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#### The ballot is a referendum on a research model that produces social change as an archival record.

Hastings 10 (Emiko Hastings, Prof @ University of Michigan, 2010, [http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10502-010-9113-2.pdf](http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10502-010-9113-2.pdf))

The persistent archival researcher Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga gained a reputation as a ‘‘destructive force.’’ Beginning as a private citizen in 1978, she worked tirelessly to research and document Japanese American internment during World War II, spending 50 or 60 h per week at the National Archives and ﬁlling her house with boxes of documents. Although not formally trained as an archival researcher, she examined hundreds of thousands of pages of documents and developed a complex cross-referencing and indexing scheme to follow the paper trail of evidence through multiple collections of records at the National Archives. Her research revealed a pattern of abuses of power by multiple branches and agencies of the US government after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, which had resulted in the unjust internment of 120,000 innocent Japanese Americans. This documentary evidence formed the basis of a groundbreaking report in 1983 by the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, which concluded that Japanese American internment had been caused by ‘‘race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership’’ (Fujita-Rony 2003). Herzig-Yoshinaga’s research, combined with discoveries by Peter Irons, a legal historian, also allowed Irons to reopen the Supreme Court cases of Gordon Hirabayashi, Minoru Yasui, and Fred Korematsu, which had upheld the legality of internment during World War II. Irons and a team of lawyers successfully overturned their convictions, leading to new understandings of internment that spurred the redress movement for all Japanese American internees (Irons 1983; Murray 2000). This episode in Japanese American history illustrates the power of archival records to document injustice and promote social change. The very documents that were originally used to control the Japanese American population became the documents that enabled recognition of injustice and led to the conclusion of the redress movement. My own archival research into Japanese American internment documents began as a search for a glimpse into my family history. During World War II, my grandmother, a second-generation Japanese American, was interned with her family in Poston, Arizona. My grandfather’s family was also interned in that camp, although he was a lieutenant in the all-Japanese-American 442nd regiment in the US Army. Like many other Japanese Americans, they remained quiet about their experiences after the war, and my grandmother passed on before I was old enough to ask her about it. They lost most of their personal belongings during the relocation, and cameras were conﬁscated in the camps, so there were no family pictures from that time period. One day when I was browsing the Online Archive of California for a research project, I came across the War Relocation Authority (WRA) collection at the Bancroft Library, and on a whim, typed in my grandmother’s name. To my surprise, the search returned a photograph from the Poston internment camp. Looking at the digitized photograph, I immediately recognized my grandmother in a group of legal staff members (Fig. 1). Her slightly mischievous smile was exactly the same, and she looked so much like my aunt that the family resemblance was unmistakable. Finding this photograph online in an archival collection was a revelation to me. After this discovery, I went to the National Archives website and searched for her in the database of War Relocation Authority case ﬁles. From her case ﬁle summary, I found out that she had been a ﬁrst-year college student when she was interned, had been to Japan once before the age of 10, and her potential occupation was ‘‘Semiskilled dressmakers and seamstresses.’’ These small pieces of information ﬁlled in gaps in my knowledge of her life and helped me to reconstruct a family history I had never known. Like many others before me, I found a personal meaning in the archives when I uncovered records that revealed my family’s past. People use archives for many reasons, ranging from the personal to the political. Archiving the records of Japanese American internment has allowed for many reinterpretations of this episode in American history, leading to political redress and healing of collective memories. The case of Japanese American internment during World War II provides an example of two seemingly contradictory purposes of documents: social control and social justice. First, in enacting internment, the US government created and used documents to establish control over the Japanese American evacuees. During the course of enacting internment, records were created, maintained, and kept as evidence of organizational activities; this was the primary value of the records for their creators. Second, the documents were repurposed after internment to reinterpret the meaning of that era and to seek redress for interned Japanese Americans. This secondary informational value of the records was made possible because the documents had been preserved at repositories such as the National Archives. The case of Japanese American internment documents illustrates one value of archives to society: to preserve documents that can aid in the reinterpretation of historical events and the recognition of past errors. The use of records for social justice is a key illustration of the power of recordkeeping. By relying on the documentary record created during Japanese American internment and preserved in archives, it was later possible to hold the American government accountable for the violation of people’s rights. The use of archives for social justice is a subject that has received increasing recognition in the archival community in recent years. Archivists such as Verne Harris, David A. Wallace, Randall Jimerson and others have contributed to a growing body of literature on this topic. In Archives Power, Jimerson calls on archivists to recognize their ethical responsibilities and ‘‘respond to the call of justice.’’ He emphasizes that access to archives is essential for those who seek to redress past injustices (Jimerson 2009). The case of Japanese American internment is one of many such uses of archives to document and redress historical injustices, such as US government records on American Indian tribes or the post-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings in South Africa. In all of these cases, the documents originally created to enact control became repurposed to redress an imbalance of power and achieve social justice. What is perhaps unique about the Japanese American situation is its well-deﬁned parameters: a time period of less than a decade, involving a relatively small population and an abundance of documentary evidence. By the time the last redress payments to internees were made in 1999, Japanese Americans had achieved a signiﬁcant measure of closure and largely succeeded in redeﬁning the collective memory of that event.

