# Penn Octas 1NC

## 1 – K

## Framework

#### [ROB] ANTI-ASIANNESS IS BUILT INTO AMERICAN EDUCATION, but usually gets ignored. The Role of the Judge is to Promote Educational Justice, which means giving all students access to academic spaces – it’s uniquely key for Asian-identifying debaters, who can’t access *substantive* discussions of justice if we’re not in this space to begin with.

#### [Sawchuk et al] AND that means we need outlets for discussions of anti-Asianness.

Sawchuk et al: Sawchuk, Stephen [Associate Editor, *Education Week*], and Catherine Gewertz [Senior Contributing Writer, *Education Week*]. “Anti-Asian Violence: What Schools Should Start Doing About It.” *Education Week*, March 25, 2021. https://www.edweek.org/leadership/anti-asian-violence-what-schools-should-start-doing-about-it/2021/03 CH

For the others, she said, she described what happened, explained the legal definition of a hate crime, and discussed why the event frightened her and why she experienced itas a hate crime. She invited children to ask questions and share their feelings, but few did. Still, Trullench said she felt the session was an important way for students to get information and support as they process a traumatic event aimed at their community. Question the historic erasure of Asians from the curriculum. Kleinrock, the Washington, D.C. teacher, said one of the challenges about responding to the events in Atlanta is that there’s often no common basis of understanding among teachers or students about Asian Americans’ experiences in the United States. The community is often all but absent in curriculum, even from lessons about civil rights. And students notice. “I remember teaching 3rd grade in L.A., and I had a lot of Latinx and Southeast Asian students and got a lot of questions from them about: ‘Where are people who look like me? Where are Asian people?’ So often when we talk about race and racism we’re talking about a Black-white binary … but really young kids were noticing there was a lack of representation,” Kleinrock said. The erasure of Asian Americans is likely a product of who’s working in K-12 schools—Asians are underrepresented among school and district leaders and among the overwhelmingly white teaching force. (Just 2 percent of teachers identify as Asian compared to 5 percent of K-12 students, according to federal data.) But Kleinrock believes it’s also the product of textbooks that gloss over Western imperialism and how that directly impacted migration. These students and staff wanted to be heard, to share their stories. Miranda Trullench, counselor, Beaverton (Ore.) school district “We might learn about the Opium Wars, but not about how they impacted the influx of Asians to the West Coast. Or the influx of Korean Americans during the Korean war,” she pointed out. It’s often hard for teachers who themselves don’t know the history to know where to begin, but she encourages them to start with some inquiry-based activities, even some simple questions to gauge students’ perceptions. “When you ask kids what they think you know about a topic, or a community, or an event in history, getting the bias out there is often the most uncomfortable part. But you can’t fix what you can’t identify,” Kleinrock said. “When they say, ‘I only know about anime or sushi,’ I can start to see what they come with, and what stereotypes they’re coming in with, and how we can engage in unlearning as much as learning information.” Kleinrock has also curated a collection of resources for teachers on the website of Learning for Justice, a curriculum project of the Southern Poverty Law Center. And the Oakland district created an elementary and secondary curriculum that explores the history of anti-Asian violence, with resource guides that have now been shared nationally.

#### [ROB] Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to Foster Antiracist Dialogue, which means increasing discussion that combats manifestations of racial injustice. All Lives Matter consequentialism can’t solve the K – it furthers the ignorance behind anti-Asian violence.

## A. Links

#### 1. [A2 Global Policymaking/Treaties] (One,) The aff demands that all states conform to a single mode of policymaking to resolve their harms – all governments must enforce the aff the way the plan specs. Specific links:

#### 2. [A2 Domestic Policymaking] (Two,) They require a single policy that all states must domestically enforce, regardless of their individual needs or wants – the aff takes a uniform approach that each state takes. Specific links:

3. The aff defends an international treaty — their advocacy text says they defend “signatories of the OST” — they demand that all states conform to a single mode of policymaking to resolve their harms – all governments must enforce the aff the way the plan specs.

