

# Decolonization: A Framework to Understand and Transgress Adulthood

*Xamuel Bañales*

## Abstract

There is a growing body of scholarship that examines adulthood through various methodologies and in a variety of settings, including labor, education, and society. In addition, studies of adulthood increasingly recognize how this form of power intersects or is parallel with other forms of oppression. This research is generative for illuminating the various ways in which adulthood and other forms of power operate or contribute to limiting or exclusionary practices that young people face. However, how can we move away from discourses of liberal inclusivity toward social transformation? Why do the causes, effects, or outcomes of adulthood from a critical perspective often fall short? What can decolonial thought offer to understandings of adulthood? This essay proposes a de/colonization framework to advance understandings of adulthood and center liberation. I argue that adulthood and colonization are not separate but birthed in relation to one another. Furthermore, discourses on adulthood that fail to seriously engage with de/colonization risk perpetuating the oppression that they attempt to challenge, trouble, or address.

## Adulthood: An Introduction

One definition of adulthood is “the systematic exploitation, abuse, and mistreatment of young people by adults” (Kivel & Creighton, 1996, p. 73). DeJong and Love (2015) employ a similar definition of adulthood but expand on it by discussing “adult supremacy,” which comprises “a set of beliefs, attitudes, policies,

---

*Xamuel Bañales is an associate professor and former chair of the Ethnic Studies Department at California State University Stanislaus, Turlock, California. Email address: xbanales@csustan.edu*

© 2024 by Caddo Gap Press.

and practices that construct adults as developed, mature, intelligent, and experienced, based solely on their age and ensures that adults control the resources and make the decisions in society” (p. 490). Writing about adultism, Bell (1995) contends that, “except for prisoners and a few other institutionalized groups, young people are more controlled than any other group in society.” As adults decide what is “wrong” and “right” for youth from the time they are born, Bell argues that most young people are told “what to eat, what to wear, and when to go to bed, when they can talk, that they will go to school, which friends are okay, and when they are to be in the house,” and that “the opinions of most young people are not valued; they are punished at the will or whim of adults; their emotions are considered ‘immature’” (Bell, 1995). Such understandings of adultism are useful for calling attention to the ways in which power shapes or informs social structures and relations between young people and adults.

There is growing body of research that examines adultism in a variety of settings, including labor, education, and society (Fletcher, 2015; Pensoneau-Conway, 2017; Bertrand, Brooks, & Domínguez, 2020; Corney et al., 2022; Sutherland et al., 2023). In addition, studies of adultism increasingly recognize how it intersects or is parallel with other forms of oppression (McClellan, 2020; Hall, 2021; Sutherland et al., 2023). For example, Sutherland et al. (2023), conceptualize adultism as a structural and scalar phenomenon that is analogous to racism or sexism; the authors regard adultism as integral to the structuring of policy, culture, and economy, and conceive how it is spatially reproduced, reasserted, and resisted. Finally, there is scholarship that considers the ways in which the participation or activism of young people and adults who work together can interrupt, challenge, or trouble adultism (Bertrand, Brooks, & Domínguez, 2020; Liou & Literat, 2020; Oto, 2023). Thus, recent literature on adultism demonstrates how it operates in different spaces, it relates to domination across power, and it can be confronted to work towards social change.

In the literature on challenging adultism, one approach to initiate social change is through a reformist approach, which advocates for youth participation, partnership, or inclusion with adults in institutional settings. For example, Bertrand, Brooks, and Domínguez (2020) focus on the ways in which educational researchers and practitioners can challenge adultism that constrains youth’s sanctioned participation in decision-making sites in education. They interrogate adultism at interpersonal, institutional, and curricular levels, and argue that researchers and practitioners have a responsibility to challenge adultism as this can open possibilities in which youth and adults collaborate to advance equity. A major finding is the “need for adults to decenter their adultist perspective to create a space for young people” (p. 20). Although liberal inclusivity advances may be important to implement reformist change, this approach preserves existing communal values, often through moderate to slow measures that maintain the existing colonizing social ideas and procedures (Maldonado Torres et al., 2023). Consequently, how

effective will considerations of decentering adultism or making space for young people be if the larger social/institutional structure and colonizing logic that maintains and perpetuates it is left uncontested or intact?

Despite that contemporary scholarship and understandings of adultism are generative, a component that is missing in this work is critical engagement with colonization/coloniality and decolonization/decoloniality, particularly as it relates to place, context, ideology, and practice. As a result, adultism as an analytical lens is often divorced from colonialism/coloniality, which negates the socio-historical relationship that not only creates but also binds them. This is important because studies about adultism that fail to connect to colonialism/coloniality—by which adulthood and other age-based categories are created—thereby erases their racialization. Although literature on adultism may consider it parallel, similar, or intersecting with other forms of oppression, like racism or sexism, this perspective assumes that these axes of power are separate and ahistorical, obscuring the matrix of simultaneous, interrelated, and overlapping relations and structures that Western imperialism and modernity/coloniality produces. Hence, without a serious commitment to decolonization, the purpose, strategies, or solutions of challenging adultism, at best, achieves liberal inclusivity, which is not only made possible by, but also reifies, the narratives, logics, epistemologies, and violence of modernism/colonialism (Glenn, 2015). In other words, discourses on adultism that do not actively engage with de/colonization, wittingly or unwittingly, run the interconnected risk of: (1) addressing one form of power at the expense of another; (2) perpetuating or reaffirming the system which produced the oppression; and (3) rendering fraught solutions, rather than the liberation of marginalized populations, specifically young people of color.

Thus, this essay seeks to advance a de/colonial framework to understand, engage, and theorize adultism to move beyond liberal inclusivity or ahistorical notions of oppression toward the liberation of marginalized populations and collective transformation. The fundamental premises are: (1) decolonial thought is a generative framework by which to understand and transgress adultism; (2) adultism is the systematic exploitation, abuse, and mistreatment of young people by adults that is created and reaffirmed by modernity/coloniality; and (3) decolonization or decoloniality is the goal by which to achieve liberation and collective transformation. Specifically, colonialism serves as a basis why which to understand adultism, and decolonization becomes the objective to challenge, disrupt, or transgress it toward liberation. The first part of the article describes key concepts, themes, and theories that are central to decolonial thought. The essay continues by engaging the imbricate nature of adultism and colonialism. In the sections that follow, I focus on the colonizing oppression of young people in a contemporary context and conclude by looking towards decolonizing forms of youth activism and organizing.

