They can see how the work of an organization like CISPES connects to the themes of anti-imperialism, self-determination, and economic justice, while also collaborating with women, youth and LGBT organizations. After exploring the CISPES website, students can visualize, discuss, and plan how communities build egalitarian societies. In an International Issues course designed to address the racism embedded in the dominant narratives of U.S. foreign policy and imperialism, it is important to highlight texts of resistance when teaching about the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary. Students will be able to deconstruct the monolithic message of U.S. dominance and analyze specific critiques of this dominant narrative.

1898: “An Empire is Better Than a Republic”

What were the intentions of the United States in the late 19th century given its changing identity on the world stage? Influenced by the publication of two influential texts, Alfred Thayer Mahan’s *The Influence of Sea Power* in 1890 and Frederick Jackson Turner’s “The Significance of the Frontier in American History” in 1893, the United States’ commitment to Manifest Destiny on the North American continent expanded beyond its changing borders, becoming a mission of global domination rooted in white supremacy. Stephen Kinzer describes the ideas of Mahan and Jackson in his book *Overthrow - America’s Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq.* About naval power he writes, “To achieve that control, [Mahan] asserted, a nation must maintain a navy powerful enough to protect its merchant fleet and force uncooperative countries to open themselves to trade and investment.” He quotes Turner who wrote, “For nearly three centuries the dominant fact in American life has been expansion...That these energies of expansion will no longer operate would be a rash prediction; and the demands for a vigorous foreign policy, for an inter-oceanic canal, for a revival of our power upon the seas, and for the extension of American influence to outlying islands and adjoining countries, are indications that the movement will continue.” Both works make the connection that emerged previously, American militarism and imperialism is linked with economic growth and investment.

This history of U.S. intervention that began in the late 19th century highlights a critical tension between the apparent and actual purposes of these “regime changes.” Kinzer writes about this pattern: “The United States repeatedly used its military power, and that of its clandestine services, to overthrow governments that refused to protect American interests.” He continues, “Each time, it cloaked its intervention in the rhetoric of national security and liberation. In most cases, however, it acted mainly for economic reasons—specifically, to establish, promote, and defend the right of Americans to do business around the world without interference.” We can see this contradiction between rhetoric and reality analyzing the purpose of the Spanish-American War. Was the purpose to secure freedom for Cuba from centuries of rule under imperial Spain? Or were these themes of liberation used to convince the American people to support the war while
annexation of Cuba for military, political, and economic power was the actual goal? As we consider these questions, it is important to remember that there are no singular answers. A wide range of interests tried to define the meaning of the war and its purpose.

As students study 1898, they will value returning to José Martí. In the years leading up to U.S. involvement in the war, Cuban rebels resisted Spanish control and held their own in a battle for political self-determination and freedom from imperial rule. José Martí led his fellow patriots in these anti-imperialist efforts. In Martí’s last letter, posted by his comrades after his war-related death, he sought “to prevent, by the independence of Cuba, the United States from spreading over the West Indies and falling, with that added weight, upon other lands of our America.” Not only does Martí reclaim the name of America to include lands outside of borders to the north, he links Cuban independence to a check on the future imperial domination, not of Spain, but of the United States.

The United States’ entrance into the Spanish-American War in 1898 symbolized a shift. The U.S. entered the war in the name of fighting empire, ultimately to secure a new role as an empire itself. The war also signified a reunification and relegitimization of the Confederacy by the United States; the nation seemingly unified with a common purpose of bringing liberty to those outside of the United States who need it. In his book *The End of the Myth: From the Frontier to the Border Wall in the Mind of America*, Greg Grandin describes how expansion reunited the North and South in the post Civil War era: “White southerners bitterly opposed Reconstruction, a military occupation imposed on the entire defeated Confederacy, but they came together with the northerners ‘on the subject of Manifest Destiny.’” Grandin investigates the contradictions implicit in this shift: “The War of 1898 was alchemic. It transformed the ‘Lost Cause’ of the Confederacy—the preservation of slavery—into humanity’s cause for world freedom.” While self-determination was the implied purpose for global interventions and war, U.S. leaders had never shifted from their long-standing white supremacist policies. Even President William McKinley took a “victory tour” of the South after the defeat of Spain, wearing a Confederate badge on his lapel and saying, “When we are all on one side, we are unconquerable.” McKinley uses a colorblind narrative to celebrate unity, while failing to acknowledge or take action to protect the lives of African-Americans who were left out of the “one side” he celebrated. Grandin continues, “Nothing was truly reconciled, nothing transcended, at least when it came to the country’s founding paradox: the promise of political freedom and the reality of racial subjugation.” Students will recognize this paradox as they witness similar contradictions in history and in the human rights struggles of present day.

