Their strategy against suffering and oppression are mere compulsions based on ressentiment and reaction to escape the inevitable reality of suffering. This produces an impotence and destructiveness against the world, maintaining a dominant self-aggrandizement against society.

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg 68-70

The burden of this chapter is to expose the insidious nature of _ressentiment_, a disease of the mind which drastically distorts reality for the specific purpose of the self-aggrandizement of an individual or group. Obviously those who feel the need for self-aggrandizement are those who experience themselves as somehow weak, insignificant, and even impotent in their world as they perceive it. The constitution of the world, as they find it, is radically and hurtfully different from the way they would like it to be. They perceive it as unwelcoming, strange, fundamentally unmanageable and hence, in some inexplicable sense, dangerous. This apparent unmanageability, this seemingly inherent danger in the constitution of the world, presents itself as an existential problematic to be resolved—or circumvented. To experience the world thus, I suggest, is to suffer a peculiar estrangement and a desire to escape genuine encounter with what is. Thus, estrangement is the fundamental experience of the individual or group infected with _ressentiment_, estrangement resulting from a basic sense of impotence.

To overcome this sense of impotence, the suffering individual or group employs a variety of strategies, psychological maneuvers, as compensatory measures. Quite naturally, the more satisfactory these strategies prove to be, the more they reduce his anxieties by camouflaging what appear to be the inherent dangers of the world, the more the sufferer resorts to them until they harden into existential traits, into habits that define and circumscribe his way of life. Therefore, his sense of security, his well-being, depends on the efficacy of these strategies. Differently expressed, these strategies become, for him, _existentially necessary_ defenses against reality.

In time, these existentially necessary strategies become, in a profound sense, _compulsions_ which severely inhibit the individual's growth as a person, rendering him psychologically and even intellectually inflexible. Since they are reactions to the individual's perception of his world, they mark his way of life as fundamentally _reactive_, and never proactive, since the latter implies the possibility of risk, and hence of danger. It should be evident, however, that a

[margin annotations: "- we are not", "1", "2", "3", "4"]

reactive way of life is one that refuses to come to terms with experiences as they truly are. Thus, it is a mode of avoidance which, in the final analysis, is an attempt to deny reality by trying, in a manner of speaking, "to go around it" or "to fly over it." This attempt at flight from reality constitutes at once the most urgent need and basic strategy of *ressentiment*.

The most obvious point to bear in mind is that the denial of reality is an act of the imagination which *transfigures* the world to make it compatible with the needs of the suffering individual or group. This transfiguration, albeit imaginary, is a manifestation of the creative possibilities of *ressentiment*. It is here, precisely, that the disease becomes dangerous, not only to the sufferer, but to the world that confronts him. For the transfiguration is a *striking out* at the real world, an attempt to annihilate its compelling and intractable and dangerous immanence. It is the suffering individual's attempt to negate the reality of the world he finds unendurable, yet inescapable. Thus transfiguration is the individual's desperate effort to destroy the world as it presents itself to him, and in this respect *ressentiment* manifests its destructive capabilities as well.

Since it was estrangement that caused the individual's desire to transfigure the world in the first place, it follows that to the extent that he is eventually able to feel "at home" in the world, to that extent he has succeeded in transforming it. To say that this transfiguration is an act of the imagination it not to say that it is innocent or harmless in its implications for the external world. To be sure, current trends of "happiness" psychology view "successful transfiguration" of the world, even if imaginary, as successful "coping." But this "happiness" psychology, which seeks "coping" as its end, is an extreme perversion of traditional psychological hedonism derived from the teachings of Epicurus. Whereas Epicureanism, properly understood, takes into account the dangers of extremism in self-indulgence and teaches judicious moderation in the gratification of desires, today's "happiness" psychology (so prevalent on TV and in run-of-the-mill newspaper columns) advocates an egotism bordering on solipsism. That is, by advocating the view that "whatever makes me cope is good," this "happiness" psychology sends the message that nothing exists save that which serves to make me happy. On this view, reality-denial is a valid "coping mechanism" until it proves otherwise.

It is this "otherwise" that is problematic, whether we are considering "happiness" psychology or *ressentiment*. In either case, the mechanism of denial is central as a mode of being-in-the-world. For the individual stricken with *ressentiment*, it is not merely the attainment of happiness that makes reality-denial necessary—but *existence itself*. It is the sense that he simply cannot exist in the world as it is, that

Ressentiment is the fundamental lens that has created the possibility of anti-black discrimination, slavery, disempowerment, and colonization of indigenous people, which operates on the basis of dehumanization

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

It is commonly supposed that white racism is a disease of sorts, such that if white people would only come to understand this, and just cure themselves, then black people would to a large extent and at long last be unshackled from the chains of their subordination and oppression. Thus construed, racism has been singled out as the culprit, the primary hindrance to black progress, the fundamental burden placed on the backs of black people. But this argument is unsound because the basic premise—namely, that racism is a disease—is false.

After a long and absorbing study of the problem of white racism and black oppression, I have come to the contentious conclusion that racism is *not* the disease that it has been made out to be, but a mere *symptom* of an underlying disease, a peculiar and uniquely European pathology diagnosed by Nietzsche as *ressentiment*, and by Sigmund Freud as a cultural neurosis which characterizes European civilization.

Ressentiment is the fundamental burden of being black in a white-dominated world. It is a disease that manifests itself in manifold and insidious ways, with racism being its most overtly recognizable form. Indeed, even racism is a cover to hide an essential aspect of this disease, namely, a desperate and obsessive need for self-aggrandizement.

This obsessive need for self-aggrandizement has given rise to a host of problems constituting the so-called "pathology of black life conditions." The "peculiar institution" of slavery, the disempowerment of indigenous peoples by imperialism and colonialism, as well as the infamous Jim Crow laws, and the prevailing system of anti-black discrimination, have all been consequences of the white obsession with self-aggrandizement.

Among the manifold ways of its expression, as we shall see, *ressentiment* entails elements of xenophobia and misanthropy. It is the psychological project of racism to hide both of these entailments. Racism would not be possible without xenophobia; and its ruthlessness in the service of imperialism and colonialism would have been impossible without the misanthropy which it hides.

Ressentiment has remained undetected precisely because of its insidiousness, and because of our habit of interpreting phenomena from the surface. Thus, for example, the victim-blaming psychology so well explored by William Ryan, in his book *Blaming the Victim* (1971), has served effectively to mask the disease of *ressentiment*. In fact, victim-blaming is a form of psychological projection which, as I shall show, is an essential self-protecting mechanism in the *modus operandi* of *ressentiment*. And no one has suffered more from the victim-blaming syndrome than have black people in a white-dominated world. I shall show why black people have been the most logically appropriate, though profoundly unfortunate, victims of this *ressentiment* projection.

As victims of the white man's obsession with self-aggrandizement, black people have failed in their liberation efforts because of their lack of self-knowledge. This is not to cast aspersion on the collective intelligence of black people, which would be absurd. Rather, it is to say that, historically, black people have been conditioned to think of themselves as quite other than they are: they have been taught deliberate falsehoods about themselves. They have been beaten, coerced, and cajoled into believing—or into professing belief in—these falsehoods, which have been exclusively negative. These teachings, lessons in black inferiority, have come from the Europeans with a single overriding motive, namely, their own self aggrandizement. This white passion for self-aggrandizement, which necessitated the myth of black inferiority, has been the greatest obstacle to black liberation and hence to any meaningful black progress.

To begin with, having been captured to be brought to the New World as a docile labor force, the Africans were effectively deprogrammed as persons; they were *depersonalized*, robbed of their identity, with the intention of making them completely subservient to the white captors and entirely dependent. They were forbidden to form meaningful group relationships, for fear of the very real possibility of insurgency. For centuries, by virtue of the same fear, they were forbidden to speak their native languages and were allowed to learn only so much of the rudiments of a perverted version of English as would render them serviceable in bondage. Strict laws were enacted forbidding anyone to teach black people to read and write—effectively prohibiting communication and access to any information that might arouse their curiosity about their peculiar and insupportable condition as bondsmen in a strange land amidst utterly freakish and cruel men. Perceived as heathens, the Africans were taught to worship a white Christian God, in a white heaven surrounded by a host of white angels and saints, but a God whose earthly representatives were the very white people who were terrorizing them into servitude. For the white God, they were

taught, demanded obedience and subservience to white men. They were taught that such subservience and obedience to white men as God demanded might, in time, be richly rewarded.