4. Their framework is util — they’re centered around a singular conception of pleasure and pain that makes their framework the ONLY way to approach ethics – their framework props up a single way of being that can’t account for relevant differences between groups, or forms of pain that go beyond extinction. Specific links: “EVERYTHING ELSE regresses,” “Extinction outweighs,” etc.

5. Foster in their first advantage says there must be ONE approach to the aff because countries are “making their own rules” — that’s a form of enforcing COOKIE-CUTTER POLICIES that demand mimicry

## B. Impacts

#### [Eng & Han 1] COLONIAL MIMICRY: in requiring Asian states to take an identical approach to Western ones, the aff demands reproduction of whiteness.

Eng & Han 1: 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], and Shinhee Han [Psychotherapist in New York City]. “Racial Melancholia, Racial Dissociation.” Duke University Press, January 2019. https://www.dukeupress.edu/Assets/PubMaterials/978-1-4780-0160-7\_601.pdf AC/CH

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.**

#### [Watson] AND white mimicry has empirically caused imperialism both within and *from* Asian states – results in SERIAL POLICY FAILURE, since new forms of colonialism keep replacing the old.

**Watson:** Watson, Jini Kim. [Duke University; she is an Assistant Professor of English and Comparative Literature. Her research focuses on the literature and culture of the Asia-Pacific, postcolonial theory, comparative modernities, and theories of architecture and urbanism.] “Imperial mimicry, modernisation theory and the contradictions of postcolonial South Korea.” Routledge, 10:2, 171-190, May 2007. AC/CH

An enormous amount has been written on **the Meiji period (1868–1912) of Japanese history, an era of spectacular growth and the rapid adoption of European technologies. Formed within this period, Japan’s colonising impulses must be understood as an integral part of the country’s effort to modernise through Westernisation.** In the intensely competitive geopolitical situation of the late nineteenth century, a Japanese-led counterforce against the West was perceived as the only means of resisting European domination of the globe. In 1887 the Japanese Foreign Minister Inoue Kaoru urged: what we must do is to transform our empire and our people, make the empire like the countries of Europe and our people like the peoples of Europe. To put it differently, we have to establish a new, European-style empire on the edge of Asia. **After attaining Taiwan (Formosa) in the 1895 Sino-Japanese War, further regional control through the defeat of Russia in 1904, and then rule over the Korean peninsula in 1910, Japan felt itself elevated to the ranks of the great** Western imperial powers, and regarded its first colony as ‘a symbol of the nation’s equality with the West and of its participation in the great work of modern civilization’. In the struggle for pieces of China, European-style imperialism was confirmed as the order of the day and Japan set out to not only emulate it, but surpass it. Several historians have noted, however, that the centuries-old national imaginary that went along with European colonisation simply did not exist in Japan; in Jansen’s phrase, ‘there were no Japanese Kiplings’. As a result, along with modern economic theories, **Western, and particularly British, colonialist thought and practices were actively studied and appropriated (right down to copying British** colonial **uniforms and architecture), and a chair in Colonial Studies at Tokyo University was established.** Taiwan and Korea played typical colonial roles as providers of raw materials (rice, sugar and minerals), labour and markets for the expansion of resource-poor Japan. Not long after **Japan** had **reinvented its own state institutions on the model of Western imperial nations,** it implemented similar reforms in its colonies. Results included modern education, finance, trade and transport systems, the rationalist replanning of the colonial capitals Seoul and Taipei, and the construction of grand, neo-Baroque administration buildings and governor’s mansions as symbols of Japan’s imperial power**.** When considering the kind of postcolonial critical tools which might interrogate or deconstruct Japanese colonial thinking and practices, the first difficulty is in recognising that the latter’s origins are not in Japan. Postcolonial scholars note that Japanese colonialism was at once the purest face of colonial brutality, and colonialism’s mere imitation. In Chungmoo Choi’s words: Japanese imperialism reproduced the fictionality of the European colonial discourse. It was a pastiche of the European Enlightenment. Japanese imperialism simulated and reproduced this grand but empty narrative, in yet another form of colonialism, not with any Enlightenment pretense but through a pastiche of colonization.

