## Part 1: The White Way

#### [Torres] RACISM RUNS RAMPANT IN EDUCATION – it affects all aspects of schooling, so an anti-racist orientation is uniquely key now.

Torres: Torres, Christina. [8th grade English teacher in Honolulu, Hawaii] “All Students Need Anti-Racism Education.” Tolerance.org, July 30, 2020. CH

As more and more teachers, administrators, schools and organizations are questioning their practices and looking at the racist history of their institutions, many are finally asking, “How we can listen to and support Black students, teachers and communities who have been systemically silenced for too long?” This question is essential, and examining anti-Blackness in our practice is something we all must be looking at. Looking at anti-Blackness or inequities brought about by systems rooted in white supremacy and racism is something all students should be doing. While more institutions, including primarily or historically white ones, are committing to this work, white teachers with primarily white students can feel hesitant to discuss these issues since they may not feel it affects them. This idea is a fundamental misunderstanding of what anti-racist work actually is. Anti-racist work means acknowledging that racist beliefs and structures are pervasive in all aspects of our lives—from education to housing to climate change—and then actively doing work to tear down those beliefs and structures. Those beliefs and structures don’t just exist in primarily white/and or privileged institutions—they thrive there. Schools that house mostly students and teachers who have benefited from white privilege can lack the perspective to push back on institutional malpractice or racist mindsets that may be present. In addition, it is difficult to convince those with power and privilege to give those privileges up without clear education and work to understand why doing so is a necessity for true justice in our society. Doing the work in spaces of privilege may look different, but educators cannot pretend that anti-racist work doesn’t exist simply because their student body isn’t directly harmed by racism. There are clear aims that primarily white and otherwise privileged institutions must work toward in the fight against racism. Teachers must re-evaluate their curriculum. When teaching standards and core curricula have been developed for your students, it’s easy to simply follow along. However, it’s important to remember that our education system has been founded on historically racist practices, including silencing those from disenfranchised communities. It’s not just BIPOC who need to see themselves in the literature or history they study. White students need to hear those perspectives as well, just as straight and cisgender students need to read LGBTQ+ stories. This is because students need not just mirrors but also windows into other cultures, as Dr. Rudine Sims Bishop notes in her essay “Mirrors, Windows and Sliding Glass Doors.” Students from communities with white privilege need to hear voices from other perspectives in order to grow their own thinking. Those perspectives need to be diverse and empowering as well—only showing Black suffering or slavery does not begin to break down problematic beliefs about Black people. Instead, students coming from positions of power need to see and understand the power and agency of those who have been historically disenfranchised, particularly since society frequently tells them otherwise. This will allow white students and teachers to have a more accurate and nuanced understanding of our history, while also ensuring they can center BIPOC voices and be allies and accomplices instead of “saviors.” Students need to understand privilege and rethink power. Students from privileged communities can struggle to understand privilege since they may feel that they have had to work hard or struggle at times in their lives. Teachers must help students understand how privilege works at a systemic level that may have given students an edge that, while it may be one they didn’t ask for, is still very real. The work does not stop there, though. It can be easy in teaching privilege to fall into the trap of “white guilt” or “privilege guilt” (or even “survivor guilt” for BIPOC who have moved up socioeconomically and have internalized the belief that their communities were something to be “survived”). While guilt can be an important emotion to notice and process, educators should help students move through it to a place of action. Beyond “feeling bad” about generations of oppression, how can they use this knowledge to advocate for change and begin breaking down their own racist beliefs? How can they also reframe their understandings of privilege so that they stop prioritizing hegemonic ideas of success and worth? Some of that will mean teaching students to analyze and reframe how they see values and stories from other cultures. Most of us were taught to praise white-dominant cultural ideas: financial success, rugged individualism, paternalism. Because of this, cultures with different priorities may not be seen as “successful” or “valuable” in our eyes and in the eyes of our students. We need to teach students with privilege not to be “saviors” for historically disenfranchised communities, but rather to listen to, value and stand in kinship with them so we can work together toward justice. Schools must interrogate their practices and how they gained institutional privilege to begin with.

#### [ROJ] The Role of the Judge is to Promote Anti-Racist Education in Debate, meaning that they must endorse discussions about that subject.

#### [Eng & Han] And COLONIZATION IS AT THE ROOT OF RACISM – the expectation of Asian mimicry of whiteness and white appropriation of Asian culture filters into educational spaces.

Eng & Han: Eng, David L. [Professor of Asian American Studies, the Program in Comparative literature and Literary Theory, and the Program in Gender Sexuality and Women’s Studies at the University of Pennsylvania], Han, Shinhee [Psychotherapist in New York City, she has worked on the counseling services at the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Barnard College and Columbia University]. “Racial Melancholia, Racial Dissociation.” Duke University Press, January 2019. BZ//AC

Racial melancholia as psychic splitting and national dis-ease opens on the interconnected terrains of mimicry, ambivalence, and the stereotype. **In his seminal essay “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse,” Homi Bhabha describes the ways in which a colonial regime compels the colonized subject to mimic Western ideals of whiteness.** At the same time, this mimicry is also condemned to failure. Bhabha writes, “Colonial mimicry is **the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually reproduce its slippage, its excess, its difference.… Almost the same but not white.”** Bhabha locates and labels the social imperative to assimilate as the colonial structure of mimicry. He highlights not only the social performance but also its inevitable, built-in failure. This doubling of difference that is almost the same but not quite, almost the same but not white, results in ambivalence, which comes to define the failure of mimicry. Here we elaborate on Bhabha’s observations of mimicry with its intrasubjective internalization into the psychic domain through the logic of racial melancholia. It is important to remember that, as with Bhabha’s analysis of mimicry in the colony, Freud marks ambivalence as one of melancholia’s defining characteristics. In describing the genealogy of ambivalence in melancholia, Freud himself moves from the domain of the social to the realm of the psychic. He notes that the “conflict due to ambivalence, which sometimes arises from real experiences, sometimes more from constitutional factors, must not be overlooked among the preconditions of melancholia.”29 According to Freud, melancholia not only traces an internalized pathological identification with what was once an external but now lost ideal. In this moving from outside to inside, we also get a strong sense of how social injunctions of mimicry configure individual psychic structures as split and dis-eased. The ambivalence that comes to define Freud’s concept of melancholia is one that finds its origins and routes in social history—in colonial and racial structures impelling performative displays of mimicry and man.