A de/colonial framework to understand and transgress adultism is critical

for several reasons. For example, professionals who work with young people, including educators, psychologists, family therapists, or others, may not only take the implications of age and power for granted but also see them detached from colonizing processes. By examining the role of young people during colonialism throughout the Americas can underscore how they were central in shaping understandings of labor, race, gender, age, and power in modernity/coloniality. Furthermore, placing attention to politics of age and colonization can elucidate how they relate to empire as well as modern/colonial subjectivity. Since the oppression of youth is a technology of colonialism (DeJong & Love, 2015), the patterns that emerged in understandings of racialization are connected to religious and political beliefs and experiences that were rooted in how colonial childhood and generations followed. This points to how central adultism and colonialism were to imperialism and to shaping the contemporary context.

### Decolonial Thought

The term “decolonial” has been central in critical conversations and spaces that have long trajectories in many parts of the planet, but particularly in the geographical area of the Americas. Two scholarly frameworks serve as points of departure: (1) theories of coloniality/modernity emergent in Latin America that are used widely to examine colonial power through formations of race, class, gender, and sexuality; and (2) decolonial feminisms, which draws upon women of color thought in the U.S. that responds through scholarship, coalition, and creative action to the impact and simultaneity of oppressive systems (Lee-Oliver & Bañales, 2023). Decolonial scholars focus on colonialism/coloniality and decolonization/decoloniality, which have gained increasing traction in academic spaces, activist movements, and social media. Furthermore, scholars of colonialism often challenge and expand discourses of decolonization by centering material concerns, including advocating for land sovereignty and reparations (Agozino, 2021; McDonnell & Regenvanu, 2022).

Scholars of decolonial thought trace modernity and the emergence of colonialism as far back as 1492 when the invasion/invention of America begins (Dussel & MacEoin, 1991; Dussel, 1995). Unlike Eurocentric Marxist perspectives which locate modernity in the Industrial Revolution and in philosophies of the Enlightenment, decolonial thinkers trace the development of modern civilization in its “underside,” which describes the colonial encounter of the Americas: the colonized, exploited, marginalized that are pushed or excluded to the fringes (Dussel, 1995; Alcoff & Mendieta, 2000; Maldonado-Torres, 2008). Furthermore, modernity cannot be understood without its “dark side” of coloniality as they are constitutive of one another and exist simultaneously (Mignolo, 1995; 2011). Hence, modernity/coloniality “are two sides of the same coin and not as two separate frames of mind: you cannot be modern without being colonial; and if you

are on the colonial side of the spectrum you have to transact with modernity—you cannot ignore it” (Mignolo, 2005, p. 6). However, colonialism denotes a political and economic relation of domination over the sovereignty of a nation or people, while coloniality refers to long-standing patterns of power that emerge because of colonization and continue in the contemporary, well beyond the strict limits of colonial administration (Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

Decolonial scholars also consider that colonialism and coloniality are an integral component of racism and capitalism. Encapsulated in the concept of the coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000), it describes a new model of domination in the Americas established by two central axes: the idea of “race” and structure of labor control. The project of colonizing the Americas became a model of power that would be inseparable from systems of domination (like capitalism) structured around the idea of race. As such, colonization and its long-standing patterns of power that emerged came to define economy (labor exploitation, land appropriation, control of natural resources), authority (army, institutions, administration), culture (family, control of gender and sexuality), and knowledge and inter-subjective relations (epistemology, education, and formation of identity) (Mignolo, 2007; Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

In addition, decolonial feminist scholars, who draw from U.S. Third World women of color thought, centralize heteropatriarchy in the coloniality of power (Lugones, 2007; Maile, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013; Médez, 2015; Alarcón et al., 2020; Lee-Oliver & Bañales, 2023; Bañales forthcoming). For example, pointing to pre-colonial nongendered cosmologies and gynocratic egalitarianism, Lugones (2007) introduces a new understanding of gender constituted through modernity/coloniality by arguing that colonization imposed a new gender system. Central components of decolonial feminisms includes affirming that gender is a construct of modernity/coloniality, expanding the narrow treatment of gender in theories and analyses about decolonization, and centralizing resistance, plurality, and coalition to defy the logics of categorial, hierarchical, and dichotomous colonial power (Sandoval, 2000; Lugones, 2007, 2010; Pérez, 2010; Rodrigues, 2022). Furthermore, contemporary decolonial feminist scholarship addresses racial capitalist heteropatriarchy through a variety of critical topics, such as ableism, transgender embodiment, nonbinary epistemologies, and coalitionary action (DiPietro, 2020; Lee-Oliver & Bañales, 2023; Salas-Santa Cruz, 2023).

Methodologically, decolonial thinkers look outside the colonial centers of power and focus on the “others of empire” to reclaim the epistemic traditions (or *saberes/conocimiento*) of the colonized (Walsh, 2007; Mignolo, 2009; Anzaldúa, 2015; Medina & Whittle, 2019). An example of this are women of color and decolonial feminisms which have contributed to establishing a literary method that bridges the personal with the political, theoretical, creative, and spiritual. The method includes critical scholarship, poetry, prose, political analysis, fiction, storytelling, autobiography, self-reflection, and other forms of creative writing

and practice that often examined one's own life (see Hull et al., 1982; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983; Davis, 1990; Pérez, 2007, 2010, and 2019; Lee-Oliver & Bañales, 2023). In addition, women of color and decolonial feminist methodologies includes multi-issued and solidarity coalition building approaches to politics, organizing, and action (Lugones, 1987; Sandoval, 2000; Pérez, 2010; Fujiwara & Roshanravan, 2018; Mohanty & Carty, 2018; Alarcón et al., 2020; Bañales, 2023; Bravo & Figueroa-Vásquez, 2023; Lee-Oliver & Bañales, 2023; Maese, 2023). For instance, women of color in the U.S. worked in solidarity and linked struggles across transnational colonial borders by recognizing the similarities of their racialized, economic, gendered, and sexualized oppression among themselves and with women in the Third World (See Sandoval, 2000; Lugones, 2003; Bacchetta, 2010). In the context of the Americas, specifically settler colonial societies like the U.S., a decolonial framework is appropriate for understanding the relationship between adultism and colonialism.