**Classroom Focus: Dominant Narratives and Counter Narratives**

A discussion of the content above gives students an opportunity to practice naming the dominant narratives central to this historical period. As students name these narratives, they can analyze their impact, while also analyzing the counternarratives. For example, Mahan himself uses the keyword when he describes expansion as the “dominant fact in American life.” Students can connect this evidence to the narrative that centers U.S. militarization and intervention as the necessary response to, and not the cause of, international conflict.

Teachers can also draw students’ attention to the words used to describe the United States versus the rest of the Western Hemisphere, including Central and South America and the Caribbean. Many use America and the United States interchangeably, not making the differentiation that José Martí made over a century ago.
Teachers can use Martí’s primary source discussed above in two ways: To document U.S. motivations for war and to discuss the words we consciously and unconsciously use to describe stolen land. How do the dominant and counter narratives show up in the words we use? How can we support our students to use these reflections to strengthen their critical analysis of dominant and counter narratives?

Central American Resistance and Black Anti-Imperialism

With the pattern of U.S. intervention established in 1898, later episodes in the 20th century continue this pattern. In addition to the United Fruit Company’s invasion of Central America, the United States government intervened and overthrew the Nicaraguan president José Santos Zelaya in 1909. This period was the “imperial phase” when “Americans deposed regimes more or less openly.” Following this imperial phase was a post WWII “political situation infinitely more complex than it had been at the dawn of the century.” Kinzer references the Soviet Union, “a force in the world that limited [U.S.] freedom of action.” With the pattern continued, yet shifted in a new Cold War reality, “the United States began using a more subtle technique, the clandestine coup d’état, to depose foreign governments.” One of the most significant actions took place in the 1950s in Guatemala where “diplomats and intelligence agents replaced generals as the instruments of American interventions.” This intervention was another example of the United States’ violent response to those who talked back to empire as they sought self-determination, land reform and economic justice for their country.

In the spring of 1944, teacher-led protests erupted in Guatemala. They resisted the fourteen-year dictatorship of General Ubico, who held power after over a century of aristocratic rule following Guatemala’s liberation from Spain in 1821. In their book, Bitter Fruit: The Story of the American Coup in Guatemala, Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer describe the players in this revolution: “A growing body of schoolteachers, shopkeepers, skilled workers and students staged public demonstrations demanding freedom to organize.” Teachers held tremendous power in this movement; initially striking for higher pay and refusing to march in the annual Teachers’ Day Parade. They led multiple non-violent protests culminating in the largest protest in the country’s modern history on June 29, 1944. General Ubico’s militaristic response led to the death or injury of approximately 200 people; one of whom as Maria Chinchilla, a teacher who became a national martyr for the push to oust the dictator and improve social and economic conditions for Guatemalans. This teacher led protest and resistance movement is a prime example of “digging out lost alternatives.” Teachers can put this history in conversation with recent teacher protests throughout the United States. For decades, the power and voices of teachers, a profession made up of mostly women, has been undermined and silenced. What are the conditions that lead teachers to shift from compliance to resistance? What is the significance of teachers rising up against consolidated power and advocating not only for themselves but for another kind of world for the children and families they encounter in their day-to-day experiences of teaching?

One of the ironies connected to later U.S. involvement in the overthrow of democratically elected President Arbenz is that the protests in the 1940s in Guatemala can be traced back to the “promises of democracy” protesters heard on the radio during World War II. Franklin Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms” speech calling for universal freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from want and fear resonated with Guatemalans as they resisted their own country’s reality. FDR’s New Deal and his public support for trade unions also sparked interest in labor organizing and a belief that government should devote itself to the public good. Not only that
but events in Mexico, to the north of Guatemala, inspired protests. The nationalization of Mexico’s oil resources disrupted the inevitability of the Monroe Doctrine that U.S. corporations had to control the resources and markets of the Western Hemisphere.\textsuperscript{36}