**They add:**

This discussion on intergenerational dilemmas of immigration and assimilation brings us to the related issue of mourning, melancholia, and language. Nelson, a first-generation Japanese American student who emigrated from Osaka to New Jersey when he was five, sought therapy with me (Dr. Han) in 1996, presenting chronic struggles with depression associated with racial conflict. Nelson is the eldest child and has two siblings, a brother and a sister, both of whom were born in the United States. Before Nelson entered school, his mother spoke only Japanese to the children. When Nelson started kindergarten, his teacher admonished his mother to replace Japanese with English at home if she wanted her children to assimilate and to become successful students. Despite the mother’s broken English, she followed the teacher’s instructions assiduously, speaking only English to her children. **Nelson recounts a story that took place later in grade school. During a reading lesson, he mispronounced “crooked” as “crookd” (one syllable). His teacher shamed him publicly for his failed speech act—his failed act of mimicry — and demanded to know where he learned to mispronounce such a simple word. Nelson reluctantly replied that he learned this pronunciation from his mother. Nelson remembers, in particular, feelings of social embarrassment and shame from the ridicule of his teacher and classmates.** What we learn about Nelson’s case history is that, although his original connection to the primary object (the mother) was through the Japanese language, this connection was interrupted by a foreign property, English. The mother’s poor mimicry of English severed and revised the earliest mother-child attachment, one brokered in Japanese. As such, Nelson could no longer mirror himself from his mother, in Japanese or in English. This estrangement from language, both native and foreign, is a double loss. Although acquiring a new language (English) should be perceived as a positive cognitive development, what is often not acknowledged sufficiently is the concomitant psychic trauma triggered by the loss of what had once been a safe, nurturing, and familiar language to the young child (Japanese). The loss of Japanese as a safe and nurturing object reveals another way to think about racial melancholia in relation to processes of immigration and assimilation. In Nelson’s case history, melancholia results not only from a thwarted identification with a dominant ideal of unattainable whiteness but also a vexed relationship to a compromised Japaneseness. Nelson’s situation reveals how on two fronts ideals of whiteness and ideals of Japaneseness are lost and unresolved. **Here the problem of accent marks an impossible social compliance. In both instances, language is the privileged vehicle — the privileged property— by which standards of successful assimilation and failed integration are measured. In this sense,** language itself might be thought of as a kind of property right and stereotype, demanding a flawless mimicry on the part of the young Nelson, whose failed performance leads him to shame and self-abasement at a crucial moment of social and psychic development**. Nelson’s transition from Japanese to English is another example of the negotiation between mourning and melancholia in the immigration and assimilation process. That is, although he suffers a loss and revaluation of his mother tongue, his transition into the adopted ideal of the English language is anything but smooth. We need to emphasize that the shaming ritual to which the grade-school teacher subjected Nelson—one all too common in the Darwinian space of the classroom— is one that not merely makes his transition into English difficult but also demonizes and repudiates the mother (and the mother tongue and accent) at the same time.** What was once a loved and safe object is retroactively transformed into an object of shame and insecurity. To the extent that the figure of the mother originally represents safe notions of “home,” Nelson’s estrangement from his mother, and from his mother tongue, renders her unheimlich— unhomely, unfamiliar, uncanny— a topic that critical race scholar Mari Matsuda has explored in her legal analyses of accent discrimination.44 The relationship between language, pedagogy, and assimilation into a mainstream national citizenry is examined also in a short story by Monique T. D. Truong. “Kelly”(1991) is about a young Vietnamese refugee, Thuy-Mai, who finds herself in the improbable space of a North Carolina classroom of 1975. Truong’s narrator composes a distressing epistolary monologue to her one and only (and now absent) friend from that dark period of her life, Kelly. In doing so, she reenacts the melancholic logic discussed above. That is, an intersubjective external dialogue meant for two parties is melancholically internalized and transformed into an intrasubjective monologue of one remarkable for its anger and solipsism. What is an epistolary, after all, other than an impassioned (but not necessarily answered) plea to the other? Truong’s narrator recalls their grade-school teacher: Kelly, remember how Mrs. Hammerick talked about Veteran’s Day? How about the Day of Infamy when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor? Mrs. Hammerick, you know, the mayor’s wife always had a sweet something surrounding her like she had spent too much time pulling taffy.... Kelly, you only knew that she liked the Beths and the Susans cause they wore pink and never bulged and buckled out of their shirt plackets. I was scared of her like no dark corners could ever scare me. You have to know that all the while she was teaching us history she was telling, with her language for the deaf, blind, and dumb; she was telling all the boys in our class that I was Pearl and my last name was Harbor. They understood her like she was speaking French and their names were all Claude and Pierre.45 Truong’s story expands our discussion of language and its performative effects on the constitution of good and bad national subjects. Here, Mrs. Hammerick’s common language for the “deaf, blind, and dumb”—a language from which Thuy-Mai is emphatically excluded—is used to create and then separate good students from bad students within the institutionalized space of the classroom. The Susans and the Beths, the Claudes and the Pierres, are all, as Louis Althusser would put it, “interpellated”by the mayor’s wife as good citizen- subjects of the classroom and nation-state.46 Truong emphasizes how **education is a primary site through which narratives of national identity and belonging are established and reinforced through pedagogical compliance. At the same time, the Vietnamese refugee, Thuy-Mai, is pathologized as Asian enemy, dismissively labeled “Pearl Harbor,”erroneously conflated with the Japanese, and implicitly rendered a menace to the coherence and integrity of the US nation-state. Mrs. Hammerick is, of course, not literally speaking French (though Vietnam was of course colonized earlier by France), but Truong’s attention to language underscores the ways in which an unconscious discourse of colonialism and race, of national inclusion and exclusion, is circulated in the classroom.** Furthermore, as Lowe points out, Mrs. Hammerick’s nationalizing tract is simultaneously a gendered discourse: “The narrator’s observations that the teacher’s history lesson addresses ‘all the boys’further instantiates how the American nationalist narrative recognizes, recruits, and incorporates male subjects, while ‘feminizing’and silencing the students who do not conform to that notion of patriotic subjectivity.”47 Racialized subjects, such as Nelson and Thuy-Mai, become “good”citizens when they identify with the paternal state and accept, as Lowe summarizes, “the terms of this identification by subordinating [their] racial difference and denying [their] ties with the feminized and racialized ‘motherland.’”48 In the following section, we turn to Melanie Klein’s theories of good and bad objects, of good and bad mothers and motherlands, to explore the politics of aggression and destructiveness, of guilt and reparation, as they configure the psychic limits of racial melancholia and expand on Freud’s account of loss and interminable mourning.