### **Colonialism and Adultism: Co-constructed in Relation**

Colonialism is not only a past historical event but an ongoing structure (Glenn, 2015) that has adultism at its core. As colonization applies to indigenous peoples, the term involves “the conquest and expropriation of territories; massive loss of life through war, forced labor, and disease; erasure or marginalizations of cultures and languages; and the redefinition of a process of violent conquest as ‘inevitable’ because of supposed differences in levels of ‘civilization’” (Mallon, 2012, p. 1). Settler colonialism required the forced and violent removal of indigenous people with the goal of seizing and establishing property rights over land and resources, including using militarized genocide. In addition, settlers occupied land and established an exclusionary private property regime and coercive labor systems, such as chattel slavery (Glenn, 2015). Theoretical conceptions of colonization also include the racial, class, gender, and sexual hierarchies that European modernity created and reinforced as it colonized, enslaved, and disappeared populations through the planet (Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

It is the modern/colonial context that creates adulthood. Etymologically speaking, the word “adult” first appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary in 1656 and “adulthood” not until 1870 (Jordan, 1976, p. 4; Merser, 1987, p. 56; Côté, 2000, p. 13). Although “adults” existed in the colonial era, the idea of adulthood did not until much later after “manhood” or “womanhood” became less common (Jordan, 1976; Merser, 1987). In colonial times, social roles were understood as being a “static” or “fixed” phenomenon, but as modernity evolved, the idea of the “human” signified the process of “becoming” (Jordan, 1976, p. 2), when society understood people as changing and capable of recreating themselves. As Jordan (1976) states, “[w]e have moved, over the years, from condition

to process. In our culture, adulthood as a condition used to be simply assumed; as a process, it now seems to demand explanation” (p. 11). By the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the concept of adulthood popularized in American culture, and it emerges by a process of exclusion that came from prior definitions of other stages in the life cycle. The temporal category of “adult” is not produced in isolation but is defined relationally with other age-based categories, such as childhood and adolescence (Wyn & White, 1997; Côté, 2000).

While adulthood did not become common until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, discourses of colonialism were central to modern formulations of childhood. For example, DeJong and Love (2015) identify five discourses of colonialism that constitute modern constructions of childhood. These are: (1) child/adult dualism parallels the colonizer/colonized and other binary opposites, such as evil/good, inferior/superior, and savage/civilized; (2) individuals with souls to be saved parallels the colonizer as civilized savior of the colonized, child-like primitive and heathen; (3) Western Man as discoverer of nature and truth parallels how colonized people, like children, are considered a blank slate to shape and instill moral codes; (4) linear time and assigned value to growth and progress parallels childhood/colonized as preparation and development for adulthood/colonizer; and (5) childhood as dependent or dependency parallels the colonized as helpless, ignorant, and backwards while positioning the colonizer as advanced and in power and control.

Colonial discourses of childhood—and therefore inadvertent notions of adulthood—communicate and extend a modernist logic across empire building. When examining Dutch colonization of the East Indies and its implications to Europe, Stoler (1995) underscores how European concepts and discourses were mobile and circularly transportable between the colonies and metropole. This included age-based understandings, categories, and identity constructs that intersect with race and class as they traveled through a “circuitous imperial route,” for “becoming adult and bourgeois meant distinguishing oneself from that which was uncivilized, lower-class, and non-European” (p. 151). From this perspective, colonists not only transported age-based prescriptions through imperialism but also reflected a power that structured the colonial context of the colonizer and colonized (Memmi, 1997). Thus, childhood is a modern social construct (Ariès, 1962) that is central to the coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000), by which an always already racialized adultism emerges intimately tied to labor, gender, and violence.

Although child labor in Europe had a long tradition that ideologically extended to the Americas, this did not parallel but took new forms with colonialism. In the Americas, labor came in a context that included murder, enslavement, and constant breaking up of families or clans. This involved not only racial and gendered bloodshed, but also inter-generational violence which included using young people in various ways as tools of conquest (de las Casas, 1992). Alongside the genocide of Indigenous people in the Americas, the enslavement of Africans exemplifies the development of the colonial project through young people. For

instance, European boys constituted forty percent on crews as pages, cabin boys, and apprentices (Hecht, 2002, p.9), and research on the Transatlantic Slavery Database has revealed that by the late nineteenth century nearly half of the enslaved people forced out of Africa were children (Duane, 2010, p. 14). Since children accounted for a significant proportion of the enslaved population that was transported in the late eighteenth century across the Atlantic, practical and economic concerns shaped the standard method of categorizing slaves according to age-based categories. There was no concrete way to determine the exact age of the enslaved since age records were not standard, but height was usually the measure to gauge who was considered a child, adolescent, or adult. Many planters had a clear preference for adult African males, but there is evidence that young people were also prioritized and sold in sizeable proportions. For example, in one ship of captives sold in Jamaica, thirty percent were boys and girls, many not more than eight or nine years of age (Diptee, 2007, p. 50-51). Although some planters specifically requested young slaves, they were hesitant of those that they deemed too young. Nevertheless, if the price was low enough, enslaved young Africans were purchased despite wariness. Often in plantations, when they did not contribute to the alarming mortality rates, enslaved children began working at the age of five or six, and served as full hands in the fields by the age of twelve (Marten, 2007, 3). Although many enslaved children were made to perform agricultural tasks on plantations, some were also geared towards domestic or skilled labor (Diptee, 2007).

The idea of children working—in factories, mines, and agricultural areas in Europe or as slaves in the Americas—was possible because young people were seen as a cheap and easily exploitable source of labor (Cunningham, 1990; Diptee, 2007). However, despite imperial-colonial connections, such as colonial attitudes about the exploitation of child (enslaved) labor that reflected a long-standing British tradition of utilizing children to work, there were of course fundamental differences. One major difference is that most child laborers in the Americas were enslaved/colonized, while those in Europe generally were not. That is, children in Europe, regardless of harsh labor conditions, were generally regarded as subjects of the crown, while enslaved children were considered property of the crown, like their colonized adult counterparts. Both enslaved children and adults had no legal protection or rights to wages, and enslaved families were legally under the control of white plantation owners and their social and economic interests (Diptee, 2007, p. 53-54). Colonized children rarely had access to education or literacy. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, many enslaved children experienced similar levels of unhygienic surroundings, poverty, and material deprivation like other poor free (non-slave) children. In contrast to free offspring, however, enslaved children, like their parents, had little control of their lives. For example, the infancy of a slave child in Brazil depended on whether the owner wished to use, rent, or sell the mother as a wet nurse to a third party (Kuznesof, 2007).



Slavery's continuous violence threatened the integrity of families, challenging the relationship between mothers and their children.

