### Advocacy: We believe that, contextualized in the debate space, the resolution is part of the war against American Indians. We advocate using debate as a starting point to correct our understanding of war, in order to correct our epistemology and heal past traumas

# Contention 1: Whiteness

### Whiteness is an effect of inherited habit

Ahmed, 2011 (Sara, University of London “A Phenomenology of Whiteness”, Sage Publications, Accessed 19 September 2011 from the Royal Institute of Technology)

Habit worlds But how does whiteness hold its place? In this section I explore how whiteness ‘holds’ through habits. Public spaces take shape through the habitual actions of bodies, such that the contours of space could be described as habitual. I turn to the concept of habits to theorize not so much how bodies acquire their shape, but how spaces acquire the shape of the bodies that ‘inhabit’ them. We could think about the ‘habit’ in the ‘in-habit’. We need to examine not only how bodies become white, or fail to do so, but also how spaces can take on the very ‘qualities’ that are given to such bodies. In a way, we can think about the habitual as a form of inheritance. It is not so much that we inherit habits, although we can do so: rather the habitual can be thought of as a bodily and spatial form of inheritance. As Pierre Bourdieu (1977) shows us, we can link habits to what is unconscious, and routine, or what becomes ‘second nature’.3 To describe whiteness as a habit, as second nature, is to suggest that whiteness is what bodies do, where the body takes the shape of the action. Habits are not ‘exterior’ to bodies, as things that can be ‘put on’ or ‘taken off’. If habits are about what bodies do, in ways that are repeated, then they might also shape what bodies can do. For Merleau-Ponty, the habitual body is a body that acts in the world, where actions bring other things near. As he puts it: my body appears to me as an attitude directed towards a certain existing or possible task. And indeed its spatiality is not, like that of external objects or like that of ‘spatial sensations’, a spatiality of position, but a spatiality of situation. If I stand in front of my desk and lean on it with both hands, only my hands are stressed and the whole of the body trails behind them like the tail of a comet. It is not that I am unaware of the whereabouts of my shoulder or back, but these are simply swallowed up in the position of my hands, and my whole posture can be read so to speak in the pressure they exert on the table. (2002: 114–5, emphasis in original) Here, the directedness of the body towards an action (which we have discovered also means an orientation towards certain kinds of objects) is how the body ‘appears’.4 The body is ‘habitual’ not only in the sense that it performs actions repeatedly, but in the sense that when it performs such actions, it does not command attention, apart from at the ‘surface’ where it ‘encounters’ an external object (such as the hands that lean on the desk or table, which feel the ‘stress’ of the action). In other words, the body is habitual insofar as it ‘trails behind’ in the performing of action, insofar as it does not pose ‘a problem’ or an obstacle to the action, or is not ‘stressed’ by ‘what’ the action encounters. For Merleau-Ponty, the habitual body does not get in the way of an action: it is behind the action. I want to suggest here that whiteness could be understood as ‘the behind’. White bodies are habitual insofar as they ‘trail behind’ actions: they do not get ‘stressed’ in their encounters with objects or others, as their whiteness ‘goes unnoticed’. Whiteness would be what lags behind; white bodies do not have to face their whiteness; they are not orientated ‘towards’ it, and this ‘not’ is what allows whiteness to cohere, as that which bodies are orientated around. When bodies ‘lag behind’, then they extend their reach. 156 Feminist Theory 8(2) Downloaded from fty.sagepub.com at Royal Institute of Technology on September 19, 2011

### The construction of Whiteness within institutions indefinitely detains marked

Ahmed, 2011 (Sara, University of London “A Phenomenology of Whiteness”, Sage Publications, Accessed 19 September 2011 from the Royal Institute of Technology)