#### [ROB] Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to Confront Manifestations of Racialized Violence. To clarify, this is not about “solving” racism, but about articulating and resisting its causes.

## Part 2: The March of History

#### [Haskins] BOTH THE DISCOURSE AND ACT OF PRIVATE SPACE COLONIZATION ARE RACIST – they further a white adventurism designed to undermine POC.

**Haskins:** Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM//AC

In the Destination Mars subcommittee meeting, Cruz said, “At the end of the day, the commercial sector is going to be able to invest billions more in dollars in getting this job [of getting to Mars] done.” In his Thursday remarks regarding the Space Force, Pence also implied that celestial territories would be treated as private property (even though owning private property in space is explicitly illegal per the Outer Space Treaty, which the U.S. and dozens of other nations signed in 1967). “While other nations increasingly possess the capability to operate in space, not all of them share our commitment to freedom, to private property, and the rule of law,” Pence said. “So as we continue to carry American leadership in space, so also will we carry America’s commitment to freedom into this new frontier.” This approach to public-private partnerships directly mirrors colonist practices. For instance, the British East India Company violently colonized parts of India on behalf of the company, but over time, ownership of the stolen land shifted to Great Britain. While these risks feel a part of a far away future, in the present, idealizing colonization as a positive, replicable aspect of American history speaks to an unsettling indifference from leaders about the violent history of colonization. And by referencing historical events that victimized people of color, leaders paint a vision of the future in which people of color continue to be excluded, Walkowicz said that the social and economic legacy of colonization is ignored. **By using narratives of adventurism and heroics, white** American**s were able to convince other white** American**s that they were not only** entitled **to steal and conquest land and persons, but that it was their destiny. Ralph said to The Outline that this mythology remains central to the way Americans conceptualize their history and culture. “Colonization is portrayed as a heroic conquest,” Ralph said.** “These practices are framed as central to American identity, essential to governance, politics, and all major social institution. But not depicted as a colonizing that is one caused by violence, displacement, dispossession.” **Even when people aren’t explicitly referring to settlements in space as “colonies,” they still use the rhetoric of colonizing the New World and the American frontier, which erases the stories of and violence against the p**eople **o**f **c**olor **who lived and ranched in the region. But how did this language start being used in the first place? Presidents have also used frontierism and colonialism to get white citizens behind their agenda. When** President **J**ohn **F**. **K**ennedy **announced his intention to bring Americans to the Moon in 1962, he paraphrased one of the earliest colonists on the North American continent.** “William Bradford, speaking in 1630 of the founding of the Plymouth Bay Colony, said that all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties, and both must be enterprised and overcome with answerable courage,” Kennedy said. Bradford was the governor of the Plymouth Bay Colony at the time of the Pequot War. In an overnight attack, British colonizers massacred four hundred soldiers, non-soldiers, and children. Bradford later described the act of genocide as a Christian victory. “...victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the prays therof to God,” Bradford wrote, “who had wrought so wonderfully for them, thus to inclose their enemies in their hands, and give them so speedy a victory over so proud and insulting an enemy.” Although Kennedy did not characterize his vision for the Moon as creating a “colony” specifically, the association he wanted to create is clear: **The Moon is the next version of the New World, the next frontier for American conquest.** In his speech, Kennedy continues that men like Bradford teach us that “man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred.” However, if “man” is a stand-in for “white colonizers,” “knowledge and progress” unabashedly brushes over the lives of indigenous persons and people of color that were lost in their quest to “explore.” It’s a profusely sanitized version of reality. “It’s fascinating that a term like ‘colonizing’ can be seen in neutral terms when it can’t exist without violence and dispossession,” Ralph said. It can’t exist without violence to establish a political hierarchy. Every colonial project is about managing populations, subjugating people, extracting resources.” But Kennedy was not the first person to use of colonizing language in the context of space. John Wilkins, one of the first people who ever theorized about humanity’s future in space, wrote “A Discourse Concerning a New World and Another Planet” back in 1638, where he argued that the Moon will be a place for human habitation in the future. Although it was a piece of science fiction theorization at the time, Wilkins justified his argument by saying that God created the Earth and stars for people to use in his honor. Colonizers are adventurers, Wilkins argues, whose ideals are worth replicating on other planets. “The invention of some other means for our convenience to the Moon cannot seem more incredible to us, than this did at first to them, to be discouraged in our hopes of the like success,” Wilkins wrote, admitting that any mission to the moon would be far in the future. “We have not now any [Sir Francis] Drake, or Columbus, to undertake this voyage, or any Daedalus to invent a convenience through the air.” Sir Francis Drake was a slave-trader, and of course, Christopher Columbus is responsible for the genocide of almost 3 million people on the island of Hispaniola (now the Dominican Republic and Haiti). As space travel has become more technologically feasible, science-fiction writers have speculated about how a space society would actually function. Arthur C. Clarke envisioned that “colonial” would be a dirty word in space in his 1954 book Earthflight: “And to do [enter Solar politics], one had to go to Earth; as in the days of the Caesars, there was no alternative. Those who believed otherwise or pretended to — risked being tagged with the dreaded word colonial.’” For Clarke, colonialism was equated with privilege in a space society, not because of racism and violence on Earth. Later in the novel, Clarke doesn’t hesitate to compare travelling between planets, and the nobility of doing so, with British colonizers travelling between continents in earlier centuries. Adilifu Nama, a professor of African American Studies at Loyola Marymount University who has written about the representation of race in science fiction, said that science fiction movies and books during the 1950s and 1960s often included narratives of invasion from alien lifeforms directly alongside conceptualizations of existing in other worlds. These anxious science fiction narratives became popular during the Civil Rights Movement. “We had [an] invasion emerging [during the Civil Rights Movement] of black folks invading these once pristine white spaces: with public transportation, public schools, and eventually particular neighbourhoods and black folks having access to better, more upscale neighbourhoods,” Nama said. “So there is also this invasion society around racial purity, and the tensions of science fiction can be read not only as Cold War anxieties, but racial anxieties about the other.”