When colonizing did not happen in an explicitly violent manner, the project of conquest happened *through* young people in other ways. For example, colonizers epistemologically targeted young people to enact and develop the coloniality of power. Since "civilizing" indigenous youth meant lessening the constant threat of warfare, colonists would come to see cultivating the Indian child as necessary for conquering the New World (Duane, 2010, pp. 22-27). In New Spain, where religion and warfare were principal activities, converting indigenous young people was instrumental to further colonialism. Unlike the Spanish settlers who were considered violent, immoral, and unjust, early missionaries had the objective of converting Indians to the Catholic faith and to transmit knowledge and useful skills. One of the ways they accomplished this was by employing children who were taught in specific ways. Following King Charles' recommendation of converting the children of the Aztec nobility to set examples for the rest of the population, the Franciscans taught religion, music, reading, and writing in Spanish and Náhuatl to the sons of the nobility. In turn, indigenous youth served as translators of sermons, serving as teachers and preachers to parents, elders, and to others in the region. At the college of the Holy Cross in Mexico City, seventy Indian boarding students, from twelve to seventeen years of age, received instruction in Latin grammar, logic, rhetoric, and aspects of philosophy and theology, music, and herbal and therapeutic medicine (de Estrada, 2007, pp. 18-21).

Because understandings and experiences of European children in the Americas differed with those of the colonized young, traditional concepts of childhood and children also served to further conquest. Children were familiar and malleable enough to place new meaning on them in the colonial context to make sense of the latter. When colonists in early America sought to make sense of intercultural contact and conflict, they turned to the child to help them articulate their feelings of vulnerability, while also displacing that powerlessness away from white adults who did not want to reveal their sense of loss of control. The child, like slave, wife, and servant were understood in Europe as symbols of servitude. Children, however, particularly the very young, represented the most dependent on those who had more power. Because of insecurity and for their purposes of control and power, colonists called and conceived those they deemed subordinate as "children," since this associated them with dependence, subservience, and inferiority in being (Duane, 2010).

By depending on old meanings of childhood, colonists utilized infantilizing metaphors to portray the colonized and enslaved as children. The comparison was based on an imaginary European normality that suggested that European children and colonized adults were generally on the same developmental level (Studer, 2021). The colonized perpetually have been "compared and equated with children, a representation that conveniently provided a moral justification of imperial polices of tutelage, discipline and specific paternalistic and materialistic strategies

of custodial control” (Stoler, 1995, pp. 150-151). To offer an example, the vice-royalty of Peru and other authorities commonly characterized native Andeans as childish and childlike (Dean, 2002, p. 21). Regarding Africans in the New World, “Colonial whites maintained that the enslaved were an inherently lazy, dishonest, and immoral racial group and that they could only be productive if guided by whites who would have the power of the law and the whip” (Diptee, 2007, p. 59). Many whites viewed slaves as children regardless of age that needed to be clothed, nursed, fed, and looked after (King, 1995, p. xvii). Proslavery writings similarly portrayed all enslaved as children in need of care, and popular culture at times also kept (white) women out of political spheres by aligning them with children too (Duane, 2010, p. 5). The notions that Indians were better off under European tutelage and that Negroes were naturally of a childlike character prevailed into the twentieth century. As such, colonies were described as childlike or in need of paternal guidance that were unable to reach European levels of reason and modernity on their own (Studer, 2021).

Many of the comparisons of the colonized with children were gendered and applied with varying degrees. For instance, in French colonialism in Northwest Africa during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, colonial authors described Muslim women as childlike and compared their intellectual capacities, reasoning, and behavior to those of children (Studer, 2021). In addition, the infantilizing metaphor of the colonized became scientific reality in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century when craniology became popular by scientists. Gould (1993) provides several cases: Paul Broca sought measures to prove the inferiority of Blacks and women, arguing that the brain was larger in adult males in “distinguished” men and in superior races than in the elderly and in women; a German anthropologist argued that the Negro brain had a spinal cord like that of children and women and came close to the type of brain found in higher apes; a renowned German anatomist wrote that the Negro brain was like that of children and females; and a scientist compared the brain of adult Blacks with that of a white fetus seven months old (pp. 73-112). Although white women were also compared to children as inferior, it’s important to note that white feminists in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century asserted their own “maturity” by depending upon a contrast with other adults who remained more childlike (Rollo, 2018). Moreover, in contrast to the independent, educated, and modern “Western woman” in control of her body and sexuality, there is a homogenous view that the “Third World Woman” is a traditionalist and oppressed (Mohanty, 1988; de Carvalho & Senkevics, 2017).

Although the hierarchy existing between adult and child is older than European colonialism, when combined with the infantilization of racialized populations it brings a new set of ways to understand this relation of power. The child/adult binary is a central feature of colonial racialization and early modern philosophical and scientific construction of whiteness and white superiority (Rollo, 2018). Furthermore, colonial domination is partly maintained “through the socialization

of settler children who learn to accept their subordinate position, and learn not to question or challenge the beliefs, attitudes, policies, and practices of colonialism” (DeJong & Love, 2015, p. 495). Indians, Blacks, and to some degree white women, were depicted in deficit or excess to male whiteness, which was the standard in delineating the boundaries of a “proper” adult. Those who survived genocide and slavery and grew older, in many ways, could never “grow up” since they did not have the luxury of enjoying the same privileges as white adults. So long as white children moved away from “savagery,” the puritan concept and its disciplinarian ways became normalized: the heteropatriarchal order of colonial authority was reaffirmed. What this revealed was a racialized childhood of which whites could emerge as potential adults and the infantilization of the colonized in perpetual servitude and primitiveness. A racializing adultism is fundamental to colonialism, and this logic, culture, and structure of coloniality continues in current times.

### The Coloniality of Youth

The colonizing oppression of young people persists in the contemporary. One of the ways that the coloniality of youth is evident was in the numerous, negative, and national discourses about gang and juvenile crime by both conservatives and liberals at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. John J. Dilulio—then a Princeton professor in politics and public affairs—published the influential article “The Coming of the Super-Predator” in 1995 (Dilulio, 1995). This article predicted a “new wave” of youth “criminals” that would soon terrorize the nation by 2000. The increase in urban populations of Black and Latino youth was the cause, and these “super-predators” would soon brutalize, rape, and murder fellow (white) citizens for no apparent reason. This theory gained popular attention at the time when, in the name of “protecting” Western interests in ensuring the constant “flow of oil,” the U.S. engaged in one of the largest military operations since the post-World War II era against Iraq known as the Gulf War (McAlister, 2001). In the State of the Union Address given on January 23, 1996, then President Clinton shared his plan to take back the streets from crime, gangs, and drugs by forming community partnerships with local police forces. He made reference to The Crime Bill of 1994, which provided funds for 100,000 new police in communities, and stated that he was “directing the FBI and other investigative agencies to target gangs that involve juveniles in violent crime, and to seek authority to prosecute as adults teenagers who maim and kill like adults” (Clinton, 1996).