The white obsession with self-aggrandizement necessitated a full-scale program of dehumanization of the Africans, a wiping away of all traces of their past, an obliteration of their sense of ever having been somebody. The systematic obliteration of the Africans' past, the radical denial of their history, while it enhanced the self-aggrandizement of white people, left black people for the most part in a limbo on the time-line of human development. Insofar as this demolition of the Africans' past succeeded, a more cruel form of dehumanization can hardly be imagined—orchestrated by a people, Europeans and Euro-Americans, who actually were foolish enough to consider themselves civilized.

As a legacy of the horrors of centuries of dehumanization, historians and anthropologists like Melville Herskovits, for example, have been at pains to make sense of "the myth of the Negro past." Even the notion of a "myth" here suggests, absurdly, that black people had no past, no history until they were ravaged by Europeans. But this "myth," as I shall show, has been a product of the white mind in its diseased and tortured state. The African past, in case white people have conveniently "forgotten," is proudly coincident with the origin of man, and hence with the beginning of human history. Thus the only myth to be clarified is the *white myth* of "the myth of the Negro past." The great wonder, then, is not whether the Africans had a past, but that, in a sense miraculously, they have been able to survive the centuries of torture and malicious oppression suffered at the hands of "civilized" white people.

The alternative is a confrontation with the Hell which is reality - it is only through this stance that oppressed individuals can attain a self-consciousness and self-transcendence as a prerequisite to true freedom.

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

The African's declivity is synonymous with a secular fall from grace, his loss of nativity, so to speak, and his absorption into and by that turbulent stream of an utterly alien experience of radical unfreedom—physically, spiritually, metaphysically. Yet there is, Fanon has suggested, a possibility of rebirth, of self-transformation through transcendence.

But transcendence is devoid of passivity; it is the festive conquest after the struggle *to be*, the reward for becoming oneself. It is the prize, as Zarathustra would say, of self-overcoming. The struggle to overcome, to attain the ascent, demands manly courage—courage to be zestful. And yet, Fanon doubts: "in most cases," he says, "the black man lacks the advantage of being able to accomplish this descent into a real hell" (1967:8). This "lack," I suggest, is his lack of authentic self-consciousness, that inner/outer acute awareness of one's relation with his world. This lack constitutes a man's self-imprisonment, his unfreedom. It is precisely this condition of unfreedom that is the African's problem, for it shuts him off from a vision of his ownmost reality, and hence from a cognizance of his own self. Thus, he cannot encounter his real self, which in its nakedness constitutes the "real hell" of which Fanon speaks, and which, ultimately, is the springboard for the possibility of transcendence. The inability to encounter oneself in one's nakedness renders an individual disadvantaged and radically impotent with respect to the possibility of transcendence. For the most part, on Fanon's view, this is the condition of the African: a perverse lack of *self-understanding* and perhaps even an unwillingness to make that treacherous leap into that hell which is the necessary prerequisite for the radical self-enlightenment, without which he can never be truly free. In consequence, unillumined, the truth of his own reality, as African, eludes him, and he sees himself only as others—the Europeans—see him, from a distance as it were, distorted. Thus he sees himself, however dimly, in the reality of the Other: which is to say that his meaning, his ontological significance, resides in that Other. In that case, Fanon is right when he says: "However painful it may be for me to accept this conclusion, I am obliged to state it: For the black man there is only one destiny. And it is white" (10).

We embrace Life-affirmation as the ideological proactive stance in light of the ruling principle of Eurocentricity is the way to overcome and transgress the ressentiment embedded in the impacts of the affirmative. Our leap into affirmation is the way to gain self-transcendence

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

Now clearly, all the observations made thus far suggest that Eurocentricity, the reigning ideology of the modern world, requires its dialectical opposite, its own negation, if we are to emerge as human persons properly speaking. The life-denying, life-stultifying character of the European *Weltanschauung* must be overcome, must be supplanted, and be replaced by an ideology of life-affirmation. The ideology of life-affirmation entails the full range of possibilities for our self-transcendence. It entails nothing less than the reclaiming of self-respect by nonwhite peoples from the deadly grasp of those *ressentiment*-laden Europeans who, by virtue of their misguided will to power, are convinced that the destiny of the whole human race rests not in the hands of the God they have compelled most of mankind to worship, but in their own hands. By implication at least, those Europeans have presumptively ascribed to themselves the very omniscience and omnipotence that they have said belong only to God. The arrogance of this conviction is a clear manifestation of the diseased form of Eurocentricity, namely, Eurocentr*ism*. More particularly, it is symptomatic of a species of megalomania which has its roots in the Europeans' misguided will to power, their indomitable will to dominate.

But Eurocentrism leads inexorably to the abyss of which Fanon spoke, to the pit of iniquity. It leads to the maelstrom made possible by the European *ressentiment*-created cosmology of illusions. To paraphrase Karl Marx, Eurocentrism is the death-knell of mankind. For this very reason, Eurocentrism must be overcome, must be left behind as a gross aberration in man's historical development—in just the same sense in which, on Freud's view, individuals must leave behind the primodial stage of "pri-

"primary narcissism" as a necessary condition of maturity as human persons. Psychological health or maturity entails an increasing ability to be open to the otherness of others, to the possibility of loving others, and hence to the possibility of widening one's world. On the contrary, however, the European's obsession with self-aggrandizement is symptomatic of an exaggerated fixation on his over-prized self. However, this manifest inability to move beyond—to transcend—the primordial love of self, the absolute refusal to embrace or accept the otherness of others as legitimate, is significantly symptomatic of what Freud has called the

"narcissistic neuroses." Ives Hendricks, an outstanding practitioner and teacher of psychoanalysis, whose authoritative study, *Facts and Theories of Psychoanalysis* (1946), is still considered an exemplary text, explains the problem of the narcissistic neuroses as follows:

> The extreme example of pathological over-evaluation of self is seen in the megalomaniac, who has so completely "invested" his own person with his own love as to be indifferent to anything but his own greatness, beauty, or power.... He does not consciously lie about himself; he actually *feels* himself to be the greatest and most important of human specimens. (116)

That this description fits the clinical picture of the pathology of *ressentiment* should be evident. But there is more, as David Stafford-Clark (1972) tells us: "Patients with narcissistic neuroses...live in their inner world of woe or exaltation, of terror or despair, and have nothing to offer or accept from the outside world" (160). There is no doubt that this clinical picture from the psychoanalytic angle of vision is compatible with Nietzsche's diagnosis of *ressentiment*-laden Europeans who inhabit their self-made cosmology of illusions. Nor, as we have seen, is there any doubt that these illusions are productions of the Eurocentric imagination. It is this world, the *eurocentristically* contrived world, that we must leave behind, because it is in essence reality-negating. And we must make its antithesis, *life-affirmation*, our creed and *praxis*. We must make life-affirmation nothing less than the most urgent categorical imperative for all who desire to be "whole men," in Fanon's ontologically significant sense of this phrase.

We should never doubt for a moment that life-affirmation as a way of life is possible. Despite the sickening providentialism advocated by Hegel in his philosophy of history, according to which our present state of *being-in-the-world* is at all times determined by God's unerring Reason, we know better. We know that human choice, in a profound and often incomprehensible way, has something to do with how we behave and what, eventually, we become. And we know that our choice entails responsibility for what we do as long as we live, and hence responsibility for the guilt and shame, or innocence and praise, that we ultimately receive as our just punishment or reward.

