

Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis

ISSN: 2325-1204. Journal homepage: <https://www.iastatedigitalpress.com/jctp/>

Volume 11, Issue 3, 2022, Article 9, <https://doi.org/10.31274/jctp.13026>

Resoulience: Reimagining resilience (and ourselves)

Sahar D. Sattarzadeh, *DePauw University*

Recommended Citation

Sattarzadeh, S. D. (2022). Resoulience: Reimagining resilience (and ourselves). *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis* 11(3), Article 9. <https://doi.org/10.31274/jctp.13026>

Copyright and Open Access

© 2022 Sahar D. Sattarzadeh



This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial \(CC BY-NC\) 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits any sharing and adaptation of the article, as long as the original author(s) and source are credited and the article is used for non-commercial purposes.

Resoulience: Reimagining Resilience (and Ourselves)

Sahar D. Sattarzadeh

DePauw University

Weaving in a personal journey that reflects on the entanglements of justice and victimhood, this invitation to reimagine resilience proposes a spiritual framework that humanizes us. In this paper, the cultural, physical, social, and spiritual possibilities of resilience are explored, particularly through rewriting resilience as multidimensional and productive—humanizing. Through a proposal to undiscipline resilience and interrogate how “justice” is positioned, we reconsider picturing resilience differently, as re[soul]ience. There are countless exemplary demonstrations of resoulience, constructive resilience, transformative resistance, and/or transformative resilience that are not chronological, but rather sociocultural and spiritual. Examples of communities, particularly those most marginalized and oppressed have demonstrated, through time, space, and genetics, across generations, that transcendence is not only passed on as a form of sociocultural knowledge production, pedagogy and praxis, but also through our inherent nobility, our spiritual DNA. A few cases of such communities are presented here. Resoulience proposes a perspective beyond resilience that is intergenerational, sustainable, and manifest in our physical, social, and spiritual afterlives.

Keywords: Resoulience | nobility | victimhood | reimagining resilience | gender-based violence

“You may not control all the events that happen to you, but you can decide not to be reduced by them.”

—Maya Angelou

“Strong communities are born out of individuals being their best selves.”

—Leanne Betasamosake Simpson

“Pain is important: how we evade it, how we succumb to it, how we deal with it, how we transcend it.”

—Audre Lorde

Introduction

What if resilience was undisciplined? With its discursive resurgence across academia, activism, and social reality, resilience has a number of formal, disciplined definitions that sometimes fall short in capturing a humanizing response to oppression. As much as resilience is mentioned and hashtagged across social media, particularly within the context of social justice, it is praised, interrogated, and critiqued. There are active discourses across social media and elsewhere where people have expressed how they are “tired of being resilient” or “tired of being called resilient” (Twitter, 2021a; 2021b), including refusals of the “BIPOC trope of being strong and resilient” such as the “strong Black woman” due to its detrimental societal implications (Egbunu, 2020; Golden, 2021; Manke, 2019). The “Strong Indigenous Resilient” movement (Reclaim Your Power, 2021), on the other hand, understands resilience

as a persistence to not only survive, but also thrive in spite of intergenerational genocide against Indigenous communities. Colpitts and Gahagan (2016) argue that “deficit-focused” approaches must be replaced by “strengths-based” models in understanding and addressing healthcare for LGBTQ+ communities. Regardless of how resilience is understood or defined within such contexts, a shared desire to be humanized persists. This shared understanding demands an undisciplining of resilience because, it appears, resilience is not always enough. There are possibilities and realities, after all, that remind us of our just and equitable humanity—beyond our corporeal human bodies. Reimagine a resilience that is spiritual and not solely material; a resilience that is demonstrative, not solely descriptive.

Resilience is often understood from a lens that centers the oppressive forces that many peoples and communities face. It rarely, if ever, centers the human beings that experience and endure suffering *beyond* their suffering recognizing how the damage envelops our humanness, our humanity, our inherent nobility. In this paper, combined with the author’s selected personal experiences, the cultural, physical, social, and spiritual possibilities of resilience are explored through various complementary perspectives and disciplines, particularly through rewriting resilience as multidimensional and productive—as humanizing¹. Through a proposal to undiscipline resilience and interrogate how justice is positioned, the reader is invited to reconsider picturing resilience differently, as *re[soul]ience*.

There are countless exemplary demonstrations of resoulience, constructive resilience, transformative resistance, and/or transformative resilience that are not chronological, but rather sociocultural that will be introduced here. Examples of communities, particularly those most marginalized, invisibilized, and oppressed have demonstrated, through time, space, and genetics, across generations, that transcendence is not only passed on as a form of sociocultural knowledge production, pedagogy and praxis, but also through our inherent nobility, our spiritual DNA. As much as hereditary and intergenerational traits of trauma are studied, so too are similar associations between resilience (Akbar, 1996; Barker, 2020; Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005; Clukay et al., 2019; DeGruy, 2005; Halloran, 2004). However, there are also undisciplined explanations that cannot be scientifically understood alone, demanding a coherence between scientific and spiritual phenomena. Thus, when resilience is not adequate in accurately capturing our humanity, it may help to identify examples that humanize rather than normalize damage as a banner for justice and equity-driven work. Here, damage is also revisited as spiritual harm, an attack on the human soul (Deer, 2005), and resoulience, therefore, is interpreted through a spiritual resilience/resurgence that is not limited to political ends and means (Million, 2009). An emerging and evolving understanding, therefore, a looking beyond resilience is proposed and reimaged here—one inspired by a personal journey in accompaniment/citational kinship with many other journeys.

¹ As a “Middle Eastern” woman/“woman of color,” and a daughter of settler refugees of Azeri and Iranian/Persian descent, the evolving education I constantly rely upon and grow from is most often learned from women, LGBTQ+, Two-Spirit, and non-gender conforming peoples of diverse Indigenous, ethnic, and racial perspectives around the globe, ranging from various disciplines, non-disciplines, and undisciplines. My identity as a member of the Bahá’í community foregrounds my spiritual understanding that each and every human being is inherently noble and has an unconditional spiritual capacity within their respective souls, inspiring a proposed reimagining of resilience as “resoulience” in this work. Consequently, “spiritual citational kinship” with numerous activists, artists, and scholars of African/Black and/or Indigenous descent highlighting spiritual associations are centered here.

Un/becoming a “Victim”

The motivation to reimagine resilience was catalyzed by a personal experience with violence. Caught in an unsatisfactory tug-of-war between dichotomous poles of victimhood and survival, I craved a more humanizing arrival that embodied a transformative resilience. Ironically, resilience was compromised for victimhood because it became a provocative selling point or marketing strategy to pathologize and problematize the growing crisis of violence against women.

Domestic Violence Awareness Month (October in the United States) dramatically shifted my understanding of the relationship between justice, equity, and resilience. In October 2011, a faith-based non-governmental organization (NGO) focused on women and girls’ rights, convened the Interfaith Domestic Violence Coalition on Capitol Hill. It was a press briefing for invited members of the United States Congress and their staff in the U.S. Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. The briefing was an advocacy initiative to address the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which had expired and was being considered for reauthorization for the 2012 fiscal year. Along with three other women from diverse faith backgrounds, representing religious or interfaith domestic violence organizations and programs, I was invited by the NGO to participate in the Interfaith Domestic Violence Coalition panel for the press briefing. When I was introduced to speak, however, the last words of the introduction caught me off-guard: “. . . and she is a victim of domestic violence.”

Despite having jotted down talking points in advance, suddenly, I felt ill-prepared and out of place. An intense sensation of heat overpowered my being. There was no intention to present myself as the victim on display for the event; to be honest, I had never actually shared my abusive relationship history with the conveners. The emcee of the event, a White Christian clergywoman introduced as a “survivor” of domestic violence, shared the obstacles she had faced due to a deficient, broken system. It was a story she *chose* to tell. While there was likely no malintent on the part of the sponsoring NGO, I still could not help but feel exploited and tokenized as the poster “victim” for the briefing. I never consented to such a representation. My nobility was instantly invisibilized (Sattarzadeh, 2021), flanking in the shadows of my “trauma.” Nevertheless, there was no running away at this point. It was my turn to approach the microphone and share my story. “Thank you for inviting me to speak about this very important issue,” I began. “I want to clarify, however, that I do not self-identify as a ‘victim’ . . .”