The complicated story of U.S. involvement in the overthrow of Arbenz needs more time and space than this unit allows. Nevertheless, a few key points related to the dominant and counter narratives of the unit are important. For decades, colonialism and capitalism shaped Guatemala’s economic system. So much so that “the need to reform the system of ownership was universally recognized.”\textsuperscript{37} The problem relates to plans to increase production without corresponding plans to reform the distribution of land and wealth. For example, when increased production benefited the United Fruit Company, “the major portion of those profits went abroad to foreign stockholders.”\textsuperscript{38} When Arbenz took power, he changed the dominant narrative:

"I do not exaggerate when I say that the most important pragmatic point of my government and of the revolutionary movement of October is that one related to a profound change in the backward agricultural production of Guatemala, by way of an agrarian reform which puts an end to the latifundios and the semi-feudal practices, giving the land to thousands of peasants, raising their purchasing power and creating a great internal market favorable to the development of domestic industry."\textsuperscript{39}

The election of Arbenz alarmed the United Fruit Company as ideas of land reform spread among the poor majority. As a result, President Eisenhower, who used the CIA for regime change throughout the world, worked with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and his brother Alan Dulles, CIA director and board member of United Fruit, to organize the “Operation Success” coup to oust Arbenz in 1953. And while the dominant narrative uses safety to justify U.S. involvement in international affairs, Kinzer and Schlesinger provide the counter narrative: “American national security considerations were never compelling in the case of Guatemala.”\textsuperscript{40} This coup in Guatemala led to the installation of a series of U.S. supported conservative military dictators and eventually decades of civil war, suffering, and instability. This example is one of many teachers can use to illustrate the connection between U.S. intervention in Central America and the trauma, racism, and violence presently affecting migrants throughout America.

In addition to teaching students about these historical connections between actions by the U.S. government and the experiences of non-white American migrants, this unit highlights additional voices of resistance. As many crises triggered by white supremacist, imperialist, and capitalist interventions exploded across the globe, Black Americans found solidarity with people impacted by violence disguised as the safeguarding of democracy.

In their book, \textit{Black Against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party}, Joshua Bloom and Waldo E. Martin, Jr. describe the life and work of Polly Graham in North Carolina to illustrate issues that motivated the Black Panthers to advocate for racial and economic justice in the United States. For this unit, Polly Graham is an interesting example whose work can be put into conversation with the contemporaneous revolution in Guatemala in the 1940s. The dominant narratives of U.S. history and international issues focus primarily on valorizing the Allied Powers during the World War II era. By instead focusing on Polly Graham’s story and the push for land reforms in Central America during the 1940s, we can dig out lost alternatives and create new narratives. The parallels between Graham and the Guatemalan protests are worth exploring. “Polly Graham knew about hardship and struggle. In the 1940s, she had been part of a failed attempt to organize
low-wage black workers in the R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Factory in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.”41 Not only are there commonalities in the Graham’s efforts and the efforts of those who fought for land reform; there are also commonalities in the responses to these efforts driven by familiar dominant narratives. The authors continue: “But the virulent anti-unionism, magnified by racism and anti-Communist hysteria, had beaten that noble and long-forgotten effort.”42 Ultimately, the Black Panthers became involved when they organized the Black community in Winston-Salem in 1970 as Graham faced eviction. Using the Black Panthers’ involvement can be a powerful pivot point in the classroom. Of course, the Black Panthers were involved in this hyper-local issue of housing rights for working women; they were also involved internationally as they situated the struggles of the Black community within a larger struggle of the fight for self-determination around the world.

In 1968, the Black Panthers sent a delegation to the Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Vietnam in Quebec. “Throughout the conference, various Black Panther speakers drew an analogy between their struggle and that of...Vietnam. They compared the rapid expansion of police departments and the brutalization of blacks in American [cities] with the occupation of Vietnam by the U.S. military.” Their analogy continued when discussing “the wars of repression being waged against those seeking self-determination throughout Latin America and the Third World and among communities in the United States, even against the white hippies and the leftists and those who are looking for much individual freedom.”43 In addition to these analogies, the Black Panthers countered the dominant narrative that holds laws up as colorblind, race neutral, and impartial. They shared a counter narrative that breaks the oppressor’s hold on what is good, legal, and right. At the conference they said, “We say that the oppressor has no laws and no rights that the oppressed are bound to respect.”44 By making this statement, the speakers disrupt the inevitability of the rule of law when it is a tool of white supremacy and colonialism.