William Bennett—another Princeton professor and former director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy under President Bush Sr. and President Reagan’s former Secretary of Education—along with Dilulio and John. P. Walters continued with the super-predator thesis in their 1996 book *Body Count* (Bennett, Dilulio, & Walters, 1996). The book was published in an election year in which these influential political commentators further developed the popular theory of

super-predator youth (of color), which served as the scapegoat that alleviated the nation's racial and economic anxieties both nationally and abroad during the Clinton's presidential term. Articulating the description of this term, the authors of *Body Count* write:

America is now home to thickening ranks of juvenile 'super-predators'—radically impulsive, brutally remorseless youngsters, including ever more preteenage boys, who murder, assault, rape, rob, burglarize, deal deadly drugs, join gun-toting gangs, and create serious communal disorders. They do not fear the stigma of arrest, the pains of imprisonments, or the pangs of conscience. They perceive hardly any relationship between doing right (or wrong) now and being rewarded (or punished) for it later. To these mean-street youngster, the word 'right' and 'wrong' have no fixed moral meaning. (p. 27)

The "super-predator" term encoded youth of color as "different" to the law-abiding (middle-class white) adults, and the theory behind this term identified young people of color as fearless, dangerous, and violently out of control. According to the authors, the surge of youth violence was a result of "moral poverty," which included the failure of parents and the local community of not providing young people appropriate training to become hard working, law abiding, moral citizens.

The super-predator theory spoke nothing of the crisis of adulthood and pervasive racism in which displaced anxieties were placed upon youth of color. Based on the 1997 U.S. Census Bureau data, Males (1999) provides an explanation for the development of the super-predator theory by highlighting the racial demographic transition in which the younger (of color) populations (35 percent were under 18) did not reflect the 80 percent of America's adults over 40 years old who were whites of European origin. Since the U.S. experienced higher birth rates in communities of color during the late 1970s and early 1980s, politicians and intellectuals used racist logic to have people believe that "the country could expect a dramatic increase in crime in the next ten years, when those poor, inner-city children entered their teen years" (Tovares, 2002, p. 68).

Media representations in the late 1980s and 1990s also characterized this generation in a negative manner, such as being apathetic, apolitical, and ignorant on the one hand, and deviant, violent, or criminal on the other. For example, Giroux (1997) argues that Hollywood film productions demonize both urban white and Black youth. In several films, white youth are or depicted through the lens of stupidity and amusement or presented and framed "through the degrading textural registers of pathological violence, a deadening moral vacuum, and a paralyzing indifference to the present and future" (Giroux, 1997, p. 44). However, what connects these two types of negative representations of young whites is their contrast to other 1990s Hollywood representations of Black youth, which are largely shaped largely by classist racial tropes. Pointing to films produced by Black filmmakers, Giroux contends that their narrow representations of Black male youth reinforced the dominant neoconservative understanding of blackness as the "oth-

er” and a social problem. In many ways, popular culture in the U.S. at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century demonstrated the workings of coloniality and adultism in which the racial order founded on the designation of childhood and adolescence/youth as a site of naturalized criminality, violence, and servitude to which Black, Indigenous, and People of Color are relegated (Rollo, 2018).

In addition to negative discourses and media representations, the coloniality of youth is also evident in the juridical attacks of young people. One example was Proposition 21 in California, which was known as the “Juvenile Crime Initiative” on the March 2000 ballot. According to the 2000 California Primary Election Ballot Measure Summary, Proposition 21 would increase “punishment for gang-related felonies, home-invasion robbery, carjacking, witness intimidation and drive-by shooting, and [would create] crime of gang recruitment activities” (California Secretary of State). Despite that data had shown that anti-gang measures, such as the 1988 “Street Terrorism Enforcement And Prevention Act” (known as STEP Act) had little to no real effect in reducing violence (Klein, 1995), and that juvenile crime statistics had recently dropped at the state and national levels, Proposition 21 passed by 62 percent majority. Like other ballot measures in California during the 1990s that were orchestrated with racist agendas (HoSang, 2010), along with the increase of the prison industrial complex (González, 2009 [2000]), led many to strongly believe that Proposition 21 would disproportionately affect and further criminalize low-income youth of color.

Challenging this reiteration of the coloniality of youth, Proposition 21 sparked a unique decolonizing social movement before the state’s political landscape that came to be called as “the new youth movement” (Martínez, 2000). This movement included a statewide coalition of majority youth groups that came together and launched a grassroots, militant street-protest campaign all over California against the proposition (Tilton, 2010). This coalition was unique as it recognized the importance of many intersecting categories of difference—such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and religion—strategically linked through age. Young people from various communities and backgrounds took part in creating an integrated identity politics by forming a racially and culturally heterogeneous political movement against Proposition 21 organized strategically under the category of “youth.” Although the anti-youth law passed in California, people were transformed in the movement and through the activist and consciousness-raising process. Furthermore, this movement served to further decolonize identity, knowledge, and power (Bañales, 2012).

### **Conclusion: Decolonizing Youth Activism**

The idea of decolonization was birthed with colonization itself but did not become a project until the twentieth century. Although opposition to colonization manifested before, it is in the 20<sup>th</sup> century that the decolonial turn is substantiated.

Announced by the groundbreaking scholarship of W.E.B Du Bois in the early 1900s, the decolonial turn is concretized through interrelated (particularly post World War II) global assertions that intellectuals like Aimé Césaire and Frantz Fanon articulated, and the manifestation of social and political transformation (Maldonado-Torres, 2006, 2007, and 2011B). The collapse of the European Age in the first two World Wars, along with the wave of decolonization in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and other territories, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century led to critical reflection of oppressed people across the globe (Prashad, 2007; Mignolo, 2011). While anti-colonial and decolonial politics, intellectual thought, and artistic expression previously existed, it is in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century that the amount of self-awareness and coalitional efforts that challenge colonization and imperialism intensifies, such that it impacted traditional epistemic fields like anthropology (Gough, 1968, Hymes, 1972; Lewis, 1973; Asad, 1973). The decolonizing turn, although having roots in the 18<sup>th</sup> century independence movements, and solidified during the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, does not mean that the goal is to “go back” in space and time, or that colonization exists now in the same way as before. In contrast to Jürgen Habermas’ conception of the unfinished project of the Enlightenment/modernity, another way to understand decolonization is as an unfinished project (Maldonado-Torres, 2011A).

Youth activism was central to enacting the decolonial turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Bañales, 2012). As Sylvia Wynter suggests, the 1960s social movements could be understood as the possible beginning of a new opening of the epochal shift that began the process of resignifying symbolic representations and reordering episteme (Wynter, 1995). The decade of the 1960s was unique because “it marked the first time that youth *as* youth played a central role in the shaping of oppositional movements aimed at those in power. . . . Young people had never before taken to the streets by the thousand to dramatically challenge those institutions responsible for the perpetuation of racial inequality at home and military intervention abroad” (Muñoz, 1989 [2007], p. 1). One example of this activism took place On February 1<sup>st</sup>, 1960, when four Black college students challenged the racist Jim Crow system in the U.S. South head-on by sitting at the lunch counter designated for whites only at the Woolworth’s in Greensboro, North Carolina. This direct action initiated what would later be known as the “sit-ins,” and by the fall of 1960, over seventy thousand people had participated in this form of protest in over one hundred communities (Levy, 2019, p. 17).