The consistent frequency and weight of this gender-based justice vernacular was already too familiar. Even when considering the purpose of our gathering and the title of the federal law, the *Violence Against Women Act*, for example, the emphasis clearly falls on the victimized body of women, disregarding the accountability of the perpetrators and the systems and structure that embody and nurture such violence. Having experienced all the predetermined stages of “battered woman syndrome” (BWS) (Roth & Coles, 1995), while simultaneously self-diagnosing it on occasion, is another reminder of how such branding creates new, problematic opportunities and pathologies through a “syndrome” for those of us who have endured abusive relationships to be systematically beaten up and diminished by ourselves and others—even if only symbolically—over and over again. It becomes an intersectional, gendered burden to bear.

“The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives,” as the Combahee River Collective writes in its “A Black Feminist Statement” (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). In attempting to identify the disease, we still become diseased, pathologizing our experiences of abuse. Despite the shared anecdotes of victimization and trauma that may (or may not) have been expected of me at the congressional hearing, I refused to go there. That refusal was a resistance to how I was introduced, to how I was scripted to perform (Simpson, 2016).

Ironically, being introduced as a victim took me completely off-script of my own pre-drafted words; yet, it also challenged me to create a new narrative for myself, adapting from (not comparing to) Sharpe's (2016) "Black annotation" and "Black redaction" of representations that dehumanize people of African/Black descent and Lineman Nelson's (2001) "narrative repair" of "damaged identities" through counterstorying.

Simultaneously, I had been volunteering as a Court Companion and Victim Advocate at the Abused Persons Program, an initiative of the county health department where I lived. Volunteering for the program was a self-prescribed attempt to heal from leaving an abusive relationship (which many, I recognize, are not privileged to do, due to varying circumstances) by hoping to support others who had also experienced domestic or intimate partner violence. Among the program staff and our cohort of volunteers, I was the only one who had openly verbalized experiencing an abusive relationship, revealing a close-up understanding of how justice falls short. While I sensed a genuine collective desire to help those victimized by abuse, the program lacked sufficient, relevant educational and economic resources, and most importantly, it lacked any epistemic experience—or what Deer (2015) refers to as "the kind of knowledge we gain from experiencing something; a visceral knowledge that can invoke the physical senses and the genius of memory" (p. 14)—from its targeted population, thus neglecting the insightful, vital contributions that could be shared with the program. The dichotomies of "victim" and "offender" used in the space are dehumanizing and diminish the possibility of any inherent nobility. Both labels emphasize the act of infliction/damage committed without suggesting an elsewhere or otherwise. There is no room for resilience between them. Therefore, despite their good intentions, the program staff's efforts seemed paternalistic and surface-level at most, disregarding the diverse sociocultural contexts of the people they intend to serve. While I shared my perspectives during the training sessions, I am not sure whether anyone was receptive to them. One thing was for certain, the program and the court system only viewed us as victims.

In such systems, abused women, Two-Spirit, LGBTQ+, and non-gender conforming peoples are inherently victims—before even arriving, granting them the latitude to perform victimhood; and then, there are those unwritten codes deciphering who deserves protection, who deserves the abuse, who deserves or should be rescued or saved, and who should be doing the rescuing or saving and for what reason(s). Like Cole's (2012) critique of the White Savior Industrial Complex in media coverage of Africans and African conflicts, for example, marginalized voices are muted or silenced, subtitled, and/or interpreted through voices in postures and positions of greater privilege and socioeconomic and/or political power. After all, all a savior sees and reasons is need narrowly based on images of "hungry mouths, child soldiers, or raped civilians" (Cole, 2012), avoiding the social reality of more complex systemic forces at play. Such surface-level readings of society, where intentions to "help" peoples and places persist, requires "some humility with regards to people in those places . . . some respect for the agency of the people" (Cole, 2012). After all, individuals and groups have already done a great deal of work to improve their conditions and/or communities (Cole, 2012), but such responses have been overshadowed by narratives of trauma and justified entitlements and privileges of needing to be saved. Conjuring Spivak's notable essay *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, Tuck and Yang (2014) raise similar concerns regarding a "major colonial task of social science research that has emerged," which is "pos[ing] as voicebox, ventriloquist, interpreter of subaltern voice" (p. 225).

Becoming a "battered woman," therefore, not only emerges from a historical, patriarchal normative script. Its imprint deepens when it becomes economized, ethnicized, disabled, genealogized, gendered, geographized, Indigenized, and/or racialized. This especially occurs when examined through the lens of colonial histories—justifying, normalizing, and reproducing diverse forms of violence and stereotypes against Indigenous, Black, ethnic,

Indigenous, racial, disabled, and non-/gendered bodies (see Deer, 2015; Hammad, 2010; Hartman, 2007; Ritchie, 2017; Sharpe, 2016). This victimhood is oftentimes internalized and perpetuated, especially for already marginalized and underrepresented communities, and it becomes further detrimental such as in the “Superwoman Schema” (SWS) imposing mental distress of societal norms and expectations upon African American women, which can be traced back to historical and sociocultural contexts of settler colonial racial discrimination and gendered racism (Allen et al., 2019; Woods-Giscombé, 2010). Ultimately, if the oppression persists “long enough and effectively enough, you [may] begin to do it to yourself . . . becom[ing] a collaborator” (Baldwin & Giovanni, 1973, p. 17), in/directly complicit. In some instances, such “collaborations” and complicities also erase other significant identities that have shaped and continue to shape us.

For five years, I was in a relationship with a man who was economically, emotionally, physically, psychologically, and spiritually abusive towards me. My former partner’s abuse was fueled by evident preexisting insecurities that swiftly avalanched from the intel he collected during his frequent violations of my privacy, including reading my email messages, as well as journal entries about my interrogations of uninvited advances from men and the details of a gang rape I had endured just a year prior to meeting him. His mother had tragically passed away from advanced ovarian cancer during the early weeks of our courtship. Coincidentally, I was diagnosed with an early stage of ovarian cancer two weeks following her earthly departure. Oddly enough, I assumed my cancer diagnosis would serve as a form of protection or shield from the abuse, perhaps an unyielding bond between us; but instead, it swiftly became irrelevant, invisible. Our relationship ended in 2009, and two years later—two months after that congressional press briefing—I was formally diagnosed with having post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Two years later, we attempted to give the relationship another try, but even in its rekindling, it inevitably failed. The relationship was an accelerant to a lingering disbelief in my own nobility. All of my relationships—regardless of shape or form—were mirrors of a distorted reality, reflecting the neglect of my spiritual self.

To be truthful, it has taken me well over a decade to share this personal experience openly and publicly. Obviously, I am not the first and only soul to share such an account, nor will I be the last, unfortunately. Initially resistant to being the center of attention, to be centered at all, this story was safeguarded in a silent corner, hidden from view, until dear, beloved souls gave me permission to share it. Drawing inspiration from W. E. B. DuBois’s use of memoir in *The Souls of Black Folk* and *Dusk of Dawn*—inspired by Chandler and Spivak’s terminology—Saidiya Hartman, explains that an “autobiographical example . . . is not a personal story that folds onto itself; it’s not about navel gazing, it’s really about trying to look at historical and social process and one’s own formation as a window onto social and historical processes, as an example of them” (Saunders, 2008, p. 5). Likewise, Audre Lorde’s reference to her personal story in *The Cancer Journals* as “not academic,” but rather as “a piece of life-saving equipment” that “kept [her] alive during the time that [she] wrote it” (Lorde et al., 1982, p. 11), encouraged me to reconcile and feel at ease to open up and share this story. The urge to share this now is simply because it finally manifested as a rupture I needed to address. And in the words of Lorde (1982), “now it’s out there, the umbilical cord is cut, it has a life of its own” (p. 2). It is no longer mine, nor does it belong to me.

Silence once served as a protective armor—for my own guilt and shame and for my former partner—from the backbiting, verbal abuse, and judgments projected from others in their attempts to slander his character. In addition to unlearning unjust sociocultural norms and other forms of socialization (we do not often freely speak about such personal issues in Azeri/Iranian/Persian households), gossip and backbiting, unfortunately, had already emerged among a number of those privy to this particular slice of my life. Even in the deafening secrets and silence, voices secretly whispered. Aside from the desire to avoid being exposed

and judged by the world, I had no interest in presenting the self-inflicted image of damaged victim or recovering survivor. Both “victim” and survivor still give way and weight to the experience of trauma, albeit differently. For me, survivor has been associated with surviving cancer (American Cancer Society, 2021), rape (National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2021), and domestic violence (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2021). Like victim, therefore, I believe survivor, as a construct, still anchors an individual’s trauma or pain and centers the damage or scars therefrom, limiting it to the human body—not the capacities of the heart, mind, and soul. Thus, survivor/ing emphasizes the scars that remain from such experiences, not the education received or knowledge learned, not the process of healing, growth, and progress. Instead of transcending the pain and suffering—accepting and acknowledging it happened, grieving it, and so on—one becomes stuck in limbo within a projected and/or internalized, one-dimensional posture of survivor of one’s own individual and collective making. To be clear, there is no desire on my part to dispossess or diminish the name survivor from those who closely identify with it; it is solely a personal preference not to be perceived as a survivor or surviving.

