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Since Donald Trump’s election, we have witnessed widespread and highly visible public protest in response to recently instituted draconian policies. The Movement for Black Lives, women’s marches, sanctuary cities, airport pickets, strikes by service workers, and a grassroots Democratic Party resurgence are uplifting a new generation of inspiring leaders. Although such demonstrations are not new, they have taken on a renewed intensity in this current political climate.

Alongside these high-profile protests is a different kind of under-the-radar politics: grassroots activists are developing models of resistance grounded in relationship building. It is led by people in local communities—sometimes in the heart of “Trump country”—with few state supports and little means to survive. Having endured decades of devastating cutbacks in social programs and the implementation of an array of carceral and other punitive policies, they are working together to collectively weave their own safety net and, in the process, offering an alternative vision of change. This kind of radical engagement often doesn’t get the attention it deserves. Social movements have always been characterized by both spectacular demonstrations and day-to-day organizing. Although historians and journalists highlight the “big moments,” the day-to-day work, which cultivates leadership in ordinary people and lays the groundwork for mass protest, leads to meaningful and lasting change.

My students and I got an up-close look at some of the grassroots organizing through a course I taught at Barnard College called “Mississippi Semester.” We partnered with a low-income advocacy group in Biloxi, the Mississippi Low-Income Child Care Initiative (MLICCI), spent a week traveling around the state, and came away with an appreciation for the transformative politics practiced by local residents. Perhaps most surprising, the grassroots organizing was not all located in the blue bubble of Jackson. We witnessed powerful examples in places like Biloxi and the Delta, often considered more conservative areas of the state.

I designed “Mississippi Semester” as a pedagogical experience centered on engagement with a community organization. A buzzword in academia, “community engagement” often takes the form of service-learning and student internships, which frequently burden community groups rather than aid them. Many campus-community collaborations recognize the value of experiential learning and community-based knowledge, but the approach is too often one of extracting knowledge from the community rather than establishing an equal partnership between community and students. The intention of this course was not solely for students to be educated in a non-classroom environment or to engage in experiential learning. Nor was it primarily about learning from community residents. My aim was not to organize a course around my or the students’ research agenda, but to carry out a project designed and directed by the community organization for its own benefit.

MLICCI has worked for over 20 years with child-care providers—many of whom are as poor as the parents they serve—and lobbied for expanded child care assistance for women on welfare. I first learned of it when I gave a keynote lecture for the Ms. Foundation’s Economic Justice Program grantees four years ago. MLICCI representative Cassandra Welchlin, who was in attendance, asked me to come to Mississippi and present at their statewide women’s economic security summit. During that December 2016 visit, I learned from Executive Director Carol Burnett that the small-scale, low-budget organization needed some research assistance. At the same time, in the wake of the heated presidential election, my students were clamoring for involvement in social justice work. Thus, my partnership with MLICCI fused with student interest into a course proposal that would give students an opportunity to work with low-income women in Mississippi and provide a service to MLICCI.

Teaching such a course required resources. I applied for and received a college-based “Innovation in Teaching Grant” to cover the cost of the trip as well as other expenses. I wanted to ensure that financial hardship was not a barrier for student enrollment. Barnard is an elite, private, women’s liberal arts college connected to Columbia University in New York City and thrives on a model of intensive teaching and learning. The course was enormously time consuming. I took care of many details and logistics, everything from making airline and van rental reservations to developing a Google survey for students interested in the course. Over 30 students applied for eight slots. I chose a diverse group of students with a range of intellectual interests and technical skills. But I also wanted students with a certain amount of life experience, who I believed could easily acquire the necessary cultural fluency and work closely with our partners.

MLICCI asked us to develop an index of women’s economic security to assist them in their lobbying efforts. Mississippi has one of the most inaccessible Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) programs in the country. Out of 12,000 statewide applications for TANF in 2016, only 165 were approved. The state also has one of the highest poverty rates in the country. MLICCI was trying to pressure state officials to release federal TANF child care assistance funds so poor women could get child care subsidies and enter the workforce. Our data, they believed, would help them make that argument.