(L) democracy

Eurocentric values embedded into Americanization through democracy is controlled by ressentiment which inevitably do violence to non-whites

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

No more prophetic words were uttered in the century, and they came from his wide experience of racism, in America and abroad; from his extraordinary breadth of scholarship concerning Africa and Africans; his pioneering research in the as yet uncharted sea of ambiguities of race relations (at a time when what we now know as sociology did not yet exist), and finally – and perhaps most importantly – from a close analysis of his own inner experience of what he has so appropriately called his "two-ness," that near-schizoid and tragic sense of being at once two distinct persons, one black, the other American, with not so much as a hyphen to give that sense of unity, that experience of self-cohesion so necessary for genuine personhood. His prophesy was relayed to the world with utmost sincerity, but he was repaid in the end with enmity – even the enmity of some of his own race who thought that although racism existed, you would have to look very hard to find it. And so his talk of a virulent racism infecting the whole body politic in America and the rest of the European-dominated world was viewed by some as a psychological projection of his own bitter black racism.

Now the twentieth century has ended, and Du Bois' ringing prophecy still has not been heeded with either the seriousness or the urgency that reason and common sense would have suggested. And as the century closed, one could feel a resurgence, a scarce-muffled reawakening, of the treacherous pathology of racism just beyond the horizon. If, as some historians believe, the future resembles the past, and if on that assumption one can draw reasonable inferences about what the future holds, then whatever else the future brings, racism will rear its ugly head as an ineliminable feature of twenty-first century American civilization. Worse, since America is *the* dominating culture-bearing power in the world, then the Eurocentric value-paradigm which drives America's ideological sense of world supremacy can be expected to do further damage to the spiritual integrity and aspirations of the nonwhite world. For The malaise of *ressentinent* expresses itself here in the desire to Americanize the world, a desire which hides behind the putatively providential imperative to "bring democracy" to the rest of the world's peoples, on the ground that they have been too retarded, and hence too "unfortunately placed" to understand and appreciate

No such thing as an indigenous nation

Champagne, 07 (Duane, member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa from North Dakota, *The American Indian Quarterly,*" In Search of Theory and Method in American Indian Studies", He is a professor of sociology and American Indian studies, a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the ucla Native Nations Law and Policy Center, p. 359-360)

Like the definition of who is an "Indian," <u>the definition of "indigenous peoples" has great implications, is controversial, and is often a stumbling block to ratification of the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples by nation-states in the United Nations. The expression "nations" is often used to describe indigenous peoples,</u> but as noted, <u>this expression is generally used for legal and political purposes and often does not describe the way that indigenous peoples understand their communities or polities. "Nation" is the term in use around the world, and indigenous [End Page 366] peoples in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere use the expression for political and legal rhetorical purposes. But a unified collection of individual citizens in support of the government is not the way most American Indians would describe their community organization. For many practical and legal purposes, "nation" is an expression of value, but for analytical and research purposes it does not describe traditional or many contemporary indigenous or American Indian political communities</u>. Many American Indian and indigenous communities are characterized by strong families and sometimes clans or bands. Often religion, political relations, economic organization, and community organization are closely interrelated. If American Indian peoples are nations only, then they fit into theories of nation, but "nation" has a very specific meaning in Western political theory. In many ways <u>"nation"</u> is the best term to use for political legal purposes, but it <u>does not conceptualize the specific patterns of internal political and social dynamics of Indian communities. If we are going to generate a theory of collective choice from the point of view of indigenous individuals, groups, and communities, then the term "nation" does not offer much insight into the diversity or possibilities for choice, change, or continuity within indigenous communities.</u>

Ressentiment is the root cause of violence that is perpetuated in terms of white racism in a Eurocentric value system. Only through an analysis of this concept can we attempt to cure the disease of white racism

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)   I want to suggest that as long as racism remains the entrenched problem that it is, then it cannot ever be discussed enough. I suggest that talking about racism becomes nauseating when it is just that, *talk;* when it becomes a matter of merely marshalling instances of its manifestations, a mere listing of cases to *prove* that there is racism in America. Talk about racism becomes interesting when it is enlightening as opposed to being idle, grievous chatter that goes around in vicious circles. It becomes interesting, and not nauseating, when we get an insight into *the very nature* of racism; when we come to understand that it is symptomatic of an illness, of a peculiar pathology, and when we get some insight into its cause or causes. For to understand the nature of an illness is to go along way towards trying to find a cure, if it is curable. Furthermore, once we understand that racism is the symptom of an illness, however irredeemable the racist might seem, we might still be able to view him in a somewhat different light. I am not here suggesting by "different light" that we should find him suddenly tolerable; as long as he remains a racist, neither he nor his behavior could be rationally tolerable. For he and his kind, and what they have done, have caused their country, and all of us, grievous harm, morally, politically, and spiritually. Most tragically, *racism has murdered* innocent people, and will continue to do so until it is well understood and treated at its roots.

I have argued that the roots of white racism are definitely traceable to, of all the unexpected places, a Eurocentric metaphysical system from which an absurdly narcissistic ontology was derived, favoring the European. But narcissism – secondary narcissism, to be precise – is a pathology, from which it follows that any axiology, any system of values founded upon it, must itself be pathological. It took a European genius, no less, to discover this. It took the genius of Friedrich Nietzsche to point out, through a most penetrating analysis of the condition of modern man, that the Eurocentric angle of vision which serves as the value-paradigm of Western civilization manifests not an "objective" view of the world as we are made to believe, but the psychological projection of a peculiar European soul-sickness which he diagnosed as *ressentiment.* Thus it was by way of a thoroughgoing *philosophical* analysis of the moral psychology of a people, the Europeans, that we have been brought to the threshold of a truly *existential* understanding of the phenomenon of white racism. That is to

say, through an existential analysis of *ressentiment*, we can now view the panoramic unfolding of the disease underlying white racism in its pathological manifoldness.

This is my basic motive for writing this book: to cease idle talk about a malaise that ravishes all that it touches, and to shed even a little light on its pathological nature such that somehow, soon, we might find a way to mute if not eliminate its terribly destructive capacity. Hopefully, this angle of vision that I bring to the subject might give rise to a different kind of debate, one founded less on emotions than on reason and experience. I take it that this debate is more urgent than it might seem. For now, at the start of the twenty-first century, black Americans have not, except on some gratuitous occasions, been allowed to enter the arena of the American Dream, though they have never ceased to dream. When the great W.E.B. Du Bois expressed his prescience in *The Souls of Black Folk* in 1903, many thought he was an alarmist, and his language hyperbolic. He said then, in words so uncomfortably true and so well known that they hardly need repeating: "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line – the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America, and the islands of the sea" (1989:13).

The black/white paradigm erases Asian bodies from the racial spectrum. This move by anti-racist liberals may seem to make the American race debate less complicated, but the link of omission is a real exclusion that dismisses a history of discrimination to make an over simplified argument about American racial apartheid
Shin, 2004 (Jean ,Asian Law Journal, "The Asian American Closet", May, 1 Asian L.J. 1, lexis)

For anti-racist liberals, the Asian American closet serves a different kind of protective function. For liberals, the existence of non-black minorities in America, such as Asian Americans, muddles and complicates the otherwise clear black/white dichotomy that has been at the center of the American race debate. Whitening non-black ethnics is one way to solve, or at least to ignore, the problem. To the extent that closeting, or covering, ethnic identity allows Asian Americans to appear "whitened," the Asian American closet allows the anti-racist project to proceed with less complication.
In an article that mainly focuses on the way that the black/white paradigm has worked to exclude Latinos/as from racial discourse, Juan F. Perea criticizes the "persistent focus of race scholarship on Blacks and Whites, and the resulting omission of Latinos/as, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and other racialized groups" from such race scholarship. Perea criticizes scholars such as Cornel West and Andrew Hacker for slighting the histories and experiences of Latinos and Latinas in their discussions on race. Similar criticisms of these scholars could easily be made with regards to their treatment of Asian Americans. In his book, Two Nations, Hacker describes the racial dynamics of the United States almost exclusively in terms of the black and white races. Hacker does mention the existence of Asian Americans, noting that "recent immigration from Asia and Latin America complicates any discussion of race." But any disruption to Hacker's black/white framework that is caused by this complicating immigration is quickly smoothed over by de-racing Asians and Latinos, and by making them, for the purposes of the discussion, into whites. Insofar as we consider the position of Asians and Latinos, Hacker says, "color is becoming less important. Most Asian immigrants arrive in this country ready to compete for middle-class careers ... so if Asians are not literally "white,' they have the technical and organizational skills expected by any "Western' or European-based culture."
Hacker thus erases the race of Asian Americans, by declaring that they are not "literally" white, but implying that they are effectively so. Hacker's characterization of Asians as readily assimilable, well-educated, and upwardly mobile echoes common perceptions of Asian Americans as being the "model minority." By dismissing Asian Americans as basically white, Hacker protects his original thesis: that America is a black and white country, effectively divided by an informal system of apartheid, which has deeply contributed to the continued class stratification of America along racial lines. An honest look at Asian American history would of course [*19] complicate this picture - Asian Americans, after all, have historically been excluded and discriminated against in a number of legal and extralegal ways. In order to avoid these problematizing complications, Hacker deracinates Asian Americans altogether.