## Thus, C. Alternative

#### [Eng & Han 2] Reject the aff’s method and replace it with Asian Melancholia, or “AM,” a recognition of why forced integration of white technocracy into Asianness is unjust.

Eng & Han 2: 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], and Shinhee Han [Psychotherapist in New York City]. “Racial Melancholia, Racial Dissociation.” Duke University Press, January 2019. https://www.dukeupress.edu/Assets/PubMaterials/978-1-4780-0160-7\_601.pdf AC/CH

﻿THE “CONDITION” OF WHITENESS Configuring whiteness as a contagion, Birdie Lee, the narrator of Danzy Senna’s novel Caucasia (1998), connects assimilation to illness and disease. Separated from her African American activist father, Birdie and her blue-blooded mother flee from the law in a racialized and radicalized Boston of the 1970s. Eventually, the two take up residence in New Hampshire, where Birdie passes as “Jesse” and for white. This assimilation into the whiteness of New Hampshire plagues Birdie, who wonders if she “had actually become Jesse, and it was this girl, this Birdie Lee who haunted these streets, searching for ghosts, who was the lie.”1 This vexing condition of whiteness alters the narrator’s physical existence—the manner in which Birdie walks, talks, dresses, and dances. Moreover, it configures the sphere of the affective—the ways in which Birdie ultimately apprehends the world and its occupants around her. Physically and psychically haunted, Birdie/Jesse feels “contaminated.”2 This is the condition of racial melancholia. A DIALOGUE ON RACIAL MELANCHOLIA As noted in our introduction, part I of this book focuses on Generation X, largely second-generation and comparatively privileged Asian Americans attending public and private universities from the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s. Our psychoanalytic perspective is that of racial melancholia. This chapter is the outcome of a series of sustained dialogues on racial melancholia in which we engaged during the fall and winter of 1998. It was first published in 2000 as an article in the clinical journal Psychoanalytic Dialogues, and we have edited and updated it for publication here. We originally wrote “A Dialogue on Racial Melancholia” as a critical response to disturbing patterns of depression we witnessed in a growing number of our Asian American students and patients. Not all Asian Americans are depressed, but several studies have shown higher levels of social isolation and depressive symptoms among Asian American adolescents in comparison to their African American, Latino/a, and white peers.3 The article provided an opportunity for us not only to reflect on race and depression but also to consider more generally various approaches to investigating problems of race, immigration, exclusion, and loss in psychoanalytic theory and practice, a topic as important in 1998 as it is today. As Freud’s privileged theory of unresolved grief, melancholia presents a compelling framework to conceptualize registers of loss and depression attendant to social and psychic processes of immigration, assimilation, and racialization.4 Freud typically casts melancholia as pathological. However, we are more concerned with exploring this psychic condition as a depathologized “structure of feeling,” to borrow a concept from Raymond Williams describing emergent patterns of emotion still struggling for social form and recognition.5 From this particular vantage, melancholia might be theorized in relation to our everyday conflicts and struggles with experiences of racial exclusion and discrimination. Furthermore, even though Freud conceives of melancholia in terms of individual loss and suffering, we are equally interested in approaching melancholia as a collective psychic condition—more interested, that is, in addressing group identities and identifications. How might a focus on racial identifications and differences in psychoanalytic theory allow us particular insights on the history of the Asian American subject in relation to the subject of history—to historical processes of immigration, assimilation, and racialization underpinning the formation of Asian American subjectivity? ASSIMILATION AS/AND MELANCHOLIA Freud’s theory of melancholia provides a provocative model to consider how processes of assimilation work in the United States, and how the depression that characterizes much of contemporary culture for Generation X might be theorized in relation to race. In the United States today, assimilation into mainstream culture for people of color still means adopting a set of dominant norms and ideals—whiteness, heteronormativity, middle-class family values, Judeo-Christian religious traditions. The exclusion from these norms—the reiterated loss of whiteness as an ideal, notably—establishes a melancholic framework for assimilation and racialization processes in the United States precisely as a series of failed and unresolved integrations. Let us begin with Freud’s essay “Mourning and Melancholia” (1917), in which he attempts to draw a clear distinction between these two psychic states through the question of “successful” and “failed” resolutions to loss. Freud reminds us at the start of his essay that “mourning is regularly the reaction to the loss of a loved person, or to the loss of some abstraction which has taken the place of one, such as one’s country, liberty, an ideal, and so on.