It becomes possible to talk about the whiteness of space given the very accumulation of such ‘points’ of extension. Spaces acquire the ‘skin’ of the bodies that inhabit them. What is important to note here is that it is not just bodies that are orientated. Spaces also take shape by being orientated around some bodies, more than others. We can also consider ‘institutions’ as orientation devices, which take the shape of ‘what’ resides within them. After all, institutions provide collective or public spaces. When we describe institutions as ‘being’ white (institutional whiteness), we are pointing to how institutional spaces are shaped by the proximity of some bodies and not others: white bodies gather, and cohere to form the edges of such spaces. When I walk into university meetings that is just what I encounter. Sometimes I get used to it. At one conference we organize, four black feminists arrive. They all happen to walk into the room at the same time. Yes, we do notice such arrivals. The fact that we notice such arrivals tells us more about what is already in place than it does about ‘who’ arrives. Someone says: ‘it is like walking into a sea of whiteness’. This phrase comes up, and it hangs in the air. The speech act becomes an object, which gathers us around. So yes they walk into the room, and I notice that they were not there before, as a retrospective reoccupation of a space that I already inhabited. I look around, and re-encounter the sea of whiteness. As many have argued, whiteness is invisible and unmarked, as the absent centre against which others appear only as deviants, or points of deviation (Dyer, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993). Whiteness is only invisible for those who inhabit it, or those who get so used to its inhabitance that they learn not to see it, even when they are not it (see Ahmed, 2004b). Spaces are orientated ‘around’ whiteness, insofar as whiteness is not seen. We do not face whiteness; it ‘trails behind’ bodies, as what is assumed to be given. The effect of this ‘around whiteness’ is the institutionalization of a certain ‘likeness’, which makes non-white bodies feel uncomfortable, exposed, visible, different, when they take up this space. The institutionalization of whiteness involves work: the institution comes to have a body as an effect of this work. It is important that we do not reify institutions, by presuming they are simply given and that they decide what we do. Rather, institutions become given, as an effect of the repetition of decisions made over time, which shapes the surface of institutional spaces. Institutions involve the accumulation of past decisions about how to allocate resources, as well as ‘who’ to recruit. Recruitment functions as a technology for the reproduction of whiteness. We can recall that Althusser’s model of ideology is based on recruitment: ideology ‘acts’ or ‘functions’ in such a way that it ‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by the very precise operation which I have called interpellation or hailing, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: ‘Hey you there.’ (1971: 163, emphasis in original) The subject is recruited by turning around, which immediately associates recruitment with following a direction, as the direction that takes the line Ahmed: A phenomenology of whiteness 157 Downloaded from fty.sagepub.com at Royal Institute of Technology on September 19, 2011 of an address. To recruit can suggest both to renew and to restore. The act of recruitment, of bringing new bodies in, restores the body of the institution, which depends on gathering bodies to cohere as a body. Becoming a ‘part’ of an institution, which we can consider the demand to share in it, or even have a share of it, hence requires not only that one inhabits its buildings, but also that we follow its line: we might start by saying ‘we’; by mourning its failures and rejoicing in its successes; by reading the documents that circulate within it, creating vertical and horizontal lines of communication; by the chance encounters we have with those who share its grounds. To be recruited is not only to join, but to sign up to a speciﬁc institution: to inhabit it by turning around as a return of its address. Furthermore, recruitment creates the very ego ideal of the institution, what it imagines as the ideal that working ‘at’ the institution means working towards or even what it imagines expresses its ‘character’. As scholars in critical management studies have shown us, organizations tend to recruit in their own image (Singh, 2002). The ‘hey you’ is not just addressed to anybody: some bodies more than others are recruited, those that can inherit the ‘character’ of the organization, by returning its image with a reﬂection that reﬂects back that image, what we could call a ‘good likeness’. It is not just that there is a desire for whiteness that leads to white bodies getting in. Rather whiteness is what the institution is orientated ‘around’, so that even bodies that might not appear white still have to inhabit whiteness, if they are to get ‘in’.

### Non-white bodies are consequently viewed as “disruptive”, and are marked for indefinite detention

Ahmed, 2011 (Sara, University of London “A Phenomenology of Whiteness”, Sage Publications, Accessed 19 September 2011 from the Royal Institute of Technology)

It can be problematic to describe whiteness as something we ‘pass through’: such an argument could make whiteness into something substantive, as if whiteness has an ontological force of its own, which compels us, and even ‘drives’ action. It is important to remember that whiteness is not reducible to white skin, or even to ‘something’ we can have or be, even if we pass through whiteness. When we talk about a ‘sea of whiteness’ or ‘white space’ we are talking about the repetition of the passing by of some bodies and not others, for sure. But non-white bodies do inhabit white spaces; we know this. Such bodies are made invisible when we see spaces as being white, at the same time as they become hypervisible when they do not pass, which means they ‘stand out’ and ‘stand apart’. You learn to fade into the background, but sometimes you can’t or you don’t. The moments when the body appears ‘out of place’ are moments of political and personal trouble. As Nirmal Puwar shows us, when bodies arrive who seem ‘out of place’ in such institutional worlds we have a process of disorientation: people blink, and look again. The proximity of such bodies makes familiar spaces seem strange: ‘People are “thrown” because a whole world view is jolted’ (Puwar, 2004: 43). Bodies stand out when they are out of place. Such standing re-conﬁrms the whiteness of the space. Whiteness is an effect of what coheres rather than the origin of coherence. The effect of repetition is not then simply about a body count: it is not simply a matter of how many bodies are ‘in’. Rather, what is repeated is a very style of embodiment, a way of inhabiting space, which claims space by the accumulation of gestures of ‘sinking’ into that space. If whiteness allows bodies to move with comfort through space, and to inhabit the world as if it were home, then those bodies take up more space. Such bodies are shaped by motility, and may even take the shape of that motility.