Turn: Voting aff creates a static notion of whiteness: "Whiteness is white supremacy." That politics contributes to the project of white supremacy.

Monahan 08 (Michael J., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Marquette University, Racial Justice and the Politics of Purity, 2008, http://www.temple.edu/isrst/Events/documents/MichaelMonahanUpdated.doc)

The abolitionist/elimitavist position demands that any legitimately anti-racist endeavor stand simultaneously as a rejection of race, or at least racialized identity. As Alcoff and Outlaw have argued (though in different ways), this demands that one have an ahistorical sense of identity – that one reject the way in which one's "interpretive horizon" has been positioned by one's racial membership. Again, this is because **the abolitionist ontology** both **reduces whiteness to white supremacy – whiteness just is – purely - an affirmation of white supremacy, and offers an effectively disembodied account of agency, such that the only way to be anti-racist is to reject whiteness.** But what I have been trying to show is the way in which **the history of white people has always been one of ambiguity and contestation over the meaning of whiteness** (and that the same is true, though in different ways, for members of all racial categories). **The history is one of different people who were white in certain important ways, but were not white in other ways,** or at least were white in ways different from other white people, engaging in a process of arbitrating the meaning and significance of that whiteness. Part of **the project of white supremacy**, therefore, **was not merely the domination of non whites, but the determination of the meaning of whiteness as fixed, given, and above all, pure. It is a history of brutal conquest, genocide, chattel slavery, torture, and Jim Crow,** and by no means do I wish to suggest that we ignore or "white wash" that history. **But it is also the history of John Brown, Sophie Scholl, the San Patricio Brigade, and, among others, those Irish servants in Barbados who risked their lives alongside enslaved Africans. The insistence that antiracism must reject whiteness – that John Brown, in struggling against white supremacy, was therefore not white –capitulates to the politics of purity**. We must understand racial membership, therefore, not as a static and pure category of identity, but as an ongoing context for negotiating who "we" are (both as individuals and as groups) and how we relate to each other. Because races, like all social categories, are historical, and this history gives them meaning and significance, their reality is manifest both politically (in how our social structures and organizations take shape and interact) and individually (in how we understand ourselves and our place in the world). But, and this is the crucial point for my approach, the histories themselves are histories of contestation of meaning, and fraught with ambiguity, such that we participate in the process of shaping the meaning of race not only in the here and now, but also its meaning and significance historically. **The elimitavist ontology insists,** therefore, not **only on purity for racial categories themselves (one either is or is not white), but also employs a politics of purity in its approach to history. That is, it treats the history of whiteness purely as a history of white supremacy, and any individuals or groups who break politically with white supremacy thereby demonstrate their non-whiteness. What I am calling for is a rejection of purity in both of these senses.** Racial memberships and the identities that go along with them never really function as all or nothing categories (though they may pretend to do exactly that), and **to ignore white struggles against white supremacy is as much of an inadequate interpretation of history as it would be to ignore white affirmation of white supremacy.** And this is true for all racial categories and identities. They are all fraught with ambiguity, indeterminacy, and even outright contradiction, and part of my claim is that the damage is done in large part by trying to conceive of them as purified of that ambiguity and contradiction, for it is that **insistence on purity that links racial categories to oppressive norms.**

1) democracy

Eurocentric values embedded into Americanization through democracy is controlled by ressentiment which inevitably do violence to non-whites

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

No more prophetic words were uttered in the century, and they came from his wide experience of racism, in America and abroad; from his extraordinary breadth of scholarship concerning Africa and Africans; his pioneering research in the as yet uncharted sea of ambiguities of race relations (at a time when what we now know as sociology did not yet exist), and finally – and perhaps most importantly – from a close analysis of his own inner experience of what he has so appropriately called his "two-ness," that near-schizoid and tragic sense of being at once two distinct

persons, one black, the other American, with not so much as a hyphen to give that sense of unity, that experience of self-cohesion so necessary for genuine personhood. His prophesy was relayed to the world with utmost sincerity, but he was repaid in the end with enmity – even the enmity of some of his own race who thought that although racism existed, you would have to look very hard to find it. And so his talk of a virulent racism infecting the whole body politic in America and the rest of the European-dominated world was viewed by some as a psychological projection of his own bitter black racism.

Now the twentieth century has ended, and Du Bois' ringing prophecy still has not been heeded with either the seriousness or the urgency that reason and common sense would have suggested. And as the century closed, one could feel a resurgence, a scarce-muffled reawakening, of the treacherous pathology of racism just beyond the horizon. If, as some historians believe, the future resembles the past, and if on that assumption one can draw reasonable inferences about what the future holds, then whatever else the future brings, racism will rear its ugly head as an ineliminable feature of twenty-first century American civilization. Worse, since America is *the* dominating culture-bearing power in the world, then the Eurocentric value-paradigm which drives America's ideological sense of world supremacy can be expected to do further damage to the spiritual integrity and aspirations of the nonwhite world. For The malaise of *ressentiment* expresses itself here in the desire to Americanize the world, a desire which hides behind the putatively providential imperative to "bring democracy" to the rest of the world's peoples, on the ground that they have been too retarded, and hence too "unfortunately placed" to understand and appreciate the blessings of democracy American-style.

Root cause

Eurocentrism is a cultural imperialist condition that has shaped western civilization to devalue all that do not fit the phenotype of white. This condition imposes a cultural program of domination

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black

9
1 o f 3 pg.)

On both logical and ontological grounds, here arises the human problematic of Africans and African-derived peoples. As alarming as it might seem, and as "painful" as it might be for him to accept it, Fanon here speaks an astounding truth. Black people in the generality *desire* whiteness, however much they deny it. But the ferocity and contentiousness of a denial can accomplish nothing save to suspend the search for truth.

To say that the black man's destiny is white is to say several important things. It is to say, first off and truly, that black people have been conditioned to admire what white people admire. And they have been conditioned through a long period of white world-dominance. As self-proclaimed bearers of culture and civilization, white people have consistently imposed their values upon the nonwhite world, while nihilating the values of nonwhite peoples. Thus white people have, through the centuries of world-dominance, taught and imposed their values upon others as cultural imperatives, and nothing less. Resistance to the invasive ferocity of cultural imperatives has often meant death—and even genocide. That the majority of the nonwhite world has not left this earth in spite of genocide speaks for itself. It says in effect that either the premise that white people have always taught and imposed their values on others is false, or that white cultural imperialism is the prevailing state of affairs in the nonwhite world.

Indeed, were it not the case that white cultural imperialism is the way of the modern world, then the terms "successful" and "dominance" would be crucially nonsensical as attributes of Western civilization. And yet, no reasonable person would deny either that Western civilization has so far been successful at what it has attempted, or that it is dominant in the world. Nor would any reasonable person deny that Western civilization is European. Thus the modern world, dominated as it so conspicuously is by Western civilization, is a Europeanized world. But to say this is to imply that the world's regnant culture is European, that it is fashioned principally by European minds. To concede all this is to concede *necessarily* that the modern world is Eurocentric, and that, necessarily too, the axiol-

ogy—the theory upon which rest all modern value systems—is the product of the European mind. Now, if Emerson and Whitehead are correct in their appraisal of Plato's influence on European thought, then it follows that the "European Mind" is, in a profound sense, Plato's mind "writ large." And we have seen in the previous Chapter that what I have called Plato's metaphysical mistake, i.e., his cosmology of illusions, is none other than the modern habitat of *ressentiment*, that uniquely European disease.