#### [Smiles] In fact, the logic of appropriation has justified settler colonialism for centuries.

Smiles: Smiles, Deondre. [Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, University of Victoria, in B.C., Canada] “The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space.” *Society and Space*, October 26, 2020. societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space CH

To most scholars, and certainly to the virtual majority of Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island, it is no secret that the country we call the United States of America was built upon the brutal subjugation of Indigenous people and Indigenous lands. Fueled by the American settler myths of terra nullius (no man’s land) and Manifest Destiny, the American settler state proceeded upon a project of cultural and physical genocide, with lasting effects that endure to the present day. The ‘settler myth’ permeates American culture. Words such as ‘pioneer’, the ‘West’, ‘Manifest Destiny’ grab the imagination as connected to the growth of the country in its early history. America sprang forth from a vast open ‘wilderness’. Of course, for Indigenous people, we know differently—these lands had complex cultural frameworks and political entities long before colonization. Words like ‘pioneer’ and ‘Manifest Destiny’, have deep meanings for us too, as they are indicative of the very real damage dealt against our cultures and nations, damage that we have had to work very hard to undo. Trump’s address raises key insights into the continuing logics of settler colonialism, as well as questions of its future trajectories. Trump’s invocation of ideas such as the ‘frontier’ and ‘taming the wilderness’ draws attention to the brutal violence that accompanied the building of the American state. Scholars such as Greg Grandin (2019) make the case that the frontier is part of what America is—whether it is the ‘Wild West’, or the U.S.-Mexican border, America is always contending with a frontier that must be defined. Language surrounding ‘frontier’ is troubling because it perpetuates the rationale of why the American settler state even exists—it could make better use of the land than Native people would, after all, they lived in wilderness. This myth tells us that what we know as the modern world was built through the hard work of European settlers; Indigenous people had nothing to offer or contribute. For someone like Mr. Trump, whose misgivings and hostility towards Native people have been historically documented, this myth fits well with his narrative as President—he is building a ‘new’ America, one that will return to its place of power and influence. The fact that similar language is being used around the potential of American power being extended to space could reasonably be expected, given the economic and military potential that comes from such a move. Space represents yet another ‘unknown’ to be conquered and bent to America’s will. However, such interplanetary conquest does not exist solely in outer space. I wish to situate the very real colonial legacies and violence associated with the desire to explore space, tracing the ways that they are perpetuated and reified through their destructive engagements with Indigenous peoples. I argue that a scientific venture such as space exploration does not exist in a vacuum, but instead draws from settler colonialism and feeds back into it through the prioritization of ‘science’ over Indigenous epistemologies. I begin by exploring the ways that space exploration by the American settler state is situated within questions of hegemony, imperialism, and terra nullius, including a brief synopsis of the controversy surrounding the planned construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea. I conclude by exploring Indigenous engagement with ‘space’ in both its Earthbound and beyond-earth forms as it relates to outer space, and what implications this might have for the ways we think about our engagement with space as the American settler state begins to turn its gaze skyward once again. I position this essay alongside a growing body of academic work, as well as journalistic endeavors (Haskins, 2020; Koren, 2020) that demands that the American settler colonial state exercise self-reflexivity as to why it engages with outer space, and who is advantaged and disadvantaged here on Earth as a result of this engagement. Settler Colonialism and ‘Space’ A brief exploration of what settler colonialism is, and its engagement with ‘space’ here on Earth is necessary to start. Settler colonialism is commonly understood to be a form of colonialism that is based upon the permanent presence of colonists upon land. This is a distinction from forms of colonialism based upon resource extraction (Wolfe, 2006; Veracini, 2013). What this means is that the settler colony is intimately tied with the space within which it exists—it cannot exist or sustain itself without settler control over land and space. This permanent presence upon land by ‘settlers’ is usually at the expense of the Indigenous, or original people, in a given space or territory. To reiterate: control over space is paramount. As Wolfe states, “Land is life—or at least, land is necessary for life. Thus, contests for land can be—indeed, often are—contests for life” (2006: 387). Without land, the settler state ‘dies’; conversely, deprivation of land from the indigenous population means that in settler logic, indigeneity dies (Povinelli, 2002; Wolfe, 2006.) The ultimate aims of settler colonialism is therefore the occupation and remaking of space. As Wolfe (2006) describes, the settler state seeks to make use of land and resources in order to continue on; whether that is through homesteading/residence, farming and agriculture, mining, or any number of activities that settler colonial logic deems necessary to its own survival. These activities are tied to a racist and hubristic logic that only settler society itself possesses the ability to make proper use of land and space (Wolfe, 2006). This is mated with a viewpoint of landscapes prior to European arrival as terra nullius, or empty land that was owned by no one, via European/Western conceptions of land ownership and tenure (Wolfe, 1994). Because of this overarching goal of space, there is an inherent anxiety in settler colonies about space, and how it can be occupied and subsequently rewritten to remove Indigenous presence. In Anglo settler colonies, this often takes place within a lens of conservation. Scholars such as Banivanua Mar (2010), Lannoy (2012), Wright (2014) and Tristan Ahtone (2019) have written extensively on the ways that settler reinscription of space can be extremely damaging to Indigenous people from a lens of ‘conservation’. However, dispossession of Indigenous space in favor of settler uses can also be tied to some of the most destructive forces of our time. For example, Aboriginal land in the Australian Outback was viewed as ‘empty’ land that was turned into weapons ranges where the British military tested nuclear weapons in the 1950s, which directly led to negative health effects upon Aboriginal communities downwind from the testing sites (Vincent, 2010). Indigenous nations in the United States have struggled with environmental damage related to military-industrial exploitation as well.

