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## K

## 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. [A2 LARP – Private Appropriation] (One,) 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. [A2 LARP – Generic] (Two,) The aff frames space appropriation through a “problem-solution” lens that treats passing a policy as key to “helping” people, *and racism as the failure of specific forms of appropriation*. Specific links from the aff:

#### 3. [A2 LARP – Topic] (Three,) They use a ban on space appropriation to stop violence – they imagine that passing a policy will resolve extinction and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ [insert aff impacts]. Specific links from the aff:

#### 4. [A2 Util] (Four,) Their framework takes a *holistic* view of pain and pleasure, assuming those are universal goods that look the same for all people – they can’t account for relevant differences between privileged and marginalized groups, since they abstract away from that in their tags. Specific links from the aff:

1. Their framing of hedonism as the ultimate good means we never critically examine WHAT GIVES PEOPLE PLEASURE — means they PAPER OVER the problems with hedonistic colonialism

2. They position all forms of util as fundamentally the same — their meta-ethic assumes every form of pleasure is the same — means they equate white colonizers’ sense of pleasure with that of the colonized, when those are fundamentally different

3. They assume pleasure alone is valuable — that’s the literal logic of colonizers — the idea that we should do whatever we want to make ourselves happy IS THE LOGIC OF WHITE WESTERNIZATION

4. Their methods section is a giant link — they prop up a ruse of solvency with Archer — relying on “legal education” means we ONLY EVER LOOK TO WHAT THE LAW \*IS\* and don’t get to function outside of it — that’s a tool of KEEPING THE COLONIZED IN POSITIONS OF SUBSERVIENCE

## B. Impact

#### [Smiles] SERIAL POLICY FAILURE – they’re trying to solve the wrong problem – ALL space appropriation furthers settler colonialist logic. Framing the aff as a solution misses the source of the harm; they misdiagnose the disease, so their cure won’t work.

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.

## 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.

#### [Kim 2] AND we solve better – A-O disrupts the Western humanism used to justify set col.

**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

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.

## DA

## A. Link

#### [Link] The aff read a 6-minute speech where they positioned themselves as the solvency advocate – they read the advocacy text by itself. This is NOT just a link of omission – it’s a norm that if you advocate for something, you read an author who supports that position.

## B. Impacts

#### 1. First, appropriation DA: they cite non-white authors to justify the aff, but don’t bother to ask them whether they think the advocacy is a good idea – it doesn’t matter whether they DO or not if you don’t actually cut that part of the literature. Your selective use of these authors lets you cherry-pick minority voices whenever it suits your interests – that’s a LINK TURN to the aff because you performatively show the very impositions you indict.

#### 2. [Aronson] Second, white saviorism: your framing positions YOU as the person who can stop cultural domination – if you aren’t citing authors who make that argument, who the frick died and made you the arbiter of what marginalized people want?

Aronson: Aronson, Brittany A. [Assistant Professor, Miami University] “The White Savior Industrial Complex: A Cultural Studies Analysis of a Teacher Educator, Savior Film, and Future Teachers.” *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, Vol. 6, Issue 3, 2017. CH

In 2012, Nigerian-American novelist Teju Cole coined the term white savior industrial complex (WSIC) in response to a popular video blowing up on YouTube – “Kony 2012.”1 The WSIC refers to the “confluence of practices, processes, and institutions that reify historical inequities to ultimately validate white privilege” (Anderson, 2013, p. 39). Essentially, as Cole explained, a WSIC involves a “big emotional experience that validates privilege.” Ultimately, people are rewarded from “saving” those less fortunate and are able to completely disregard the policies they have supported that have created/maintained systems of oppression (i.e. The U.S.’s exploitation in Haiti has contributed to poverty and corruption, yet Americans can feel good about their charity after the Earthquake). The rhetoric around how Americans often talk about Africa—as a continent of chaos, warthirsty people, and impoverished HIV-infected communities, situates these countries as places in need of heroism. This mindset perpetuates the need for external forces to come in and save the day, but what gets left out of this conversation are the roles settler colonialism and white supremacy have had in creating these conditions in the first place (Smith, 2012). 2 Distorted narratives that paint Africa and other developing countries in these ways allow for the hegemonic project of whiteness and white supremacy (Allen, 2001) to do exactly as intended: to create a need for white intervention for “emotional needs to be satisfied” so the opportunity for agency at the local or individual level becomes nonexistent (Cole, 2012). The argument is framed in such a commonsense manner that any opposition to a white savior coming in to save the day is deemed in a negative light.

