

Model Minority K

Objectivity is defined as

(Merriam Webster) <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/objectivity>

the quality or character of being objective : **lack of favoritism toward one side or another** : freedom from bias.

Links

Objectivity is impossible, reproduces the quo, and works to privilege dominant cultural ideologies.

Chison 10 [David Chison Oh, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at Denison University. His research interests include Asian/American representations in media, Asian American identity and media, and Asian American ethnic media 1/13/10 Complementary Objectivity and Ideology: Reifying White Capitalist Hierarchies in Time Magazine's Construction of Michelle Rhee]

<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.860.5947&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Objectivity as a journalistic norm has been much criticized. Both Schudson and Altschull point out that objectivity was not historically the professional norm for news workers but that it **emerged as a means of selling more papers** because the **apolitical perspectives** could **attract a larger client base for the** Associated **Press** and larger circulations for daily newspapers. Despite its pragmatic economic beginnings, objectivity has become so widely accepted that simply **criticizing** the norm of **objectivity** in public discourse **has become unacceptable** (Altschull, 1995). This is **because** the norm **of** objectivity has been associated with the positivist science **belief that facts can be separated from values** (Schudson, 1999) **and that journalists are neutral transmitters** of facts (Reese, 1990). This assumption, **however**, has been widely challenged. Scholars argue that **journalists are unable to separate their own value systems from their reports** (Gans, 1979) because **knowledge is interpreted through the journalist's own standpoint** (Tuchman, 1999). Furthermore, Entman writes that **impartiality is impossible because writing and editorial choices necessarily reflect value judgments**. **Journalists**, however, **hold on to** norms of **objectivity because it protects the credibility of the profession** (Gans, 1979) and because it protects individual journalists from criticism and charges of libel (Entman, 1989) in what Gaye Tuchman has called the "strategic ritual of objectivity." **By providing two sides of a story, journalists can claim their reports are fair** (Altschull, 1995) and that seeing multiple points of view approaches more closely "objective truth" (Fishman, 1980). Though objectivity may legitimate journalism and protect journalists, multiple scholars argue that **objectivity reproduces the dominant status quo** (Altschull, 1995; Dolan, 2005; Entman, 1989; Gans, 1979; Glasser, 1992; Glasser & Ettema, 1991; Goldman & Rajagopal, 1991; Hackett, 1984; Marken, 2007; Parenti, 1993; Reese, 1990; Schudson, 2003; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996; Young, 1990). **Objectivity works to privilege dominant cultural ideologies in three ways. First, when journalists' beliefs align with what they perceive as universal** or dominant cultural beliefs, **they do not realize they are violating norms of objectivity by reproducing these dominant cultural beliefs** (Gans, 1979; Young, 1990). **Second**, the norm of **objectivity requires reporters to tease apart their subjectivity** and strip their analysis from a story (Entman, 1989; Wien, 2005). To write a story that still has analysis, depth, and opinion, reporters turn to sources to provide perspective. By and large, sources that are sought are "official" sources because their positions of authority resonate with the news value of prominence (Croteau & Hoynes, 2003; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996), because it is relatively easier to find official sources Downloaded from jci.sagepub.com at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on March 5, 2016 154 Journal of Communication Inquiry 34(2) (Shah, 1993), and **because of journalists' close relationships to dominant elites** (Reese, 1990). Furthermore, **journalists tend to**

uncritically accept the definitions and points of **view of political and other elites** (Hackett, 1984; Young, 1990), **legitimizing the status quo and delegitimizing marginalized groups** (Young, 1990). To further cement social power, **elites can manipulate the norms of objectivity to favor their points of view** (Entman, 1989) such that news **media are** the unwitting **vehicles** through **which power is maintained** (Altschull, 1995). Though it is arguable that the bias is unintentional, close working relationships with official sources leads to news that reinforces the values of powerful social actors and institutions, reinforcing the cultural and political status quo (Blank-Libra, 2004; Croteau & Hoynes, 2003; Herman & Chomsky, 2002). **Third, journalists can manipulate the norm of objectivity themselves to favor particular points of view** while hiding their biases from view. Shah (1993) writes that reporters can hide in an “aura of neutrality,” **claiming that they are acting independently while, in fact, being intertwined with special interests**. The “aura of neutrality” then, **acts as disguise for naturalizing ideological domination**. Reese (1990) also pointed out that perceived impartiality disguises ideological messages, **blunting counterhegemonic opposition**. Similarly, Friedman (1998) writes that **objectivity hides the ideological role of the press in shaping culture and public opinion**. One method identified by Parenti (1993) to hide and legitimate dominant ideology is through “false balancing.” False balancing hides dominant ideology because it appears the reporter has done her due diligence in examining all sides of a story, while actually propping up the favored perspective and delegitimizing the disfavored perspective. Goldman and Rajagopal (1991) pointed out that in coverage of labor, the use of objectivity is frequently employed to falsely pit labor’s “demands” against society rather than corporate management. In the case above, objectivity hides power by presenting a weak, labor argument against a “commonsensical,” capitalist argument and by inaccurately presenting the conflict as labor versus the general society, while hiding and favoring capitalist points of view.