Since the task before us was a little outside my area of expertise—I had done a lot of research and writing on poverty but was not a quantitative expert—I reached out to the college’s Empirical Reasoning Center. They assisted us with culling data, selecting indicators for the index, and training students in Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping. As the students discovered, poverty is hard to quantify, despite countless official measures and statistics, because it is subjectively measured and interpreted. We wanted intersectional data—poverty broken down by race, gender, and geographical area—that would allow us, for example, to compare the poverty rates of black mothers with three children to white mothers with three children. Since this was hard to extract from general census data, we relied on the American Community Survey that offered more comprehensive information about a sample of families. Prior to the trip, we brainstormed which variables to weigh more heavily as we formulated the index. Is housing or transportation more important? How should we take into
account the ages of children? How important is education relative to having a job? The goal for our trip, per MLICCI’s request, was to travel around the state and interview local stakeholders to get feedback on our proposed indicators. We generated a long list of questions about housing, health care, income, and job security.2

In addition to community-driven research, the other pillar of the course was collaboration. The students and I worked together to learn GIS mapping. Students also brought to the table an array of skills—on-line publishing, web design, filmmaking, photography, and statistics. From the get-go, rather than lead the students, I marshalled their talents and worked alongside them to collectively assist the organization’s advocacy work. Rather than transferring the responsibility of supervising students onto the community organization, as a class we collaboratively muddled through obstacles we encountered. Students’ invaluable input in the unfolding of the course determined our final products—a website and a self-published written report. As a result, the course had no blueprint and was less clearly defined at the outset. Because I was not always the expert and had to cede some power, students had a sense of ownership and honed their leadership skills. After six weeks of brainstorming, intensive research about quantifying poverty, and Skype conversations with MLICCI, we were ready to embark on our trip.

Collective Power in Mississippi

We landed in Gulfport, Mississippi, on a balmy afternoon in the middle of March, ready to spend a week in the heart of the Deep South. Most of the students had never traveled to the region but were eager to step outside their comfort zone, visit a Deep Red State, and put into action what had so far been abstract discussions in the classroom. We had no delusions of volunteerism or an alternative spring break—do-gooder experience to help the less fortunate. Our aim was to build relationships, offer skills, develop capacity, produce something tangible, and learn.

One of our first interviews was with a job training program, Women in Construction (WinC), run by the nonprofit Moore Community House in Biloxi. Initiated during Hurricane Katrina, which devastated the Mississippi Coast, the program channeled women into higher-paying construction trades to make a dent in the gender pay gap. It did so by giving participants practical skills, a stipend, and child care. About 20 of us were sitting in a circle at Moore Community House—15 trainees and 5 of us from Barnard. The trainees were mostly African American, with some Latinx and white women.

The previous night, the eight students, the course assistant, and I crammed into my Best Western hotel room to review our list of questions. We decided that getting a handle on women’s economic security meant not only thinking about insecurity—what people lacked—but also understanding what security meant. How would one’s life be transformed with economic security? What would individuals do that they are unable to do now?

Economic security seems to intuitively translate into more leisure time and self-gratification. It is not intuitive, however. The equation of economic security with personal fulfillment is partly a product of neoliberal ideas of individualism circulated in popular culture. Investment firms such as Charles Schwab and pharmaceutical companies have instilled in us aspirations for a life of travel, relaxation, hobbies, and walks along the beach. Economic security and healthy living, we are told, means finally doing the things we have always wanted to do. We predicted that for our interviewees, economic security would mean quality time with their children or engaging in self-care and that day-to-day life would be less stressful and most certainly not centered on crisis management. Or it might mean a full night’s sleep—a luxury for single parents who sometimes have to work two jobs or travel long distances for work. We had several predictions about what having an economically secure life would mean for women in Mississippi.

We did not anticipate the response articulated by most women at the meeting. Rather than seeking personal fulfillment, they would choose to give back to the community and help others. Interviewees hoped to create a recreational space for young people in the neighborhood. They wanted to ensure that the less fortunate were cared for. The sense of communal responsibility was surprising and inspiring. Our interviewees didn’t have steady work, were sometimes separated from their children, had been on welfare, and/or had poor health. Despite these multiple challenges, their long-term goals, their visions for a better life were about collective well-being, not individual advancement or personal leisure. Why did people respond this way? Is it because poverty by necessity leads to reliance on others? Is it because they learned the hard way that real transformation comes through collective change? Or does it have something to do with the history and culture of the South? I suspect the answer lies in some combination of all of these. Our meeting at Moore Community House revealed how ordinary people, hidden from public view, are creating alternative models of collective well-being and social justice in response to state abandonment. The commitment to the collective left a powerful impression on us.