#### [Eng & Han 3] ALT PRECLUDES CASE – we can’t engage in policymaking if we don’t address its failures.

Eng & Han 3: 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], and Shinhee Han [Psychotherapist in New York City]. “Racial Melancholia, Racial Dissociation.” Duke University Press, January 2019. https://www.dukeupress.edu/Assets/PubMaterials/978-1-4780-0160-7\_601.pdf AC/CH

DEPATHOLOGIZING MELANCHOLIA The process of assimilation is a negotiation between mourning and melancholia. The Asian American subject exemplified by Elaine and Nelson does not inhabit one or the other—mourning or melancholia—but mourning and melancholia coexist at once in processes of assimilation and the negotiation of social and psychic borders. This continuum between mourning and melancholia allows us to approach racial melancholia as conflict rather than damage. Indeed, we must investigate further the condition of racial melancholia as the intrasubjective displacement of a necessarily intersubjective dynamic of conflict and trauma in all its various social manifestations. We have described racial melancholia among Asian Americans in Generation X as tracing a trajectory from love to hate of the lost object, a hate that is subsequently transformed into self-hate in the course of moving from the external social world into the internal domain of the psyche. If racial melancholia traces the history of social exclusions relating to immigration, assimilation, and racialization for the Asian American subject and configuring that exclusion as an intrasubjective psychic form of self-hate, then how might we reverse this trajectory and address this condition as an intersubjective subject-subject relation? The attention to racial melancholia as conflict rather than damage not only renders it a productive category but also removes Asian Americans from the position of solipsistic “victims” singularly responsible for their own psychic maladies. We are dissatisfied with racial discourses and clinical assessments that pathologize people of color as permanently damaged—forever injured and incapable of being “whole.” In contrast, our exploration of intersubjective conflict—between mainstream and minority cultures as well as on the intergenerational level— draws attention to race as relation by expanding K lein’s notion of reparation and reinstatement to a communal level. Our discussion of immigration, assimilation, and racialization pursued here develops them as issues involving the fluid negotiation between mourning and melancholia. In this manner, melancholia is neither pathological nor permanent but, to return to Williams, “a structure of feeling,” a structure of everyday life. In Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics (1999), Jose Esteban Munoz observes that, for queers as well as for people of color, melancholia is not a pathology but an integral part of daily existence and survival. Munoz provides, as we do, a corrective to Freud’s vision of melancholia as a destructive force and states that it is instead part of the “process of dealing with all the catastrophes that occur in the lives of people of color, lesbians, and gay men. I have proposed a different understanding of melancholia that does not see it as a pathology or as a self-absorbed mood that inhibits activism. Rather, it is a mechanism that helps us (re)construct identity and take our dead with us to the various battles we must wage in their names— and in our names.”55 Within the continuum of mourning and melancholia is a productive gap inhabited by the various issues under discussion here—immigration, assimilation, and racialization; mimicry, ambivalence, and the stereotype; sacrifice, loss, and reparation. The social and psychic negotiations of these various issues are the internal conflicts with which Asian Americans have struggled on an everyday basis. This struggle does not necessarily result in damage but is in the final analysis a necessary process of political engagement and action. It is the work of renarrating loss and rebuilding communities. “Suffering,”Klein offers, contains productive capacities: It seems that every advance in the process of mourning results in a deepening in the individual’s relation to his inner objects, in the happiness of regaining them after they were felt to be lost (“Paradise Lost and Regained”), in an increased trust in them and love for them because they proved to be good and helpful after all. This is similar to the way in which the young child step by step builds up his relation to external objects, for he gains trust not only from pleasant experiences but also from the ways in which he overcomes frustrations and unpleasant experiences, nevertheless retaining his good objects (externally and internally).56 We would like to think about the numerous difficulties of Asian American immigration, assimilation, and racialization processes in terms of “Paradise Lost and Regained.” The reinstatement of lost and loved objects in a racist world that would not have them encompasses the productive capacities of racial melancholia. It also indexes the possibilities of hope and the will of the racial subject— its abiding fidelity to the beautiful picture. In the work of racial melancholia lies an important ethical and political project. In “Mourning and Melancholia,”Freud describes the melancholic’s inability