### White privilege depends on the devaluation of non whites

Thompson (Audrey, “Summary of Whiteness Theory” http://www.pauahtun.org/Whiteness-Summary-1.html )

Whiteness as a Normalized Category Whiteness theory treats whiteness not as a biological category but as a social construction. Insofar as whiteness is thought of as “natural,” it is understood in essentialized terms — either as a personal attribute or as a scientific category. Yet who counts as white depends on what is at stake. CRT scholar Cheryl Harris suggests that whiteness is best thought of as a form of property. Conceived of as legal or cultural property, whiteness can be seen to provide material and symbolic privilege to whites, those passing as white, and sometimes honorary whites. Examples of material privilege would include better access to higher education or a choice of safe neighborhoods in which to live; symbolic white privilege includes conceptions of beauty or intelligence that not only are tied to whiteness but that implicitly exclude blackness or brownness. White privilege is different from simple Eurocentrism. Eurocentrism refers to standards and values that start from European-based culture and experience and that either ignore or denigrate other cultural values and experience. The problem with Eurocentrism is a failure of pluralism, a lack of appreciation for other cultures. Insofar as white standards of beauty or intelligence are simply narrow or parochial, they are Eurocentric. By contrast, white privilege depends on the devaluation of non-whites. Insofar as white standards of beauty or intelligence rely on an implicit dichotomy or opposition between white purity, say, and black primitivism, they create a hierarchy that cultural pluralism cannot overcome. Whiteness-privileging mechanisms work in several, sometimes paradoxical ways. For example, on the one hand, whiteness is normalized; it is taken for granted and therefore invisible. On the other hand, it is treated as preferable. If this seems counter-intuitive, think of how maleness in U.S. society is both the “normal” and the preferred condition. People in the U.S. rarely talk about the white-heterosexual-maleness of the U.S. presidency — it is taken for granted as the normal condition — but if someone raises the possibility of a female, gay, and/or non-white president, the widespread preference for a white, heterosexual, male president quickly becomes apparent. Whereas whiteness is not treated as a race, and thus is invisible, blackness and brownness are “marked” racial categories — departures from the racial norm. Sometimes this departure will be marked as exotic; sometimes, as a difference that well-meaning whites politely ignore. More often, it will be marked as a special interest, a problem, or a form of deviance.

# Contention 2: Historical Trauma

### Stereotyping of American Indians Leads to Negative Self Identity

Thorn (David, “Being American” <http://www.littlewolf.us/nativeidentity.html> )

An analysis of each of these actions, and the impact they have had on cultural identity formation for the Native people of today, would be extensive to say the least, so this topic will not be addressed fully in this project, but it should not be overlooked in any discussion of identity formation for the Native Americans, because not only has it influenced the Native peoples self identity, it has also influenced the perception the American public has of the Native American identity. Starting back in the 1800’s the American people had already established an idea of what an “Indian” was, and what they looked like. Popular novels and newspapers of the time, depicted Native people as fierce, savage beasts who wore practically no clothes accept for the full feather headdress that streamed down their back. This of course was not the true picture, but in the environment the Native people had been thrust into, this was the image that they were expected to exhibit. Once again, cultural traditions were pushed aside to accommodate the hegemony of the time, and the Native identity took yet another turn. Through the years this image has persisted even to this day. Dime novels of the 1800’s depicted the “Indian” as a savage, and in later years popular writers like Zane Grey and Louis L’Amour continued the portrayal of the bloodthirsty savage. It was an easy transition then, when the camera was introduced and film became the popular medium. Some of the first American films were westerns, and like the popular literature of the time, the “Indians” once again was depicted as the “savage” who is defeated in the end by the hero. From movies to television, with each new medium, a new interest is fostered in the “Western”, and with this interest comes the usual depiction of “the Indian”. The Native people have been forced to live in a world that has a long established image, of what a Native American is, and today’s society continues to perpetrate the Native American Identity as something it is not. The old image of the cigar store Indian, Red Man chewing tobacco, and land O’ lakes butter are just a few of the popular images that are seen on almost a daily basis by the American public. Combine this with the Professional sports, and school mascots that portray the old image of the Native American, and you are talking about nearly the entire population of the United States having the stereotypical idea of Native people reinforced many times a day, 365 days a year. The following are a few examples: The identity of the Native people is not just being reinforced for the American public on a daily basis, but also on the Native people themselves, and especially on the Native children who grow up exposed to this concept of “The Indian”. In America today, the popular culture degrades and ridicules the Native American population on a daily basis, and no other minority group is subjected to this cultural insensitivity. In order to understand how this is possible, in a land that supposedly offers everyone freedom and equal rights, you must consider the demographics of the Native Americans, and address the issue of “Agency”. According to the Census 2000 figures issued by the U.S. Census Bureau, the total population of the United States is 281,421,906, and the Native American population of the United States is listed as 2,475,956. Statistically the Native American population is only 0.9% of the total U.S. Population. If you include Native Americans who are combined with at least one or more other races, you come up with a total “Indian” population of 4,119,301, for a 1.9% of total U.S. population. These numerical figures do not give Native people much of a voice in a very large population, and it is even worse when you look at where the Native Americans live. According to the same Census 2000 figures, “four out of ten Native Indians live in the Western United States, and over half of all Native Indians live in only 10 of the 50 States”. “Less than 1 percent of the total Native Indian population is located in 21 of the States”. Not only are the Native people few in numbers compared to the overall population, but also they are demographically spread out in such a manner as no to have any political strength. If a minority group cannot exercise a political voice in the society, then they are invisible to the hegemony and warrant no consideration. They are given no consideration when the government is making and interpreting policies, because they have no agency as a group. In essence, the Native people have had to endure a government who accidentally, and purposely, killed off the majority of the Native population with disease. A government who forced them from their homeland, incarcerated them on reservations, and left them without the resources to survive. A government who enacted laws meant to stop the Native people from practicing their religion and teaching their culture to the next generation. A Country that has established its own identity for the Native people, and reinforces it in everyday popular culture, despite the objections of the Native people themselves. An identity is formed over a long period of time, taking in factors and experiences of the past, and blending them with the present. When you consider the past few hundred years for the Native Americans, it is easy to see how an entire ethnic group could develop a negative self-identity. In reality, it is hard to see how the Native people have managed to exist in such a hostile environment as America has been for them. Exist they do however, but in modern times they have found themselves battling with one of their old enemies from the past. The enemy who is once again threatening the existence of the Native people is disease.