#### Education about Japanese internment prevents a repetition of internment and racist policies

Posnick-Goodwin -12 (Sherry, “Japanese American internment: What have we learned?,” California teachers association, Vol. 16, Iss. 9, http://www.cta.org/en/Professional-Development/Publications/2012/06/June-Educator-2012/manzanar-main.aspx)

“They were told they were going to the camps for their own protection. But the guns weren’t facing out. They were facing in.” There is silence as Jenny Chomori describes how innocent Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II. Sixth-graders at Thomas Starr King Middle School in Los Angeles are shocked that U.S. residents were locked up after the bombing of Pearl Harbor just because they were Japanese. Most lost their homes and all their possessions. How could that happen, asks Chomori, in a land dedicated to justice for all? Her class is creating podcasts and movies about the Japanese American internment and reading “Farewell to Manzanar,” a memoir about a concentration camp near Mt. Whitney that once held 10,000 Japanese inmates. For Chomori, the internment issue is personal. Her father’s relatives were imprisoned in Manzanar while her father fought in the U.S. Army. Her mother’s relatives were sent to an “assembly center” at Santa Anita, also in Southern California, where they were put in horse stalls before being shipped to a camp in Arkansas and then relocated again to Arizona. “When they registered at the camps, they became just a number,” says Chomori, a member of United Teachers Los Angeles. “How would you like to no longer be a person and just be a number?” Students wonder why the inmates didn’t try to escape from Manzanar. “They had nowhere to go,” Mikhail Holliday says to his classmates, explaining that Manzanar was surrounded by wilderness and the Mojave Desert. Anniversary of an injustice This year marks the 70th anniversary of Executive Order 9066 signed by President Roosevelt, which resulted in 120,000 Japanese Americans being relocated to detention camps. Inmates lived in primitive and challenging conditions. Those interned at camps such as Manzanar reacted in different ways. The Japanese culture taught “gaman,” to persevere or to endure, so some accepted their fate. Others resisted, protested, or organized politically. Many others enlisted or were drafted. “Nisei” are the first generation to be born in America. Ten thousand volunteered in the all-Nisei 100th Infantry Battalion, the foundation for the 442nd Regimental Combat Team. Active for just the last two years of the war, the 442nd was the most decorated unit, for its size and length of service, in the history of the U.S. military. Some 6,000 served in the Military Intelligence Service, playing a key role in the Pacific Theater, intercepting and decoding enemy messages. Thousands who served defended the reputation of their community with their lives while their families were interned. It wasn’t until the 1988 Civil Liberties Act (often called the Redress Bill) was signed into law that the United States apologized for the unjustified internment of Japanese Americans. “There was shame in being incarcerated. They wanted it to be forgotten,” Chomori said, adding that she is grateful her parents talked about the camp, because many former inmates never discussed it. As a college student, Chomori visited Manzanar with other activists and helped raise awareness about what happened there. Manzanar Pilgrimage Day became an annual event thereafter, held the last Saturday in April and attended by people from throughout the country. Now a national historic site, Manzanar still has the original guardhouse plus reconstructed barracks and mess hall. Redlands Teachers Association member Gary Peplow takes his fourth- and fifth-graders to Manzanar every year. He believes that studying the Japanese internment helps students question what the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence really stand for. Both are required reading in his class. Student Carl Schubert called the visit “amazing. We could see the guard towers. The cabins had dirty wood floors, no insulation or walls to separate the cabins. It’s hard to imagine that thousands of people lived that way.” Peplow says his students are always indignant to learn about this unpleasant chapter in American history, and for that reason alone it should be taught. “I use the past to focus on what’s going on right now. I ask them to consider whether racism still causes people to react in the same way today. By learning from our mistakes, we can make the world a better place.” History repeats itself? To commemorate the anniversary, CTA’s Pacific Asian American Caucus conference in May was titled “Manzanar: A Living History Experience.” Cliff Kusaba, chair of the caucus, describes the conference as a powerful experience. “For me, it was personal. It was where my family lived.” Attendees ate meals in the reconstructed mess hall and met in the auditorium. They visited the interpretive center, talked with former inmates and visited the campground, ending the conference at the Manzanar monument and cemetery. Now, 70 years later, history may not have repeated itself, but it did take a similar turn after Sept. 11, observes Kusaba. “The panic after 9/11 was similar to what ensued after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor,” says the Teachers Association of Long Beach member. “The Patriot Act brought civil rights and privacy into question. Members of the Muslim community have come to Japanese Americans to ask us about our experiences. They feel a connection to us because they are also under attack.” Kusaba says that the Japanese American internment story is usually glossed over in history books and seldom taught in depth. “But these things should be taught — it’s an issue of civil rights, freedom and what it means to be a United States citizen.”