The question raised by Fanon's assertion that the destiny of the black man is white, is at bottom a question of how successful the European mind has been in its program of cultural imperialism within the African frame of reference. I have called it a "program" deliberately, for white world-dominance has been an imperialist achievement by Europeans and Euro-Americans. The logical geography of the concept "achievement" entails at least the *intention* to bring about some desired end; likewise, logically, the concept of an intention necessarily entails first of all a goal, and a plan sufficiently capable of bringing it about. It is this idea of plan that I mean when I use the word "program" in reference to white cultural imperialism. And I am using the word "program" precisely in this sense because I wish to be rid of the foolish notion that there is no such thing as white cultural imperialism; and that, insofar as it might seem that way, it just *happens* because people, as people, just happen to like the same things, and so on. I wish to be rid of this rationalization, which in this instance is a pretty shoddy psychological stand-in for rank denial. For no one can reasonably deny that the Eurocentric *Weltanschauung*, which is the practical implementation of a European self-serving theory of human nature and culture, has invaded and conquered the mental space of every people the Europeans have encountered. As DuBois (1970A) has said:

> This theory of human culture and its aims has worked itself through warp and woof of our daily thought with a thoroughness that few realize. Everything great, good, efficient, fair and honorable is "white." Everything mean, bad blundering, cheating, and dishonorable is "yellow," brown, and black. The changes on this theme are continually rung in picture and story, in newspaper heading and moving picture, in sermon and school book, until, of course, the king can do no wrong—a white man is always right, and the black has no rights which a white man is bound to respect.... All through the world this gospel is preaching; it has its literature, it has its priests, it has its secret propaganda, and above all—it pays. (1970A:315)

It should be clear by now, then, that the modern world is

Eurocentric, which is to say that modern man's outlook is Eurocentric. It sounds indeed as if I am saying that modern man has some sort of disease, doesn't it? As a matter of fact, I *am* asserting precisely that. Modern man, i.e., "civilized" man, as this concept has come to be understood, *is* diseased. And the disease, as Nietzsche has so penetratingly diagnosed it, is *ressentiment*. Thus the African, who Fanon has said "lacks the advantage of being able to accomplish this descent into hell," is a thoroughly modern man, an effectively "civilized" man, and hence a very sick man. He is a man at once self-deceived and self-alienated. In many respects, the modern man in this sense finds his identical twin in the anti-hero in Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* who declares with a kind of pathetic honesty and frankness that he is sick, very sick indeed.

The oppressed must first raise their consciousness in order to create possibilities to affirm world's wisdom and shatter Eurocentric imperialism

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

It is necessary at this juncture to reiterate that the emergence of a new world order centered philosophically on Man and the significance of the human spirit, requires a new mode of thought, a paradigm shift from a life-denying Eurocentrism to a life-affirming philosophy of redemption. All the world's oppressed—the multi-hued "wretched of the earth"—must raise their consciousness, or have their consciousness raised, to the level of this requirement and acknowledge it as a *sine qua non* for their possible redemption. All the world's oppressed, by virtue of a common suffering at the hands of misguided, hate-filled misanthropes as proponents of Eurocentrism, have an obligation *as human beings* to reject completely Alexis de Tocqueville's ontological premise that "MAN, preeminently so called" is the white man. For therein lies, as we have seen, "the valley of tears" between the races of man. Admittedly, to devise and live in accordance with a life-affirming philosophy is to wage war on the beneficiaries of Eurocentrism and their insidious ideas. And yet, it is only by winning the war on misanthropy that the world's oppressed in bondage will be able to shatter their chains—intellectual, spiritual, and material. It is only by winning such a war that mankind will be able to minimize evil and intolerance in this world.

It should be obvious that the philosophy and *praxis* of redemption must be rooted in the ethical and moral values of what has come to be called "the world's wisdom." This inestimable and inexhaustible depository of wisdom-sayings is omnipresent if we but try to find it. As the very wise Pascal has said, "All good maxims are in the world. We only need to apply them" (1910:125, Aph.380). But as Pascal suggests, we may apply the maxims rightly or wrongly—depending, presumably, on our motives. Pascal in the same place says, "It is true there must be inequality among men; but if this be conceded, the door is opened not only to the highest power, but to the highest tyranny." Our understanding of Eurocentrism has taught us the motive of the Europeans, namely, to gain "the highest power," and to rule the world along the lines of "the highest tyranny." And we have seen where the Eurocentric attitude has led. We are living witnesses to the Europeans' abuse of "the highest power," which, in its multifaceted manifestations, goes by the awe-inspiring and presumptively respectable name of "Imperialism." And we know by experience that in its anti-human effects, Eurocentric imperialism is but another name for the "highest tyranny." Thanks to this experience, we can do nothing less than choose wisely from the values inherent in the world's wisdom-sayings, being mindful of Pascal's warning:

> To leave the mean is to abandon humanity. The greatness of the human soul consists in knowing how to preserve the mean. So far from greatness consisting in leaving it, it consists in not leaving it. (1910:125, Aph. 378)

Our experience has taught us that the Eurocentric *Weltanschauung* took the wrong road—away from the mean, abandoning humanity—toward the extremes of "highest power" and "highest tyranny." Thus the Eurocentric *Weltanschauung* has come to embrace inhumanity.

If Pascal is right about the necessity of adhering to the mean (which is a view advocated by many ancient philosophers, including Confucius and Aristotle), then it is obvious that we can find in the world's maxims a set of values compatible with our desire for self-affirmation.

It is equally obvious that in the war for the reconstitution of man, precisely these values, reaffirmed now, will be the most powerful weapon against the enemy. In "the world's wisdom" we can find a plentiful supply of maxims from which to derive, logically and ontologically, the basic principles of the philosophy of life-affirmation. For wherever human beings are held in highest esteem, there you will find a way of life and a set of guiding principles or an ideology of life-affirmation. We need such a world-view and way of life as an antidote to the prevailing Eurocentrism. Rightly chosen, the life-affirming maxims will provide us with "counsels full of prudence" (to borrow Spinoza's apt phrase).

Indeed, it was his observation of the power of Eurocentrism over men's minds that prompted W.E.B. Du Bois to state so prophetically his famous proposition that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line." However, whatever may be the problem of the twenty-first century, it will not be the color line—provided that we find a way to revoke Eurocentrism and create a world order centered on the *human person* as "MAN, pre-eminently so called." Let us therefore do as Fanon has suggested with such compelling reasonableness and urgency in a passage quoted earlier, namely, "Let us try to create the whole man, whom Europe has been incapable of bringing to triumphant birth" (1963:313). Having borne the cross for centuries, and having worn "the curse of civilization at the hands of almighty Europe," as Nahm (1947) has described it, the world's oppressed have won the right to wear the crown. And we should all wear it proudly, however unaccustomed might be this crown of victory. But the ultimate vindication of our humanity consists in this imperative: we must adopt a new attitude of self-assurance without racial arrogance, even as we anticipate the glorious sound of Gideon's trumpet, and fix our eyes steadfastly on Jubilee.

The Eurocentric ability to define and conceptualize a priori is linked to the universalized and narcissistic imposition of cultural imperialism that forces the embodiment of white values and non-selfhood

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

The European capacity to conceptualize *a priori*, to name and define before hand the nature of things, is at once remarkable and enviable. In this, much of the European power lies. For to be able to name and define things is, in a lordly sense, to hold power over them. "In the beginning was the *word*, and the *word* was God," is a scriptural lesson worth heeding, for the *logos* implies an awesome power. It is this capacity to conceptualize that underlies, obviously, the value-structures of the European *Weltanschauung*, the imposition of which I shall be referring to as cultural imperialism. Thus the European, seeing things *not as they are in themselves, but as he desires them to be*, proceeds to name the world of things according to his desires and revulsions. Thus what he desires he calls "good," and what he finds revolting he calls "bad" or "evil." As a consequence the modern world, under white dominance, has undergone an incredible whitening. For the thoroughly "civilized" man in the modern world, then, values have become alchemized; there has been a radical transvaluation of values suitable to the idiosyncrasies of European tastes. But idiosyncrasies, like eccentricities, are peculiarly linked to egotism and narcissism; and, as will become clear, Eurocentric valuations are nothing more than European narcissism universalized in the form of cultural imperialism.