**Turns and outweighs the aff on CYCLICAL HARMS – they CREATE THE CONDITIONS THEY TRY TO SOLVE.**

## Case

#### [Etheredge 1] COGNITIVE ETHNOCENTRISM: they assume what’s best for [insert country] without analyzing that country’s history or culture – creates both performative and substantive harms.

Etheredge 1: Etheredge, Lloyd S., Ph.D. [Research Director, Policy Sciences Center, Inc.] “Is American Foreign Policy Ethnocentric? Notes Toward a Propositional Inventory.” American Political Science Association, 1988. CH

The study of ethnocentric biases can be bracketed by two null hypotheses: Null Hypothesis (1): No Bias De facto, most of international systems theory assumes - and tells students - that culturally-based perceptions are irrelevant to the analysis of international relations. An American can readily analyze the international behavior of country A or country B, or a hegemon, or a client state, without much regard to the name of the country, its history, languages, customs, or cultures. Just as economists tell us that profit maximization behavior is universal, and use models with the (alleged) power to transcend time, place, and circumstance, so an international systems theorist would tell us that power-maximization behavior (subject to security dilemma constraints) embodies a universal grammar. One can tell - and understand the story of power and politics, in the same terms, regardless of century or culture. Thus, Piscatori ((1985), p. 320)) is probably representative of most international relations theorists when he asserts that "Muslim statesmen, like all statesmen, are guided more by the cold calcula tions of national interests than by the passionate commitment to ideological values... Muslim leaders invariably go about determining their business as 4 everyone else does. There may be much to say for this null hypothesis. Certainly, standard world histories use a set of conventional categories to tell the story of most international events across cultures and millenia (e.g., Roberts (1984), Kennedy (1988)). American behavioral theorists and political anthropologists, alike, have readily adopted similar categories and ideas about power to discuss a wide range of cases (e.g., Bailey (1969), Riker (1962): coalition-formation, authority relations, dominance and dependency, leadership and followership, deterrence and revolution (etc.), are taken to be categories that represent crosscultural and trans-historical universals:

He adds:

Types of Ethnocentric Bias There are four types of ethnocentric biases which might be distinguished: A. Cognitive ethnocentrism By cognitive ethnocentrism I refer to “innocent” errors in which the categories for understanding the world unwittingly and erroneously generalize from one’s own culture. Rather than being objective, the decision maker uses overlays for understanding the world which, like the use of alchemy rather than chemistry, lead to repeated policy failure. We might imagine three levels at which this type of pr might be observed in case material: 1. The simple generalization of one's experience with others in one's own culture. Thus Harry Truman, for example, is said to have thought Joseph Stalin was similar to Boss Pendergast of Missouri and erroneously expected Stalin to behave like an American party boss (Larson (1987). 2. The broader overlay of political categories that reflect the naive assumption that other nations, and leaders can be understood readily by using the model of one’s own political system. Thus, for example, we might predict that American foreign policy has only been grounded in realism and worked well in one specialized arena Western Europe in the period since World War II. A similarity between political cultures (plus the teaching, in America, of its European cultural heritage) has helped to create a local match between what Shepard (1987) has, in another context, called "the principles of the mind and the regularities of the world." The categories and theories of America’s political culture generalized successfully in circumstances where decision makers could pursue American security interests, work through established governments which are democratic (and in countries whose elites wish them to be), and champion freedom, stability, and economic growth in the same coherent package without troubling trade-offs. The Marshall Plan reconstruction of Western European economies after World War ll and the NATO alliance against the Soviet Union effectively served American security, political stability, economic growth, and other shared values. Such an American template, transferred elsewhere, is probably a good candidate to introduce ethnocentric biases. It may not organize realistic analyses and effective choices for successful policies in areas of the world with other principles of cultural and political organization; instead, it will produce policies impeded by irrelevant categories. (E. g. Wiarda (1985), Etheredge (1985), p. 172) . 3. Category errors may be simple, relatively innocent, errors. But they may also arise because the world is understood through scripts which place America at the vanguard of the forces of history with the belief that political forces and human aspirations in other countries tend, naturally to press their political development toward becoming like the United States. The analysis of the concept of "political development," for example, presents numerous arguments that American-derived cognitive templates have been used inappropriately for understanding developing countries.