#### Permutation do both. Only the permutation solves--our methodologies are not mutually exclusive. Incorporating the historical analysis and the narrative of the 1ac is key.

Lai 6
 (Clement Lai, Comparative Ethnic Studies at UC Berk, Between ‘Blight’ and a New World: Urban Renewal, Political Mobilization, and the Production of

Spatial Scale, 2006)

It was during the A-2 phase and within this context of continued neighborhood dislocation and dispersal that CANE formed in 1973. An examination of both the organization’s political actions as well as its representational and ideological strategies shows that CANE’s politics were more than a politics of the local. There were moments when CANE was able to broaden its struggle and jump scale. CANE’s composition reflects its scalar strategy. Its multi-class membership was comprised of college students, leftist activists (many of whom were affiliated with the older Jtown Collective),28 small business owners, residents (mostly renters), and social service providers (Committee Against Nihonmachi Eviction 1975, Omatsu 1994, Tasaki 2000, Geron 2003). Put another way, CANE was a ‘mass organization’ whose composition represented the full panoply of the groups within the Asian American Movement (Tasaki 2000, Geron 2003). The majority of its members were Japanese American men and women, largely Sansei (3rd generation) but also some Nisei (2nd generation) and Issei (1st generation), and significantly CANE’s membership included a few Chinese- and African American residents and storeowners from the Western Addition. Although CANE’s leadership was mostly Sansei, at various times it was similarly multiracial and multiethnic. 29 CANE’s multigenerational membership facilitated its 1980s grassroots organizing through the National Coalition for Redress and Reparations (NCRR) to gain redress and reparations for the internment experience, which was made possible, in part, by the intergenerational sharing of stories about the experience, i.e. talk-story (Omatsu 1994; Geron 2003). 30As a grassroots organization influenced by Marxist-Leninist-Maoist thought, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Black Power Movement, ideologically CANE interpreted urban renewal in terms of class struggle and the worldview of internal colonialism. Its activists argued that redevelopment represented the interests of property and corporate capital (both Bay Area and transnational). To this end, they attacked the RDA and the Kintetsu Corporation, maintaining that urban renewal would result in the destruction of J-town as a community of residents and small businesses, leaving a commodified, Japanese-themed amusement park, a tourist trap, which they satirically referred to Kintetsu-Town – sort of a multicultural, ‘ornamental’ version of Disneyland without fast rides or animatronic singing pirates. They also directed their class critique at the Nihonmachi Community Development Corporation (NCDC), which was the RDA’s designated local community representative. Specifically CANE argued that NCDC did not represent the interests of J-town’s residents because NCDC’s membership was restricted to propertied landholders and business owners who could afford to purchase voting shares. Thus CANE understood and critiqued the goals of the redevelopment master plan, making the case that it was driven by corporate imperative and recognizing that redevelopment’s commodification of space maximized exchange-values – the ‘highest and best use of the land’ – to the detriment of the use-values that were important to residents, such as the existence of a vibrant community; this is what Lefebvre (1991) means when he contrasts spaces of exchangevalue (the space of the technocrat) and spaces of use-value (social space). Instead of condominiums and luxury apartments housing the employees of San Francisco’s service oriented, post-war economy, CANE called for two things: 1) a halt to the destruction of J-town and the dispersal of its residents; and 2) the construction of below-market rate housing and affordable commercial space for small businesses. They advocated nothing less than the preservation of a Japanese American community. A key component of this politics of community included CANE’s framing of urban renewal as analogous to the internment experience, which carried deep resonance for Japanese Americans. Put another way, by equating eviction with evacuation, urban renewal was framed as a community threat akin to the WWII internment. One should note that this argument was made at a time when the Japanese American community was still attempting to recover from the trauma of the internment experience.31 This appeal to a sense of collective experience was effective because collective memory makes up part of what French theorist Henri Lefebvre (1991) refers to as social space or the lived space of the everyday (collective memory in place), a central element in the spatiality of social movement mobilization around use-values. In part, CANE’s class critique was also informed by the ideology of internal colonialism. While not all of CANE’s members adhered to this worldview, the internationalist, anti-capitalist, and anti-racist aspects of internal colonialism resonated with activists at the time.32 Internal colonialism interpreted ethnic enclave formation as the product of racism and colonialism, and in this sense, it was a direct challenge to the hegemony of assimilationist theory. Japantowns were understood as physical manifestations of these colonial relationships. Through this analogy, activists made conceptual and political linkages between their struggles and those of Third World liberation. More broadly speaking, this ideology facilitated the formation of ties of solidarity between its adherents and other subordinated groups in the U.S., perhaps contributing to CANE’s multiracial composition. Significantly, internal colonialism promoted community based organizing because of its emphasis on self-determination, s\