Like the young activist of the 1960s who demanded for revolutionary change across the planet, youth continue to be the catalyst for social change, immersed in decolonizing action in variety of ways, including on the ground at the grass-roots level and through social media (Liou & Literat, 2020). For instance, young people: organized marches, vigils, sit-ins, and occupations for Black Lives Matter (Bort & Aleah, 2020); raised awareness, expressed their voices, and enacted activism to stop Asian hate, protect sacred lands, or make change in Native American

and Indigenous communities (Bañales, 2014; Channel Kindness, 2021; Menjivar, 2021; Drake, 2022); ushered a new era of political activism—from the DREAM Act, to DACA, to deportations and policing—that influenced elections, shaped policies, and sparked national conversations about exclusion and belonging (Arteaga, 2020); spearheaded feminist movements worldwide, calling attention to social injustices like gender-based violence (Restless Development, 2023); led the charge against climate disaster, including rising sea levels in the Pacific (Burton, 2019; Weik, 2023); worked for social transformation and breaking boundaries by centering Queer, Trans, and gender-nonconforming identities and experiences (Dupere, 2017); and engaged in ongoing struggles for the liberation of Palestine (Park, 2023). Often, the organizing of young people draws upon a “pedagogy of solidarity” (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012) that is unapologetically committed to decolonizing goals to activate youth-led spaces, anti-oppressive youth-adult partnerships, and activism done in coalition amongst youth and adults (Liou & Literat, 2020; Oto, 2023). As decolonizing youth activism demonstrates, interrogating adultism simultaneously requires challenging the European/Euro-American modern/colonial capitalist/patriarchal world system (Grosfoguel, Maldonado-Torres, & Saldívar, 2005) or the heterosexual colonial/modern gender system (Lugones, 2007).

To conclude, this essay brings into conversation adultism and theories of de/colonization and de/coloniality. The purpose was to: (1) propose decolonization/decoloniality as a framework by which to understand, theorize, and transgress adultism; (2) bring awareness to the imbricated relationship between adultism and colonialism/coloniality; and (3) point to decolonizing youth activism to further achieve liberation and social transformation. If we are dedicated to anti-youth oppression or dismantling adultism, a commitment to decolonization/decoloniality is essential. While decolonization may refer to historical movements of cultural reclamation or land sovereignty, decoloniality relates to liberation in the contemporary. In many forms, to decolonize is to “undo” or “unlearn” the logic of colonization of the past as it continues to the present, even if colonial domination in a historical sense may not be overt. Furthermore, decolonization and decoloniality are not only about resisting oppression but also about affirming, insisting, and creating from a multiplicity of spaces and modalities that challenge and transgress colonizing values, relationships, attitudes, institutions, and society. As much as colonization/coloniality is negation, destruction, violence, and hate, decolonization/decoloniality is affirmation, creation, healing, and love.

## References

- Agozino, B. (2021). Reparative justice: The final stage of decolonization. *Punishment & Society*, 23(5), 613-630. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14624745211024342>
- Alarcón, W., Benefield D. M., Fukushima, A. I., & Maese, M. (2020). Guest editors' introduction: 'World'-making and 'world'-travelling with decolonial feminisms and women of color. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 41(1), x-xxi.

- Alcoff, L. M., & Mendieta, E., eds. (2000). *Thinking from the underside of history: Enrique Dussel's philosophy of liberation*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2015). Now let us shift . . . the path of *conocimiento* . . . inner work, public acts. In A. Keating (ed.), *Light in the dark/Luz en lo oscuro: Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality* (pp. 117-159). Duke University Press.
- Ariès, P. (1962). *Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life*. Vintage Books.
- Arteaga, P. (2020). How young, undocumented organizers fought to bring DACA into existence. *Smithsonian: National Museum of American History*. <https://americanhistory.si.edu/explore/stories/how-young-undocumented-organizers-fought-bring-daca-existence>
- Arvin, M., Tuck, E. & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations*, 25(1), 8-34.
- Asad, T., ed. (1973). *Anthropology and the colonial encounter*. The Ithaca Press.
- Bacchetta, P. (2010). Decolonial praxis: Enabling intranational and queer coalition building. *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(2), 147-192.
- Bañales, X. (2012). *Decolonizing being, knowledge, and power: Youth activism in California at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. PhD dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Bañales, X. (2014). Paper rocket productions: A decolonizing epistemology of young indigenous filmmakers. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*, 3(2), 152–66.
- Bañales, X. (2023). A conversation with Favianna Rodriguez: World-making through decolonial feminist activism. *Feminist Formations*, 35(1), 154-194. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2023.a902073>.
- Bañales, X. (Forthcoming). Not only an academic field but movements: Advancing Ethnic Studies with decolonial feminisms. In A. I. Fukushima & K. Melchor Quick Hall (eds), *Decolonial feminist genealogies and futures*.
- Bell, J. (1995). Understanding adultism: A major obstacle to developing positive youth-adult relationships. Published through *YouthBuild U.S.A.*, accessed December 5, 2023, [https://actioncivics.scoe.net/pdf/Understanding\\_Adultism.pdf](https://actioncivics.scoe.net/pdf/Understanding_Adultism.pdf)
- Bennett, W. J., Dilulio, Jr., J. J., & Walters, J. P. (1996). *Body count: Moral poverty ...and how to win America's war against crime and drugs*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bertrand, M., Brooks, M. D., & Domínguez, A. D. (2023). Challenging adultism: Centering youth as educational decision makers. *Urban Education*, 58(10), 2570-2597. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920959135>
- Bort, R., & Aleah, K. (2020). Year in review: How Black Lives Matter inspired a new generation of youth activists. *RollingStone*. <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/black-lives-matter-protests-new-generation-youth-activists-1099895/>
- Bravo, S., & Figueroa-Vásquez, Y. C. (2023). Reflections: On strike MoMA, caribe fractal and decolonial feminisms as political arts practice. *Feminist Formations*, 35(1), 30-46. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2023.a902064>
- Burton, N. (2019). Meet the young activists of color who are leading the charge against climate disaster. *Vox.com*. <https://www.vox.com/identities/2019/10/11/20904791/young-climate-activists-of-color>
- California Secretary of State. *California primary election ballot measure summary*. <https://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/2000/primary/summary-21-22.htm>, (accessed on Dec. 15, 2023).
- Channel Kindness. (2021). 5 young Asian activist building a kinder world. *Channel kindness: a project of born this way foundation*. <https://www.channelkindness.org/five-aa>



