



Association of Mexican American Educators Journal

A peer-reviewed, open access journal

Volume 20 Issue 4

2026

AMAE Special Issue

Community Resistance and Educating in an Authoritarian Climate

Guest Editors

Patricia D. López, PhD
California State University, Fresno

Sergio Fernando Juárez, PhD
California Polytechnic University San Luis Obispo

Editors

Patricia Sánchez, PhD
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Antonio J. Camacho, PhD
AMAE, Inc.

Associate Editors

Julie L. Figueroa, PhD
Sacramento State

Lucila D. Ek, PhD
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Managing Editor

Caryn Calisi
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Book Review

Education and the Politics of Interruption: Does the Right Always Win?

Primavera Leal Martínez
California Polytechnic State University

Apple, M. W., Lima, I. G. D., & Gandin, L. A. (2026). *Education and the Politics of Interruption: Does the Right Always Win?* (M. W. Apple, I. G. de Lima, & L. A. Gandin, Eds.; 1st ed.). Routledge. Paperback: \$64.99

Primavera Leal Martínez
California Polytechnic State University

In *Education and the Politics of Interruption: Does the Right Always Win?*, editors Michael Apple, Iana Gomes de Lima and Luis Armando Gandín (2026) build a comparative volume centered on education as a “crucial site of struggle” (p. 2). The book offers “interruption” as a useful political vocabulary to describe how community members, students, parents, and teachers have responded to “rightist” projects (p. 1). Interruption appears to mean more than opposition or resistance. It involves disrupting “dominant practices and knowledge” while considering progressive possibilities. But the concept is only analytically useful if we can distinguish different forms and consequences of interruption. The book’s contextual specificity makes the need for conceptual differentiation especially important.

Apple et al. (2026) also contend that many different actions can constitute interruption. Using critical race theory and LatCrit foundations, Solórzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) provide a useful lens for assessing whether interruption names something genuinely distinct or simply relabels resistant action. According to the editors, resistance can be differentiated based on its relationship to social justice and oppression. What does interruption capture that transformational resistance, dissent or social movement rhetoric do not already capture?

For instance, “pedagogical rupture” may give greater specificity to something the editors call interruption (Hannegan-Martinez et al., 2024). The concept suggests that transformation can begin before visible institutional victory. A rupture changes interpretation, creates conditions for resistant action, and potentially produces capacities that have later political significance.

Interruption becomes analytically useful not just in naming acts of opposition but also directing attention to how resistant actions disrupt dominant practices and in knowledge, sometimes without or before an institutional win. Yosso’s (2005) community cultural wealth framework identifies resistant capital among several forms of knowledge and capacity that Communities of Color develop and possess, deliberately shifting away from deficit-oriented

institutional standards. The issue is not how much change occurred, but what counts as evidence of political consequence (Yosso, 2005). If interruption cannot be evaluated only by policy outcomes, then the next question is who is allowed to define what successful political transformation looks like.

Apple (2026) asks “who is the ‘we?’” (p. 18). Along these lines, if rightist educational power operates by making particular meanings appear normal, legitimate, or common sense, then interruption must also involve rhetorical processes. Flores (1996) shows how Chicana feminists create discursive space by refusing dominant definitions, establishing voice, crafting rhetorical “home,” and building bridges to others. Can creating discursive space itself constitute an interruption before formal institutional change occurs?

If racialized norms influence how political actors and their actions are interpreted, the same conduct could be viewed as resistance in one context but dismissed as disorder or incivility in another. Flores (2016) argues that rhetorical criticism exposes the racialized standards through which voice, legitimacy, and political action become recognizable. This complicates the book’s category of interruption because the issue is not only which actions produce transformation, but which actors and practices are recognized as politically meaningful interruption at all.

The editors say that the volume is concerned with including material from the Global South because Northern analytical tools may be inadequate for studying Global South contexts (Apple et al., 2026). Therefore, Global South inclusion should mean more than adding geographic context. Instead, those chapters should have the capacity to produce or revise theory. The book’s ordering matters because the U.S., England, Poland, and Australia appear before Brazil, Chile, and India, which means the earlier Global North countries concretize the concept.

The question is whether the later Global South chapters illustrate an already fixed concept or whether they are allowed to alter what interruption means. Peres-Neto (2024) states that Global South is not merely geography but a political and epistemological agency, which matters for understanding how theory should emerge from epistemologies instead of merely being applied to them. The question of how successful interruption is recognized is inseparable from the question of who gets to define interruption. If interruption is supposed to produce or name political transformation, and different communities may recognize

transformation through different epistemological and rhetorical criteria, then the book must account not only for whether interruption occurs, but also for whose standards concretize whether it is consequential. Who has the authority to determine what counts as interruption, who counts as an interrupter, and what evidence makes interruption recognizable as transformative?

Interruption is valuable because it resists the fatalistic assumption that right-wing educational power is inevitable. This concept is politically generative because it foregrounds possibility, resistance, and counter-hegemonic action. However, it is less precise as an analytical category because the volume leaves open questions of differentiation, recognition, consequence, and epistemic authority.

References

- Apple, M. W. (2026). United States: Can we win? Social mobilizations and the politics of official knowledge. In M. W. Apple, I. Gomes de Lima, & L. A. Gandín (Eds.), *Education and the politics of interruption: Does the right always win?* (pp. 16–38). Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., Gomes de Lima, I., & Gandín, L. A. (Eds.) (2026). *Education and the politics of interruption: Does the right always win?* Routledge.
- Flores, L. A. (1996). Creating discursive space through a rhetoric of difference: Chicana feminists craft a homeland. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 82(2), 142–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639609384147>
- Flores, L. A. (2016). Between abundance and marginalization: The imperative of racial rhetorical criticism. *Review of Communication*, 16(1), 4–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2016.1183871>
- Hannegan-Martinez, S., Mendoza Aviña, S., Delgado Bernal, D., & Solórzano, D. G. (2024). (Re)imagining transformational resistance: Seeds of resistance and pedagogical ruptures. *Urban Education*, 59(7), 2066–2095. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420859221092973>
- Peres-Neto, L. (2024). Global South: A political agenda to understand communication? *MATRIZes*, 18(1), 127–143. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v18i1p127-143>
- Solórzano, D. G., & Delgado Bernal, D., (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36(3), 308–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901363002>
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>