The women in the job training program are not outliers. There is a long history of collective action in Mississippi. I had been to Mississippi before but hadn’t spent much time there. Mississippi, nevertheless, played a prominent role in my radical imagination—not as a site of poverty and despair, but as a site of resistance and tenacity. As an undergraduate at the University of Michigan in the 1980s, I was immersed in anti-racist organizing with the student group the United Coalition Against Racism, which dug deep into history and theories of social change. The example that we turned to most frequently was the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

SNCC adopted a distinctive approach to grassroots organizing in the South.3 Veteran activist Ella Baker, the brainchild behind SNCC, encouraged young people to chart their own path and remain independent of more established civil rights organizations, such as Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). SCLC was organized hierarchically with power concentrated at the top. King’s oratorical gift was the key to SCLC’s strategy of mobilizing masses of ordinary people to participate in high-profile demonstrations with the aim of pressing
government officials to dismantle racially discriminatory local and federal legislation. Ella Baker advised the young leaders of SNCC to embrace a political agenda that was “bigger than a hamburger” by setting its sights not only on desegregation but also on social transformation. SNCC rejected the top-down structure of SCLC, adopted group-centered leadership, and chose to organize rather than mobilize. It invested in working with communities over an extended period of time. Rather than devote energy to passing legislation, which targeted elected officials, SNCC shifted its gaze toward empowering ordinary people. Members set up shop in rural Southern communities, got to know local folk, and created space to enable them to speak for themselves. SNCC nurtured the confidence that gave ordinary Mississippians the courage to confront white landowners, stand tall in the face of threats of violence, and walk into the statehouse and register to vote. An empowered local leadership would ensure that the vulnerable would not be victimized even when high-profile leaders left town and cameras were turned off. SNCC’s methods reflect the significance of communal approaches and the deep bonds among people that frames so much of the history of organizing in Mississippi.

One take away from our trip to Mississippi is the echo of collective power evident among 1960s activists. We witnessed similar collective solutions to deep-seated social problems. Networking among advocacy organizations and the commitment to building community are powerful ingredients in Mississippi progressive politics. Cooperation Jackson implemented an alternative economic model that subverts the patterns of exploitation and expropriation that undergird racial and economic inequality in the South. Its worker-owned and collectively organized farm, catering business, and community center are rooted in a vision of democratic engagement and social transformation. Springboard to Opportunities, which describes itself as a “radically resident-driven” affordable-housing advocacy nonprofit, launched a basic-income pilot program, Magnolia Mother’s Trust, to provide poor single mothers with cash payments. Magnolia emerged from one-on-one and focus group conversations with local residents who insisted that, more than anything, families needed cash. Both Cooperation Jackson and Magnolia Mother’s Trust are envisioning and realizing new forms of racial and economic justice.

Less well known are models of change outside Jackson. The Nollie Jenkins Family Center, started by Ms. Ellen Reddy in Holmes County as a child care center, is a space that serves and empowers the local community. According to one student, the Center is “One of the most striking and significant instances of the unique ‘spirit’ of activism that I observed in Mississippi.” The foundational premise of the Center is that every family needs to be cared for and everyone has a responsibility to look out and care for one another. The community—not child protective services, the police, or school officials—becomes the means to address behavioral problems, mental health challenges, and domestic violence at home or school. The Center is developing an agenda of expanding economic opportunities in the Delta, making schools safe for everyone, supporting sexual autonomy for young people, and empowering African American girls. One of my students described this as “the abolitionist future.”