olidarity, and autonomy (all of which were vital conceptions to the formation of an oppositional social space [Lefebvre 1991]) (Kim 2002). In the interests of promoting community control, activists returned to enclaves in an attempt to redress ‘brain drain’ from their communities, i.e. they drew parallels between the exodus of college trained individuals from the enclave and what was occurring with the developing world’s ‘best and the brightest.’ Within this context, the struggle for autonomy should be viewed in terms of its global historical significance rather than being limited exclusively to the enclave. Part of the liberal capitalist state’s crisis of legitimacy during the late 1960s and 1970s was a social political challenge by marginalized groups in opposition to both the state and also established entities, like labor unions, which had become incorporated into the Keynesian welfare state (Negri 1988). Elements of this ideology informed CANE’s tactics at the neighborhood level, which included educating residents, assisting with relocation of residents and small businesses, targeting municipal government with lobbying, direct action, and civil disobedience, and engaging in mass actions. Importantly CANE’s oppositional and autonomous vision of community and of development facilitated the formation of wider connections beyond the neighborhood: for example, members spoke in front of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; got a resolution passed at the 1974 National Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) meeting that condemned redevelopment; assisted with the I-Hotel struggle in San Francisco; and shared information and organizing strategies with contemporaneous anti-redevelopment movements in Los Angeles, Seattle, and Honolulu.33 CANE also made contacts and shared support networks with Japanese farmers resisting the expansion of Narita Airport outside Tokyo. It would be wrong to ignore the internationalist influence of internal colonialism and argue that this last connection was made possible entirely through ethnicity. These linkages are examples of attempts to jump spatial scale. They demonstrate a refusal to confine political action exclusively to the scale of the neighborhood or city and a recognition that the proponents behind urban renewal were similarly operating at multiple scales. Ultimately CANE did not stop urban renewal in the Western Addition. If anything redevelopment stopped because of policy shifts in the 1970s under the Nixon Administration, which changed both the nature of federal urban policy and the methods used to fund these projects.34 CANE was successful, however, in delaying and stopping some demolitions, in relocating some residents and businesses, in helping change the terms of redevelopment, and in assisting with the establishment of both limited low-rent housing through the Japanese American Religious Federation (JARF) and also a cultural center, the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center of Northern California (JCCCNC). CANE’s eventual transition from an antiredevelopment organization to a civil rights organization, the Japanese Community Progressive Association (JCPA), whose activities included organizing the grassroots campaign for redress and reparations for the Japanese internment and assisting with Jesse Jackson’s Rainbow Coalition presidential campaigns, must be seen as attempts to rearticulate struggle at larger scales through practice and discursive strategies. In terms of additional legacies of urban renewal, redevelopment contributed to the dispersal of many but not all of J-town’s residents (something that had already begun as a result of internment): the interesting thing is that, in the face of these changes, street fairs have become means to recreate Japanese American community – a dispersed community recreated partly through performance and nostalgia. Although Japantown was radically altered by urban renewal, enough Japanese residents remained in J-town, through the efforts of grassroots mobilizing and social service provider advocacy, that a Japanese community survived – one that worked, lived, and raised families in J-town and one that was able to re-appropriate some of these redeveloped spaces as community institutions, such as the J-town Bowling Alley, which has recently been the site of a closure struggle between the building’s management company and community groups. This, in other words, is a testament to urban renewal’s unresolved legacy – the continued struggle between social space and externally imposed attempts to maximize the spaces of exchange-value.35 Even though redevelopment in the Western Addition never became a cause célèbre akin to the I-Hotel, the importance of CANE’s struggle against urban renewal lies less in the outcomes of its members’ organizing – the relative success or lack of success in stopping renewal – than in how they organized, how they made sense of the urban renewal process, and how they understood the world. To emphasize success exclusively leads to the sort of scholarly inattention or even dismissal seen in Wei’s (1993) flawed history of the Asian American Movement or Hartman’s (2002) excellent history of the politics of property and development in San Francisco. The stress, then, should be placed on CANE’s spatial strategy, on their attempts to produce and mobilize around (social) space under conditions of crisis. Clearly examining the spatiality of social movements has implications for social movement theory and for analysis and hopefully the practice of contemporary movements of the mundane and the revolutionary, at the level of the hiccup or the level of the apocalyptic. These struggles include the organizing of immigrant women sweatshop workers through workers’ centers, like Asian Immigrant Women’s Advocates (AIWA), or the anti-capitalist organizing of the Black Bloc. Furthermore, my study speaks to an important episode in the Asian American Movement of the 1960s and 1970s, when Asian Americans were involved in struggles over land, housing, social space, and the ‘right to the city’ (Lefebvre 1996).36 It is important to realize that, though it is often times assumed in mainstream academic and political arguments that the Asian American community today is terribly middle-class and/or suburbanized, the older Asian American community was dispersed, dislocated, or just plain ‘assimilated,’ in part, through the effects of redevelopment programs. Moreover, these struggles for below-market rate housing have not disappeared – certainly not for many Asian American seniors and new immigrants.37 In addition to Asian American Studies and social movements literature, my study has implications for critical theories of race. Ruth Gilmore defines racism as “…the state-sanctioned and/or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death, in distinct yet densely interconnected political geographies (Gilmore 2002,261).” This study shows that urban renewal also functions as a form of state-sponsored, sociospatial differentiation, one whose success depended on ‘racial projects’ that linked the state, capital, and the production of space to the deadly social construction of embodied difference. It is not enough to understand how groups are racialized in relation to each other, but one must also understand how this process is spatialized. One need only contrast the construction of the hyperorientalized Japan Center with the near Dresden-like devastation of the Fillmore District, which ultimately contributed to rise of Jim Jones’ Peoples’ Temple in the Western Addition and the 1978 Jonestown Massacre in Guyana (Hartman 2002). This is, as Stuart Hall (1992) puts it in a slightly different way than Gilmore, “the fatal coupling of difference and power.” Finally, this study has implications for how we theorize crisis and its resolution, particularly with respect to the state and property relations. Drawing from W.E.B. Du Bois (1935) on the undermining of post-Civil War Reconstruction at the hands of the ‘dictatorship of property’ and from Ruth Gilmore (1999) on anti-prison organizing by women of color, we can use the past (both distant and recent) to think through the crisis of the present. Both shed light on crises created not only by gentrification but also by neoliberal structural adjustment induced privatization and the related, never-ending funeral procession that masquerades as a war on terrorism. The latter, to paraphrase John Maynard Keynes and Toni Negri in a slightly different context, is nothing less than a ‘party of catastrophe,’ a ‘hanging party,’ whose true triumph is not one of the will but of creating a society of singular rapaciousness built and dependent on the Saturn-like devouring of its children. Thus, the work of Peter Linebaugh (2003a, 2003b) and Iain Boal (2004, forthcoming) can be linked to Thomas Rainborough’s tears through examination of other historical, contemporary, and future struggles over the spaces of the everyday, of social space, which, in a more general way, is a historical tendency or aspiration against dispossession - at any spatial scale and no matter how mundane. Though it appears that we are heading toward a twilight – somewhere beyond tragedy and farce – I hope that, by invoking this historical tendency, this aspiration, this dreaming, what I am pointing toward instead is the scream or rather the collective scream (chorus-like yet contrapuntal, full of refusal and irony), which has certainly sounded in the past, is sounding in the present, and may yet sound more clearly and more loudly than the scream/howl of the expropriators.