### President Obama Issues Native American Apology Resolution, Not Read Aloud

Capriccioso 2010 (Rob, “A sorry saga: Obama signs Native American apology resolution; fails to draw attention to it” <http://www.indianlaw.org/node/529> )

Is an apology that’s not said out loud really an apology? What if the person expressing the apology doesn’t draw attention to it?  Those are questions that some tribal citizens are asking upon learning that President Barack Obama signed off on the Native American Apology Resolution Dec. 19 as part of a defense appropriations spending bill.  The resolution originated in Congress and had passed the Senate as stand-alone legislation in the fall. The House ended up adding the resolution to their version of the defense bill in conference.  Sen. Sam Brownback, R-Kan., originally introduced the measure intending "to officially apologize for the past ill-conceived policies by the U.S. government toward the Native peoples of this land and re-affirm our commitment toward healing our nation’s wounds and working toward establishing better relationships rooted in reconciliation." His bill passed the Senate in 2008 and 2009.  The version signed by Obama became watered down, not making a direct apology from the government, but rather apologizing "on behalf of the people of the United States to all Native peoples for the many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect inflicted on Native peoples by citizens of the United States."  The resolution also includes a disclaimer: Nothing in it authorizes or supports any legal claims against the United States, and the resolution does not settle any claims.  Even with the more general language, the apology is historic, but the White House has made no announcements to date about it. Nor has Obama expressed an apology to any tribes or Indian citizens, despite saying on the presidential campaign trail that he thought an apology was warranted. At the White House Tribal Nations Conference on Nov. 5, Obama noted, among other observations, that treaties were violated with tribes and injustices had been done against them, but he did not offer an explicit apology. The resolution Obama signed specifically "urges the President to acknowledge the wrongs of the United States against Indian tribes in the history of the United States in order to bring healing to this land."  So, by signing the document as part of the defense spending bill, did Obama fulfill the resolution? Or, does he have an obligation to say the apology out loud and to let tribes know he signed the resolution?  According to White House spokesman Shin Inouye, there are "no updates at this time" on how Obama might proceed.  Inouye also confirmed that a press release was issued by the White House regarding the president’s signature of the defense appropriations bill, but not one on the apology resolution - nor did the defense release mention that the apology was part of that legislation.  When other countries have apologized for travesties against their own indigenous populations, their leaders have been more up front than the Obama White House to date.  In June 2008, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper gave a widely noted speech to parliament and tribal leaders, apologizing to survivors of the country’s residential boarding school system. It was well-received by many First Nations individuals, and some said it helped them feel a sense of healing.  Before that, Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd apologized in parliament to all aboriginals for laws and policies that "inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss."  Past presidents of the United States have also been willing to offer apologies to harmed groups.  In 1997, President Bill Clinton said during a press conference that the government was sorry for its role in the Tuskegee syphilis experiment on African Americans. And President Ronald Reagan made a formal statement when he signed the Japanese Internment Apology law in 1988, which carried with it financial restitution.  The up-in-the-air quality of the current Native American resolution and the federal government’s handling of it is concerning to some Native Americans.  Robert T. Coulter, executive director of the Indian Law Resource Center, said there has been an "overwhelming silence" regarding the resolution.  "There were no public announcements, there were no press conferences, there was no national attention, much less international," said the Citizen Potawatomi Nation member.  "You might think that something would be announced, that something would be said about it. After all, they’re apologizing to Native Americans, and yet, I don’t know that people have really heard about it.  "What kind of an apology is it when they don’t tell the people they are apologizing to? For an apology to have any meaning at all, you do have to tell the people you’re apologizing to.  "I have had my doubts on whether this is a true or meaningful apology, and this silence seems to speak very loudly on that point."  Still, Coulter said the resolution doesn’t have any legal meaning, no matter if Obama and Congress members say it out loud or not.  "The real test is if Congress actually takes action to back up the apology - will it approve the Cobell settlement, will the Indian health bill become law?"  Washington state Rep. John McCoy, a citizen of the Tulalip Tribes, said he was happy that Obama signed the apology, but he would like a verbal statement.  "The president has been pretty busy with high priority stuff, but I’d hope that he’ll select a time and place to make an announcement. I’m sure many tribes will bring this issue to the forefront with him."  McCoy believes tribal citizens should take the development as a win, and move on in a meaningful way.  Chris Stearns, a Navajo lawyer and former Clinton administration official, believes Obama will call attention to his signing of the resolution at some point, but there are political realities: First, this is a congressional resolution shepherded by Brownback, so Obama might want to let him take the lead; and second, this is an election year, if Obama were to make a big deal out of an apology, it could be painted by opponents as a weakness or political correctness.  No matter the politics of the situation, some tribes aren’t waiting for a statement from the president. Some have already inserted their histories into the congressional record, and plan to bring that record, coupled with the resolution, to state and local leaders, using the documents to remind and educate them on tribes’ historical presence and sovereign status.