to get over loss in negative terms. We instead focus on the melancholic’s absolute refusal to relinquish the racial other— to forfeit alterity— at any costs. As Hannah Arendt suggests, and as the case history of Nelson eloquently underscores, an accent is the refusal to give up the mother or mother tongue.57 Put otherwise, the development of pride in one’s culture, as Beverly Greene points out, can be an important if complex source of psychic resilience, alternately a site of psychic vibrancy or shame.58 Freud lays out in his essay the provocative idea that in melancholia “the shadow of the object fell upon the ego.”59This idea is notable for, throughout the Freudian oeuvre, it is the ego that holds sway; the narcissism of “His Majesty the Ego”reigns supreme.60Equally so, Lacan emphasizes this narcissism of the ego, reversing Freud’s formulation in “Mourning and Melancholia”by insisting that it is always the shadow of the ego that falls on the object.61In our present discussion, however, we have the loved object rather than the ego holding sway. Racial melancholia thus delineates one psychic process in which the loved object is so overwhelmingly important to and beloved by the ego that the ego is willing to preserve it even at the cost of its own self. In the transferential aspects of melancholic identifications, Freud suggests, “is the expression of there being something in common which may signify love.”62 This community of love—as W. R. D. Fairbairn, Jessica Benjamin, Christopher Bollas, and others have noted—is possible only through the aggressive and militant preservation of the loved and lost object.63Hence, the melancholic process is one way in which racially disparaged objects and others live on in the psychic realm. This behavior, Freud remarks, proceeds from an attitude of “revolt” on the part of the ego.64 It displays the ego’s melancholic yet militant refusal to allow certain objects to disappear into social oblivion. In this way, Freud tells us, “love escapes extinction.”65 This preservation of the threatened racial object might be seen, then, as a type of ethical hold on the part of the melancholic ego. The mourner, in contrast, has no such ethics. The mourner is perfectly content to kill off the lost object, to declare it to be dead yet again within the domain of the psyche. We might describe this dynamic as a historical politics of love and hate in racial melancholia—indeed, a psychic pedagogy of surviving hating and being hated in a long history of race and whiteness as property.66 While the ambivalence, anger, and rage that characterize this preservation of the lost object threaten the ego’s well-being, we do not imagine that this threat is the result of some existential tendency on the part of the melancholic; it is as we have been arguing throughout this chapter a decidedly social threat. Ambivalence, rage, and anger are the internalized refractions of an institutionalized system of whiteness as property bent on the exclusion and obliteration of the racial object. If the loved object is not going to live out there, the melancholic emphatically avers, then it is going to live here inside of me. Along with Freud, “we only wonder why a man has to be ill before he can be accessible to a truth of this kind.”67 It is the melancholic who brings us face to face with this social truth. It is the melancholic who teaches us that “in the last resort we must begin to love in order not to fall ill. ”68 Both Butler and Douglas Crimp isolate the call of melancholia in the age of aids— the historical period of this chapter’s case histories— as one in which the loss of a public language to mourn a seemingly endless series of young male deaths triggers the absolute need to think about melancholia and political activism. Munoz highlights the communal nature of this activist project—the community-oriented aspect of collective rather than individual losses, of collective rather than individual identifications, and of collective rather than individual revolt: “Communal mourning, by its very nature, is an immensely complicated text to read, for we do not mourn just one lost object or other, but we also mourn as a ‘whole’— or, put another way, as a contingent and temporary collection of fragments that is experiencing a loss of its parts.”69A series of unresolved fragments, we come together as a contingent whole. We gain social recognition as a racial collective in the face of this communal loss. There is a militant refusal on the part of the ego— better yet, a series of egos —to let go, and this militant refusal is at the heart of melancholia’s productive political potentials. Paradoxically, in this instance, the ego’s death drive may be the very precondition for survival, the beginning of a strategy for living and for living on. Butler asks of melancholia, “Is the psychic violence of conscience not a refracted indictment of the social forms that have made certain kinds of losses ungrievable?”70And Crimp ends his essay “Mourning and Militancy”with this simple and moving call: “Militancy, of course, then, but mourning too: mourning and militancy.”71 We pause here to insert yet another permutation of this political project in relation to the Asian American immigration, assimilation, and racialization processes we have been discussing throughout this essay: mourning and melancholia.