#### Intersectionality Net benefit-

#### Evaluating multiple perspectives together is key

Razack, professor, Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, 98 [Sherene, “Race, Space, and Prostitution: The Making of the Bourgeois Subject”, Canadian Journal of Women and the Law, 12/1, pg. Women’s Studies International]

To focus on one system of oppression has not sufficed to point the way to effective reform. While feminists have long argued that prostitution maintains a patriarchal social order, we have not often understood its role in securing a racial and classed social order. A spatial analysis enables us to see at least the three interlocking systems of white supremacy, patriarchy, and capitalism at work in the production of a hegemonic masculinity. When we ignore these interconnections, we over-simplify what can be achieved by regulation or deregulation.

#### Racist discourse was created by war powers – our aff solves. When we interned the Japanese, we had to justify it by creating a discourse of urban blight.

Lai 6
 (Clement Lai, Comparative Ethnic Studies at UC Berk, Between ‘Blight’ and a New World: Urban Renewal, Political Mobilization, and the Production of

Spatial Scale, 2006)

At its largest, the Western Addition’s Nihonmachi encompassed a 20-block area centered between Western and Octavia and Post and Pine.8 The neighborhood flourished until the Second World War when FDR issued Executive Order 9066, which forced the evacuation of West Coast Japanese Americans from the Western Defense Zone into concentration camps. This emptied the neighborhood of its inhabitants, creating a sort of volkloser Raum, a peopleless space, not only in J-town but also along the entire West Coast (Agamben 1999).9 These events facilitated the expansion of the smaller African American neighborhood centered along Fillmore Street, which grew between 1940 and 1950 from 2,144 to 14,888 residents (over a 700 percent increase) (Seigel 2000-2001). Most of these new residents were from the South, having traveled to San Francisco in search of war industry jobs (France 1962). After the war, some of the district’s Japanese Americans returned in an attempt to salvage the shattered pieces of their lives, but within a few years, both the Japanese- and African American communities in the area confronted not only the post-war economic downturn but also urban renewal.Urban renewal in the Western Addition was never just about the local reshaping of a neighborhood. To produce the Western Addition as redeveloped space required four key elements: 1) the Bay Area elite’s envisioning