The Model Minority Myth emerged and is perpetuated by the media

Reynoso 18 [Valerie Reynoso is an Author at CounterPunch.org Founded in 1994, CounterPunch is a bi-monthly magazine published in the United States that covers politics 2018/05/10/ history of the model minority myth in the us]

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2018/05/10/history-of-the-model-minority-myth-in-the-us/>

“Model Minority” is an idea that **emerged during the 1960s in the US that states that nonwhite groups of people are able to essentially revoke racial and socioeconomic oppression, that pose as barriers to achieving and earning as much as whites, through hard work**. One of the main racial groups that are popularized as being a model minority group is Asians. **According to the model minority myth, Asians are the racial minority group that managed to prosper in the US through hard work and education, hence setting an example for other marginalized racial groups to follow**. Despite this, **history shows that the idea of the model minority is a myth that was perpetuated by corporate media, as well as tokenizes oppressed nationalities to justify the bootstrap theory**. Asian-Americans are stereotyped as the model minority and as having significant proximity to whiteness and the upper class. This is not necessarily true given the history and continuation of how Asian-Americans have been and continue to be treated in the US. From the 1850s to the post-WWII era, Asian-Americans were socialized as an inferior, foreign specimen that posed a threat to the Anglo-Saxon, Protestant race. Chinese migrants were seen as a “Yellow Peril” that is always foreign no matter for how many generations they have resided in the US. This orientalism and xenophobia were used to subjugate Chinese male workers as underpaid indentured servants, during the California Gold Rush of the 1850s and the construction of the Transcontinental Railroad. These Chinese laborers were also confined to segregated communities where they would also be fallen victim to racial mob violence. Anti-asian laws in the US further codified orientalism as part of the institutionally racist oppression of Asian-Americans. For instance, the Chinese Exclusion Act banned immigration based on national origin and required Chinese leaving the US to receive special permits to return. Additionally, Chinese laborers, regardless of skill level, were prohibited from entering Congress. In 1860, California banned Asians from public schools and Asian children were rendered inferior in said institutions. Likewise, Executive Order 9066 authorized the internment of Japanese-Americans under US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1942 during WWII, when the US was at a peak of anti-Japanese orientalism. It is more than evident that prior to the 1960s, Asian-Americans were socialized and treated as dangerous foreigners and subjects of capitalist, socioeconomic exploitation—which is far from embodying the idea of the model minority. The 1960s marked a turning point regarding widespread perception and treatment of Asian-Americans in the US, as well as the connotation of model minority denoting Asian-Americans. **In January 1966, the New York Times published a piece titled “Success Story, Japanese-American Style,”** by sociologist William Peterson. **This article illustrated Japanese-Americans as being the most superior group in the US**, even exceeding the status of white Americans. This contrasts greatly with the 1942 internment of

Japanese-Americans in concentration camps, which hid them away from the rest of US society and contributed to their erasure and invisibility. **The elevated image of Asian-Americans spiked in the mid-1960s, greatly due to corporate media spreading the model minority myth** and coinciding with growing tensions among African-Americans. During this time period, African-Americans were dominating national attention given their demands for racial equality and the development of the Civil Rights Movement. In the 1990s, many white college students felt racially victimized due to their belief that Asian-Americans were more accomplished than them and that US universities had implemented biased policies in favor of African-Americans, such as affirmative action. Given this, the model minority myth was applied differently to Asian-Americans and African-Americans because Asian-Americans were seen as a group that had risen up the social ladder and gained proximity to whiteness and the bourgeois class on their own, whereas African-Americans were seen as a people who gained privileges due to so-called handouts from institutions and getting by with less hardship due to that. Both embodiments of Asian-American and African-American model minority myths also uphold the bootstrap theory. The bootstrap theory emerged during the European era of immigration from 1880-1920 and is the idea that one simply has to work hard and “pull themselves up by the bootstraps,” whereas African-Americans had supposedly become a model minority by government support and affirmative action. **The idea of the model minority myth is a fallacy because in order for a group to be socialized as such, they have to assimilate into the dominant culture and gain proximity to whiteness by all means or have racial stereotypes imposed on them.**

Impacts

We buy into media perception of Asian Americans and become complicit within the myth. It causes a complete erasure of communities that don’t abide by that perspective. We are silenced, our problems are ignored, our struggles are invisible.