[pi-activists-to-follow/](#)

- Clinton, W.J. (1996). State of the Union Address, U.S. Capitol, available at <https://clinton-whitehouse4.archives.gov/WH/New/other/sotu.html> (accessed, Dec. 2, 2023).
- Corney, T., Cooper, T., Shier, H., & Williamson, H. (2022). Youth participation: Adultism, human rights and professional youth work. *Children & Society*, 36(4), 677-690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12526>
- Côté, J. E. (2000). *Arrested adulthood: The changing nature of maturity and identity*. New York University Press.
- Cunningham, H. (1990). The employment and unemployment of children in England c. 1680-1851. *Past & Present*, 126, 115-150.
- Davis, A.Y. (1990). *Women, culture, and politics*. Vintage.
- Dean, C. (2002). Sketches of childhood: Children in colonial Andean art and society." In T. Hecht (ed.), *Minor omissions: Children in Latin American history and society*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- de Carvalho, M., & Senkevics, A. (2017) "Third World" girls: Gender, childhood and colonialism. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 5, 125-138. doi: 10.4236/jss.2017.56011.
- de Estrada, D. T. (2007). Indian children in early Mexico. In J. Marten (ed.), *Children in colonial America*. The New York University Press.
- DeJong, K., & Love, B. J. (2015). Youth oppression as a technology of colonialism: Conceptual frameworks and possibilities for social justice education praxis. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 48(3), 489-508. DOI: 10.1080/10665684.2015.1057086
- de las Casas, B. (1992 [1542]). *A short account of the destruction of the Indies*, ed. and trans. by Nigel Griffin. Penguin Putnam Inc.
- Dilulio, Jr., J. (1995). The coming of the super-predators. *Weekly Standard*.
- DiPietro, P. J. (2020). Neither humans, nor animals, nor monsters: Decolonizing transgender embodiments. *Eidos: A Journal for Philosophy of Culture*, 34, 254-291.
- Diptee, A. A. (2007). Imperial ideas, colonial realities: Enslaved children in Jamaica, 1775-1834. In J. Marten (ed.), *Children in colonial America*. New York University Press.
- Drake, K. (2022). 11 Indigenous youth making a difference in their communities. *Teen Vogue*. <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/11-indigenous-youth-making-a-difference-in-their-communities>
- Duane, A. M. (2010). *Suffering childhood in early America: Violence, race, and the making of the child victim*. The University of Georgia Press.
- Dussel, E. (1995). *The invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the other" and the myth of modernity*, trans. by M.D. Barber. Continuum.
- Dussel, E., & MacEoin, G. (1991). 1492: the discovery of an invasion. *CrossCurrents*, 41(4), 437-452. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24460351>
- Fletcher, A. (2015). *Facing adultism*. Common Action Publishing.
- Fujiwara, L., & Roshanravan, S. (2018). *Asian American feminisms and women of color politics*. University of Washington Press.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society*, 1(1), 41-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2022.2082733>
- Giroux, H.A. (1997). *Channel surfing: Race talk and the destruction of today's youth*. St. Martin's Press.
- Glenn, E. N. (2015). Settler colonialism as structure: A framework for comparative studies of U.S. race and gender formation. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(1), 52-72.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214560440>
- González, D. (2009 [2000]). Jobs not jails! No on proposition 21. *Fight Back! News: News and Views from the People's Struggle*. <https://fightbacknews.org/articles/noprop21>, (accessed on Dec. 15, 2023).
- Gough, K. (1968). Anthropology: Child of imperialism. *Monthly Review*, 19(11), 12-27.
- Gould, S. J. (1993[1981]). *The mismeasure of man*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Grosfoguel, R., Maldonado-Torres, N., & Saldívar, J. D. (2005). Latin@s and the “Euro-American menace”: The decolonization of the U.S. empire in the twenty-first century. In R. Grosfoguel, N. Maldonado-Torres, & J. D. Saldívar (eds.), *Latin@s in the world-system: Decolonization struggles in the 21<sup>st</sup> century U.S. empire* (pp. 3-27). Taylor & Francis.
- Hall, S. F. (2021). Panoptical time, cissexism, and heterosexism: How discourses of adulthood discipline queer and trans youth. *Feminist Formations*, 33(2), 283-312. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2021.0035>
- Hecht, T., ed. (2002). *Minor omissions: Children in Latin American history and society*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- HoSang, D. M. (2010). *Racial propositions: Ballot initiatives and the making of postwar California*. The University of California Press.
- Hull, G. T., Scott, P. B., & Smith, B. (eds.). (1982). *All the women are white, all the blacks are men, but some of us are brave: Black Women's Studies*. The Feminist Press.
- Hymes, D. (ed.). (1972). *Reinventing anthropology*. The Random House.
- Jordan, W. D. (1976). Searching for adulthood in America. *Daedalus*, 105(4), 1-11.
- King, W. (1995). *Stolen childhood: Slave youth in nineteenth-century America*. The Indiana University Press.
- Kivel, P., & Creighton, A. (1996). *Making the peace: A 15-session violence prevention curriculum for young people*. Hunter House Inc.
- Klein, M. W. (1995). *The American street gang: its nature, prevalence, and control*. The Oxford University Press.
- Kuznesof, E. A. (2007). Slavery and childhood in Brazil (1550-1888). In O. E. González & B. Premo (eds), *Raising an empire: Children in early modern Iberia and colonial Latin America*. The University of New Mexico Press.
- Lee-Oliver, L., & Bañales, X. (2023). Editorial introduction on decolonial feminisms: Engagement, practice, and action. *Feminist Formations*, 35(1), vii-x. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2023.a902060>.
- Levy, P. B. (2019). *The civil rights movement*. ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Lewis, D. K. (1973). Anthropology and colonialism. *Current Anthropology*, 14(5), 582-597
- Liou, A., & Literat, I. (2020). “We need you to listen to us”: Youth activist perspectives on intergenerational dynamics and adult solidarity in youth movements. *International Journal of Communication*, 14, 4662–4682. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/viewFile/15807/3209>
- Lugones, M. (1987). Playfulness, ‘world’-travelling, and loving perception. *Hypatia*, 2(2), 3-19.
- Lugones, M. (2003). *Peregrinajes/Pilgrimages: Theorizing coalition against multiple oppressions*. Rowman & Littlefield Press.
- Lugones, M. (2007). Heterosexualism and the colonial/modern gender system. *Hypatia*, 22(1), 186-209.
- Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia*, 25(4), 742-759.