One year later, the Black Panthers continued their organizing and activism at the Pan-African Cultural Festival in Algiers, Algeria where their anti-imperialism “found fertile international ground.”45 Bloom and Martin compared the Black Panthers’ contributions to the ideas of W.E.B. Du Bois from twenty-five years earlier “that blacks in America were subjugated and oppressed and denied self-determination much like those in the colonies in Africa.”46 While dominant narratives in the United States portrayed and reported on the Black Panthers as threats to (white people’s) security and liberty, anti-imperialists around the world valued the synthesis of race and class politics that they represented. According to Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver, the organizers of the festival in Algiers saw the Party as “the nucleus of a future, American government.”47 Visualizing an alternative future is another example of the disruption of inevitability that has been the focus of this unit.

Classroom Focus: A Conversation with the “Three Evils”

One way to effectively frame these examples of resistance to U.S. imperialism and repression is to put them into conversation with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s 1967 speech “America’s Chief Moral Dilemma.” First, students will quickly activate their background knowledge about Dr. King in preparation for analysis and comparison. Second, the narrow lens that students likely bring about Dr. King as a civil rights leader only will stretch. The Atlantic published a selection of the speech from which teachers can pull excerpts:
The triple evils of racism, economic exploitation, and militarism. The great problem and the great challenge facing mankind today is to get rid of war...During a period of war, when a nation becomes obsessed with the guns of war, social programs inevitably suffer. Now I know that there are people who are confused about the war and they say to me and anybody who speaks out against it, ‘You shouldn’t be speaking out. You’re a civil rights leader, and the two issues should not be joined together.’ Well ... the two issues are tied together. And I’m going to keep them together.48

After learning new content and analyzing Dr. King’s speech, students can return to the work of finding evidence of dominant narratives and counter narratives in the sources and stories of the unit. Students will also be better prepared to study the connections between socialism and anti-militarism and the work of the War Resisters’ League that is the focus of the next section.

**Women Resisting War**

As we examine the connection between militarism, capitalism, and white supremacy in American history, specifically the use of the U.S. military to defend interests overseas, we can also learn from the connection between anti-militarism and socialism in American history. In 1923 Jessie Wallace Hughan founded the War Resisters’ League, an organization that continues to fight against imperialism, racism, greed, and militarism. In 1928 Hughan wrote the instructional and philosophical manual, *What is Socialism?* where she makes the connection between the oppression and lack of agency of working people and the international war machine’s relentless mission. This socialist and anti-militarist tradition is seen throughout the 20th century in both political and poetic writing by women across regions and continents. The voices in this section are clear examples of “Talking Back to Empire.” While Hughan’s whiteness emerges as problematic in her work, the remaining texts are from women of color whose ideas can talk back to Hughan as well. In addition to Hughan’s 1928 book, poetry by Central American women born in the 1950s, reports of resistance to nuclear weapons in Puerto Rico, and the manifesto of an international peace coalition led by women in the 1980s are sources that exemplify lost alternatives and the disruption of inevitabilities.

Jessie Wallace Hughan includes a definition of socialism in her book: “Socialism is the political movement of the working-class which aims to abolish exploitation by means of the collective ownership and democratic management of the basic instruments of production and distribution.”49 However, she does not limit her analysis to economics; she disrupts the dominant narrative by presenting a vision that offers a pathway to alternative economic systems and makes the connection between capitalism, imperialism, and militarism. First, she aligns Socialists around the world with the movement for pacifism, “In the movement for World Peace, the Socialists of all countries have always taken an active part, agitation for arbitration and disarmament and opposing specific wars as they arose.”50 She questions the dominant narrative that connects safety to war, militarized interventions, and annexations in her description of imperialism and its “menacing proportions.”51 Hughan aligns socialism with pacifism and calls for the abandonment of what Mahan had celebrated a few decades before: “American Socialism is distinctly pacifist. It opposes conscription and compulsory military training; it advocates treaties which shall substitute for war the peaceful settlement of disputes; it favors international disarmament, and, pending disarmament, the abandonment of the program of
‘aggressive militarism and big navy building.’ This critique of Mahan’s thesis illustrates another counter narrative. Rather than accept aggression and naval power as the best tools for maintaining security, Hughan explains how opposition to the draft and international disarmament are necessary for peace.