In the Oxford English Dictionary, survive is limited to definitions of “to continue to live after the death of another,” “outlive,” “remain alive,” or “to continue to live [or] exist after” another, such as in obituaries when the departed is “survived by” a loved one (OED Online, 2021a). The definition is limited to the material body, lacking an empowering spiritual quality. Maya Angelou’s *Still I Rise* comes to mind. Rising, as an act of transcendence, does not submit to dehumanization. Instead, it is a persistent, insistent resistance to it. Again looking to the words of Audre Lorde (1980), living is also an option. Lorde dedicates *The Cancer Journals* to “the possibilities of self-healing and the richness of living for all women” (p. 2). Lorde (1980) also explores how survival extends to a resilience in living: “by taking part in a process of life that is creative and continuing, that is growth” (p. 30). The concern is that survivor becomes an imposed core of one’s identity, and in most cases, it is disproportionately gendered and racialized (Boyle & Rogers, 2020). Surviving also has a tendency to burden the survivor, absolving and exonerating individuals, institutions, and systems of their oppressive cultures and practices. This is why, for example, Indigenous resurgence is so significant for its dependence upon “center[ing] transformative alternatives to this present [of Indigenous dispossession]” (Snelgrove et al., 2014, p. 2).

On that October day on Capitol Hill, the projection of a victim status upon me was utterly disempowering. In the same instance, there was no desire on my part to trivialize or delegitimize the injustice or diminish the urgency of domestic/intimate partner/gender-based violence. Similarly, I did not wish to undermine the genuine empathy and aspirations for justice and healing they evoke. Loved ones and colleagues whom I confided in about my abusive relationship had intentions of saving me. Even those secret well-intentioned, yet failed, interventions among a few clusters of friends deeply rooted in social justice activism, which I learned of years later, backfired in unhealthy, toxic modes, even dissolving friendships. All I desired was to avoid being (mis)represented or replicating the “danger in damage-centered [narratives] . . . [as a] pathologizing approach in which the oppression singularly defines a community” (Tuck, 2009, p. 413), such as women in violent relationships. Pathologizing my toxic experiences diminished me to a damaged, broken being that needed saving, lacking considerations for how I imagined and needed to reimagine myself. Tuck (2009) suggests opting for desire-based frameworks instead where images of desire reimagine through a lens of possibility. They humanize communities popularly portrayed as damaged both internally and externally. I am less likely to perceive myself in such a diminutive state if the narrative I and others impose on such communities is desire-based. Tuck (2009) further argues that transforming such narratives and practices challenge conceptions of both disciplinary and “justice”-oriented understandings of resilience.

Unbecoming a victim not only gives way to undefining and redefining resilience, but other forms of undoing as well. Mapping various understandings and uses of resilience also yield opportunities for differentiating between justice-centered perspectives and disciplinary perspectives of resilience.

Un/defining and Undisciplining Resilience

Resilience is hashtagged over 3,000,000 times across Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter combined, but the meanings of resilience implied behind the millions of social media posts are not necessarily universal (Social Searcher, 2021). According to the Oxford English Dictionary, resilience is disciplinarily defined as:

[e]lasticity; the power of resuming an original shape or position after compression, bending, etc. *Mechanics*, [t]he energy per unit volume absorbed by a material when it is subjected to strain; the value of this at the elastic limit; figurative uses, [t]he quality or fact of being able to recover quickly or easily from, or resist being affected by, a misfortune, shock, illness, etc.; robustness; adaptability (OED Online, 2021b).

This notion of elasticity of resilience is echoed in Keet's (2018a) reading of Catherine Malabou's theory of brain plasticity as a metaphor for the South African University as "flexible, moldable, pliable, with an inscribed transformative ability rooted in the 'nature' of the knowledge and the disciplines with which it works" (p. 1). In essence, the plasticity refers to the university's capacity to transform from within. Keet (2018b) calls for the academic community to "excavate the [innate] plasticity of the university" (p. 20). To imagine that a higher education institution has a capacity for resilience from within is also frequent in la paperson's *A Third University is Possible* when it is argued that "[w]ithin the colonizing university also exists a decolonizing education" (p. xiii).

Returning to the subsequent Oxford English Dictionary definitions above, there is the definition of resilience to remain unchanged by a "compression" or "bending," to "resist being affected by," which are non-human characteristics. Furthermore, the "quality or fact of being able to recover quickly or easily from" implies that resilience is not universal, but rather, conditional. In these instances, definitions of resilience are insufficient and limiting. They are dehumanizing.

According to the American Psychological Association (APA) (2012), resilience is defined as "the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or significant sources of stress . . . [it] not only helps you get through difficult circumstances, it also empowers you to grow and even improve your life along the way." What "adapting well" means is relative and unique to each context, however. Southwick et al. (2014) argue that resilience requires a critical, evolving, inter-/multi-disciplinary understanding and approach especially since "humans are embedded in families, families in organizations and communities, and communities in societies and cultures" (p. 12). Resilience is misunderstood. It is not limited to healing or bouncing back. Resilience is also intrinsic, learned or acquired, strengthened, and socialized; it is more about being rather than doing; it is internal and external; and it manifests individually and collectively (Menakem, 2017). Definitions and meanings of resilience, then, are divergent and unrestrained by a singular discipline. One cannot help but read between the words and lines to envision resilience anew—as acts of justice.

Interdisciplinary perspectives of resilience are frequently motivated by social justice (Southwick et al., 2014), but what social justice requires is usually left to the imagination. To reimagine resilience, we can continue to study. Today, an ever-evolving understanding of the

various dimensions of resilience is pivoted by proclamations of (in)justice and/or (in)equity. Like recent trends surrounding diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education, however, social justice is one of the most commonly used, un/contested, and un/defined terms within and beyond academic, activist, corporate, governmental, community-based, and non-state actors and spheres (Ahmed, 2012). Justice becomes a “redress discourse,” whereby the space between what is possible and impossible is complex and varied (Best & Hartman, 1997, p. 3). Some interpretations of justice (and resilience) reproduce in/justice, and therefore, are characterized by both limitations and possibilities. It seems appropriate, then, to also create space to interrogate justice from the individual to the collective, “making space for a critical conversation of what justice is, or more precisely what justice wants, what it produces, whom it fails, where it operates, when it is in effect, and what it lacks” (Tuck & Yang, 2018, p. 3). Thus, in revisiting resilience, not only is there an intent to continue the challenging task of redefining and reimagining what justice means through our individual and collective experiences and learnings, but also through the extraction and coherence of our respective, diverse and overlapping, integrated positionalities and reflexivities.

Justice is arduous, demanding, and heartbreaking. If the COVID-19 pandemic continues to remind the world, justice requires that we face historical, transmuting injustices and inequities that have evolved from colonial and imperial projects—anti-Blackness, anti-Indigeneity, xenophobia, heteropatriarchy, systemic racism, etc. (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2020). But it is also fulfilling, life-giving, and celebratory. Justice also requires us to think intergenerationally and sustainably, collectively, and through beautiful, humanizing frames and actions. As Roy (2020) reminds us in her both present-day realities and future possibilities of the global COVID-19 pandemic,

Historically, pandemics have forced humans to break with the past and imagine their world anew. This one is no different. It is a portal, a gateway between one world and the next. We can choose to walk through it, dragging the carcasses of our prejudice and hatred, our avarice, our data banks and dead ideas, our dead rivers and smoky skies behind us. Or we can walk through lightly, with little luggage, ready to imagine another world. And ready to fight for it.

There is an inspirational beauty in Roy’s words—viewing ourselves, each other, and the world “anew,” reimagining and living for a world that is deserved/necessary for all. Similarly, justice, in its in/completeness requires that we humanize ourselves and each other (Tuck & Yang, 2014), even re-humanizing, when necessary, over and over again.