- Maese, M. (2023). Lxs caravanerxs and nonsecular protest: Rethinking migrant family separation with Un llanto colectivo. *Feminist Formations*, 35(1), 268-292. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2023.a902077>
- Maldonado-Torres N. (2006). Césaire's gift and the decolonial turn. *Radical Philosophy Review*, 9, 111–137.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 240-270.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2008). *Against war: View from the underside of modernity*. Duke University Press.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Enrique Dussel's liberation thought in the decolonial turn. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(1), 1-30.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Thinking through the decolonial turn: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and critique—an introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2), 1-15.
- Maldonado-Torres, N., Bañales, X., Lee-Oliver, L, Niyogi, S., Ponce, A., & Radebe, Z. (2023). Decolonial pedagogy against the coloniality of justice. *Education Theory*, 73(4), 530-550.
- Mallon, F. E., ed. (2012). *Decolonizing native histories: Collaboration, knowledge, and language in the Americas*. Duke University Press.
- Marten, J., ed. (2007). *Children in colonial America*. The New York University Press.
- Martínez, E. (2000). The new youth movement in California. *Z Magazine*.
- McAlister, M. (2001). *Epic encounters: Culture, media, and U.S. interests in the Middle East, 1945-2000*. The University of California Press.
- McClellan, P. A. (2020). Portraits of black girls: Reflections on schooling and leadership of a black woman principal in an age of adultism. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 52(3), 256-269, DOI: 10.1080/00220620.2020.1786357
- McDonnell, S., & Regenvanu, R. (2022). Decolonization as practice: returning land to Indigenous control. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 18(2), 235-244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801221100963>
- Medina, N., & Whitla, B. (2019). (An)other Canada is possible: Rethinking Canada's colonial legacy. *Horizontes Decoloniales / Decolonial Horizons*, 5, 13–42. <https://doi.org/10.13169/decohor.5.1.0013>
- Memmi, A. (1997 [1965]). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Beacon Press.
- Méndez, X. (2015). Notes toward a decolonial feminist methodology: Revisiting the race/gender matrix. *Trans-Scripts*, 5, 41-59.
- Menjívar, J. (2021). 10 young Asian American and Pacific Islander Activists you should know. *DoSomething.org*. <https://www.dosomething.org/us/articles/10-young-aapi-activists-you-should-know>
- Merser, C. (1987). "Grown-ups": A generation in search of adulthood, G. P. Putnam's.
- Mignolo, W. D. (1995). *The darker side of the renaissance: Literacy, territoriality, and colonization*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2005). *The idea of Latin America*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Introduction: Coloniality of power and de-colonial thinking. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 155-167.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought, and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 159–81.

- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mohanty, C. (1988). Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 30, 61-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/fr.1988.42>
- Mohanty, C. T., & Carty, L. E. (eds.). (2018). *Feminist freedom warriors: Genealogies, justice, politics, and hope*. Haymarket Books.
- Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (eds.). (1983). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.
- Muñoz, C., Jr. (2007 [1989]). *Youth, identity, power: The Chicano movement*. Verso.
- Oto, R. (2023). "This is for us, not them": Troubling adulthood through a pedagogy of solidarity in youth organizing and activism. *Theory & Research in Social Education*. DOI: 10.1080/00933104.2023.2208538
- Park, J. (2023). Palestinian youth movement speaks. *The Real News Network*. <https://therealnews.com/palestinian-youth-movement-gaza-truce-ceasefire-western-left-solidarity>
- Pensoneau-Conway, S. L. (2017). Parenting the possible. *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking*, 4(1), 130-138. <https://doi.org/10.14321/qed.4.1.0130>
- Pérez, L. E. (2007). *Chicana art: The politics of spiritual and aesthetic altarities*. Duke University Press.
- Pérez, L. E. (2010). Enrique Dussel's *Ética de la liberación*, U.S. women of color decolonizing practices, and coalitionary politics amidst difference. *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(2), 121-146.
- Pérez, L. E. (2019). *Eros ideologies: Writings on art, spirituality, and the decolonial*. Duke University Press.
- Prashad, V. (2007). *The darker nations: A people's history of the Third World*. The New Press.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533-80.
- Restless Development. (2023). Young activist are leading feminist movements worldwide, says a new report. <https://restlessdevelopment.org/2023/07/young-activists-are-leading-feminist-movements-worldwide-while-facing-rising-threats-to-safety-and-mental-health-says-a-new-report/>
- Rodrigues, L. (2022). Decolonial feminism: María Lugones' influences and contributions. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 30(1), 1-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9584-2022v30n184278>
- Rollo, T. (2018). The color of childhood: The role of the child/human binary in the production of anti-Black racism. *Journal of Black Studies*, 49(4), 307-329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934718760769>
- Salas-SantaCruz, O. (2023). Nonbinary epistemologies: Refusing colonial amnesia and erasure of *Jotería* and Trans\* Latinidades. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly*, 51(3), 78-93. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wsqr.2023.a910069>
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Duke University Press.
- Studer, N. S. (2021). The infantilization of the colonized: Medical and psychiatric descriptions of drinking habits in the colonial Maghreb. In R. Ouaisa, F. Pannewick, & A. Strohmaier (eds.), *Re-configurations: Contextualising transformation processes and*

- lasting crises in the Middle East and North Africa*. Springer VS, Wiesbaden. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-31160-5\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-31160-5_9)
- Sutherland, C., Calò, F., Steiner, A., & Vanderhoven, E. (2023). 'You don't realise they're helping you until you realise they're helping you': Reconceptualising adultism through community music, *Children's Geographies*, 21(4), 579-593. DOI: 10.1080/14733285.2022.2099245
- Tilton, J. (2010). *Dangerous or endangered?: Race and the politics of youth in urban America*. New York University Press.
- Tovares, R. D. (2002). *Manufacturing the gang: Mexican American youth gangs on local television news*. Greenwood Press.
- Walsh, C. (2007). Shifting the geopolitics of critical knowledge: Decolonial thought and cultural studies 'others' in the Andes. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 224-39.
- Weik, T. (2023). The pacific climate warriors: Youth activist on rising seas, hope, and organizing. *Teen Vogue*. <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/pacific-climate-warriors>
- Wyn, J., & White, R. (1997). *Rethinking youth*. Sage Publications.
- Wynter, S. (1995). 1492: A new world view. In V. L. Hyatt & R. Nettleford (es.), *Race, discourse, and the origin of the Americas*. The Smithsonian Institution Press.