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What is Critical Race Theory? The answer is highly debated

• The definition of critical race theory varies significantly depending on an individual’s stance on the topic:

Historic/academic definition

• CRT is an academic framework first developed in the 1960’s by legal academics like Kimberle Crenshaw, Derrick Bell and Richard Delgado
• CRT has no single definition, but traditionally refers to a framework which posits that:
  • Racism in the U.S. is comprised not only of interpersonal actions but imbued into the U.S’s founding structures, institutions, and laws
  • Racism is part of everyday life and people often unconsciously participate in systems that uphold it even if their personal actions are not biased

Opponent’s characterization

• Critics rarely define CRT, but prefer to characterize it through purported outcomes and impact, such as:
  • Endorses segregation, stereotyping, group-based guilt, race essentialism
  • Denounces the U.S. as a racist country
  • Operates as a mechanism to shame, humiliate and guilt certain individuals
  • Pushes institutions, schools, government to accept liberal values and ideologies
  • Reduces people to identity characteristics, which serves to unfairly discriminate and demoralizing those associated with racism or sexism (e.g., white males)

Source: New York Times; New Yorker; EdWeek; Vox Media
Critical race theory, an academic framework from the 1990’s, gained national attention in summer of 2020 as a conservative talking-point

**Evolution of CRT debate**

- **1990’s**
  - Critical race theory is coined as a term and developed as an academic framework by legal scholars

- **2010’s**
  - Study and acceptance of key tenants of critical race theory, like a stronger understanding of the history of racism in U.S. institutions (e.g., prison), grows driven by cultural shifts and popular texts (e.g., The New Jim Crow)

- **Spring 2020**
  - The murder of George Floyd, and many other black Americans, ignites an increased focus on racial justice leading and a mainstream adoption of CRT-related materials and ideas:
    a) Individuals seek racial justice education through popular texts based on tenants of CRT (e.g., Kendi’s “How to be Anti-racist”)
    b) Institutions increase frequency of diversity and racial justice trainings

- **July 2020**
  - Fox News begins to air segments with conservative activist Christopher Rufo, an activist, who complains that CRT-related diversity trainings are forcing “harmful liberal ideology” upon employees in the private and public sectors

- **Fall 2020 – present**
  - Conservative politicians, activists, and media pick up CRT as a popular issue and push for anti-CRT legislation for federal employees and schools; legislation is introduced in 27 states

- **Sept. 2020**
  - Fox airs a popular segment with Christopher Rufo in which he calls on Trump to end CRT-related diversity trainings; President Trump issues an executive order banning these trainings for federal employees

Source: *Montana DOJ; ^WUSF Public Media; **SC State House .gov*
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Active CRT related bills are largely concentrated in the Midwest and Northeast; Southern states more commonly utilized non-legislative actions

- 27 states have proposed or passed a CRT related measure
- 9 states are poised to debate these measures in the coming legislative session (NH, MI, MO, OH, KN, PA, NJ, NY, WI)

Source: Flourish Media
CRT related legislation saw a surge in the spring of 2021, but tapered off by 2022; only 9 bills are active or proposed for the 2022 legislative session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th># of states</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No state-level action or bill introduced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill introduced- then vetoed or overturned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AZ, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill withdrawn or stalled indefinitely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MA, RI, AK, LA, WV, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill signed into law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ID, ND, TX, OK, IO, TN, SC, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill proposed or moving through legislature</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NH, MI, MO, OH, KN, PA, NJ, NY, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other state level action taken</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FL, MT, UT, AL, GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Flourish Media

States with potential to pass legislation in 2022; may be of interest for WWAP event
Anti-CRT actions are largely enacted through legislation with occasional use of legal opinions and school board rulings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Legislation:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rider legislation:</strong></th>
<th><strong>School board approval:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Attorney General opinion:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition:</strong></td>
<td>Enacted through traditional law-making (e.g., passed in senate and house and signed into law by Governor)</td>
<td>Included in a Governor's state budget as funding pre-requisite for public education institutions</td>
<td>School boards, appointed by state governors, pass rules banning teaching of CRT or the 1619 project in public schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example(s):</strong></td>
<td>• Ex. Texas HB 3979  • OK HB 1775</td>
<td>• SC included a clause to prohibit schools from using state funding to teach that “individuals have certain traits, experiences or responsibilities due to race or sex”**</td>
<td>• FL: School board banned CRT and the 1619 project as part of a broader amendment to “ban theories that distort historical events” and that racism can only be taught as “interpersonal, not as a structure embedded in American laws and norms”**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Montana DOJ; ^WUSF Public Media; **SC State House.gov
The primary goal of most anti-CRT legislation is banning classroom discussion of racism, sexism, and these concepts in U.S. history.

### Types of anti-CRT laws, by frequency in legislation (2021):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Specific edict</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Limits or bans on how teachers can instruct on ‘divisive topics’ particularly racism and sexism</td>
<td>Definitions vary on what types of instruction related to racism and sexism are unacceptable; definitions on following page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ban teaching CRT and CRT-related curricula (particularly the 1619 project)</td>
<td>Banning CRT requires a legal definition, which varies significantly across proposed legislation; Definitions on following page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Limits or bans on teaching that emphasizes individual student's characteristics (e.g., race, gender)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prohibit students from receiving community service credit for work with ‘advocacy groups’</td>
<td>Advocacy groups often defined as “any organization engaged in lobbying for legislation at the local, state or federal level, or in social or public policy advocacy”*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prohibit schoolteachers from ‘engaging in political, ideological or religious advocacy’ including sharing partisan opinions on controversial issues</td>
<td>Some bills specify specific ideologies, as in NH which prohibits, “Socialism, Marxism, or any doctrine promoting a negative account or representation of the founding and history of the US”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase parental and school board access to all curricula used</td>
<td>Florida’s bill pairs this increased access with legal rights to sue schools if parents feel the curricula is teaching harmful concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limit or prohibit teachers from engaging in ‘race or sex stereotyping’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limits on discussion of privilege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ban schools from hosting speakers or assigning books which advocate for ‘racist or sexist’ concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Flourish Media; *(TX HB3979
Laws vary significantly in their definitions of CRT and protections with some focused-on students and others on upholding U.S. reputation.