In terms of fragments and wholeness, disciplines were designed to be separated from one another. Justice—in deeds, thoughts, and words—is inherently un-/non-/inter-/multi-/trans-disciplinary. What, then, might *undisciplining* resilience look like? In both academia and activism, especially through efforts motivated by justice, we are called to include multidimensional frameworks of disciplines (Liebig et al., 2001; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017; Naples, 2010; Parker et al., 2010), working across and between various disciplines (interdisciplinary); collaborating with others from different disciplines (multidisciplinary); and, through the disciplines (transdisciplinary) (Graff, 2015). In the same instance, however, a justice-centered approach also interrogates how and why contemporary academic disciplines and fields were historically created and have evolved, particularly as motivated by unjust and inequitable intentions, centering whiteness, heteropatriarchy, Euro-American thought, and the Northwestern Hemisphere as repositories of knowledge. Thus, the im/possibilities of disciplines could also naturally be explored (Rabaka, 2010).

Activists, artists, and scholars may aim to transcend “disciplinary decadence”—“the ontologizing or reification of a discipline”—or the belief that disciplines must remain intact

and eternal, just as they were created or designed to be (Gordon, 2006, p. 4), breaking free from our “narratively condemned status” within disciplines (Wynter, 1994, p. 70). More can be done than simply emphasizing interdisciplinarity, but also being undisciplined, pushing against the reinscribing of destruction and marginalization of specific peoples and groups that disciplines often design (Sharpe, 2016). Undisciplining knowledge, pedagogy, praxis, research, and social action can be enacted through the “making and ongoing reshaping of modern disciplines” that are inseparable—not oppositional—to them (Graff, 2015, p. 5). This undisciplining may yield non-disciplinary approaches by erasing and pushing back against “borders and boundaries of disciplinary knowledge” to engage with and produce knowledge which “transgresses, transcends, and transverses disciplines or specific fields of scholarly inquiry” (Rabaka 2010, p. 13). Disciplines exist because of their borders. All possibilities of inter-/multi-/trans-/non-/un-disciplinarity could be explored, therefore, obliterating and reimagining areas of study could be borderless, challenging the very existence of disciplinary borders and boundaries of disciplines (Rabaka, 2010). Erasing borders that perpetuate Euro-American and patriarchal hegemonies even “in between frontiers” frees up space and disrupts geopolitical configurations where disciplines are born, settle, and occupy (de Sousa Santos, 2014, p. 195). Undisciplining resilience opens possibilities for breaking free from simplistic, essentialized, dichotomous relationships such as: victim-perpetrator, oppressed-oppressor, self-other, Global North-Global South, savage-civilized.

In/visibilizing Trauma and Nobility

This appeal to seek liberation from the entanglements and fetters of damage and victimhood is neither unique nor limited to my personal experiences with ovarian cancer, intimate partner, domestic, gender-based, and sexual violence. There are extensive systems and structures, as well as prescriptive beliefs deeply embedded in our global society where a duality of visibilized trauma and invisibilized nobility is reproduced and normalized, even when motivated by a pursuit for justice. Lorde (1980) explains the internal conflict many women face in expressing their pains coping with breast cancer “in a valiant effort not to be seen as merely victims” (p. 1), when justice also demands that emotions such as pain and fear have a right to coexist with the desire to overcome, reimagine, and transform. In describing the combined sexual and colonial violence countless Native women have endured, Deer (2005) explains—despite unpopular understandings outside Native communities—they are equivalent to “attacks on the human soul,” through the destruction of culture and rape of women, resulting in “a kind of spiritual death,” (p. 459), which more universally applied, could be understood as a spiritual injury, a dehumanizing of the human, and a rejection of the soul’s existence. A spiritual death or annihilation/rejection of the soul’s existence is thus, a denial of one’s nobility. In offering a critical First Nations women’s narrative analysis of mostly White male scholarship, Million (2009) addresses the importance of how such experiences behind narratives are also “felt” and not just told—and thus, incomplete. Million (2009) refers to First Nations women’s felt experiences as their “sixth sense about the moral affective heart of capitalism and colonialism” (p. 54). Challenging postcolonial and anticolonial scholarship that praises Indigenous resistances, while simultaneously having a lingering fascination with Indigenous trauma and victimization, Million (2009) argues that simply transcending pain is not sufficient, that spiritual associations must also be recognized. Anchoring trauma on selected individuals and communities has a proclivity to deny and withhold resilience as a possibility, further normalizing damage and preserving stereotypes, thus withholding the power of being human. Consequently, resilience becomes an exclusive opportunity, rather than an inherently, humanizing, universal quality, robbing ourselves and each other of nobility.

Reimagining Resilience, Visibilizing Justice/Nobility

Inspired by the Bahá'í tradition, nobility is defined here as the highest aspiration—a spiritual reality, a truth—inherent in every individual soul; justice is considered a noble quality ('Abdu'l-Bahá, 1972). Learning this, however, has also forced me to question how, for decades, I could conceive of the inherent spiritual nobility of others and their justice while denying my own. But if justice is a noble quality, what is true nobility, and what role(s) does it play in response to oppression, (in)justice, and (in)equity? What does nobility look like in the face of oppression, and would I recognize it? What examples in the world could I learn and draw from? How can we authentically and humbly engage in social action and the relevant discourses of society to assail the injustices and inequities of this world, while concurrently amplifying the spiritual reality—the nobility (and therefore, constructive resiliency)—of the soul?

These questions have since evolved into two broad questions that I am still aiming to perfect. First, how can we reconceptualize and participate in a body politic where we visibilize and center nobility in public discourses and social actions on the various entangled dimensions of injustice and inequity, including academic and activist spaces (and their convergences)? Second, how do exemplary narratives of resoulience help us honor and recognize the nobility of peoples and communities without delegitimizing and denying the social forces of oppression that exist and persist in the world? These questions, I imagine, are only a few of those I will live with all the days of my life, on this earthly plane, attempting to humbly explore and learn from.

It is my belief that visibilizing the inherent nobility of human souls is a key ingredient in the possibility of reimagining resilience as resoulience. Resoulience is evidence of the spiritual capacity in human souls to transcend turmoil and transform them into realities—not solely possibilities—for individual and collective advancement. Resoulience acknowledges human imperfections, flaws, and struggles. Resoulience rejects that our struggles singularly identify us. Resoulience underscores resilience as a universal, spiritual reality, surpassing material or physical limitations.

What if narratives of injustice and inequity faced by communities were paralleled by these noble qualities they possess? How might a nobility framework yield new opportunities for reimagining noble souls and their capacities of constructive thought and action in the face of injustice? While I fully advocate the necessity of unearthing and studying all facets of oppression, stopping at the paralysis of damage or victimhood from such oppression seems incomplete, falling short, and even a missed opportunity. Why not, rather, prepare and seek out pathways of transcendence through that oppression?

Today, more than ever, we are immersed in a cumulative amplification and hypervisibility of injustice and inequity on a number of intersecting levels. The global COVID-19 pandemic, combined with a rampant, heightened response to worldly injustices of anti-Blackness, anti-Indigeneity, anti-Asian violence, extremes of poverty and wealth, vaccine apartheid, xenophobia, racism, and patriarchy, and the list goes on—despite their persistence for centuries—have been characterized by varying calls for public action. Most of these movements have been motivated by the necessities of collective justice, while others have been fueled by demands for individual liberties. Mass public outcry is usually synonymous with or derived from—but not limited to—terms and concepts such as activism, boycott, demonstration, protest, resistance, and social movements. The most prolific scholars of social movement studies, particularly those educated and residing within a factory-like white, patriarchal Euro-American system of formal higher education, limit their definitions of collective action to criteria characteristic of contention and oppositionality. These conditions are clearly the most popularized, but there are also more humanizing elements of social

change that are almost always hidden from view (Asher-Schapiro, 2016; holt, 2020; Karlberg & Smith, 2021; Physicians for Human Rights, 2016; Ryan, 2015; Smith, 2019; Sørensen, 2016; Vinthagen, 2006; Vizenor, 2008). While the study of social movements is important, these criteria limit the possibilities of social change and the inherent capacities and contributions of humankind, especially the persistent efforts of those categorized and segmented as marginalized, oppressed, underserved, and so on. Such criteria visibilize negative imagery of collective action, while invisibilizing the inherent nobility of individuals and communities engaged in such action and their pursuit of justice and equity. The intensity of discourses and actions revolving around racial injustice, anti-Indigeneity, and anti-Blackness in the United States and globally reveals that this trend in visibilizing suffering while invisibilizing nobility is nothing new. However, the case for naming and centering inherent nobility is a novel, Bahá'í-inspired, perspective (Arbab, 2000; Sattarzadeh, 2021).