### Historical Trauma as a Result of Massive Group Trauma

Braveheart 1980 (Dr. Maria Yellow Horse, PhD,“Welcome to Takini's Historical Trauma” <http://historicaltrauma.com> )

Dr. Maria Yellow Horse Braveheart, PhD, conceptualized historical trauma in the 1980's, as a way to develop stronger understanding of why life for many Native Americans is not fulfilling "the American Dream". This site exists to begin a collaboration of community advocates, allies, teachers, and students of historical trauma towards a stronger understanding of unresolved historical grief.   What is historical trauma? Historical trauma is cumulative emotional and psychological wounding over the lifespan and across generations, emanating from massive group trauma. Native Americans have, for over 500 years, endured physical, emotional, social, and spiritual genocide from European and American colonialist policy. Contemporary Native American life has adapted, such that, many are healthy and economically self-sufficient. Yet a significant proportion of Native people are not faring as well.   Our purpose is to heal from the historical unresolved grief that many indigenous individuals and communities are struggling with. Historical unresolved grief is the grief that accompanies the trauma. (Brave Heart, 1995,1998, 1999, 2000) The historical trauma response is a constellation of features in reaction to massive group trauma. This response is observed among Lakota and other Native populations, Jewish Holocaust survivors and descendants, Japanese American internment camp survivors and descendants. (Brave Heart, 1998, 1999, 2000)   We offer to you an opportunity to learn or to share your learning of historical trauma prevention, intervention, healing, and experiences. Research of the historical trauma intervention approach has shown significant reduction in anger, sadness, guilt, and shame. (Brave Heart, 1996-1998). A number of excellent Native American researchers have begun conducting strong research and teaching that is beginning to create a more unified approach towards healing.   Here have been many great leaders of the tribes that were ravaged and interned. These brave Native leaders who did everything humanly possible in the face of the ongoing march of European-American colonists across their land to protect their people and their way of life, but sadly to little or no avail. They eventually saw countless violent acts perpetrated on their people and lands. Descendants of these early leaders to this day suffer the adverse effects of historical trauma grief that is displayed into the present day.   What is Historical Trauma? The collective emotional and psychological injury both over the life span and across generations, resulting from a cataclysmic history of genocide.  The effects of historical trauma include: unsettled emotional trauma, depression, high mortality rates, high rates of alcohol abuse, significant problems of child abuse and domestic violence. There are 583 federally recognized tribes, like the ones listed below, where the impact fof historical trauma is often most pronounced. Understanding the experiences of a community is important towards beginning the healing process. Genocide, imprisonment, forced assimulation, and misguided goverance has resulted in loss of culture and identity, alcoholism, poverty, and despair. We offer the historical trauma intervention model, which includes four major community intervention components.  First is confronting the historical trauma.  Second is understanding the trauma.  Third is releasing the pain of historical trauma. Fourth is transcending the trauma.  We offer 3 major hypotheses for the intervention model: 1. Education increases awareness of trauma, 2. Sharing effects of trauma provides relief, 3. Grief resolution through collective mourning/healing creates positive group identity and commitment to community,  Six Phases of Historical Unresolved Grief  1. 1st Contact: life shock, genocide, no time for grief. Colonization Period: introduction of disease and alcohol, traumatic events such as Wounded Knee Massacre.  2. Economic competition: sustenance loss (physical/spiritual).  3. Invasion/War Period: extermination, refugee symptoms.  4. Subjugation/Reservation Period: confined/translocated, forced dependency on oppressor, lack of security.  5. Boarding School Period: destroyed family system, beatings, rape, prohibition of Native language and religion; Lasting Effect: ill-prepared for parenting, identity confusion.  6. Forced Relocation and Termination Period: transfer to urban areas, prohibition of religious freedom, racism and being viewed as second class; loss of governmental system and community.