and implementation of a plan to alter the entire region’s political economy, population, and landscape; 2) the contracting of two major transnational developers, the Kintetsu Corporation and the National-Braemer Corporation, to build the (hyper)orientalized Japan Center, the centerpiece development of the first phase of urban renewal in the Western Addition; 3) direct federal government funding and its supporting legal/institutional framework; and 4) an elaborate scalar discourse of ‘urban blight’ that equated ‘blight’ with urban crisis in racialized, gendered, and classed ways. The goal of all of these measures was the production of a space that would ensure the continued accumulation of capital at ever larger scales (the accumulation of post-war super profits), but the discursive/ideological explanations themselves focused on racialized, classed, and gendered disorder operating at smaller spatial scales. There was, in other words, an attempt to privatize or “individualize disorder” (to use Allen Feldman’s [1991] term) by formulating a ‘racial project’ linking the material restructuring of space with justifying discourse that reduced scale in representing the Western Addition as ‘blighted’ (Omi and Winant 1994, Gilmore 1998/1999, Nevins 2004).10 Post-Second World War urban renewal was imagineered in the final years of the war and implemented over a period of four decades by a relatively select clique of spatial actors and institutions operating at the municipal, Bay Area regional, national and transnational scales.11 Chief among these actors was the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, which Chester Hartman (2002) describes as a semi-autonomous “super agency” (15). Headed by Justin Herman from 1959-1971, the RDA was the local institutional actor in charge of the day-to-day business of planning, building condemnation, eviction, and demolition whose powers included the ability to issue bonds, purchase land, control large sums of federal funding, and exercise eminent domain. However, the RDA operated closely with and in many cases took its lead from private developers, Bay Area business elites, and city government officials who operated through organizations like the Bay Area Council (BAC), Blyth-Zellerbach Committee (B-Z Committee), and San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal (SPUR).12 Thus urban renewal was advanced by a close collaboration of public and corporate interests, who, as early as the final years of WWII, began commissioning strategic plans that identified neighborhoods for redevelopment. This master plan for urban renewal was guided by two imperatives: regional planning and specialization within the Bay Area, and making the most of the U.S. conquest of Japan – also known as the “Pacific Rim strategy.” Starting with the Metropolitan Defense Committee (MDC) in 1944, Bay Area economic interests emphasized greater regional coordination and planning with sub-regional specialization of economic functions. For example, the South Bay (Silicon Valley) was envisioned as the post-war center of aerospace and electronics and San Francisco importantly was seen as the hub for both tourism and business, and administrative and legal services (what today is called finance, insurance, and real estate [FIRE] services) (Hartman 2002). As a consequence of this shifting economy, housing for the employees of this new economy had to be constructed.13 Seven neighborhoods, including the Western Addition, were targeted by pro-redevelopment advocates for urban renewal because their proximity to the civic center made them ‘ideal’ locations for this projected new luxury apartment and condominium housing, and their existing populations, largely people of color and/or white working-class, became a ‘problem’ that would require an ‘appropriate remedy.’14 The Pacific Rim strategy, or what I like to refer to as a ‘Reorientation toward the Orient,’ was the Bay Area elite’s attempt to resurrect the old orientalist dream of capturing the riches of the Pacific Rim.15 The essential question was how would the Bay Area elite take advantage of the U.S. conquest of Japan – How would they profit from Pacific Rim hegemony? It was this strategy that informed and molded the construction of the Japan Center. The proposed ‘Manhattanization’ of the downtown area and the repositioning of the Bay Area within the changed global political economy were twin efforts on the part of capital and the state to ‘jump scale’ beyond regulatory and/or geographic boundaries (Smith 1992); capital’s jumping of scale, of course, is not new – another notable example being imperialism. Of critical importance to urban renewal was the federal government’s creation and funding of the urban renewal program through the 1949 Omnibus Housing Act, which underwrote two-thirds of the costs of these projects. It is equally imperative to note that, during this period, urban renewal was not the only federally funded program that attempted widespread socio-spatial engineering. The lion’s share of effort and funds went into highway and road construction and the Federal Housing Administration’s (FHA) insuring of mortgages, almost exclusively in new suburbs. One cannot separate urban renewal from the complementary programs that promoted suburbanization.16 In other words, redevelopment and suburbanization should both be viewed as part of the same massive, subsidized redistribution of land, resources, and people that occurred at the zenith of the Keynesian welfare state’s influence (Gilmore 1998/1999).17 This state sanctioned process exacerbated socio-spatial cleavages and facilitated or solidified the institutionalized intergenerational transfer of white privilege as property wealth (Harris 1993, Oliver and Shapiro 1995, Pulido 2000). Finally, urban renewal in San Francisco was marked by a significant transnational element. In addition to assuming a strategic orientation toward the Pacific Rim, city officials hired the National-Braemer Corporation and the Kintetsu Corporation to be the primary developers of the Japantown Center – the centerpiece development in the first half of the Western Addition’s renewal (A-1), which included a luxury hotel, the Miyako, a Japanese Consulate, a peace pagoda (which was designed in Japan and built in the Bay Area), and a Japanese Trade and Cultural Center (JTCC). 18 The JTCC symbolized and served as an encapsulated space for San Francisco’s trade orientation toward the Pacific Rim, and the entire center itself was designed as a space of tourism, a sight/site for voyeuristic experiencing of things Japanese. Urban renewal advocates, in fact, promoted the Japan Center as a ‘sure-fire’ hotspot for tourism like Chinatown, which had become a major tourism site since the late 19th century. The original plans included showrooms to display the latest wares of Japanese corporations like Nissan and Sony, staff dressed in Japanese-style outfits, and the architecture was garishly and perhaps ironically (faux) Japanese for the architect was Japanese American. Significantly, the fact that international corporations received the bid to develop an ‘authentic’ site of Japaneseness foregrounds the issue of transnational capitalism and its ability to reshape physical and conceived spaces by commodifying and, in this case, (hyper)orientalizing them.19