In the process of spiritually excavating my inherent nobility, I was pulled by the arts and scholarship that would help me on this journey. In my research, I encountered many artistic and scholarly critiques of the hypervisibility of communities and peoples' trauma and victimhood, as well as arguments justifying the necessity to underscore and center their suffering. There were also works that visibilize the nobility of communities that endure injustice and how they constructively respond to systemic oppression (e.g., Charging, 2020; Bida, 2022; Dougher, 2022; Madden, 2022; Menakem, 2017; Noah, 2015; Rodriguez, 2022). Representations that piqued my attention were those uniquely captured moments that humanize and celebrate individual and collective joy, self-care, and preservation in the midst of suffering just as much as they shed light on anger, grief, and pain. They highlight the resoulience of communities popularly portrayed on a default setting of broken, disrobed of our nobility and costumed in descriptors of deficiency or what Walter (2016) calls the "five 'Ds' of data": disparity, deprivation, disadvantage, dysfunction, and difference (p. 80). Hetey and Eberhardt (2018) demonstrate how the tendency of academics and activists to advocate for justice by highlighting racial inequalities—in their case, within the U.S. criminal justice system—could actually backfire, diminishing concern for such institutional, systemic racial disparities fostering their further justification and rationalization (e.g., racial criminalization and stereotyping, victim-blaming). Instead, they suggest such inequalities should be presented with context, challenge stereotypical associations, and highlight the roles of institutions rather than victimized individuals (Hetey & Eberhardt, 2018). Nopper made a similar argument explaining why she avoids using hashtags such as #StopAsianHate that advocate for an increase in policing against individuals and groups that are already disproportionately policed and surveilled by law enforcement, especially during a significant climb in anti-Asian discrimination and violence during the COVID-19 pandemic (Asian American Writers' Workshop, 2021). Most of the COVID-19 pandemic-related racial disparities data captured lacks deeper analysis into the origins and implications of how and why these disparities emerge and persist in the first place.

Representations of Resoulience

There are obstacles we regularly face in terms of naming and acknowledging both the social and spiritual realities of our communities, but there is also growing evidence throughout the world that resoulience and the inherent nobility of individuals and communities are visibilized in spite of oppressive conditions (Benjamin, 2018; Deer, 2005; de Sousa Santos, 2014; Egbuono, 2020; Hartman, 1997; Keet, 2018; Lorde, 1980; Million, 2009; Sharpe, 2016; Tuck, 2009; Tuck & Yang, 2014). The beauty of resoulience is its reliance upon an internal power of the spirit of peoples and their communities. It also surpasses the quantitative frontiers of resilience that have been amplified by social actions

and discourses emerging across social media spaces, suggesting that #StillHere is commonly (mis)interpreted and limited to a physical or mental resilience. Stereotypes and trauma-centered narratives are uprooted, and seeds of humanizing stories are planted in their place.

Regarding her collection of stories in *Krik! Krak!*, for example, Haitian American author Edwidge Danticat explains that she aspired to center voices of Haitians she knew who were not simply poor, but people having “extraordinary dreams but also very amazing obstacles” (Birnbaum, 2004). Danticat explains that the context and content of what she often writes is “complicated.” Although her love for and personal connection to Haiti make it enjoyable to write about, sometimes, it is painful and difficult to comprehend (Birnbaum, 2004). Despite its complications, in her interview with Birnbaum (2004), Danticat explains “often people want to hear about [Haiti] in sound bites,” only becoming a site or story of interest when it makes the headlines:

People think that there is a country there that these people are only around when they are on CNN . . . whenever they are in the news, that’s when they exist. If you don’t see them they don’t exist. I think Haiti is a place that suffers so much from neglect that people only want to hear about it when it’s at its extreme. And that’s what they end up knowing about it. There is a frustration too, that at moments when there’s not a coup, when there are not people in the streets, that the country disappears from people’s consciousness (Birnbaum, 2004).

When “the country disappears,” its beauty, humanity, and justice disappear. This popularized image of a helpless and conditionally visible Haiti is—to a degree—comparable to the case of Syria. A simple Google Image search for “Syria,” will reveal what perceptions control the public digital discourse on Syria. There is a striking, invisibilized reflection about Syria that travel photographer Slobodan Tomić (2019) writes in his blog post:

Syria is a beauty within which the beast of conflict and destruction still resides, but that beast has been sever[e]ly wounded and is now in its death throes . . . Syria is a warrior who proudly wears her scars. Syria is the mother of an unbreakable spirit, merciless to those who seek war, open-hearted to those who come in peace.

Tomić (2019) explains that Syrians he met preferred to identify what was happening as a “crisis” or “insurrection” rather than a war. Syria was not globally visible outside of its diaspora until the ensuing conflict persisted over the past 10 years (BBC, 2021).

One of the most saliently underreported stories in Euro-American mass media about Syria that still stick with me, emerges out of the besieged town of Madaya. For one year, the Syrian government and allied Hezbollah forces had occupied the town preventing its 40,000 residents from leaving; the village was frequently bombed and encircled by approximately 12,000 landmines in between 65 sniper-manned checkpoints surrounding the 12-foot square kilometer radius (Asher-Schapiro, 2016; Physicians for Human Rights, 2016). Despite numerous casualties in Madaya, security forces prevented medical supplies and personnel from entering the town. Thus, alternative arrangements had to be made. Consequently, a first-year dental student, Muhammad Darwish, and a veterinarian, Mohammad Yousef, along with another dental student—all with insufficient medical training—worked fulltime performing all medical procedures on injured residents of Madaya in a makeshift hospital. Although they felt “extremely helpless in the face of Madaya’s acute needs” (Physicians for Human Rights, 2016, p. 7), this provisional medical team—to the best of its ability, and with limited resources and skills, provided specialized medical care. Unfortunately, sometimes, they were unsuccessful, but their response to the medical crises they were facing in Madaya is an

innovative example of resoulience—all attributed to a mobile phone application network. In January 2016, members of the Syrian American Medical Society (SAMS) established a WhatsApp group connecting these three Madaya-based volunteer health workers with a network of medical specialists in the United States. Through an exchange of text messages, audio, and video calls, Syrian American medical specialists offered free medical consultations and guidance to a veterinarian and two dental students in order to prepare for and/or perform live medical procedures via an unconventional, creative form of telemedicine in a “conflict zone.” Although this parallel narrative does not diminish the mediatized economic, political, and social realities of civil war across Syria, it still overpowers it, centering a humanizing story about a community’s resoulience despite all odds.

An undisciplined understanding of resoulience provides a spiritual gateway to understanding how the inherent nobility of peoples and communities are manifest in various spheres and mediums of society, particularly addressing how narratives of damage are rewritten. Many have created—through education, storytelling, scholarship, the arts, and social action—humanizing narratives that push back against or creatively spin one-sided or dominant narratives of victimhood. Humor is one of the most creative outlets that refuses tropes of victimhood and deprivation. “Rez comic” Reg Charging’s (2020) TikTok video satirizing poverty narratives of Native peoples living on reservations centers highly exaggerated statistics, including: “188% homelessness,” “198% unemployment,” and “-39% happiness.” In a comedy bit, Trevor Noah (2015) parodies U.S. perceptions of Africans and how they are reinforced by aid organizations like UNICEF that frequently feature infomercials of African children with a “trained Disney fly . . . on their top lip” as if the fly is “the watermark for a starving African.” Oftentimes, narratives of damage or trauma for peoples and geographies are backed by em/sym-pathetic intentions, but their *implications* do not necessarily always align. After all, the historical and political uses of trauma and victimhood are considered to be nuanced (Fassin & Rechtman, 2009). Charging’s and Noah’s responses to such portrayals and depictions are reminders that resoulience manifests in many forms, even through humor. In *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Vine Deloria, Jr. writes, “One of the best ways to understand a people is to know what makes them laugh. Laughter encompasses the limits of the soul. In humor life is redefined and accepted” (p. 140). Even through laughter, humanization and recognition of the soul’s nobility is possible.