Our partner organization, MLICCI has fostered a network of dozens of low-income child care centers and community organizations around the state. The interracial group works assiduously to create spaces of conversation and build a collective agenda that will improve the lives of poor women and children. Executive Director Carol Burnett, a native Mississippian, has been organizing in the state for over 30 years. A petite white woman and one of the state’s first female ordained Methodist ministers, Burnett is deeply committed to racial and gender justice. Jearlean Osborne is the community organizer who travels around the state making the all-important connections that are the heart of MLICCI’s work. Roberta Avila has been involved in social justice work for 35 years and is a founding member of the Mississippi Immigrant Rights Coalition. MLICCI envisioned the economic security index as a collaborative project that would incorporate the input of a wide range of advocacy groups—folks on the front lines of women’s poverty—and as a strategy to foster dialogue among local communities about the meaning of women’s economic security. To that end, we met with groups and individuals across the state involved in health care, legal justice, domestic violence, and drug rehabilitation to draw on their knowledge and expertise. Collaboration, collectives, partnerships, and social bonds came up again and again on our trip. They were evident in the political work we witnessed, a component of research partnership, and a guiding principle of the class.

Outcomes, Challenges, and Takeaways

After returning from our trip, the students used the data we gathered in Mississippi to produce a GIS report that mapped several indicators: education, earnings, health care, child care, poverty, and unemployment. The report starkly illustrated the close correlation among poverty, race and gender, which impacted black women most severely. The report was preliminary. Given the constraints of a 15-week semester, we couldn’t include all, or even most, of the relevant indicators. And some of the most significant information we gathered through interviews, about debt and transportation for example, was not captured in the available census data. We concluded that a more comprehensive survey was necessary to fill in the gaps of available poverty data.

When I taught the course the second year, we conducted oral histories to supplement the quantitative data with qualitative data. Through hour-long interviews, students learned how the various poverty indicators were intertwined in a family’s life. For example, families without transportation had a hard time holding down a job, accessing welfare benefits or utilizing child care services. Child care and systematic racism sometimes served as insurmountable barriers for people who sought to return to school to improve their economic standing. Or they found themselves mired in education debt. The narratives put a human face on the quantitative data students had compiled the previous year and enabled us to see how multiple indicators compounded the problem of poverty.
One challenge that students encountered was the unpredictability of the workload. The flexible structure and changing expectations of the course—to accommodate student input and MLICCI’s shifting needs—was difficult for students accustomed to advance planning. They understood that the course required a huge time investment, yet this was not their only course. During the first year, we only decided halfway through the semester to produce a written report, which turned out to be a large undertaking. Work was also distributed unevenly. The class was organized into teams, which meant that students did different amounts and types of work, with some immersed in “intellectual” work while others engaged in technical work.

The second iteration of the course was more challenging. My goal of students centering themselves was more difficult perhaps because of the way the trip was organized. In year two, we began our week by visiting museums and historic sites, which generated personal trauma for students because of the proximity to the vicious racial violence that marked Mississippi’s history. Interpersonal conflict, feelings of guilt and blame, and reflection about one’s own family history and personal experiences took center stage and quickly manifested in racial tensions within the class, with white students seeking care and Black students wanting their own space.

In both years, students of color felt that the burden of emotional labor fell on them. As one student explained, the “emotional labor...was done/most necessary by other students of color in the class” because of the hesitation and insecurity of white students. "Black students were pressured to be more reserved, even-tempered, and we were encouraged by the other students to gather less and be more inclusive. Interestingly, each of the Black women of the course found solace in one another, and in the Black women organizers we met in Mississippi." "Black students, in general, felt more comfortable in Mississippi than white students and were able to more easily engage with local residents. White students expressed anxiety about speaking out for fear of offending people: "I often am worried about being accidentally offensive or failing to be politically correct. For this reason, I often refrain from speaking and focus on listening. I don’t know if this is always the best decision." It was not easy to balance the collective goals of the course with individual student needs.

Even though several students felt that the class dynamics mapped onto familiar racial patterns, the praxis of racial solidarity they observed in Mississippi disrupted expected ideas of race. MLICCI is a multiracial organization. Two white MLICCI leaders, Carol Burnett and Matt Williams, quickly earned the respect of all students:

"Matt and Carol from MLICCI expanded my ideas of the role of white people in social justice work, which is something that I have been grappling with for a while now. Admittedly, I was thrown off at first when we Skyped with them, having spent weeks talking about the racial injustices women of color were experiencing at the hands of white people in Mississippi, but I appreciated the ease and swiftness with which they called out the systemic racism at the root of all the issues. Furthermore, they were not racially conscious out of a desire to collect social capital and clout – which I have observed frequently at the liberal bubble of Barnard/Columbia – but rather because they knew that what was going on was not right. ... Our trip to Mississippi was life changing for me in a number of ways, and in one of the most salient, it expanded my ideas of what social justice work can and should look like."