### Historical Trauma Result of Government Destruction of the Native Identity

Eliot (Shannon, “Native American tribal communities provide hope for overcoming historical trauma”)

The key to recovery from historical trauma lies in restoring a community's "original instructions" and returning to cultural roots, according to Native American mental health leader Elicia Goodsoldier. Historical trauma — which refers to a collective experience of one group experiencing repeated trauma over time — is neither immediately recognizable nor widely understood. Perhaps nowhere is Native American historical trauma more apparent than on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota. An Oglala Sioux reservation, Pine Ridge was established in 1889 and is the eighth largest reservation in the country. But despite the reservation’s size and history, Pine Ridge residents struggle. The suicide rate is 300 to 400 percent higher than the national average. Unemployment on the reservation is 85-90 percent. Nearly 40 percent of homes have no electricity. Eighty percent of the population falls below the federal poverty line. The infant mortality rate is the highest in the continent (three times higher than the national average) and the school dropout rate is 70 percent. Perhaps the most striking statistic of all relates to life expectancy. A male living on the reservation can expect to get an average of 46 years (a female gets 49), making rates comparable to third world countries like Afghanistan and Somalia. How could such conditions exist in present-day America? The answer, Goodsoldier says, lies in historical trauma and the corresponding unresolved grief born from the U.S. government’s destruction of Native Americans and their way of life beginning in the nineteenth century. Some examples of that destruction include overturning of the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851, which marked boundaries of native Lakota land and promised sovereignty; the hanging of 38 Sioux men two days after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, making it the largest mass execution in U.S. history; passage of the Dawes Act in 1887, which ended the communal ownership of reservation lands; and the Wounded Knee Massacre of 1890, where 300 people — mostly women and children — were killed by rapid fire weapons and thrown into a mass grave much like the Jewish Holocaust, according to Goodsoldier. "So often when I talk about historical trauma, people just tell me to get over it, to forget about it," Goodsoldier said. "What if I told you to just get over 9/11? How would you feel about that? Most people would be shocked at such a suggestion. It makes you think." While the concept of historical trauma has been around only for the last few decades, studies have shown that even family members who have not directly experienced the original trauma can feel the effects of the event generations later. "Each event is traumatic, but taken together they constitute a history of sustained cultural disruption and destruction directed at specific communities," Goodsoldier said. "Trauma that is held personally is then transmitted over generations to join an overarching legacy of assaults." Goodsoldier, who is originally from a Navajo reservation in Northern Arizona, was raised by her grandparents and still feels their pain. Both her grandfather and grandmother were forced into boarding schools by the government in their younger years, where they were sexually abused and banned from using their native tongue. As a result, Goodsoldier’s mother and her siblings were never allowed to learn the Navajo language, further isolating them from their roots. The historical trauma intervention model Thankfully, Goodsoldier believes that the historical trauma intervention model can lead to lasting healing. The four main intervention model components include confronting the trauma, understanding the trauma, releasing the pain, and transcending the trauma. "If we never confront the trauma, we will never get over it and we will never heal," Goodsoldier said. Multiple periods of emotional and spiritual trauma in Native American history need to be addressed, she says. They include: . Beginning of contact with the white man, which led to shock, genocide, and a lack of time to grieve in the greater interest of survival; . Economic competition over buffalo, which was a large physical and spiritual loss of sustenance; . Invasion/war period, which led to extermination and the development of refugee symptoms; . Subjugation and reservation period, where natives were either confined or translocated and had no sense of security; . Boarding school period, which destroyed the family system and to this day is main reason why families remain so disconnected as traditional parenting was lost to the boarding schools; and the . Forced relocation and termination period, which involved a transfer to urban areas and prohibition of religious freedom. After addressing the atrocities committed, it is important that the trauma is fully understood. While difficult and often time painful, Goodsoldier believes it is an essential step in the road towards becoming well. Goodsoldier agrees with the Native American scholar Vine Deloria who said that a "society that cannot remember its past and honor is in peril of losing its spirit." Common feelings and emotions during the understanding process include survivor guilt, depression and psychic numbing, fixation to trauma, low self-esteem, victim identity, anger, self-destructive behaviors, substance abuse and alcoholism, hypervigilance, internalized oppression, and a preoccupation with death. "The death identity issue really breaks my heart because I’ve talked to eight-year-olds who are considering suicide," Goodsoldier said. "Suicide is common on reservations, and when it happens, you see lots of memorials in the forms of T-shirts, car decals, posters, etc. It's a commonly held belief that the only way someone will be remembered or known at all is through death." Once the trauma is fully understood, it needs to be released as quickly as possible, according to Goodsoldier. "By allowing ourselves to feel and express the emotions and pain tied to the trauma, the healing process can finally begin," said Goodsoldier. "Validating the experience of people and not denying that events happened are also healing." And by releasing trauma, one is then fully equpped to transcend the trauma, accoring to Goodsoldier.