#### [Ngo] And this form of white colonialism pits Black and Asian identities against each other, comparing Black people unfavorably to “model minority” Asians.

**Ngo:** Ngo. Gracie [Contributing Writer at Kode Mag. Kode MagSan Francisco State University.] “The myth of the ‘model minority’ reinforces White supremacy”*El Tecolote*. http://eltecolote.org/content/en/commentary/the-myth-of-the-model-minority-reinforces-white-supremacy/ AZ//AC

I am Asian American and from a predominantly Asian-American community in Southern California. **I’ve known my entire life that I have to work twice as hard as my White counterparts to garner the same respect, to get the same job––and mine is not a unique experience. As with other children of immigrants, I was told to keep my head down and mind my own business. My parents told me that the only things that I’ve earned are the things that I’ve worked for.** But after the 2016 presidential election, I had to reconsider why these messages are harmful to our community and to others. **The Asian “model minority” myth is a pervasive stereotype, a byproduct of colonialism and racism.** American racism has crafted the myth that Asian Americans are naturally inclined to succeed because we work harder than other minority groups. **It has weaponized our** stories of **success to tear other minorities down.** At Harvard, Asian Americans have been exploited in a transparent attempt to dissolve Affirmative Action. In 1974, writer Frank Chin said of Asian Americans, “Whites love us because we’re not Black.” The Asian**-American community’s apathy to**ward **the blatant persecution of undocumented immigrants and Black poverty is borne out of the myth that we** a**re more hardworking and** thus more **deserving of** our **success.** But with a closer look, it is obvious that this is an intentionally harmful ethos.In truth, people with Southeast Asian heritage are more likely to be afflicted by poverty and crime than East Asians. And just this year, Trump has ordered the deportation of several Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees from the Vietnam War. When Trump says he will deport undocumented immigrants, he also means us. **Our proximity to Whiteness has given us a sense of safety, but we will never be White.** We are vulnerable, just like other minorities are. **We need to stop the appropriation of our success by White America to oppress the Black-American and Latino-American communities.** We are not more deserving of respect, success or empathy. We are all immigrants or children of immigrants. Asian Americans must take a hard stance against the racism and xenophobia that plagues the United States. Trump’s policies affect Asian Americans, but even if they didn’t we would still have a responsibility to utilize our unique privilege to help uplift our minority friends.

#### [Nguyen] Yet capitalism’s “divide and conquer” tactics *encourage* Asian anti-Blackness, not solidarity.

Nguyen: Nguyen, Viet Thanh. [Writer, winner of the 2016 Pulitzer Prize for his novel, *The Sympathizer*] “Asian Americans Are Still Caught in the Trap of the ‘Model Minority’ Stereotype. And It Creates Inequality for All.” *Time*, June 26, 2020. <https://time.com/5859206/anti-asian-racism-america/> CH

None of these efforts have prevented the stubborn persistence of anti-Asian racism. Calling for more sacrifices simply reiterates the sense that Asian Americans are not American and must constantly prove an Americanness that should not need to be proven. Japanese Americans had to prove their Americanness during World War II by fighting against Germans and Japanese while their families were incarcerated, but German and Italian Americans never had to prove their Americanness to the same extent. German and Italian Americans were selectively imprisoned for suspected or actual disloyalty, while Japanese Americans were incarcerated en masse, their race marking them as un-American. Asian Americans are caught between the perception that we are inevitably foreign and the temptation that we can be allied with white people in a country built on white supremacy. As a result, anti-Black (and anti-brown and anti-Native) racism runs deep in Asian-American communities. Immigrants and refugees, including Asian ones, know that we usually have to start low on the ladder of American success. But no matter how low down we are, we know that America allows us to stand on the shoulders of Black, brown and Native people. Throughout Asian-American history, Asian immigrants and their descendants have been offered the opportunity by both Black people and white people to choose sides in the Black-white racial divide, and we have far too often chosen the white side. Asian Americans, while actively critical of anti-Asian racism, have not always stood up against anti-Black racism. Frequently, we have gone along with the status quo and affiliated with white people.