## 2 – DA

## A. Link

#### [Zvobgo & Loken 1] The aff is rooted in INHERENTLY RACIST tenants of international law– their race-neutral extinction scenarios are an “all lives matter” approach that ignores ILAW’s racism.

Zvobgo & Loken 1: Zvobgo, Kelebogile [Founder and Director, International Justice Lab at William & Mary] and Meredith Loken [Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst]. “Why Race Matters in International Relations.” *Foreign Policy*, June 19, 2020. CH

Race is not a perspective on international relations; it is a central organizing feature of world politics. Anti-Japanese racism guided and sustained U.S. engagement in World War II, and broader anti-Asian sentiment influenced the development and structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. During the Cold War, racism and anti-communism were inextricably linked in the containment strategy that defined Washington’s approach to Africa, Asia, Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. And today race shapes threat perception and responses to violent extremism, inside and outside the “war on terror.” Yet mainstream international relations (IR) scholarship denies race as essential to understanding the world, to the cost of the field’s integrity. Take the “big three” IR paradigms: realism, liberalism, and constructivism. These dominant frames for understanding global politics are built on raced and racist intellectual foundations that limit the field’s ability to answer important questions about international security and organization. Core concepts, like anarchy and hierarchy, are raced: They are rooted in discourses that center and favor Europe and the West. These concepts implicitly and explicitly pit “developed” against “undeveloped,” “modern” against “primitive,” “civilized” against “uncivilized.” And their use is racist: These invented binaries are used to explain subjugation and exploitation around the globe. While realism and liberalism were built on Eurocentrism and used to justify white imperialism, this fact is not widely acknowledged in the field. For instance, according to neorealists, there exists a “balance of power” between and among “great powers.” Most of these great powers are, not incidentally, white-majority states, and they sit atop the hierarchy, with small and notably less-white powers organized below them. In a similar vein, raced hierarchies and conceptions of control ground the concept of cooperation in neoliberal thought: Major powers own the proverbial table, set the chairs, and arrange the place settings.