#### Their speech acts only focus on black females which prevents other bodies from joining the womanist movement—permutation is key

Hutchinson 4 (Darren Lenard, JD from Yale, BA in Political Science and Economics from the University of Pennsylvania, “Critical Race Histories: In and Out”, <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1102&context=aulr&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar_url%3Fhl%3Den%26q%3Dhttp%3A%2F%2Fdigitalcommons.wcl.american.edu%2Fcgi%2Fviewcontent.cgi%253Farticle%253D1102%2526context%253Daulr%26sa%3DX%26scisig%3DAAGBfm2VQ7OWExXQKB8eDDBDqMjVp-xseg%26oi%3Dscholarr#search=%22http%3A%2F%2Fdigitalcommons.wcl.american.edu%2Fcgi%2Fviewcontent.cgi%3Farticle%3D1102%26context%3Daulr%22>)

A third area of critical race innovation involves multiracial politics. Internal critics have argued that racial discourse in the United States fixates upon black/white racial issues, thereby marginalizing Latino, Native American, and Asian American experiences.95 Empirically, this observation is indisputable. Race theorists lack a full understanding of the breadth of racial injustice. The inclusion of the experiences of Latinos, Native Americans, and Asian Americans in racial discourse can improve CRT in several ways. First, a multiracial discourse permits a full accounting of the problem of racial inequality and allows for the construction of adequate remedies for racial subordination.96 Although all people of color suffer racism, often in similar ways, racial hierarchies impact communities of color in diverse ways. A narrow focus on black/white subjugation severely limits the reach of antiracist remedies. The black/white paradigm also prevents persons of color from engaging in coalition politics.97 By treating racism as a problem that affects blacks primarily (or exclusively), racial discourse in the United States divides persons of color who could align to create formidable political forces in the battle for racial justice. Binary racial discourse also causes persons of color to compete for the attention of whites, as marginalized racial groups treat racial justice as a zero-sum game.98 Instead of recognizing the pervasiveness and complexity of racial injuries, binary racial discourse leads to the tyranny of oppression ranking and to competing demands for centrality in a marginalized space of racial victimization. Recently, Critical Race Theorists, responding to the multiracial critics, have attempted to contextualize binary racial discourse. Devon Carbado, for example, recognizes the existence of the so-called black/white paradigm but pushes its critics to consider that this paradigm privileges whites and subordinates blacks.99 Because blacks and whites are situated differently with respect to the black/white paradigm, their investment in binary racial discourse likely serves diverging interests.100 If whites created the paradigm, then directing multiracial critiques toward black scholars might be misguided. Furthermore, several scholars, including those who reject binary racial politics, have documented the unique experiences of blacks in the construction of racism in the United States.101 “Black exceptionalism”102 might provide a historical and sociological explanation for the predominance of black/white racial discourse. Also, resistance to multiracial discourse among blacks might exist because non-black persons of color often benefit from white supremacy. That is, non-black persons of color sometimes align themselves ideologically and culturally with whites to elevate their status in a racially hierarchical society.103 The embrace of racial hierarchy among people of color and white-supremacist privileging (even if shifting and extremely limited) of non-black communities of color impede the willingness of blacks to engage in multiracial discourse. Furthermore, black experiences are relevant to the experiences of other persons of color for two reasons. First, anti-black racism provides an institutional and historical framework for the subordination of non-black persons of color.104 Much of the racial hierarchy in the United States was concretized during slavery—though not exclusively.105 The formation of a rigid racial caste structure in the black/white context legitimizes racist practices against all persons of color.106 Second, persons of color do not exist in mutually exclusive groups. Latino communities, for example, have large populations of persons of African descent; thus, it is difficult to bifurcate Latino and black experiences.107 Abolishing the black/white paradigm, therefore, might preclude analysis of the unique experiences facing black Latinos. Ultimately, however, the exclusive deployment of a binary black/white paradigm artificially narrows racial discourse and harms racial justice efforts. In order to construct adequate antiracist theories and to develop effective remedies for racial injustice, Critical Race Theorists must excavate the multidimensional harms that racial injustice causes, including harms that are racial but not endured by blacks. Furthermore, progressive racial politics can only survive with broad political support. The most likely support for progressive racial change comes from persons of color. Yet, the deep divisions that result from binary racial politics hinders the formation of helpful antiracist alliances. Finally, a multiracial discourse may help blacks demonstrate the pervasiveness of racial inequality. Whites tend to view racism as a relic of prior generations, and they often respond to blacks’ claims of ongoing racial injustice with suspicion.108 Moreover, in a white-supremacist culture, binary racial discourse obscures the experiences of discrimination experienced by Latinos and Asian Americans.109 As a result, whites argue that blacks should emulate “model minorities,” usually Asian Americans, who either do not suffer from racism or do not believe that racism injures them enough to oppose it on a political level.110 Binary racial discourse therefore allows whites to discredit blacks’ claims of racism by offering Asian Americans as proof that the United States has eradicated racial injustice, or that blacks can easily overcome what “little” racism still exists. Multiracial discourse, however, offers a powerful rebuttal to this negative and deceitful discourse. By portraying the complexity of racial inequality, Critical Race Theorists can counter a white-supremacist narrative that disparages blacks’ assertions of racial injustice by deploying model minority constructs.111