He adds:

Many Korean Americans were angry because they felt the city’s law-enforcement and political leadership had sacrificed them by preventing the unrest from reaching the whiter parts of the city, making Korean Americans bear the brunt of the long-simmering rage of Black and brown Angelenos over poverty, segregation and abusive police treatment. In the aftermath, Koreatown was rebuilt, although not all of the shopkeepers recovered their livelihoods. Some of the money that rebuilt Koreatown came, ironically, from South Korea, which had enjoyed a decades-long transformation into an economic powerhouse. South Korean capital, and eventually South Korean pop culture, especially cinema and K-pop, became cooler and more fashionable than the Korean immigrants who had left South Korea for the American Dream. Even if economic struggle still defined a good deal of Korean immigrant life, it was overshadowed by the overall American perception of Asian-American success, and by the new factor of Asian capital and competition. This is what it means to be a model minority: to be invisible in most circumstances because we are doing what we are supposed to be doing, like my parents, until we become hypervisible because we are doing what we do too well, like the Korean shopkeepers. Then the model minority becomes the Asian invasion, and the Asian-American model minority, which had served to prove the success of capitalism, bears the blame when capitalism fails. Not to say that we bear the brunt of capitalism. Situated in the middle of America’s fraught racial relations, we receive, on the whole, more benefits from American capitalism than Black, brown or Indigenous peoples, even if many of us also experience poverty and marginalization. While some of us do die from police abuse, it does not happen on the same scale as that directed against Black, brown or Indigenous peoples. While we do experience segregation and racism and hostility, we are also more likely to live in integrated neighborhoods than Black or Indigenous people. To the extent that we experience advantage because of our race, we are also complicit in holding up a system that disadvantages Black, brown and Indigenous people because of their race. Given our tenuous place in American society, no wonder so many Asian Americans might want to prove their Americanness, or to dream of acceptance by a white-dominated society, or condemn Tou Thao as not one of “us.” But when Asian Americans speak of their vast collective, with origins from East to West Asia and South to Southeast Asia, who is the “we” that we use? The elite multiculturalism of colored faces in high places is a genteel politics of representation that focuses on assimilation. So long excluded from American life, marked as inassimilable aliens and perpetual foreigners, asked where we come from and complimented on our English, Asian immigrants and their descendants have sought passionately to make this country our own. But from the perspective of many Black, brown and Indigenous people, this country was built on their enslavement, their dispossession, their erasure, their forced migration, their imprisonment, their segregation, their abuse, their exploited labor and their colonization.

## Thus:

#### [Kim 1] I affirm: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. I confront the racism at the heart of this appropriation through Afro-Orientalism, abbreviated “AO,” a method that emphasizes the colonialism at the root of both anti-Blackness and anti-Asianness.

**Kim 1:** Kim. Nami. [Chair, Professor, Philosophy and Religious Studies Faculty, Spelman College] “Engaging Afro/black-Orientalism: A Proposal.”*Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Religion*, Vol. 1, Issue 7, June 2010.

<http://www.raceandreligion.com/JRER/Volume_1_(2010)_files/Kim%201%2007.pdf> AC/CH

Bill V. Mullen defines Afro-Orientalism as a counterdiscourse that “at times shares with its dominant namesake certain features but primarily constitutes an independent critical trajectory of thought on the practice and ideological weight of Orientalism in the Western world.”8 Asian American studies scholar Helen H. Jun notes that although black Orientalism has no singular meaning or manifestation, it encompasses “an entire range of black imaginings of Asia that are in fact negotiations with the limits and disappointments of black citizenship.”9 Whether it is limited to the discourse of black citizenship in relation to U.S. policy on Asian immigrants, or to the discourses of antiracism and anti-imperialism, Afro/blackOrientalism, as Mullen puts it, is a “signifying discourse on race, nation, and global politics constituting a subtradition in indigenous U.S. writing on imperialism, colonialism, and the making of capitalist empire.”10 As such, Afro/black-Orientalism acknowledges not only the problems of Orientalism, Western imperialism, and capitalism but also the extent to which such problems have affected African Americans, Asian Americans, Africans, and Asians, sometimes in paralleled ways and sometimes through different trajectories. Hence, Afro/black-Orientalism, as Jun puts it, is “not employed as an accusatory and reductive condemnation that functions to chastise black individuals or institutions for being imperialist, racist, or Orientalist.”11 Rather, Afro/black-Orientalism is employed as an important site where a crude opposition between blacks and Asians can be contested, where the parallel courses of Western imperialism through Asia and Africa can be explored, where the experiences of African Americans and Asian Americans as slaves and indentured servants in the Americas, respectively, can be compared, and where cross-racial, cross-ethnic, and trans-Pacific political solidarity that is not based on racial identification can be sought out. Exploring instances of Afro/black-Orientalism in various historical contexts illuminates not only the importance of race but also how crucial it is to explore how gender, sexuality, and religion intersect with race and class in the face of ongoing racism, sexism, heterosexism, militarism, and class exploitation.

As the topic asks for an evaluation of appropriation rather than the passage of a plan, claims that the aff doesn’t “do” anything are non-unique – NO topical aff can pass a policy, given the topic’s wording.

## Part 3: New Understandings

#### [Kim 2] WE RUPTURE RACISM: A-O excavates a SUPPRESSED HISTORY of Afro-Asian coalitional resistance to white supremacy and racial cap.

**Kim 2:** Kim. Nami. [Chair, Professor, Philosophy and Religious Studies Faculty, Spelman College] “Engaging Afro/black-Orientalism: A Proposal.”*Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Religion*, Vol. 1, Issue 7, June 2010.

<http://www.raceandreligion.com/JRER/Volume_1_(2010)_files/Kim%201%2007.pdf> AC/CH