### Historical Unresolved Grief A Direct Consequence of the European Conquest

Braveheart, Duran, Johnson ("The American Indian Holocaust: Healing Historical Unresolved Grief: Dr. Maria Yellow Horse Brave Heart and Dr. Lemyra M. DeBruyn)

Abstract: American Indians experienced massive losses of lives, land, and culture from European contact and colonization resulting in a long legacy of chronic trauma and unresolved grief across generations. This phenomenon, called historical unresolved grief, contributes to current social pathology of high rates of suicide, homicide, domestic violence, child abuse, alcoholism and other social problems among American Indians. Interventions based on traditional Native American ceremonies and modern western treatment modalities for grieving and healing of those losses are described. Social ills among American Indians and Alaska Natives are primarily the product of a legacy of chronic trauma and unresolved grief across generations. Historical unresolved grief contributes to current social pathology originating from loss of lives, land, and vital aspects of Native culture due to the European conquest o the Americas. Losses from disease, annihilation, starvation, military and colonialist expansionist and assimilationist policies cause grief.  Mission Schools starting in 1700s: change Indian culture and identity  The Boarding School Era 1879 -1950s  Violence and Shame, Self-Esteem and Parenting Skills Children were removed from homes, beaten, given shaming messages of inferiority. Told Indian families were not capable of raising their own children and that Indians are culturally and racially inferior. Abusive behaviors: physical, sexual, emotional were experienced and learned by the children No emotional of spiritual behaviors to lead to positive self-esteem; no healthy parenting skills for raising their own children  Assimilation Policies: Dawes Allotment Act of 1887 Tribal (communal) land divided into individual parcels: "excess" land opened to white settlers Termination and Relocation Policies of 1950s Terminate tribal treaty status/empty the reservations by sending Indians to cities, where they faced racism and poverty Holocaust Studies Difficulties in mourning mass graves/massive group trauma Their OWN country perpetrated the holocaust Survivors have intense emotions: intense rage they must repress, which results in psychic numbing  Survivor Syndrome anxiety and impulsivity holocaust imagery/nightmares depression, withdrawal and isolation and guilt elevated mortality rates from heart disease, suicide and other forms of violent death perceived obligation to share in ancestral pain  unresolved grief survivors feel responsible to undo the tragic pain of the ancestral past, overly protective of parents, preoccupied with death and persecution  Disenfranchised Grief Grief that persons experience when a loss cannot be openly acknowledged or publicly mourned. Indians have been portrayed by dominant culture as stoic, and without feelings. Socially defined as incapable of grief, little recognition of their sense of loss, need to mourn, o ability to do so. Message is that Indians have no need to right to grieve. Disenfranchised Grief results in an intensification of normative emotional reactions such as anger, guilt, sadness and helplessness. The absence of rituals to facilitate the mourning process can severely limit the resolution of grief. When a society disenfranchises the legitimacy of grief among any group, the resulting intrapsychic function that inhibits the experience and expression of grief effects, that is, sadness and anger, is shame. Grief covered by shame negatively impacts relationships with self and others and one's realization of the sacredness within oneself and one's community. Further, European American culture legitimizes grief only for immediate nuclear family in the current generation. This may also serve to disenfranchise the grief of Native people over the loss of ancestors and extended kin as well as animal relatives and traditional languages, songs and dances. Depression/Cognitive Function Traumatic history and racism play a significant role in depression. Cognitive performance deteriorates over time in traumatized individuals. Trauma in the Present American Indians face repeated traumatic losses of relatives and community members through alcohol-related accidents, homicides, and suicides. Deaths can occur so frequently they leave people number. Domestic violence and child abuse are frequent and add to the traumas of the past and fuel anguish and destructive coping mechanisms. "New Age" imitations of traditional American Indian spiritual traditions is a form of genocide. Role and Impact of Alcohol Little known prior to contact, alcohol used as a bargaining tool on the American frontier. Role models for drinking behavior were usually pathological and associated with violence. Drunken comportment became a learned behavior for American Indians. Alcoholism death rate is 5.5 times the national average. Alcohol had a devastating effect on the health and morale of Indian people: with the reservation system, a colonized people lost control of their land, culture and way of life.  Indian alcohol abuse, a self-destructive act often associated with depression, may be an outcome of internalized aggression, internalized oppression, and unresolved grief and trauma. Anger and aggression are acted out upon oneself and others like the self (members of one's group); internalization of self-hatred as an outcome of oppression and the danger of direct expression of anger toward the dominant culture.  Identification with the Aggressor: anxiety in response to critical authority figures; an individual incorporates the harshness of the aggressive authority figure, which may be projected onto others with hostility. Healing Historical Unresolved Grief Learning and teaching tribal traditions and ceremonies; communal grief rituals, storytelling; extended kin networks to support identity formation, a sense of belonging, recognition of a shared history and survival of the group. Emotional expression of pain decreases guilt and increases joy Wiping the Tears Reattachment to Native values Development of healthy spirituality individual, family and community healing Internalized Oppression  Once a people have been assaulted in a genocidal fashion, there are psychological ramifications. With the victim's complete loss of power comes despair, and the psyche reacts by internalizing what appears to be genuine power--the power of the oppressor. The internalizing process begins when Native American people internalize the oppressor, which is merely a caricature of the power actually taken from Native American people. At this point, the self-worth of the individual and/or group has sunk to a level of despair tantamount to self-hatred. This self-hatred can be either internalized or externalized. . . Research has demonstrated the grim reality of internalized hatred result in suicide. . .Another way in which the internalized self-hatred is manifested symptomatically is through the deaths of massive numbers by alcoholism. When self-hatred is externalized, we encounter a level of violence within the community that is unparalleled in any other group in the country . . ." (Duran and Duran, 29) Disenfranchised Grief The sense that you cannot grieve; that no one hears or is listening to your grief; the dominant culture acts as if you do not have grief, or do not need to grieve. See Lisa Poupart's essay. Causes: a legacy of genocide, physical and cultural Effects: unsettled trauma, unresolved grief, internalized oppression, alcohol, child, sexual, and domestic abuse, depression, suicide 1. Education increases awareness of trauma 2. Sharing effects of trauma provides relief 3. Grief resolution through collective mourning/healing creates  positive group identity and commitment to community  Six Phases of Historical Unresolved Grief  1st Contact: life shock, genocide, no time for grief Colonization: introduction of disease and alcohol, traumatic events such as Wounded Knee Massacre  Economic Competition: sustenance loss (physical/spiritual)  Invasion/War Period: extermination, refugee symptoms  Subjugation/Reservation Period: confined/translocated, forced dependency on oppressor, lack of security  Boarding School Period: destroyed family system beatings, rape, prohibition of Native language and religion; Lasting Effect: ill-prepared for parenting, identity confusion  Forced Relocation and Termination Period: transfer to urban areas, prohibition of religious freedom racism/viewed as second class; loss of governmental system and community