The racial tensions among the students contrasted with the apparent interracial harmony in MLICCI and was the obverse of what one might expect, given the pervasiveness of racism in the South. Perhaps that is because for a white Mississippian to take an anti-racist stance requires a prior internal racial reckoning, whereas the racial liberalism that dominates Northern urban communities is accepted wisdom rather than conscious personal choice. Perhaps it is because the stakes of an anti-racist agenda and the need to confront white supremacy are much clearer in Mississippi whereas the veneer of equality in the North masks the deep racial divide, although that is slowly being chipped away. The entrenched character of anti-Black racism is becoming more evident to white liberals in the wake of the recent murders of unarmed Black people and subsequent Black Lives Matter protests. The recognition of the devastating consequences of racialized structural violence—always evident to Black and Brown people—has recently prompted many white allies to foreground white supremacy and racial privilege in their political engagements.

Equally important for students was the pedagogical model that uplifted the expertise of local Mississippi residents. According to one student: "I expected we would go to Mississippi and impart unto them the tools and vernacular that one finds only in elite institutions. This class was a necessary, and humbling, experience in that way. The first day we landed in Mississippi, I knew that there was nothing that my Political Science or Critical Theory classes could have taught me to match the expertise and authenticity of the women we met." Another student who is from a low-income background and always felt discomfort with academic research in poor communities said this:

"I strongly believe that the Mississippi course is a model for how academia can effectively engage students and researchers with the outside world in a way that is beneficial and not self-serving for the researcher/student. For example, the final report for the Mississippi course wasn’t just created for the purpose of having a culminating piece to showcase the work that we did as group of students at Barnard and Columbia. Instead it served another purpose: it showcased the work and the research we conducted at the service of MLICCI. We acknowledged the pivotal role MLICCI has played for decades in advocating for better child care policies. Throughout [the] trip to Mississippi, we also acknowledged the many volunteers, child care providers and mothers who resist the oppressive systems that limit their economic and social well-being. Before embarking on any research endeavor in the future, this course has inspired me to consider the following: Why am I researching a given topic and a particular group of people and at what cost to those being studied? How will
I ground myself in the work that has already been done on said topic? What kinds of assumptions and privileges am I approaching the research with and how will I acknowledge them? When my research is over and done with, who will it benefit?”

The course also pushed back against a neoliberal educational model that lauds individual student achievement and rewards those who outdo their peers. According to a student: “This class has been the most democratic classroom I have been in. I have moved even further away from the individualistic spotlight-seeking scholarship.” Students worked collaboratively rather than in competition. As one student explained: “It felt as if I were part of a team more so than a class, and we were all working together to achieve the same goals.” Students reported that working as a team and building relationships with a community organization were two of the most important takeaways of the course. “I appreciate the collaborative nature of the course because it was SO different than any class I’ve ever taken at Barnard. It helped me to come out of my shell and become really engaged with the coursework and my peers.”

The labor of constructing the index, interviewing local residents, and working with MLICCI fundamentally changed students’ perceptions of Mississippi and introduced them to a network of grassroots activists and community-based organizations. At the end of the semester, one student who had never considered living in the South applied for a job as a journalist in Jackson. Another student switched her career path from working in the pharmaceutical industry to policy advocacy. For another student, our approach to research prompted her to reconsider attending graduate school because “I have seen how it is possible to interview and record oral histories in an ethical way.”

Toward the end of the semester, both classes disseminated their findings and shared their experiences with the Barnard community. This course, alongside other community-engaged courses, such as Harlem Semester, Theorizing Activisms, and Seeking Asylum, taught by my colleagues prompted the college to apply for a foundation grant to teach local courses with a similar intention of collaborative learning that serves grassroots community organizations over an extended period of time. The newly funded courses may be more easily replicable at other institutions without grant support because they do not contain a travel component, which can be prohibitive in terms of cost, and hurdles such as students’ family responsibilities and work schedules. I taught a course, for example, in which students conducted oral histories of labor trafficking survivors for a New York City-based migrant workers organization, which cost very little and accommodated students with busy schedules.