The task of engaging Afro/black-Orientalism may seem challenging today because the context in which we raise concerns and questions is different from that of the early to mid-twentieth century during which African American activists and intellectuals had formed political solidarity. Also, people are no longer primarily concerned with the third-world anti-colonial struggle for nation-state sovereignty and the color line of Jim Crow racial segregation in the United States where African American activists and intellectuals began their search for global solidarity among people of color. Yet, as black feminist Patricia Hill Collins stresses, the racial hierarchies Du Bois observed a century ago continue to exist not only on a local level but also on a global scale.32 We now face what Hill Collins calls “new racism,” which is “transnational” due to the global market economy and global mass media.33 Racialized and gendered globalization continues to produce color lines in the twenty-first century. Also, while admitting that the “excavations of AfroAsian solidarity might be nostalgic and anachronistic,”34 Prashad nonetheless maintains that the “epistemological and historical archive of solidarity” and “memory of the interactions” must be brought to light.35 In a similar vein, Mullen states, “AfroAsian solidarity needs a constant reorientation to itself. The constant threat of historical erasure of the coalition building of ethnic communities necessitates an urgent, disciplined commitment to a ‘useable’ AfroAsian past.”36 By challenging white supremacy, which has persistently pit one racial/ethnic minority group against another, Afro/black-Orientalism may shed new light on the forgotten history of interactions and coalitions among African, African Americans, and Asians and Asian North Americans in their concerted efforts to resist racism, colonialism, and U.S. imperialism.37 Engaging Afro/black-Orientalism is not a naïve attempt to romanticize the relationship between people of African descent and Asian descent when the relationship between these groups has been strenuous if not totally hostile as shown in incidents such as the Los Angeles Riot of 1992 and the ongoing plight of biracial children between African American fathers and “Asian” mothers on U.S. military bases in Asia. Rather, engaging Afro/black-Orientalism needs to be understood as an effort to underscore the “political solidarity” that has characterized various forms of Afro-Asian connections and coalition, including black American protests against the Chinese Exclusion Act and other discriminatory U.S. immigration policies. In turn, this helps disrupt the black and white racial binary that has characterized racism and racial formations in mainstream U.S. culture. In what follows, I will briefly discuss some of the implications of engaging Afro/black-Orientalism for doing interdisciplinary religious/theological studies from an Asian Pacific North American feminist perspective by highlighting shared interests between the two.

#### [Kim 3] AND A-O disrupts the Western humanism used to justify set col.

**Kim 3:** Kim. Nami. [Chair, Professor, Philosophy and Religious Studies Faculty, Spelman College] “Engaging Afro/black-Orientalism: A Proposal.”*Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Religion*, Vol. 1, Issue 7, June 2010.

<http://www.raceandreligion.com/JRER/Volume_1_(2010)_files/Kim%201%2007.pdf> AC/CH

First, by looking at how African American intellectuals and political activists employed an Afro/black-Orientalist “critique” to engage American nationalism and national identity, religious/theological studies from an Asian Pacific North American feminist perspective can find ways in which it can critically engage American nationalism and American identity in the context of U.S. empire building. Observing the recent fervor of American nationalism--in other words, “excessive or fanatical devotion to a nation and its interest, often associated with a belief that one country is superior to all others”38--in the midst of ongoing U.S. war against Iraq, feminist scholar in religion Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza calls for a critical analysis of American capitalist nationalism as a structure of domination.39 The end goal of such analysis, however, is not just to critique and analyze American nationalism and national identity. Rather, as Sharon D. Welch has rightly put it, what is equally needed is to articulate “alternative forms of national identity and global order and responsibility.”40 In her response to Schüssler Fiorenza’s urgent call to engage a critical analysis of American nationalism as a structure of domination, Welch defines “critique” as a form of “patriotism and an affirmation of a complex identity as national and global citizens.”41 Such critique is found in the works of Du Bois and other African American intellectuals, who understood their fate under U.S. racist domestic policy in relation to others who suffer under Western imperial exploitation. For instance, when Du Bois talked about “the world problem of the color line” in 1914, he was linking the fate of African Americans to the race problem in the world. Likewise, African American anti-colonial activists of the 1940s strongly argued that their struggles against Jim Crow were inseparably bound to the struggles of African and Asian peoples for independence from colonialism.42 As Penny M. Von Eschen puts it, African Americans’ critique of American empire was closely related to their critique of colonialism elsewhere, and offering a critique of American empire did not preclude them from being in solidarity with other colonized people.43 Even when African Americans began embracing American foreign policy by emphasizing their American citizenship and cutting off international links of common struggle in the hope of fostering domestic civil rights toward the end of 1950s, Du Bois remarked that black Americans were “becoming Americans. But then what Americans to become?”44 Such deployment of “critique” by African American intellectuals and political activists suggests a further use of critique as a way to engage American nationalism and American identity in the twenty-first century, for such critique of Americanness was an indictment of the abstract notion of human being in Western intellectual and political discourses, which in fact meant white, Western, Christian, propertied men. While Afro/black-Orientalism contributed to debunking such notions of what it meant to be “human,” its critique of American nationalism and national identity did not scrutinize this predominantly male perspective. In engaging with Afro/black-Orientalism, religious/theological studies from an Asian Pacific North American feminist perspective can further deconstruct such a concept of human subjectivity that is heteronormative and masculine, which will, in turn, help contest other abstract notions, such as freedom, liberty, justice, and equality, in Western intellectual and political traditions.

#### [Kim 4] Next, WE SPILL OVER – A-O orientations can be used to critique other dehumanizing legacies of colonialism.

**Kim 4:** Kim. Nami. [Chair, Professor, Philosophy and Religious Studies Faculty, Spelman College] “Engaging Afro/black-Orientalism: A Proposal.”*Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Religion*, Vol. 1, Issue 7, June 2010.

<http://www.raceandreligion.com/JRER/Volume_1_(2010)_files/Kim%201%2007.pdf> AC/CH