Resoulience, therefore, demands an acknowledgement of these cultural, historical, political, and socioeconomic, and spiritual entanglements of damage and oppression so that they are not reproduced, but transformed. Like Tuck, “I invite you to join me in re-visioning [representations] in our communities not only to recognize the need to document the effects of oppression on our communities but also to consider the long-term repercussions of thinking of ourselves as broken” (p. 409). There is also the option to extend beyond Tuck’s call for representations of desire—moving along to recognition of and belief in our inherent spiritual reality—visibilizing nobility for ourselves and our communities, especially in numerous discourses about (in)justice and (in)equity. Most importantly, in this journey of renewal and reimagination, this visibilizing of nobility demands that we look at members of our human family who endure injustices and inequities—in varying degrees—with new eyes. They are not merely damaged bodies or spiritually disembodied beings, as too frequently depicted, but so much more. They are souls, embodiments of nobility or noble-embodied beings. These are representations of resoulience.

Narratives of Resoulience Around the Globe

While resoulience may be a new framework, it is not original in concept. Resoulience is a collaborative perspective inspired by undisciplinatory, reimagined representations, as well as

acts of nobility that refuse to be diminished by trauma. In addition to representations of resoulience, there are practices of resoulience. There are countless cases from around the globe where communities celebrate and honor the nobility of their souls in spite of the oppression they persistently endure. A sample of these narratives of active resoulience are presented here.

Sumud (صمود), an Arabic concept meaning steadfastness and “resilient resistance” (Ryan, 2015) can be traced back to the tenth century. Palestinian women use *sumud* as an explanation of their daily existence and collective empowerment, particularly through a reaffirmation of their identity, a preservation of Palestinian culture, and a nurturance of the Palestinian community (Ryan, 2015). holt (2020) explains how *Rezilience* (a combination of the slang term for reservation, “rez,” and resilience), an Indigenous worldview, is an active teaching and learning practice for Indigenous communities to “reclaim, relearn, and reconnect with their ancestral ways of being” (p. 72). *Rezilience* is an example of Vizenor’s reference to Indigenous *survivance* (Vizenor, 1998; 2008; Vizenor & Lee, 1999), a “moving beyond [Indigenous] basic survival in the face of overwhelming cultural genocide to create spaces of synthesis and renewal” (Vizenor, 1994, p. 53). *Survivance* echoes the sacredness of the Lakota word *takini*, which is often simply translated to survivor, but it means “to come back to life” (Brings Plenty, 2013). *Takini* is about restoring Indigenous communities and moving beyond survival, recalling stories of the ancestors and the historical trauma inherited, most associated with the U.S. Army’s Seventh Calvary massacre of hundreds of Lakota women, men, and children at Wounded Knee in 1890 (Brings Plenty, 2013). Sørensen (2016) maps *constructive resistance*, referring to “initiatives in which people start to build the society they desire independently of the dominant structures already in place” (p. 49) and relies on Vinthagen’s (2006) definition, whereby *constructive resistance* is understood to “transcend the whole phenomenon of being-against-something, turning into the proactive form of constructing ‘alternative’ or ‘prefigurative’ social institutions which facilitate resistance” (p. 7). These are many conceptual and theoretical frameworks that, like resoulience, visibilize nobility, the highest aspirations of individuals and communities facing oppression in its various forms.

The Iranian Bahá’í community comprises the largest religious minority group in the country (Minority Rights Group International, 2021). The Iranian government has been systematically persecuting its Bahá’í community for nearly 180 years, including its current policy denying all Bahá’ís access to higher education. In response, the Bahá’í community established the informal Bahá’í Institute for Higher Education (BIHE)—a grassroots collaborative endeavor established in 1987 by Bahá’í faculty who lost their previous academic positions due to religious discrimination—in order to provide opportunities to access free higher education for Bahá’í youth across Iran (Sattarzadeh, 2015). Creating the BIHE in response to oppression has been praised as an “unrelenting pursuit of knowledge [that] is perhaps one of the most outstanding examples of constructive resilience in the modern age” (The Universal House of Justice, 2014). The BIHE was developed in response to the Iranian government’s systematic denial of higher education to its Bahá’í citizenry. This constructive resilience is likened to “[p]eering beyond the distress of the difficulties assailing them . . . translating [their Faith] into actions of spiritual and social development” (The Universal House of Justice, 2007). Alternative proactive community-based measures of constructive resilience to sustain teaching and learning at the level of formal higher education have similarly been implemented (prior to and overlapping with the creation of BIHE) through “street academies” in Turkey (Aktas et al., 2020), underground universities in Kosovo (Sommers & Buckland, 2004) and Poland (Garlinski, 1975), and educational programs held in private homes, religious institutions, and offices for students in Palestine (Zelkovitz, 2014).

Visibilizing Nobility as Meditation

While understanding the constructive capacity of the soul outside of myself, the struggle to see it within me was still very real. After completing a remote session with my psychotherapist, the fog gradually began to clear for me. Several years had passed since my PTSD diagnosis, while trudging along an evolving journey of disentanglement from its fetters. All this time, justice and equity had served as dual interlocking aspirations driving my activism, teaching, research, and writing, but my attempted efforts were constantly falling short. Even my determination to highlight narratives about the constructive, transformative capacities of marginalized and oppressed peoples and communities seemed rather oxymoronic. Externally, I was wholeheartedly committed to exposing (in)justice and the nobility among the hearts, minds, and souls of the oppressed (and the oppressors), but it was in competition with the internal invisibilization of my own nobility, as well as a forgetfulness in the pursuit of justice for myself.

Clearly, this sudden pull to visibilize nobility was new and uncomfortable, especially when related to my own being. Just before our first session had concluded, and with more than thirteen thousand kilometers between our computer screens, my therapist assigned me homework: “Recite a prayer every morning to recognize your own nobility.” Mind. Blown. Her instructions were so simple, yet profoundly humbling. Pray to recognize my own nobility?!? Is that actually a thing? Prayers to the Creator for the ancestors, detachment, tests and difficulties, healing, steadfastness, (in)justice, love, gratitude, my mother and father, my brother, my profession, were among the primary motivations for prostration and devotion. Never had praying for my own nobility (let alone recognizing it) been on my mind up to that point. Ever since that moment, a humble reminder to recognize my nobility has become part of my daily morning meditation routine.

Resoulience, Afterlives, & Futures

It is my sincerest hope that calling for the visibility of nobility (and its inherent relationship to the soul) as a form of reimagining resilience as resoulience is not mistaken for a desire to avoid, dehumanize, erase, invisibilize, silence, minimize, or disconnect the social realities of bodies or trauma, injustice, and inequity in this world—nor to essentialize or homogenize those social realities. Nor am I advocating for a partial visibility. But rather, I am inviting you—all of us—to consider one that is whole—one that captures both the corporeal and spiritual reality of humankind. In *Racism is Terrible. Blackness is Not*, Perry (2020) reminds us that the spiritual reality and beauty of Blackness can be celebrated, while also acknowledging the pain of anti-Blackness, that to “[i]dentify the achievement and exhilaration in [B]lack life is not to mute or minimize racism” and that “there is a spiritual majesty of joy in suffering.”

In *Faces at the Bottom of the Well*, Derrick Bell recalls the ancestors, who were once reduced to property and dehumanized, who also persisted—“to carve out a humanity” for themselves (p. 246). Similarly, Smith’s (2019) argument for “centering the ‘pupil of the eye’” (a spiritual metaphor for people of African descent), also exemplifies a noble spiritual station in defiance of an unceasing racial oppression endured for well over five centuries (p. 7). According to Smith (2019), interpretations of this “spiritual perceptiveness” of people of African descent can be traced back across generations of African American ontologies, which W. E. B. Du Bois underscored in his attempts to “alchemize a history of oppression into a source of pride and inspiration” (p. 13). If the material or physical frame of our bodies and the damage, harm, and trauma inflicted upon them become our primary point of focus, then we reproduce the same gaze that justifies oppression—a perception that humans are reduced

to soulless bodies. We then lose sight of the core reality of the identity of our souls and their capacities of inherent nobility to withstand oppression and to do so constructively.

In an interview, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson recalls the importance of joy and love from Indigenous ancestors and how it has helped Indigenous communities persist intergenerationally: “our elders are very . . . good at is finding joy and finding beauty, and finding humor, and finding connection, and finding love, continuously and in small tiny bursts all day long” (Goethe-Institut Montreal, 2020).