#### The manipulations of spatial politics can be confronted by the historical interrogation of the aff
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Spatial Scale, 2006)

An analysis of the discourse that was employed to justify urban renewal reveals how space is metaphorically produced, particularly in terms of scale. As stated earlier in the paper, this discourse hinged upon the designation of ‘urban blight,’ which was necessary for procuring federal funding and which worked rhetorically by portraying ‘blighted’ conditions (the spaces and inhabitants) as an epidemic or crisis. Although reports by the RDA and the San Francisco Planning Commission (SFPC) make some reference to ‘blight’ endangering property values and/or investment, more often than not the threat of ‘blight’ (as measured, for example, by the concentration of condemned housing, numbers of delinquents, and frequency of crime) was rendered as a spatialized danger to the city, the community, and/or the family. For example, in many reports and in local newspaper articles, blighted areas were described as diseased parts of a larger urban body whose potentially terminal effects could only be ameliorated through the palliative of battlefield surgery, i.e. amputation and cauterization.20 Blighted areas were also depicted as breeding grounds for ‘poor citizenship,’ which constituted a danger to the larger urban and democratic community. Often this discourse was directed at the scale of the family. Many of the social indicators that were used to measure ‘blight’ focused on the absence of or threats to healthy heteronormative families in ‘blighted’ areas. For example, a San Francisco City Planning Commission (1945) report explains, “Blighted districts and slums encourage delinquency. They are known as the breeding places of crime. Buildings do provide shelter, but they can rarely be called homes. They are overcrowded, lack space and facilities for normal family life [sic]” (n.p.). Tellingly, the inhabitants of the Western Addition are referred to in another SFPC (1965) report as both “unrelated individuals – the widow, the widower, the bachelor, and the working girl [and]…Negro and Mexican-American…immigrants” (45). Thus, inhabitants of ‘blighted’ areas suffered from a dearth of sunshine, lawns, parks, and pets and a surplus of disease, delinquency, and skin pigmentation/melatonin. Bluntly put, the threat to the heteronormative family was portrayed as both a racial and a mobile menace. At any rate, left unchallenged by the state, these conditions and individuals posed a serious danger to so-called ‘normal’ children and families, especially to those of the workers in the new post-war economy. What this discourse manufactured was nothing less than an urban crisis, which was also a racial crisis (Sugrue 1996). It conflated ‘disorderly’ individuals and ‘disordered’ spaces and was accomplished through a strategic and discursive deployment of spatial scale. Besides justifying renewal, this scalar discourse performed a triple erasure by privatizing disorder or dumping scale. First, in the most immediate sense, this language deflected attention away from the destruction and dislocation that would be wrought by this intervention. Second, it hid the moneyed and propertied interests behind urban renewal. Third, like late 20th century welfare reform’s targeting of the ‘undeserving’ poor, i.e. so-called welfare queens, the crisis-filled discourse of ‘blight’ depicted neighborhoods themselves as undeserving, blaming these spaces and their residents for existing housing conditions, thereby masking the historical factors that created very real declining housing conditions. Put another way, this decontextualized language worked to erase both the history of segregation and the material basis undergirding the property relationship. Both were (and continue to be) secured by a state sanctioned phalanx of racist policies and practices, which operated at multiple levels to fabricate the conditions that became named ‘blight.’ 21 These policies and practices include, for example, everyday racist violence/terror (thuggery), restrictive covenants, redlining, homeowner associations, and even the earliest expropriation of the land through conquest and genocide. As a critical aside, it must be noted that the individualizing of disorder into racialized and gendered archetypes/tropes, like the gang member, crack addict, welfare queen, terrorist, or irresponsible corporate CEO, 22 is not a mere rhetorical play, but rather has had very material and lethal effects. By utilizing the language of crisis and war, this discourse has in most cases legitimized late 20th century dismantling of the Keynesian welfare state through the evisceration of social welfare programs and resulted in the socialization of misery and the concomitant expansion of state repression at ever larger scales. Thus, it should come as no surprise that the rhetoric of war has been deployed to combat so-called drug epidemics or out of control youth gangs because, as Randolph Bourne once noted, “War is the health of the state.”