Finally, engaging Afro/black-Orientalism can help us explore the ways in which the parameters of struggle are defined in religious/theological studies, whether the struggle is against racism, sexism, heterosexism, or imperialism. In other words, engaging Afro/black-Orientalism can assure that oppression needs to be conceptualized in ways that one form of oppression is not prioritized over another based on identity politics, or that racial/ethnic conflict among minority groups is not looked at simply as a matter between the two without dealing with white supremacy. This way of conceptualizing oppression and forming strategic coalitions based on such conceptualization becomes especially significant given the recent development of transnational alliances of Christian Right with antifeminist perspectives and practices that cut across national borders, extensively affecting and altering people’s lives. For instance, at the recent conference held in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, leaders of the Anglican Communion gave its national churches in the United States and Canada eight months to cease blessing same-sex unions and to ban the ordination of sexually active gay bishops.47 Many bishops from countries in the global South have been in the forefront of this opposition to the same-sex union. They have also been opposed to the ordination of women. Moreover, Uganda bans same-sex marriages and Zanzibar criminalizes “lesbianism” and same-sex marriages, marking “the continent as a place of legally-mandated homophobic intolerance.”48 According to Jessica Horn, Nigerian federal government’s plan to introduce the bill that proposes to criminalize same-sex marriages and to make activism for gay rights a criminal offense is based on President Olusegun Obasanjo’s premise that such unions are “un-Biblical, unnatural and definitely un-African.”49 Horn argues that a common motif in the homophobic rhetoric of African leaders is “resisting moral corruption from the West,” and the moral condemnation and persecution of non-heteronormative behavior is supported by reference to two texts that were introduced by the European colonization of Africa: “laws criminalizing ‘unnatural sex’ and the Bible.”50 But the Bible, Horn maintains, was “carried again by a new wave of US-driven Pentecostal evangelism.”51 This form of Pentecostalism has been quickly immersed into communities that face the crisis of HIV/AIDS, poverty, armed conflict, by providing “space for communal catharsis while re-entering conservative Christian mores.”52 In the face of these challenges, what is urgently needed are transnational alliances of antiheterosexist and anti-heteropatriarchal oppositions, which widen the parameters of struggle to the extent that such challenges are not simply the “problems” of those who are directly affected by them but rather the issues that should concern everyone who believe in a world that does not discriminate or dehumanize persons based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, religion, ablebodiedness, and so on. What we can inherit from Afro-Asian connections, especially from the Bandung Conference, is that the core struggles that have rendered “third world” as oppositional consciousness. Although the spirit of the Bandung has vanished, rearticulated notion of third-world oppositional consciousness that is not based on geography nor based solely on shared experiences of oppression can be useful. As Chandra Mohanty has rightly put it, thirdworld oppositional consciousness and struggle is defined as “the way we think about race, class, and gender--the political links we choose to make among and between struggles.”53 Such understanding of oppositional consciousness and struggle can help provide a platform where new ways of understanding oppression can be articulated, and where anti-racist, anti-sexist, antiheterosexist, and anti-imperialist transnational feminist alliances can be articulated and formed.

#### [Osajima] AND Afro-Asian coalitions work – empirics prove.

Osajima: Osajima, Keith. [Professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program, he is in his 15th year at the University of Redlands]. “Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans.” *Journal of Asian American Studies*, Volume 10, Number 1, February 2007, pp. 59-83 AZ//AC

**In the winter of 1968, Asian** American **students at San Francisco State College, together with** their **Black, Chicano, and Native American counterparts, embarked on the longest student strike in U.S. history with the goal of transforming higher education. The students demanded an open admissions policy to counter increasingly elitist admissions policies. They demanded a College of Ethnic Studies to provide a “relevant” education that critically examined the experiences of Third World people within a context of racism, capitalism, and imperialism. They also insisted on a curriculum that included their histories, cultures, heritages, and** contributions.1 As Glenn Omatsu notes, involvement in **the strike “deeply affected Asian** American consciousness.”2 Students **“redefined racial and ethnic identity, promoted new ways of thinking about communities, and challenged prevailing notions of power and authority**.”3 Under the emergent pan-Asian banner of “Yellow Power,” this new identity and critical con- sciousness represented “a rejection of the passive Oriental stereotype and symbolize(d) the birth of a new Asian—one who will recognize and deal with injustices.”4 While the political conditions that gave rise to the Asian American movement have largely faded under the weight of political conservatism and backlash, the goals of Asian American activists have persisted. Indeed, Replenishing the Ranks Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans in the 35-plus years since their movement’s inception, Asian Americans have made significant progress toward the goal of transforming higher education. A new interdisciplinary field of knowledge has been established. Asian American Studies has been institutionalized in programs and courses across the country. The 2003 Cornell University Directory lists 50 Asian American Studies Programs.5 **Asian** American **student activism has played a central role in the formation of many of these** programs. It is evident that young Asian Americans, like their 1960s counterparts, have continued to develop an Asian American critical consciousness and commitment to working for social change. What is less obvious is how those Asian Americans develop such a critical consciousness. What leads them to become interested in Asian American issues and activism? Some answers can be found scattered in the literature. Autobiog- raphies and biographies of Asian American activists offer one source of information, often revealing how individuals arrived at their under- standing of and commitment to political activity on behalf of Asian Americans. Helen Zia, for example, in her book Asian American Dreams, tells of how she went against the wishes of her Confucian father to go to Princeton, where, in the midst of the tumultuous 1960s, she became an Asian American activist.6 The literature on pedagogy in Asian American Studies offers indirect insights into the process of consciousness-development by identifying key teaching practices and course content that can help to change the minds of students. Diane Fujino’s chapter on integrating feminist pedagogy in Asian American classrooms is a good example. She shows how experiential learn- ing activities, combined with personal and academic-oriented reflection, can help to move students toward an Asian American consciousness.7 Within the realm of social science research, the best discussion of how Asian Americans develop a pan-Asian identity and consciousness is in Nazli Kibria’s Becoming Asian American. Based on interviews with second-generation Chinese and Koreans, Kibria’s study often found that **most respondents developed a pan-Asian consciousness in college, where a “notable individual or class had provided them with the decisive** push.”9 Involvement in pan-Asian campus organizations, in Ethnic Studies classes, and in pan-Asian social groups was a significant influence for many. This article builds upon and extends the existing literature. Based on interviews with 30 Asian Americans who professed a pan-Asian American critical consciousness and commitment to social action, the article looks specifically at **the process by which these respondents developed their interests, a process to which Brazilian educator Paulo Freire refers as “conscientization.**”10 The central purpose is to identify key factors, conditions, and processes that contribute to their critical consciousness. The article begins with a description of the research methods and analytic strategies. The main body of the article presents the analyses of the interviews. The article concludes with a discussion of how the research findings **can inform** those **activists and educators who work to bring new generations of Asian** American**s into the movement to “replenish the ranks.”**