May this be an invitation to all of us—especially to all the souls whose bodies have been and continue to feel or be treated as branded, broken, damaged, erased, inferior, invisible, and/or—as non-human, as well as those souls who, through their words, thoughts, or deeds, choose to read, see, and engage with souls as damaged, non-human, and ignoble—to visibilize nobility. Please join me in this ever-evolving journey to consider why and how visibilizing nobility helps us reimagine resistance and resilience as resoulience, to realize and celebrate our individual and collective inherent nobility, and to actualize our spiritual reality in our afterlives and our futures.

Challenging the historically situated Northwestern Hemispheric concept and identity of nobility (Leonhard & Wieland, 2011), this spiritual dimension of nobility—not unique to the Bahá’í teachings alone—not only reveals the power of our spiritual ancestral lineage, but also foreshadows the future of humankind and its inherent capacities to heal, transcend oppression, and advance intergenerationally. Arbab (2000) purports that this “striking” belief that human beings are created noble is an “extraordinary optimism . . . about humanity’s future” (pp. 175–76). Resoulience (including those similar concepts that go by many different names), therefore, is a sustainable, futuristic, intergenerational response to oppression that is associated with our spiritual afterlives.

It is my hope that these closing words and this invitation do not suggest that I have forgotten my vulnerability in feeling exposed. Beloved revolutionary spiritual ancestors have been holding my hand, accompanying me along the way. One of my favorite guided meditations of Audre Lorde (1984)—“[T]hat visibility which makes us most vulnerable is that which also is the source of our greatest strength” (p. 60)—comforts and assures me of the spiritual implications of being clothed in nobility, even if/when feeling naked. May our countless ways of reimagining resilience inspire us to reimagine our collective futures more creatively, joyously, and soulfully.

Author Note

Sahar D. Sattarzadeh, Ph.D. (saharsattarzadeh@depauw.edu) is an assistant professor in Comparative Global Studies and Political Economy within the Education Studies Department at DePauw University and a research associate at the Chair for Critical Studies in Higher Education Transformation (CriSHET) at Nelson Mandela University.

References

- ‘Abdu’l-Bahá. (1972). Paris talks. UK Bahá’í Publishing Trust.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press.
- Akbar, N. (1996). *Breaking the chains of psychological slavery*. Mind Productions & Associates.
- Aktas, V., Nilsson, M., Borell, K., & Persson, R. S. (2020). Taking to the streets: A study of the street academy in Ankara. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 68(3), 365–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2019.1708265>
- Allen, A. M., Wang, Y., Chae, D. H., Price, M. M., Powell, W., Steed, T. C., Rose Black, A., Dhabhar, F. S., Marquez-Magaña, L., & Woods-Giscombe, C. L. (2019). Racial discrimination, the superwoman schema, and allostatic load: Exploring an integrative stress-coping model among African American

- women. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1457(1), 104–127.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14188>
- American Cancer Society. (2021). *Survivorship: During and after treatment*.
<https://www.cancer.org/treatment/survivorship-during-and-after-treatment.html>
- American Psychological Association. (2012). *Building your resilience*. <https://apa.org/topics/resilience>
- Angelou, M. (2008). *Letter to my daughter*. Random House.
- Arbab, F. (2000). Promoting a discourse on science, religion, and development. In S. M. P. Harper (Ed.), *The lab, the temple and the market: Reflections at the intersection of science, religion, and development* (pp. 149–237). International Development Research Center.
- Asher-Schapiro, A. (2016, August 24). *The virtual surgeons of Syria*. *The Atlantic*.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/08/syria-madaya-doctors-whatsapp-facebook-surgery-assad/496958/>
- Asian American Writers' Workshop. (2021, March 29). *Anti-Asian violence and Black-Asian solidarity today with Tamara K. Nopper* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=17MNPXHT0wM>
- BBC. (2021, March 12). *Why has the Syrian war lasted 10 years?* BBC News.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-35806229>
- Baldwin, J., & Giovanni, N. (1973). *A Dialogue*. Lippincott.
- Barker C. (2020). *Warrior genes*. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 66(4), 755–779.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/mfs.2020.0050>
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. Basic Books.
- Benjamin, R. (2018). *Black afterlives matter: Cultivating kinfulness and reproductive justice*. In Clarke, A., & Haraway, D. (Eds.), *Making kin not population: Reconceiving generations* (pp. 41-66). Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Best, S., & Hartman, S. V. (2005). *Fugitive justice*. *Representations*, 92(1), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/rep.2005.92.1.1>
- Bida, E. (2022). *Eloy Bida*. <https://www.loybida.com>
- Birnbaum, R. (2004, April 20). *Edwidge Danticat*. *The Morning News*.
<https://themorningnews.org/article/birnbaum-v.-edwidge-danticat>
- Boyle, K. M., & Rogers, K. B. (2020). *Beyond the rape “victim”-“survivor” binary: How race, gender, and identity processes interact to shape distress*. *Sociological Forum*, 35(2), 323-345.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12584>
- Brings Plenty, J. (2013, April 11). *Save Wounded Knee*. *The New York Times*.
www.nytimes.com/2013/04/12/opinion/save-wounded-knee.html
- Bryant-Davis, T., & Ocampo, C. (2005). *Race incident-based trauma*. *Counseling Psychologist*, 33, 479–500.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000005276465>
- Clukay, C. J., Dajani, R., Hadfield, K., Quinlan, J., Panter-Brick, C., & Mulligan, C. J. (2019). *Association of MAOA genetic variants and resilience with psychosocial stress: A longitudinal study of Syrian refugees*. *PLoS ONE*, 14(7), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219385>
- Cole, T. (2012, March 21). *The white-savior industrial complex*. *The Atlantic*.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-white-savior-industrial-complex/254843/>
- Charging, R. [@regcharging]. (2020, June 26). *Every news story on Natives ever* [TikTok profile].
<https://www.tiktok.com/@regcharging/video/6842714801869688070>
- Colpitts, E., & Gahagan, J. (2016). *The utility of resilience as a conceptual framework for understanding and measuring LGBTQ health*. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 15(60).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-016-0349-1>
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. Paradigm.
- Deer, S. (2005). *Sovereignty of the soul: Exploring the intersection of rape law reform and federal Indian law*.
http://www.ncdsv.org/images/SULR_SovereigntyOfTheSoul_3-11-2005.pdf
- Deer, S. (2015). *The beginning and end of rape: Confronting sexual violence in Native America*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Deloria, Jr., V. (1998). *Custer died for your sins*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Dougher, P. (2022). *Patrick Dougher*. <https://www.godbodyart.com/>
- Egbuonu, O. (Director). (2020). *(In)visible portraits* [Film].
- Erevelles, N. (2016). *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fassin, D., & Rechtman, R. (2009). *The empire of trauma: An inquiry into the condition of victimhood* (R. Gomme, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Garlinski, J. (1975). *The Polish underground state (1939–45)*. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 10, 219–259.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002200947501000202>