For this reason, and strictly speaking, the African experience under European slavery and colonialism has gone through a radical transvaluation of values, such that those Africans emerging from that experience have, to a large and obvious extent, been transformed and conditioned to see the world through quasi-European eyes. And insofar as these newly-freed, or half-freed Africans have been teachers of their progeny, then the progeny, too, will have inherited a value system relatively alien to what we might call, for want of a better designation, their native African-isms. And it is this progressive departure from ancestral consciousness that I believe has bothered Fanon. For from the standpoint of a world-dominating axiology, the preferred values are, proximally and most often, white. That is why he has said, "I propose nothing short of the liberation of the man of color from himself" (1967:8). Because the African has become self-imprisoned by an encrusted, opaque consciousness wrought by the multifarious, invidious instrumentalities of European domination. He has become, ontologically speaking, a non-self, resident in what Fanon speaks of here as an arid zone of nonbeing. His will is the will to whiteness, a will to that which con-

ELAC NEG
CSUF 2010-2011
District Quals

Asian Americans are not less ethnic that other racial groups. This model minority stereotype treats Asian Americans as assimilated into white privilege effectively erasing the Asian body.
Shin, 2004 (Jean ,Asian Law Journal, "The Asian American Closet", May, 1 Asian L.J. 1, lexis)

The perception of the excessive assimilability of Asian Americans is epitomized by the "model minority" stereotype. Frank Wu describes the "model minority" stereotype as a belief that Asian Americans are Horatio Alger heroes for the new millennium - unusually motivated and capable of pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, in order to achieve the American Dream. The model minority stereotype posits Asian Americans as uniquely successful among minority groups. They work hard, save money, and achieve material success, while their children study equally hard and earn high marks in school.
The stereotype implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, carries a notion that Asian Americans are less "racial" or "ethnic" than are other minority groups. By becoming successful in a majority-white America, the rationale goes, the Asian American high-achiever has demonstrated that she is easily integrable into the white polis, or even, is somehow essentially "white" herself. Thus, sociologist Andrew Hacker compares Asian Americans to whites in his discussion of their success narrative, while simultaneously contrasting them with African Americans: pointing out that Asian Americans tend to be highly successful in the academic and the professional realms, Hacker wonders whether Asians who immigrate to the United States "might somehow "become white."" Hacker is not alone in perceiving Asian American success as indicia of their inner whiteness. In Yellow, Frank Wu cites a number of articles from Newsweek, People, and The New York Times that describe Asians in terms that not only posit them as a model minority, but also imply that their model minority status makes them more like white Americans, by saying, among other things, that Asians are "going to the head of the class"
The "model minority" stereotype - and the attendant supposition that Asian Americans are easily assimilable into the white American polis - has its physical analogue in the erasability of Asian ethnicity in the biracial or multiracial body. It appears that individuals with mixed white and Asian blood are generally regarded as white in popular media. To take one popularly cited example, movie star Keanu Reeves, who is half Asian/Pacific Islander and half white, is almost never recognized as being Asian American. The roles he plays do not simply fail to call attention to his biraciality, but almost explicitly erase it. His characters - Thomas Anderson in The Matrix, for example, or the quintessential California surfer dude in Bill and Ted's Excellent Adventure - are flagged, by name or by stereotype, as Anglo. Reeves has become, in the eyes of mainstream American movie audiences, "effectively white."
The same is true of actor Dean Cain. Born Dean Tanaka, Cain is of mixed Japanese and white European ancestry. He became most famous for his portrayal of Superman on television's Lois and Clark: The New Adventures of Superman, which ran during the mid-1990s. That a multiracial Asian American could play the part of the quintessential All-American superhero might have been considered a hallmark of the acceptance and assimilation of Asian Americans into the American fold, if it were not for the fact that Cain's Asian heritage has rarely been mentioned or acknowledged. In fact, the whitening of Cain suggests that forgetting or erasing his Asian heritage may have been necessary to enable the public to accept Cain as Superman.
The ability for biracial Asian Americans to be accepted as "white" has been perceived as a sign of ethnic success, a sign that Asians have been accepted into the white mainstream of America. Andrew Hacker, for instance, views the erasure of Asian blood in biracials or multiracials as part of a narrative in which Asians have been assimilated at all levels of American society, even to the level of being accepted and absorbed into the white family structure. Hacker sees the "increasing incidence of intermarriage" between Asian Americans and whites as evidence that Asians are being "allowed to move upward on social and occupational ladders." Hacker believes that in these bi-or multi-racial generations, the [*5] Asian race will disappear altogether, becoming no more than "a new variant of white." Thus the incorporation of the Asian into the white bloodstream reinforces the assimilation of the Asian into the white mainstream.

The model minority myth obscures the violent hate crimes and the very existence of racism against Asian Americans.
Shin, 2004 (Jean ,Asian Law Journal, "The Asian American Closet", May, 1 Asian L.J. 1, lexis)

There are other problems with the model minority myth, and related suppositions that Asians have assimilated easily into the American polis. As Frank Wu notes, such assumptions obscure the real problems facing Asian Americans. Anti-Asian racial prejudice, including violent hate crimes, are ignored, and the very existence of such racism is doubted. Other problems facing Asian Americans are similarly forgotten or whitewashed. The exaggerated accounts of the "model minority's" success, for instance, obfuscate the fact that Asian Americans actually earn a lower average per capita income than white Americans. Wu also points out that "according to the 1990 census, 25 percent of Vietnamese Americans and 45 percent of other Southeast Asian lived in poverty." The belief that Asian Americans are unusually successful is thus deeply deceptive. Asian Americans who accept this myth and perpetuate it by exaggerating their assimilability contribute to this deception, and they permit the mainstream to continue ignoring the poverty and attendant problems facing some Asian Americans. As a result, these problems may fail to get necessary attention, and troubled communities may not receive the help that they need.

ELAC NEG
CSUF 2010-2011
District Quals

Any residual link is a way of disabling any concept of authentic choice for indigenous communities.

Champagne, member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa from North Dakota, 2007 (Duane, *The American Indian Quarterly*," In Search of Theory and Method in American Indian Studies", He is a professor of sociology and American Indian studies, a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the ucla Native Nations Law and Policy Center, p. 360-363)

Colonial and globalized contexts create new constraints and opportunities for American Indian communities. However, American Indian communities have changed and adapted to changing climatic and ecological changes for thousands of years. The colonial context introduces much faster and radical change than before Western contact. Government policy designed to engineer cultural and political change in American Indian communities as well as increasingly globalized culture, information, markets, and political relations create new and powerful challenges to American Indian and indigenous nations. For example, cultural colonialism and hegemony works at the individual level. Boarding schools represent an effort to inculcate American culture and values into Indian children by taking them out of their community environments. Cultural change, such as adoption of Christianity, American dress styles, and knowledge from American society, is internalized at an individual level. Individuals make choices about how they want to dress and whether they will adopt some form of Christianity or remain in a life focused on traditional beliefs and understandings. Individual choices at least in part can be explained by understanding the colonial conditions experienced by a person, observing the choices made by individuals. However, people often make different choices under similar circumstances, and this leaves room for individual autonomy as well as the influence of culture and community both past and present on individual choices. Individual choices are often difficult to explain, but they become important parts of contemporary communities. An example is a group of tribal members deciding to convert to Christianity. They often form a group of converts and hence emerge as a social, political, and cultural grouping within an American Indian community. Henceforth, they may have significant influence on further choices made by the collective community. Christian tribal members may be more agreeable to adopting American forms of government, taking up wage labor, and establishing market-based businesses, all of which may create profoundly different plans and strategies within the community. Among the Tlingit in the late 1800s, many younger members of clan-family houses decided they wanted to move into single-family American frame houses. Although much clan and ceremonial identity continued, individuals made choices about how much they participated. Clan participation became more voluntaristic Social and cultural change in American Indian communities is largely a product of tribal individual, group, and collective decisions made within colonial and globalizing constraints. Not all groups or individuals within a community agree on goals, strategies, or even values, and so, as in most human communities, possible future strategies and decisions are contested on political, economic, and cultural grounds. Understanding and explaining the patterns of individual and collective choice within tribal communities should be a main focus for American Indian studies. Some present-day decolonization perspectives are a strategy of choices that individuals can make. The emphasis on decolonization models creates greater consciousness of the effects of colonization on culture, thought, and institutions. The strategy for change is personal realization and rejection of colonial constraints, especially rejection of colonial concepts and understandings of the value and history of indigenous nations. If all indigenous individuals can be decolonized, then communities can make individual and collective choices about future goals and strategies that will preserve indigenous political and cultural nations and viewpoints. In my experience, many students, especially those who have not had direct or extended contact with their home communities, find decolonized strategies and methodologies very useful and compelling. Decolonization is one strategy for confronting present-day issues and for analyzing past processes of colonization. Decolonization viewpoints, however, create dilemmas, such as how one is to decide what are oppressive colonization forces and what are social and cultural innovations that may prove valuable to communities' cultural, economic, and political well-being. Individuals and communities will disagree on such points. Who is to decide? This is not a decision that can be made by academics, although academics certainly are welcome to express their viewpoints and give advice. There are hundreds of American Indian communities, each with different cultures and colonial experiences. Consequently, there