When Hughan brings imperialism into her discussion of pacifism, the economic critique becomes even clearer. Her argument bolsters the idea that the primary purpose of the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary is to protect the economic interests of the United States. Even though Hughan decries the treatment of African-American who she describes as “deprived of political rights in defiance of the Constitution,” she uses language rooted in the racist, dominant narrative when describing places controlled by imperialist powers. Hughan describes imperialism as the “process by which the industrial nations of the West have gradually extended their economic control over the undeveloped and backward territories of both hemispheres...Its essential feature, however, is economic exploitation, and its outcome is war, whether a one-sided suppression of protesting natives or a full-fledged conflict with a jealous rival.” Her centering of economic exploitation as the essential feature of the process of imperialism, and the ultimate cause of war, disrupts the inevitability of war being used to spread democracy and highlights the more compelling, historically accurate connection between the military, imperialism, and the economic interests of the United States.

To connect this critique of imperialism back to socialism, Hughan explains how imperialism, war, and their relationship to capitalism imperil the American worker. She writes, “This type of imperialism is an immediate loss to the American worker...Even more serious than this, however, is the certainty that American workers will be called on sooner or later to support with men and money the small or great wars which will be waged to protect these investments of capitalism abroad.” Her work defines socialism and imperialism, explains why militarism contradicts socialism, and describes how an investment in war and imperialism harms the working class. Hughan’s work can be found in a comprehensive collection of women’s voices, *Women on War*, edited by Daniela Gioseffi. Hers is one voices amidst many; the remainder of this section will consider additional voices from this pivotal volume.

Michele Najlis was born in 1946 in Nicaragua. She founded the literary-political publication *Ventana* which celebrates themes of self-determination and contains “prophecies of the future.” Her work focuses on the experiences of those oppressed by unjust governments who were supported by imperialist interests. Her poetry responds to the dominant narrative that justifies imperialism and military intervention in the name of democracy and security. In her 1987 poem, “They Followed Us Into the Night,” Najlis describes the imperialist’s tactics while also centering the strength of the resistance: “They followed us into the night, they trapped us, leaving us no defense but our hands united with millions of hands.” How does the imagery of unity with millions of hands provide a counter narrative? How does this work disrupt the inevitability of war and imagine another future?

Lillian Jimenez was born in El Salvador in 1950 and imprisoned for her work as a poet and political activist. The loss of population in El Salvador was caused by the “death squads, terrorism, and the poverty” of a military dictatorship sponsored by the United States, primarily under Ronald Reagan. Jimenez’s poem, “To the Soldiers of El Salvador: Who from 1931 to 1980 Have Ruled the Country Through a Military Dictatorship,” exposes the experiences of violence, while also acknowledging war’s erasure of dreams and possibilities. In the fifth stanza of her poem from 1988, she writes:

| But tomorrow |
Even without desiring it,
they will have to see what must be seen.

They will have to pay
for the horrible fate of each victim,
for all the lips they silenced,

for all the dreams they ripped out of our breasts.57

Her attention to perpetrators’ forced reckonings with tomorrow, the fate of victims, and the violence used to attack people’s self-determination and destiny aligns with Kramer’s framework that invites us to disrupt inevitabilities, dig out lost alternatives, and widen horizons of empathy.

Alenka Bermudez was born in Chile around 1950 and moved to Guatemala, working there and in Nicaragua. Like Najlis and Jimenez, she wrote about people enduring in the face of poverty and oppression. Her own son died in the decades long war in Guatemala that resulted in the genocide of indigenous Mayans and became known as the “Silent Holocaust.” In her poem, “Guatemala, Your Blood,” Bermudez creates two worlds; one where suffering is real yet unexplainable and the other where the conflict is the semantics of how to name the suffering. She begins her 1987 poem with the following stanza:

Where is the word that will fill in for hunger
and what name can you give to this daily wanting
how to describe the empty table the abysmal eyes
Little bellies swollen forheads deformed
by weights the endless burden of centuries
horizons of smoke burned-up mattresses
no frying pan
scarcity in the stew that’s left over because of scarcity
what substantive to use
how to name a finger cut off to get the insurance
what adjective for the holocaust
in what tense do you conjugate the verb to kill
what predicate what future what pluperfect58
Students will be ready to find the parallel between Bermudez’s poem and the debates of the summer of 2019 about what to call the present-day migrant detention camps near the United States-Mexico border. Who will accept that misnaming an atrocity lessens the harm and violence perpetrated? Bermudez’s last two lines also explore the concept of time. However, this poem offers a more chilling prospect, wondering if killing has ever or will ever stop, while asking what kind of future awaits.