- Karlberg, M., & Smith, D. (2021). Responding to injustice with constructive agency. In Stockman, R. H. (Ed.), *The world of the Bahá'í faith* (pp. 442-449). Routledge.
- Goethe-Institut Montreal (2020, July 17). New nature - Keynote by Leanne Betasamosake Simpson | Resilience and adaption [Video]. <https://youtu.be/TDCQ0ZpJwAQ>
- Golden, M. (2021). *Strong black woman: How a myth endangers the physical and mental health of black women*. Mango Publishing.
- Gordon, L. R. (2006). *Disciplinary decadence: Living thought in trying times*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Graff, H. J. (2015). *Undisciplining knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the twentieth century*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Halloran, M. (2004). Cultural trauma and recovery in Indigenous Australia. *Murdoch University Electronic Journal of Law*, 11(4). <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/MurUEJL/2004/36.html>
- Hammad, S. (2010, August 29). Not your erotic, not your exotic [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.be/xarc5PFknfw>
- Hartman, S. V. (1997). *Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America*. Oxford University Press.
- Hartman, S. (2007). *Lose your mother: A journey along the Atlantic slave route*. Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2018). The numbers don't speak for themselves: racial disparities and the persistence of inequality in the criminal justice system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 27(3), 183-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418763931>
- Hill Collins, P., & S. Bilge. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Polity Press.
- holt, r. (2020). Resilience. In A. Eagle Shield, D. Paris, R. Paris, & T. San Pedro (Eds.), *Education in movement spaces: Standing Rock to Chicago Freedom Square* (pp. 67–76). Routledge.
- Keet, A. (2018a). The plastic university: Knowledge, disciplines, and the decolonial “circulations” [Abstract]. <https://lectures.mandela.ac.za/lectures/media/Store/documents/Inaugural%20lectures/Andre-Keet-Lecture-Summary.pdf>
- Keet, A. (2018b, July 28). The plastic university: Knowledge, disciplines, and the decolonial “circulations” [Lecture]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10948/21077>
- Leonhard, J., & Wieland, C. (2011). *What makes the nobility noble?: Comparative perspectives from the sixteenth to the twentieth century*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Liebig, S., Lengfeld, H., & Mau, S. (2001). Interdisciplinary social justice research. *International Society of Justice Research Newsletter*, (1), <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.199.9339&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Lineman Nelson, H. (2001). *Damaged identities, narrative repair*. Cornell University Press.
- Lorde, A. (1980). *The cancer journals*. Penguin Books.
- Lorde, A., Piercy, M., Moira, F., & Sorrel, L. (1982). Interview: Audre Lorde: Lit from within. *Off Our Backs*, 12(4), 2–3, 11. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i25774365>
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Crossing Press.
- Manke, K. (2019, December 5). How the “strong black woman identity both helps and hurts.” *Greater Good Magazine*. https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/how_the_strong_black_woman_identity_both_helps_and_hurts
- Madden, T. N. (2022). Tamara Natalie Madden. <https://www.tamarnataliemadden.org>
- Menakem, R. (2017). *My grandmother's hands: Racialized trauma and the pathway to mending our hearts and bodies*. Central Recovery Press.
- Million, D. (2009). Felt theory: An Indigenous feminist approach to affect and history. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 24(2), 53-76. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wic.0.0043>
- Minority Rights Group International. (2021). Bahá'í. <https://minorityrights.org/minorities/bahai-7/>
- Moradi, B., & Grzanka, P. R. (2017). Using intersectionality responsibly: Toward critical epistemology, structural analysis, and social justice activism. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64(5), 500–513. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000203>
- Naples, N. A. (2010). Borderlands studies and border theory: Linking activism and scholarship for social justice. *Sociology Compass*, 4(7), 505–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1751-9020.2010.00290.X>
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2021). Speakers bureau. <https://ncadv.org/speakers-bureau>
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center. (2021). Survivors. <https://www.nsvrc.org/survivors>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2020). Geopolitics of power and knowledge in the COVID-19 pandemic: Decolonial reflections on a global crisis. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 36(4), 366–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0169796X20963252>
- Noah, T. (2015, March 25). Trevor Noah: You laugh but it's true – UNICEF fly [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aNqfFafXGLA>

- OED Online. (2021a). Survive. In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved December 25, 2021, from <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/195109>
- OED Online. (2021b). Resilience. In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved June 21, 2021, from <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/163619>
- Parker, J., Samanthrai, R., & Romero, M. (2010). *Interdisciplinarity and social justice: Revisioning academic accountability*. SUNY Press.
- Perry, I. (2020, June 15). Racism is terrible. Blackness is not. *The Atlantic*. www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/06/racism-terrible-blackness-not/613039/.
- Physicians for Human Rights. (2016). *Madaya: Portrait of a Syrian town under siege*. https://s3.amazonaws.com/PHR_Reports/madaya-portrait-of-a-syrian-town-under-siege.pdf
- Rabaka, R. (2010). *Against epistemic apartheid: W. E. B. Du Bois and the disciplinary decadence of sociology*. Lexington Books.
- Reclaim Your Power [@reclaimyourpower]. (2021). Instagram. <https://www.instagram.com/reclaimyourpower/>
- Ritchie, A. (2017) *Invisible no more: Police violence against Black women and women of color*. Beacon Press.
- Rodriguez, F. (2022). Favianna Rodriguez. <https://www.favianna.com>
- Roth, D. L., & Coles E. M. (1995). Battered woman syndrome: A conceptual analysis of its status vis a vis DSM-IV mental disorders. *Medicine and Law* 14(7-8), 641-658.
- Roy, A. (2020, April 3). Arundhati Roy: “The pandemic is a portal.” *Financial Times*. <https://www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fe-fcd274e920ca>
- Ryan, C. (2015). Everyday resilience as resistance: Palestinian women practicing sumud. *International Political Sociology*, 9(4), 299–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ips.12099>
- Saunders, P. J. (2008). Fugitive dreams of diaspora: Conversations with Saidiya Hartman. *Anthurium: A Caribbean Studies Journal*, 6(1), 7. <http://doi.org/10.33596/anth.115>
- Sattarzadeh, S.D. (2015). *Reading between the lines of rights: A critical analysis of international and national discourses (de)marginalizing Indigenous and minority rights to higher education* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park]. <https://doi.org/10.13016/M23H0R>
- Sattarzadeh, S. D. (2021). When we in/visibilize our nobility . . . *The Journal of Bahá’í Studies*, 30(3), 75 – 89. [https://doi.org/10.31581/jbs-30.3.319\(2020\)](https://doi.org/10.31581/jbs-30.3.319(2020))
- Sharpe, C. (2016). *In the wake: On blackness and being*. Duke University Press.
- Simpson, A. (2016). Consent’s revenge. *Openings and Retrospectives*, 31(3), 326-333. <https://doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.02>
- Simpson, L. (2020, March 24). Not murdered, not missing: Rebellng against colonial gender violence. Verso, <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/4611-not-murdered-not-missing-rebellng-against-colonial-gender-violence>
- Smith, D. (2019). Centering the “pupil of the eye”: Blackness, modernity, and the revelation of Bahá’u’lláh. *Journal of Bahá’í Studies*, 29(1-2), 7–28. [https://doi.org/10.31581/jbs-29.1-2.2\(2019\)](https://doi.org/10.31581/jbs-29.1-2.2(2019))
- Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R. K., & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(2), 1-32. <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/21166/17970>
- Social Searcher. (2021). “Resilience.” <https://www.social-searcher.com/social-buzz/?q5=resilience>
- Sommers, M., & Buckland, P. (2004). *Rebuilding the education system in Kosovo*. International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Sørensen, M. J. (2016). Constructive resistance: Conceptualizing and mapping the terrain. *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 2(1), 49–78. <https://resistance-journal.org/2017/08/constructive-resistance-conceptualising-and-mapping-the-terrain/>
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338>
- Tomić, S. (2019, August 19). Syria, the beast in the beauty. *The Travel Club*, <https://www.thetravelclub.org/articles/travelogues/761-syria-2019>
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: a letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409 - 428. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>
- Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and Communities* (pp. 223-248). Sage Publications.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2016). What justice wants. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 2(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.2.2.0001>
- Twitter. (2021a). Tired of being resilient [Twitter search]. https://twitter.com/search?q=tired%20of%20being%20called%20resilient&src=typed_query

- Twitter. (2021b). Tired of being resilient [Twitter search].
https://twitter.com/search?q=tired%20of%20being%20resilient&src=typed_query
- The Universal House of Justice. (2014, October 1). To the Bahá'ís of Iran.
https://www.bahai.org/library/authoritative-texts/the-universal-house-of-justice/messages/20070909_001/1#018930558
- The Universal House of Justice. (2007, September 9). To the Bahá'í students deprived of access to higher education in Iran. https://www.bahai.org/library/authoritative-texts/the-universal-house-of-justice/messages/20070909_001/1#018930558
- Vinthaghen, S. (2006). Political undergrounds: Can raging riots and everyday theft become politics of normality? https://www.academia.edu/658457/Political_Undergrounds_Can_Raging_Riots_and_Everyday_Theft_Become_Politics_of_Normality
- Vizenor, G. (1994). *Manifest manners: Narratives on postindian survivance*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Vizenor, G. (1998). *Fugitive poses: Native American Indian scenes of absence and presence*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Vizenor, G. (2008). *Survivance: Narratives of Native presence*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Vizenor, Gerald, & Lee, A. R. (1999). *Postindian conversations*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Walter, M. (2016). Data politics and Indigenous representation in Australian statistics. In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 79–97). Australian National University Press.
- Woods-Giscombé C. L. (2010). Superwoman schema: African American women's views on stress, strength, and health. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(5), 668–683. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732310361892>
- Wylie Hall, J. (ed.). (2004). *Conversations with Audre Lorde*. University Press of Mississippi.
- Wynter, S. (1994). “No humans involved”: An open letter to my colleagues. *Forum N.H.I.: Knowledge for the 21st Century*, 1(1), 42–73.
- Zelkowitz, I. (2014). Education, revolution and evolution: The Palestinian universities as initiators of national struggle 1972–1995. *History of Education*, 43(3), 387–407.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2014.889226>