ELAC NEG
CSUF 2010-2011
District Quals

will be hundreds of different collective community decisions about what cultural, political, and economic changes to adopt and what elements of traditional culture and community to retain. These decisions will be difficult because many American Indian communities are generally no longer culturally homogeneous. For example, about one-third of the Navajo Nation members follow traditional ways, but about one-third are Catholic, and another third are Mormon. A former Navajo tribal chair, in personal conversation, regretted the outcome of recent votes against establishing gaming on the Navajo reservation and expressed the view that the Christians, especially the Mormon Navajo, were highly mobilized to oppose gaming. The choices about decolonization, innovation, change, and reclamation of tradition and culture must be made by each American Indian individual and nation. Such choices are a right of political and cultural sovereignty. Individuals will make choices, and it is very hard to prevent them from making choices about identity, culture, decolonization, or change. As an academic discipline, American Indian studies researchers and theoreticians should be concerned with how and why individuals and communities make the choices they do. What are the patterns of choices made about policies, identity, culture, religion, market economy, government, community organization, migration, and other issues? We need to have theories and explanations for the empirical and historical patterns of community and individual choice and strategies. While it is tempting to suggest that one or another strategy is more authentically Indian than another, as I understand more about Indian history and culture, I believe it is very necessary to try to avoid imposing one's own preferences into the way diverse American Indian communities have worked to preserve themselves. I do not think it necessary to take the side of one group or another as being more traditional or authentic. Rather, it is better to understand the entire community as the main unit of analysis and seek to understand the different and contested understandings of different groups and their ways of constructing contemporary community, government, economy, and cultures. There will be as many empirical examples of different strategies and varying degrees of consensus as there are federally recognized and nonrecognized American Indian communities. There may be patterns to the strategies of cultural and political organization among contemporary and historical American Indian communities, but each case needs analysis for its unique community, culture, government, and colonial and globalization experiences. In this way, in-depth histories and cultural and institutional case studies are profoundly useful, especially if community and individual actions and strategies are elaborated and documented. Similarly, in-depth histories of families, individuals, and subtribal communities, clans, or kinship organizations can also make significant documentations and contribute to our understanding of the diverse ways in which American Indian nations are organized and how they want to meet the challenges of the future. While there is always a great desire to give advice to American Indian communities and leaders, such advice should be given only if requested. Each American Indian nation should be respected for its own way of managing its internal issues and future strategies. As scholars, we should learn as much as we can about policy and cultural, economic, and political strategies and be prepared to provide information and research to those communities who are looking for assistance. Ultimately, each American Indian nation will make its own long-term strategies according to its own historical and community conditions. Those choices are the right of each indigenous nation and should be respected by American Indian studies researchers. The accumulation of research, theory, and knowledge in American Indian studies should address the issues that are significant for American Indian communities and individuals and should be published and distributed to the public and American Indian communities in ways that will benefit the tribal communities. Many American Indian communities now require that research conducted on their reservation be reported back to the community. American Indian studies scholars, above all other disciplines, should respect the needs and wishes of tribal communities over the disposition and distribution of research knowledge.

ELAC NEG
CSUF 2010-2011
District Quals

Any liberation movement that maintains even the smallest risk of militarism through technology is doomed to perpetual violence and war.

OGDEN & FLORENCE NO DATE CITED (*Militarism versus Feminism* by C. K. Ogden & Mary Sargant Florence. http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/florence/feminism/feminism.html.)

It is hard indeed, at a time like the present, to detach oneself even for a moment from the duties which the common danger has imposed on us all—men and women in every country. But, sooner or later, our attitude to certain fundamental questions must be decided, lest the critical moment come upon us unprepared. Every movement that stands for progress raises such questions, and none is more important than the future of the women's movement in relation to war and militarism. Will—or should—its course be modified in the light of recent events? It is hardly too early to discuss this question, for the advocates of militarism are already busy in our midst, and it is easy to take a wrong turning or a short view. Opinions within the movement are divided. Yet it seems probable that there would be less disagreement if once the results of militarism were clearly understood. We are faced by issues on which it seems not improbable that the ideals of most men are different from those of most women. The difference has usually been obscured in feminist propaganda: the argument so often has to run, and quite truly, that on the majority of questions there will be no great split of society into two halves, the men wanting one thing and the women another. But militarism, as such, raises different problems. For Feminism history has only one message on the question of war, and it is this:— Militarism has been the curse of women, as women, from the first dawn of social life. Owing to the turmoil in which it has kept every tribe and every nation almost without exception, mankind has seldom been able to pause for a moment to set social affairs in order—and the first and most crying reform has ever been the condition of woman. Violence at home, violence abroad; violence between individuals, between classes, between nations, between religions; violence between man and woman: *this it is which, more than all other influences, has prevented the voice of woman being heard in public affairs until almost yesterday.* War has created *Slavery* with its degrading results for women, and its double standard of morality from which we *[Page 4]* are not yet completely free: War, and the consequent enslavement of women, has been the main inducement to *Polygamy*, with its conception of women as property, and its debasement of love to physical enjoyment: War has engendered and perpetuated that dominance of man as a military animal which has pervaded every social institution from *Parliament*downwards. In War man alone rules: when War is over man does not surrender his privileges. Militarist ethics have perverted the peaceful and individualising tendencies of *Industry* to which woman owes so much. Industry has united with competition to produce Industrial Warfare: Commerce has combined with Imperialism for the capture of markets and the exploitation of the lower races. Militarism has ruined *Education* with its traditions of discipline and its conception of history. Militarism has even left its blighting imprint on *Religion*—on Mohammedanism the religion of conquest with its depreciation of woman; on the religion of the Prince of Peace, so that the Churches can say what they are not ashamed to say to-day. War, and the fear of War, has kept woman in perpetual subjection, making it her chief duty to exhaust all her faculties in the ceaseless production of children that nations might have the warriors needed for aggression or defence. She must not have any real education—for the warrior alone required knowledge and independence; she must not have a voice in the affairs of the nation, for War and preparation for War were so fundamental in the life of nations that woman, with her silly humanitarianism, must not be allowed to meddle therewith! And so War, which the influence of women alone might have prevented, was used as the main argument against enfranchisement, as it had been the main barrier to emancipation in the past.The circle is complete. War, Militarism, Imperialism; in every form they have proved her undoing, and yet women hesitate to-day on which side to throw their influence! Over and over again the greatest statesmen have said that peace was Utopian *only because public opinion was not ready for it;* and no one has said it more emphatically than Sir Edward Grey. But who is to create the new public opinion? Have women no better answer than hatred or despair? Over and over again Suffragists have seen that it was from militarists that their ideals met with the most bitter opposition.