Women and their families in Central America endured military invasions, violence, and chaos in the 1980s, and women in other parts of the world wondered about the impact of nuclear weapons on humanity and other life on planet Earth. This collective fear turned into resistance and galvanized women to act as Gioseppi showcases in Women on War.

Yolanda Sanchez describes the anti-nuclear protests that took place in Puerto Rico in 1984. The protests were a response to a decision by the United States to break the terms of a 1967 treaty intended to create a nuclear free zone in Latin America and the Caribbean. In the article “Fifty Thousand Puerto Rican People Demonstrate Against U.S. Nuclear Proliferation” Sanchez writes, “A review of the official documents under the Freedom of Information Act proves conclusively that installations are in place on the island, making it a nerve center for United States nuclear policy and response in Central America and the Caribbean.” Her strength is not only in organizing and protesting, but also in her access to information via the Freedom of Information Act. She makes a case for direct action by connecting the proliferation of nuclear weapons with the lack of services for people in the U.S. and on the island. She explains, “The issue has suddenly and dramatically become a very real and concrete one. A recent demonstration drew fifty thousand people into the streets. Here, as there, it is a matter of public and community education. The issue is here; the threat is real. Our call to action in the Puerto Rican communities will be based on connecting the lack of needed services to the proliferation of arms.” Just as Hughan questioned the dominant narrative that war is necessary to maintain security, Sanchez reminds us that human beings’ needs are not met when governments invest in war. She also reminds us of the failure of the United States to abide by international treaties. This is an example of another alternative narrative many assume that it is the United States’ responsibility to enforce treaties. Rarely do we see evidence of the United States’ failure to comply. This hypocrisy brings us back an essential questions where students wrestle with the relevance of a world’s policeman.

Also related to this threat of nuclear war and women’s collective response, Gioseffi includes a statement from Women for a Meaningful Summit. This group of women, that included Coretta Scott King and Maxine Waters, directed their statement to the organizers of the 1985 Geneva Summit where U.S. President Reagan and U.S.S.R. General Secretary Gorbachev met to discuss nuclear arms reduction. The statement exemplifies the art and power of imagining alternatives to the dominant narrative of nation states amassing nuclear weapons in the name of security. These women breathed life into the radical possibility of world peace: “At this moment in history human beings have the distinct opportunity to create a world at peace with justice, nuclear-free and nonviolent, one in which we live without fear of each other. We seek to reach the most lofty and moral plane that humans are capable of.” They continue to challenge the assumption that war is inevitable, weapons keep us safe, and nations must be enemies of other nations. They declare that, “War is obsolete; the existence of nuclear and conventional weapons is not a source of security; we are not enemies of one another-our real enemies are hunger, disease, racism, poverty, inequality, injustice and violence.”

This document offers real solutions about how to disrupt the inevitability of war. Rather than working within a war-based system, Women for a Meaningful Summit believe that “systems of war must be dismantled and replaced with systems of peace and justice which can be done only by nonviolent means.” They artfully recognize that the siloing and lionizing of war culture comes at a cost. They offer alternatives to build a
society that abandons war for something better. They also believe that “no nation has the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations; creative, independent initiatives by citizens are of great significance to the peace process; and peace and justice education should be an integral part of all school systems and mass media communication.” Students analyzing this source will have an opportunity to consider individual and collective contributions to the peace process, what peace and justice education should look like, and how it could be implemented in their own classroom.

Lastly, the Women for a Meaningful Summit connect their anti-military stance to socialist principles continuing the tradition examined in Hughan’s treatise *What is Socialism?* In their statement, the women confirm that there isn’t a lack of funds “to meet human needs and nurture the health of the planet which we together call our home.” Rather, they challenge policy makers who support the status quo to convert the “vast funds and resources spent on the arms race.” They articulate a counter narrative explaining that a lack of resources has never been the problem; but decisions about how to spend these vast resources demand investigation and change. Students will also benefit from studying resources provided by the National Priorities Project which overview how the U.S. spends the majority of its discretionary funding on the military and how U.S. military spending compares to the rest of the world.