The COVID-19 pandemic, budget constraints, and social distancing guidelines make it imperative to think creatively about how faculty can incorporate into their curriculum social justice work that does not require close contact or travel. Such partnerships are more important than ever as the health and economic crises are leaving communities, especially communities of color, reeling. The unprecedented scale of the crisis has led to emergency measures that only a few months ago were unimaginable. Although budgetary concerns are fueling a trend toward austerity in colleges and universities, progressive educators can also use this moment to forge new solidarities and implement an educational model that highlights collective engagement and public, as opposed to private, interests. At the very moment when our collective interest ought to be front and center, individualism, xenophobia, racism, victim-blaming and callous disregard for human life seem to have a firm hold on public discourse. Remote learning may open up possibilities for working with communities beyond our local or even national borders because physical distance may be less significant when developing virtual projects. At the same time, social distancing and reliance on virtual connections pose challenges, such as inequitable access to technology and barriers to building trust without interpersonal engagement. However, in a world of widespread COVID-19 infections, mass unemployment, and unbridled anti-Black racism, there is too much at stake to not actively reimagine our curriculum and community engagement.

Concluding Reflections

MLICCI’s development of an economic security index didn’t require a partnership with a history professor and undergraduate students. It would have been easier to write a foundation grant and commission a think tank with full-time staff and a research and marketing department to conduct this work for them. The end result of our work was less about the publication of a report than the partnership that was born. The trip to Mississippi was meaningful for the students and was especially enlightening at a historical moment when geographical divides seem to shape political discourse. It was the stuff of relationship-building and long-term collaboration, albeit with a short-term productive outcome. In addition to lobbying, MLICCI intended to use the process of constructing the index to deepen relationships and generate conversations among low-income advocates and child-care providers across the state. Moreover, engagement with the students rejuvenated them and bolstered their work. As Carol Burnett said, “Seeing our work through the students’ eyes inspired us.”

We didn’t go to Mississippi armed with our own research agenda and academic theories about poverty. We took our cues from local activists and supported work already underway. We wanted to follow and support rather than lead and teach. Although Mississippi Semester in no way replicated the radical organizing of SNCC, it enabled us to appreciate the value of building lasting relationships and uphold the voices of people who are less concerned about raising their own profile than about social transformation from the ground up. It is a model from which we have a great deal to learn about the importance of collective power and progressive social change, particularly in a context of individualism and celebrity culture.

In some ways, the political dichotomy between Red State/rural/conservative and Blue State/urban/liberal as an ideological construct functions similarly to stark North/South divisions of the civil rights period. The 1960s South—with visible Jim Crow signs, Bull Connors, the firebombing of black churches, and assassinations of local civil rights
leaders—was cast by the press as an aberration, a place that needed to be brought into line with dominant American values presumably characterized by racial equality and democratic governance. This false narrative, however, erased the widespread racial violence that plagued the “enlightened” North. It cast northerners and the federal government as the agents that eventually transformed the South, obscuring both federal complicity in Southern racism and the long history of collective change and day-to-day organizing that were hallmarks of southern Black politics.

Progressive resistance is not confined to a few liberal enclaves. The dismantling of the welfare safety net, the rise of precarious, part-time, low-wage labor, and legislation eroding workers’ rights, have made individual lives more insecure and undermined families and communities. But ordinary people are finding alternatives. Rebuilding collective power, one person at a time, as SNCC demonstrated four decades ago and as MLICCI and the Nollie Jenkins Family Center do today, may be our best hope for a different kind of future.

Notes
1. Thanks to Carol Burnett, Nara Milanich, Robyn Spencer, Destiny Spruill, Samantha Ortega and the reviewers and editors at Radical Teacher for their feedback. And a very special thanks to the team at MLICCI: Carol Burnett, Roberta Avila, Jearlean Osborne, and Matt Williams who hosted us and shared their stories. For more information about the course, see mssemester.wordpress.com