Adding Asian Americans to the Black/White paradigm relegates Asians to a footnote with minimal inclusion. The perm will only be inclusive in the most marginal of ways. The alternative alone is preferable
Chuang, 2001 (Deana K. Asian Law Journal, "Power, Merit, and the Imitations of the Black and White Binary in the Affirmative Action Debate: The Case of Asian Americans at Whitney High School", May, 8 Asian L.J. 31, lexis)

Affirmative action policies sparked controversies as they began to affect admission into higher education. To date, Regents of the University of California v. Bakke represents the only affirmative action case decided by the Supreme Court involving racial categories for admission in higher education. The Plaintiff, a White male, challenged U.C. Davis Medical School's special admissions program that reserved sixteen seats in each class for "disadvantaged" minorities. In a divided opinion, the Court held that race may be a factor in admissions program, although the U.C. Davis program which specifically reserved seats for minorities violated the Equal Protection Clause.
The confusion about the placement of Asian Americans in Bakke echoed the Gong Lum question of half a century earlier. The Court struggled with the position of Asian Americans and classified them with different groups depending on the context. In Bakke, U.C. Davis' special admissions program included Asian Americans as part of the "economically and/or educationally disadvantaged" minority groups warranting special consideration. The rest of the decision, however, ignored their presence or relegated their mention to two footnotes. First, the Court rejected the speculative leap that the school purported to make: but for the discrimination encountered by "Negro applicants [and] nothing is said about Asians," Blacks would have received better scores than the White plaintiff. In the second mention of Asian Americans, Justice Powell wrote, "The inclusion of [Asian Americans] is especially curious in light the substantial numbers of Asians admitted through the regular admissions process." Finally, Justice Marshall's dissent focused exclusively on the experience of African Americans, at one point writing, "the experience of Negroes in America has been different in kind, not just in degree, from that of other ethnic groups." Justice Marshall placed Blacks in the center of the controversy, solidifying their privileged victim status in the affirmative action debate and reinforcing the Black and White binary. Overall, Asian American inclusion in the landmark decision was indeed minimal.
Twenty years later in Hopwood v. Texas, the court ignored Asian Americans again. It described the special admissions program of the University of Texas Law School as benefiting Blacks and Mexican Americans to the detriment of Whites and "non-preferred minorities." The invisibility of Asian Americans was most blatantly demonstrated in the court's classification of the parties: "For the sake of simplicity and readability, however, we sometimes will refer to two broad categories: 'whites' (meaning Texas residents who were whites and non-preferred minorities) and 'minorities' (meaning Mexican Americans and Black Americans)." The court appears to either ignore Asian Americans or add them as sidekicks without considering their unique experiences. The fact that Asian Americans were classified as "whites" further suggests that the court cannot operate outside of a Black and White binary and if they are even mentioned at all, that all racial groups must fall in either of these two groups.
Both the histories of school desegregation and affirmative action primarily involve African Americans. African Americans occupied the center of the school desegregation cases and their experiences have defined the discussion accordingly. While Latino voices have since been added to the affirmative action debate, the experiences and history of African Americans in this country have often served as the focal point for any discussions or arguments on the topic. African American plaintiffs successfully paved the way to integration in Brown, resulting in an affirmative action debate similarly focused on African Americans and other groups that can be subsumed under their identity. Consequently, the debate moved away from abstract ideals of fairness to ideas of fairness with the African American model in mind, a situation that has forced African Americans to assume the brunt of White resentment. Affirmative action has a face - a black face - and resentment towards affirmative action policies became intertwined with resentment against African Americans.

The utter rejection of Eurocentrism is a move away from a world view of ressentiment to create life affirming paradigms of resistance and human possibilities

Rejection of A/B eurocentrism comes first and is more life affirming to end the world

Ephraim 03 (Charles W., Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Mercy College, THE PATHOLOGY OF EUROCENTRISM: The Burden and Responsibilities of Being Black pg.)

(pg 1 & 3)

However, with faith in ourselves as "infinite possibilities of unawakened music," we can—because we must—reinvigorate ourselves from the wearisome burden of *ressentiment*, infusing our spirits, replacing the tragic theme and music of a soul-weary Eurocentrism with the self-transcending music of life-affirmation. We must, in a word, reject Eurocentrism as a way of life, as well as the Hegelian providentialism that supports it. It is imperative that all of us do this.

The utter rejection of Eurocentrism is most certainly a *conditio sine qua non* for the possibility of the African's self-reclamation. And the African's self-reclamation, I would suggest, for reasons already given, is perhaps the most urgent need of the day. Thus African peoples, wherever they find themselves in the world, must work tirelessly to throw off the yoke that Eurocentrism is, and move decisively in the direction of a new musical theme—the theme of self-affirmation and self-transcendence—after centuries of existential anguish in a hell designed most particularly for them by a racist *Weltanschauung* that has become, by brute force and cunning, the "modern world view."

The new springtime music of self-transcendence and self-affirmation, coming harmoniously as it must from the very being of the world's oppressed, as a mighty human harp with "infinite possibilities" of awakened consciousness, would be at once "the unkindest fate" of Eurocentrism, and a jubilee for all mankind. Again, to paraphrase Marx, we might say that with the demise of the Eurocentric paradigm of man, the world has nothing to lose but thraldom in the swamp of inhumanity—and everything to gain by way of a life-affirming paradigm. Despite ourselves, conditioned as we have become to a life of decadence, we must play this new music and recognize the jubilee for what it is , namely, a chance at the possibility of

rebirth. In other words, the overthrowing of the Eurocentric *Weltanschauung*, and hence the overcoming of the pathology of Eurocentrism would be a reopening of the door to our human possibilities, a welcome opportunity for man to explore his ownmost potentialities for authentic humanhood. Genuine self-concern demands and requires nothing less.

Now, I am very much aware—even painfully so—that there are many colored folk around the world who, benumbed by a false consciousness engendered by the promises of a materially prosperous Eurocentric *Weltanschauung*, find themselves in the woeful predicament of being duly committed foot soldiers in the Fifth Column in the struggle against their own liberation. Abysmally ignorant, and filled with the Eurocentric lesson defining their own inferiority, they refuse to accept a basic fact of history, namely: that the material prosperity of Europeans, Euro-Americans, and all other Euro-descended peoples was derived, and is maintained, proximally and for the most part by the exploitation and oppression of the world's peoples of color. In short, the whole of the colored world, now euphemistically called the "Third World," has been the intellectual, spiritual, and material feeding pasture of the Europeans. This is why Milton C. Nahm (1947) has stated that "Greeks acquired the elements of culture from Babylon and Egypt *without paying* the forfeit of independence. The benefits...are obvious. The favored country enjoyed a steadier rate of progress, a more unbroken evolution, a comparative immunity from the sacrifice of her national resources." Nahm then urged that "if further proof be required," we should *take the sad lot of the savage tribes of today, who receive the blessing of civilization at the hands of almighty Europe, and wear it too often as a curse*" (Nahm 1947: 5,6; emphasis added). What Nahm calls here "the curse" is

what I have referred to as "the *cross*" that colored mankind in the generality have been made to bear, namely: a history of degradation and enforced *underdevelopment* at the hands of white people for the "obvious benefit" of white people. Thus, the curse entails what James has called the "stolen legacy."

Blinded by what they perceive as the uncommon virtue of a crass materialism which they wish to share, coupled with the ungovernable self-hatred they have learned so well, the loyal foot soldiers in the Fifth Column stoutly and persistently denounce any call for self-redemption, and willingly sacrifice their lives at the altar of the Eurocentric, anti-human style of life. They thus belittle themselves almost beyond repair. That these foot soldiers are an enormous danger to any progressive movement for the liberation of peoples of color—and necessarily for their own liberation—can never be taken lightly. E. Franklin Frazier has spoken scathingly about them in his *Black Bourgeoisie*, and so has C.L.R. James in *The Black Jacobins*. Wherever there are peoples of color who have imbibed the self-poisoning lesson of Eurocentrism, and hence the lesson of self-inferiority, there you will find a Fifth Column. There you will find "Black Anglo-Saxons" as prototypical of this self-hating class.

And yet, there must be a struggle commensurate with the human will and capacity to be free and self-determining. As the world is presently constituted, this struggle must aim at overthrowing Eurocentricism with its misanthropic entailments as the reigning ideology, and replacing it with a world-view centered on Man. In a consummate expression of his radical mind, Marx (1978) has said similarly that "emancipation…is only possible *in practice* if one adopts the point of view of that theory according to which man is the highest being for man" (1978:65).