# Contention 3: Education

### Education is Key to Overcoming Stereotypes That Perpetuate Historical Trauma

Reese 1996 (Debbie, “Teaching Young Children about Native Americans”)

Stereotypes Children See Most young children are familiar with stereotypes of the Native American. Stereotypes are perpetuated by television, movies, and children's literature when they depict Native Americans negatively, as uncivilized, simple, superstitious, blood-thirsty savages, or positively, as romanticized heroes living in harmony with nature (Grant & Gillespie, 1992). The Disney Company presents both images in its films for children. For example, in the film Peter Pan, Princess Tiger Lily's father represents the negative stereotype as he holds Wendy's brothers hostage, while in the film Pocahontas, Pocahontas represents the positive stereotype who respects the earth and communicates with the trees and animals. Many popular children's authors unwittingly perpetuate stereotypes. Richard Scarry's books frequently contain illustrations of animals dressed in buckskin and feathers, while Maurice Sendak's alphabet book includes an alligator dressed as an Indian. Both authors present a dehumanized image, in which anyone or anything can become Native American simply by putting on certain clothes. Ten Little Rabbits, although beautifully illustrated, dehumanizes Native Americans by turning them into objects for counting. Brother Eagle, Sister Sky (Harris, 1993) contains a speech delivered by Chief Seattle of the Squamish tribe in the northwestern United States. However, Susan Jeffers' illustrations are of the Plains Indians, and include fringed buckskin clothes and teepees, rather than Squamish clothing and homes. An Accurate Picture of Native Americans in the 1990s Native Americans make up less than one percent of the total U.S. population but represent half the languages and cultures in the nation. The term "Native American" includes over 500 different groups and reflects great diversity of geographic location, language, socioeconomic conditions, school experience, and retention of traditional spiritual and cultural practices. However, most of the commercially prepared teaching materials available present a generalized image of Native American people with little or no regard for differences that exist from tribe to tribe. Avoid presenting sacred activities in trivial ways. In early childhood classrooms, for example, a popular activity involves children in making headbands with feathers, even though feathers are highly religious articles for some tribes. By way of example, consider how a devout Catholic might feel about children making a chalice out of paper cups and glitter. Avoid introducing the topic of Native Americans on Columbus Day or at Thanksgiving. Doing so perpetuates the idea that Native Americans do not exist in the present. Conclusion Much remains to be done to counter stereotypes of Native Americans learned by young children in our society. Teachers must provide accurate instruction not only about history but also about the contemporary lives of Native Americans.

# Role of the ballot

### The survival of the debate community requires recognizing value to epistemological accountability and social position

Valdivia-Sutherland, Professor at Butte Community College, 98

Cynthia, “Celebrating Differences: Successfully Diversifying Forensics Programs,” National Communication Association’s 84th Annual Meeting.

It has been argued that forensics is (or should be) primarily an educational enterprise, rooted in pedagogy, rhetoric, and research. If this is so, then in advancing into the 21st century, an era in which societies will increasingly become multicultural, it makes sense to adopt Albert and Triandis' (1985) [the] objective of effectuating intercultural education within a multicultural society. The aim of this objective is "to prepare individuals to function effectively in both their culture of origin and in their new culture" (p. 391). Implementing this objective in forensics will not be easy. Change never is. However, while human beings do not automatically embrace the unknown, inability to move beyond a state of stasis equates to stagnation in human development. Within the world of forensics, coaches, critics, and competitors must continually adapt, evolving in their interactions with an ever-changing environment, or risk extinction. First, those of us involved in the activity must hone our self-diagnostic skills; in other words, we must consistently and honestly examine what we are doing, why, and with what effect. Are we "doing the greatest good for the greatest number?" If not, why not? Second, we must recognize the potential for educational gain when we expose ourselves and our students to multicultural awareness, knowledge, and acceptance. Not only will our learning experience be enriched, but we may also be led to explore identities and to question cultural domination, thereby increasing acceptance of differences.