## Framework

#### [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.”**28 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.

## A. Links

#### 1. The aff isolates PRIVATE space appropriation as the problem – in CX, they say they’ll defend state-led appropriation, and only indict non-state actors. (Specific links from the aff:)

#### 2. The aff frames space appropriation through a “problem-solution” lens that treats assmiliation as key to “helping” people, *and racism as the failure of specific forms of appropriation*. Specific links from the aff:

#### 3. They use a ban on space appropriation to stop violence – they imagine that passing a policy will resolve indigenous violence and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ [insert aff impacts]. Specific links from the aff:

#### 4. [A2 K] They claim to confront oppression of indigenous groups, and to change that through the aff. Specific links from the aff:

5. The aff is a form of lip service politics — they superficially claim to embrace Indigenous voices when they don’t intend to ever stop appropriating — that was CX; they say appropriation continues regardless of what Indigenous people want

6. They misunderstand set col as a matter of “inclusion” — it’s not — it’s about the MINDSET OF APPROPRIATION being bad — means the aff can’t address that when appropriation can still happen in their world

7. They MISREPRESENT Indigenous scholarship — Smiles is talking about how people UNDERSTAND space, not about a desire to appropriate it — means they don’t even represent Indigenous scholarship accurately IN THE AFF

## B. Impact

**[Mitchell]** They don’t ban approbation - they only ban approbation when they don’t consult indigenous people which is still anti-indigenous.

Mitchell 2019 (Audra Mitchell is an Associate Professor of Global Political Ecology @ Wilfrid Laurier University, “Can International Relations Confront the Cosmos” in Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations, pg 55-56)//NotJacob

**Mitchell 19**: (Audra Mitchell is an Associate Professor of Global Political Ecology @ Wilfrid Laurier University, “Can International Relations Confront the Cosmos” in Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations, pg 55-56)// JP.

Radical finitude, however, is not the only cosmological challenge undermining the foundations of IR and global theory. In fact, it is deeply intertwined with imaginaries of radical infinitude. Some responses to collective fear of finitude have produced movements that aspire to the extension of control, capital and territoriality into spatio-temporal scales that vastly exceed the limits of Western scientific knowledge. They embody an ethos that I will call ‘cosmic expansionism’: the extension of dominant forms of agency, governance and socioeconomic power beyond the specific, Western spatio-scales associated with ‘human’ experience and cognition. This form of expansionism includes techno-scientific and/or capitalist interventions into the nano-sphere; quantum computing; synthetic biology; and large-scale terra-forming or geo-engineering on earth and other planets. It also involves the colonization of other temporalities, including those of Indigenous and other non-Western worlds (Rifkin, 2017) within the linear, unidirectional, homogenization structures of Western secular time. Cosmic expansionism seeks to offer radical infinitude to ‘humanity’ by asserting domination not only over land and living bodies, but also the conditions of matter, time and space that shape and transform cosmos. One of the most salient expressions of cosmic expansionism is found in movements to colonize and extract resources from outer space. As images of a volatile, irreparably damaged and unsafe earth proliferate – that is, apocalyptic discourses of radical finitude – a new crop of commercial space entrepreneurs (‘NewSpace’) is promising an escape route. They suggest that the colonization of other planets and outer space bodies will create more space for an expanding ‘humanity’, ensuring its indefinite survival. In a 2014 conference address, NASA chief Charles Bolden stated that ‘only a multi-planet species can survive for a long period of time’. Similarly, space entrepreneur Elon Musk warns that ‘either we spread Earth to other planets, or we risk going extinct’ (Kleinman, 2013). Explaining his projects as an ‘insurance policy’ (Carroll, 2013), Musk approaches space colonization as a form of highly profitable yet publicly beneficial speculation against the possible extinction of homo sapiens. Although the colonization of outer space is often dismissed in public discourses as a science fiction plot, NewSpace entrepreneurs are committing billions of dollars to achieving their goals in a matter of decades. If they succeed, they will not be the first members of homo sapiens to make outer space their dwelling place. Many Indigenous peoples maintain relations with Ancestors, animals, plants and places on other planets and celestial bodies. To offer just three examples, Aboriginal people in Stradbroke Island, Queensland, are related to a man called Mirabooka who dwells in Sky Country in the form of a constellation and looks after the people of the earth (Bhathal, 2006). In Anishinaabe traditions, cosmic bodies including the sun, moon and stars form a family, who are the progenitors of earthly life forms and influence their lives (Benton-Banai, 2010). Similarly, within Haudenosaunee traditions, the first human – Sky Woman – fell to the watery abyss that would become earth from a hole made in the floor of Sky World by the uprooting of a sacred tree (Mohawk, 2010). From within these and other Indigenous cosmo-visions, the area designated as ‘outer space’ by Western science has been continually inhabited by Ancestors, the dead, distinct worlds and non-living beings that command respect in their own right. According to Seneca faithkeeper Oren Lyons (cited in Alfred, 2009) his people have always theorized their worlds in relation to the cosmos. This is exemplified by the Thanksgiving Address, a daily offering of gratitude to all beings. As Lyons relates, ‘you start with the grass and you wind up with the heavens and the universe, so obviously you’re thinking even more than just global, you’re thinking universal’ (Alfred, 2009: 237). Within this cosmo-vision, earth and what Western science calls ‘outer space’ are a continuous field of inhabitation and relation. Yet despite their rich and widespread presence in Indigenous philosophies and histories, the existence of these inhabitants is erased within mainstream, colonial discourses on outer space, which treat it as a dead, empty terrain with ‘no natives’ awaiting colonization (Reinstein, 1999; Grinspoon, 2004; NASA, 2014). Based on this assumption, Western scientific, military and commercial interests have made significant strides to annex, claim and shape outer space. Attempts to annex outer space within Western regimes of power have a significant history. Practices of remotely observing, mapping and naming the features of celestial bodies have been employed continuously since the 18th century (Lane, 2010), projecting imaginaries of planets and worlds onto these beings (Dittmer, 2007). Since the 1960s, outer space has been shaped by the material culture of the space race and human commerce, including thousands of satellites, rockets, their debris and the signals they beam to the Earth (Gorman, 2005; Collis, 2009). From this perspective, outer space has already been subject to significant material and ideational colonization

## Thus, C. Alternative

#### [Kim] Reject the aff’s method and replace it with Afro-Orientalism, or “AO,” a counterdiscourse to policymaking that explores the parallel oppression of Black and Asian people and locates the harm in the logic of state colonization. To clarify, this is a divestment from the political – we oppose state action and promote cross-racial coalition-building instead.

**Kim:** 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.