Kuo 15 [Rachel Kuo is a Contributing Writer for Everyday Feminism and a scholar and educator based in New York City. Her professional background is in designing curriculum and also communications strategy for social justice education initiatives 4/2/15 6 Reasons We Need to Dismantle the Model Minority Myth of Those ‘Hard-Working’ Asians]
<https://everydayfeminism.com/2015/04/dismantle-model-minority-myth/>

The myth flattens and erases Asian American identity. Asian American identities that don’t abide by the model minority rulebook are deemed invalid. Our validity and value is determined by our utility in preserving the racial hierarchy. Not only is it eugenic to ascribe character traits, like quiet, polite, and obedient, to an entire racial group, **the myth prevents coalition building within our diverse Asian American communities.** There are radically different histories, experiences, and oppressions across the Asian American diaspora, yet **often, we are lumped together as one ambiguous other.** Whenever people think about ‘Asian’ identities, they think specifically of East Asian identities, such as Chinese, Japanese, or Korean. Other groups in the Asian and Pacific Islander diaspora are erased, and their **lived realities and challenges are diminished.** **Assuming all Asians are the same, the myth also creates a mono-dimensional Asian American without regard to intersections. It does not take into account class, citizenship, language, gender, sexuality, ability, religion or other social identities.** 5. The model minority myth is used to deny racial justice. **In invoking this myth, policymakers also fail to recognize existing inequities** and create access for Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) subgroups and other racial groups. The myth **makes the economic and educational struggles** of low-income AAPI families, Pacific Islanders, Southeast Asian refugees, undocumented immigrants, and other groups **invisible** – its unambiguity and inaccuracy **makes it a convenient narrative that prevents solutions to racial and socioeconomic inequity.** For example, **only 12-13% of Hmong, Cambodian, and Laotian Americans have a college degree and less than 10% of Samoan-Americans do. 2.3 million Asian Americans are**

uninsured. AAPI groups suffer from physical and mental health disorders due to lack of culturally competent care. They're left out of leadership roles at the top of organizations. Many AAPI groups also live in poverty, face labor exploitation, and are disenfranchised from the education system. Focusing on those that are doing well makes the issues of those who aren't far less visible.

Alt

My method is conscientization – a process of constant clarification that allows us to name the world and perceive how I exist in it – through this dynamic process we have already begun and will continue

Osajima 07 [2007, Keith Osajima is a professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands. REPLENISHING THE RANKS: Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans; JOURNAL OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES (JAAS), February, Volume 10, No. 1; p. 64]

Conscientization for these respondents meant **being able to “name their world.”** That is, **a meaningful education** had helped them **to recognize** and understand **the impact** that societal conditions and forces **of oppression** have on their **lives** and the lives **of others**. As Friere writes, **the process of conscientization**, or education for critical consciousness, **involves a constant clarification of what remains hidden within us while we move about in the world,”** and it provokes “recognition of the world, not as a ‘given’ world, but as a world dynamically ‘in the making.” **Such recognition** often **inspires people to work against** that **oppression**, thus beginning their active efforts to transform the world. **Naming the world was an important step toward actively changing it.**

Framing

ROTB – prefer the team that best liberates oppressed groups. Prefer this interpretation for 2 reasons

Prefer:

- 1) Actualizing education as debaters is key. Simply talking about other things doesn't resolve how we ourselves as high schoolers can change the world. Education doesn't matter if we can't actualize it.**
- 2) Liberating oppressed groups is key for bringing more education to minorities and people. It's the only thing you as the judge can do. A vote for the neg says that conscientization is a good method and should be applied**
- 3) Ethics can't operate if they exclude voices**
- 4) Excluding voices reinforces hierarchies**

Discussion and understanding of the Racial privilege Asian Americans possess is key in resisting complicity within the myth and destroying white supremacy through multiple small coalitions.

Kuran 18 [Elena Kuran is pursuing a BA in International Affairs with minors in Ethics, Global Social Entrepreneurship, and Japanese at Northeastern University in Boston, MA 3/24/18 Anti-blackness in Asian and Asian-American Communities] <http://www.nupoliticalreview.com/2018/03/24/anti-blackness-in-asian-and-asian-american-communities/>

#Asians4BlackLives is another good example of how Asian Americans can stop being complicit in the systematic and institutionalized killing of black Americans. They're a Bay Area based group that have established principles and protocols for how best to stand in solidarity with #BlackLivesMatter. Bolded on their "Who We

Are" page: "We understand that our liberation depends on the liberation of Black people." [21] And they're right—**liberation from white supremacy is a collective struggle shared between every community of color.** So I call upon my community, a community I am proud to be a part of and want to see do better, to recognize the anti-blackness it perpetuates both internally and externally. We are not perfect; we have been influenced by dominant racist institutions, but there's also no excuse for complicity. **It's time to build mutual understanding through discussion, and** to help each other **unlearn beliefs that were instilled** without our consent but nevertheless held by our complicity. **We have an important role as the racial middle on the black/white** binary **paradigm of race** that dominates mainstream understandings of race **in America.** As Mari Matsuda said in her speech to the Asian Law Caucus in 1990, "**The middle can dismantle white supremacy if it refuses to be the middle, if it refuses to buy into racial hierarchy, and if it refuses to abandon communities of black and brown people, choosing instead to forge alliances with them**

A2