**Classroom Focus: The Work of the War Resisters’ League**

In order to make connections to this rich content, teachers can find examples of current issues and actions on the War Resisters’ League website that connect to their courses and students’ interests. Students can find evidence in the teacher-selected resources that connects to the dominant narratives the voices in this unit resist. Using the work of the War Resisters’ League, students can answer the following questions: What are people continuing to resist? How do the dominant narratives from 19th and 20th century international issues continue to show up today? In addition, students can find evidence that connects to the counter narratives and primary sources included in this unit. How do the voices and ideas that have talked back to empire echo in the current work of the War Resisters’ League? What counter narratives do we see in their work?

**Conclusion**

While the structure of this unit presents a wide-ranging, and at times disconnected, collection of voices who talk back to empire, the motivation to impact students’ ability to analyze imperialism with a critical lens remains the consistent through line. Too often, classrooms rely on dominant narratives without peeling back the layers to consider how these dominant narratives were crafted and what counter narratives exist. As a result, the inclusion of letters, speeches, poems, manifestos, newspaper articles, and other works of resistance is intended to support students as they learn about the counter narratives that are just as much a part of the history of international issues and current events. As a matter of fact, the week before the due date for this unit, protestors in Puerto Rico successfully toppled a sitting governor for the first time in history. With more time and more space, these voices of students, families, artists, the young, and the old could have been included in this work. Perhaps it can come as a relief that no unit, no volume, no collection of resources
can be comprehensive in its celebration and centering of voices of resistance. Not only is the canon of these voices of resistance too numerous, but as more and more students study these examples, they become more able to learn from them and eventually create their own.

**Student and Teacher Resources**

1. Paul Kramer’s essay, “History in a Time of Crisis”
3. The United Nations web-based resources about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
4. Web based resources on the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary
   a. [https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/monroe.html](https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/monroe.html)
   b. [https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/monroe](https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/monroe)
5. Web based maps of Central and South America
   a. [https://www.freeman-pedia.com/latin-american-independence](https://www.freeman-pedia.com/latin-american-independence)
   b. [http://mrfarshtey.net/classes/Nation-Building_in_Latin_America.pdf](http://mrfarshtey.net/classes/Nation-Building_in_Latin_America.pdf)
   c. [https://indigenoupeopleresources.com/collections/maps](https://indigenoupeopleresources.com/collections/maps)
6. José Martí Resources
   b. [https://herb.ashp.cuny.edu/items/show/515](https://herb.ashp.cuny.edu/items/show/515)
7. CISPES website and Mission Statement
8. Political Cartoon
11. Articles about the 2009 Honduran Coup
14. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s speech, “America’s Chief Moral Dilemma”
16. Daniela Gioseffi’s book, Women on War: An International Anthology of Writings from Antiquity to the Present

17. Resources on the current debate about migrant camps at the U.S.-Mexico border

18. National Priorities Project resources on military spending
   a. https://www.nationalpriorities.org/works-on/military-security/

19. Resources on recent mass protests in Puerto Rico and resignation of Governor Rossello
   a. https://www.democracynow.org/2019/7/30/puerto_rico_ricardo_rosello_resignation_aftermath

20. New Haven Public Schools’ 21st Century Competencies
   a. https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B1ycFBTyI2QHNMZ1NDg4MmQttNj0MS00ZmYzLWFmYzgtZWU2YWZiOTY0ZDg4/edit

Standards: New Haven Public Schools’ 21st Century Competencies

- Competency One: Problem Solving and Critical Thinking
  - Reason effectively
  - Make insightful judgments and decisions
  - Solve problems

- Competency Two: Accessing and Analyzing Information
  - Use research tools to access and evaluate information from multiple sources
  - Organize and synthesize information using multiple methods

- Competency Three: Communication and Collaboration
  - Articulate ideas clearly and effectively to a variety of audiences using multiple modes
  - Communicate effectively and work productively with others

- Competency Six: Citizenship and Responsibility
  - Exercise empathy and respect for diverse cultures and perspectives
  - Contribute to and take responsibility for the larger community
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