**Definitions vary from state to state, for the most common law types examples include:**

- **Ban teaching CRT and CRT-related curricula (particularly the 1619 project)**
- **Limits or bans on how teachers can instruct on ‘divisive topics’ particularly racism and sexism**
- **Limits or bans on teaching that emphasizes individual student’s characteristics (e.g., race, gender)**

- **NY:** Teaching that “individuals bear collective responsibility for acts committed by members of their race, that individuals should feel guilt because of their race or that individuals should receive discriminatory treatment based on their race.
  
  - **ND:** “The theory that racism is not merely the product of individual bias or prejudice, but that racism is systemically embedded in the American society and the American legal system to facilitate racial inequality.”
  
  - **FL:** “Instruction on the required topics must be factual and objective, and may not suppress or distort significant historical events, such as the Holocaust, and may not define American history as something other than the creation of a new nation based largely on universal principles stated in the Declaration of Independence including the 1619 Project and Critical Race Theory.”
  
  - **NH:** “Divisive concepts means a concept that a) one race or sex is inherently superior to another b) The state of New Hampshire or the United States is fundamentally racist or sexist c) An individual, by virtue of his or her race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously….”
  
  - **AL:** “Concepts that impute fault, blame, a tendency to oppress others, or the need to feel guilt or anguish solely because of their race or sex.”
  
  - **TN:** “Including or promoting the following concepts: one sex or race is inherently superior…. (6) An individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or another form of psychological distress solely because of the individual's race or sex; (8) This state or the United States is fundamentally or irredeemably racist or sexist.”

- **MT:** “a) Asking students or employees to engage, or not engage, with the class in a specific manner based on race; b) Engaging in “race scapegoating,” which means assigning fault, blame, or bias to a race or members of a race on the basis of their race. This includes claims that by virtue of race, a person is inherently racist; and c) Trainings, exercises, or assignments forcing students or employees to admit, accept, affirm, or support controversial concepts such as racial privilege, culpability, identity, or status as this constitutes compelled speech.”

- **WI:** “Shall not allow a teacher to teach race or sex stereotyping, including any of the following concepts: (b) An individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously f) An individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, bears responsibility for acts committed in the past by other individuals of the same race or sex. (g) An individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of psychological distress because of the individual's race or sex (b) Systems based on meritocracy or traits such as a hard work ethic are racist or sexist or are created by individuals of a particular race to oppress individuals of another race.”

Source: Various state legislature websites
While proponents face strong logistic and legal challenges in enforcing anti-CRT rules, unenforced laws may still be detrimental for teachers and students.

- Of the states that have passed or enacted anti—CRT related legislation, few have released plans for enforcing these laws, and those that have encountered significant legal and logistical challenges.
  - The AZ Supreme Court deemed a piece of anti-CRT legislation unconstitutional.
  - Legal commentators generally believe these laws will continue to be overturned given their legal bias against a specific group’s viewpoints and potential violation of the 1965 Civil Rights Act.

- However, commentators point out these laws are often intended as a scare tactic for teachers and school districts, minimizing the importance of actual enforcement.
  - Teachers and universities have reported class and curricula changes given fear of being penalized for teaching topics that are ‘too divisive’.

- Where specified in legislation, forms of enforcement proposed include:
  - **Financial penalties:**
    - AZ: School districts can be fined up to 5k if found in violation.
    - WI: Withhold 10% of state aid from schools in violation.
  - **Professional penalties:**
    - OK: Educators could have teaching licenses suspended and schools could lose accreditation.
    - KN: Would subject teachers who violate ban to disciplinary actions (e.g., suspension, loss of teaching certification).
  - **Student penalties:**
    - OH: If a teacher ‘promotes banned ideas’ their classes will not count towards student graduation requirements.
    - GA: Students will not receive credit for community service performed with ‘advocacy groups’.

Source: *What the hysteria over critical race theory is really about? (Vox); EducationWeek; New York Times; New Yorker; Various governmental websites*
Anti-CRT legislation is being pushed forward by an active collective of conservative activists, politicians, media, and policy groups

Key actors include:

Individuals:
- Christopher Rufo: Political activist who tracked ‘objectionable’ diversity trainings and popularized the issue on Fox News
- Russel Vought: conservative activist heading organizations promoting anti-CRT legislation

Media:
- Fox News: Utilized the term critical race theory 1,300 in 3.5 months in the spring of 2020*, propelling the issue to the mainstream for conservative voters

Policy groups:
- Key conservative policy groups have created model legislation for lawmakers and schoolboards to use and advocate for its adoption:
  - Center for Renewing America
  - Heritage Foundation
  - American Legislation Exchange Council

Politicians:
- Anti-CRT legislation has seen outspoken support from many conservative politicians:
  - Donald Trump
  - FL Governor Ron DeSantis
  - NC Rep. Dan Bishop
  - AK Sen. Tom Cotton

Source: EducationWeek; *Media Matters; New York Times; New Yorker; PBS; Various governmental websites