## B. Impacts

#### [Zvobgo & Loken 2] Justifies racism, always be enforced in an unjust way against countries of color.

Zvobgo & Loken 2: Zvobgo, Kelebogile [Founder and Director, International Justice Lab at William & Mary] and Meredith Loken [Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst]. “Why Race Matters in International Relations.” *Foreign Policy*, June 19, 2020. CH

Between 1945 and 1993, among the five major IR journals of the period—International Organization, International Studies Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Review of International Studies, and World Politics—only one published an article with the word “race” in the title. Another four articles included “minorities” and 13 included “ethnicity.” Since then, mainstream IR has neglected race in theorizing, in historical explanation, and in prescription, and shuttled race (and gender) to the side as “other perspectives.” When IR scholars do engage with race, it is often in discussions of outwardly raced issues such as colonialism. Yet one cannot comprehend world politics while ignoring race and racism. Textbooks that neglect historical and modern slavery when explaining development and globalization obscure the realities of state-building and deny the harms committed in the process. Similarly, when scholarship fails to call attention to the role that race plays in Western nations’ use of international law as a pretext for military intervention, it provides cover for the modern-day equivalent of “civilizing missions.” Likewise, studies of trade and dispute settlement almost always overlook modern arbitration’s deep roots in the transatlantic slave trade. This history is often lost in analyses of wins and losses in negotiations. Race and the racism of historical statecraft are inextricable from the modern study and practice of international relations. They are also not artefacts: Race continues to shape international and domestic threat perceptions and consequent foreign policy; international responses to immigrants and refugees; and access to health and environmental stability. Because mainstream IR does not take race or racism seriously, it also does not take diversity and inclusion in the profession seriously. In the United States, which is the largest producer of IR scholarship, only 8 percent of scholars identify as black or Latino, compared to 12 percent of scholars in comparative politics and 14 percent in U.S. politics.

They add:

Constructivism, which rounds out the “big three” approaches, is perhaps best positioned to tackle race and racism. Constructivists reject the as-given condition of anarchy and maintain that anarchy, security, and other concerns are socially constructed based on shared ideas, histories, and experiences. Yet with few notable exceptions, constructivists rarely acknowledge how race shapes what is shared. Despite the dominance of the “big three” in the modern study of IR, many of the arguments they advance, such as the balance of power, are not actually supported by evidence outside of modern Europe. Consider the democratic peace theory. The theory makes two key propositions: that democracies are less likely to go to war than are nondemocracies, and that democracies are less likely to go to war with each other. The historical record shows that democracies have actually not been less likely to fight wars—if you include their colonial conquests. Meanwhile, in regions such as the Middle East and North Africa, democratizing states have experienced more internal conflicts than their less-democratic peers. Yet leaders in the West have invoked democratic peace theory to justify invading and occupying less-democratic, and notably less-white, countries. This is a key element of IR’s racial exclusion: The state system that IR seeks to explain arises from the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years’ War and established European principles of statehood and sovereignty. Far from 17th-century relics, these principles are enshrined in the United Nations Charter—the foundation for global governance since 1945. But non-European nations did not voluntarily adopt European understandings of statehood and sovereignty, as IR scholars often mythologize. Instead, Europe, justified by Westphalia, divided the world between the modern, “civilized” states and conquered those which they did not think belonged in the international system. IR scholar Sankaran Krishna has argued that, because IR privileges theorizing over historical description and analysis, the field enables this kind of whitewashing. Western concepts are prioritized at the expense of their applicability in the world. Krishna called this “a systematic politics of forgetting, a willful amnesia, on the question of race.” Importantly, IR has not always ignored race. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, foundational texts invoked race as the linchpin holding together colonial administration and war. Belief in white people’s biological and sociological supremacy offered a tidy dualism between the civilized and the savage that justified the former’s murderous exploitation of the latter. Paul Samuel Reinsch, a founder of modern IR and foreign policy, christened the 20th century as the “age of national imperialism.” He concluded that states “endeavor to increase [their] resources … through the absorption or exploitation of undeveloped regions and inferior races.” Yet, he assured readers that this was “not inconsistent with respect for … other nationalities” because states avoid exerting control over “highly civilized nations.”

**TURNS AND OUTWEIGHS THE AFF –** they *worsen* security threats to non-White states – all of 20th century history proves it.