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## 1AC

(Nicholas Schmidle, staff writer, “GETTING BIN LADEN: What happened that night in Abbottabad”, The New Yorker, 2011,<http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2011/08/08/110808fa_fact_schmidle?currentPage=all>d)

Shortly after eleven o’clock on the night of May 1st, two MH-60 Black Hawk helicopters lifted off from Jalalabad Air Field, in eastern Afghanistan, and embarked on a covert mission into Pakistan to kill Osama bin Laden. Inside the aircraft were twenty-three Navy SEALs from Team Six, which is officially known as the Naval Special Warfare Development Group, or DEVGRU. A Pakistani-American translator, whom I will call Ahmed, and a dog named Cairo—a Belgian Malinois—were also aboard. It was a moonless evening, and the helicopters’ pilots, wearing night-vision goggles, flew without lights over mountains that straddle the border with Pakistan. Radio communications were kept to a minimum, and an eerie calm settled inside the aircraft.¶ Before the mission commenced, the SEALs had created a checklist of code words that had a Native American theme. Each code word represented a different stage of the mission: leaving Jalalabad, entering Pakistan, approaching the compound, and so on. “Geronimo” was to signify that bin Laden had been found.¶ “On the morning of Sunday, May 1st, White House officials cancelled scheduled visits, ordered sandwich platters from Costco, and transformed the Situation Room into a war room…Obama returned to the White House at two o’clock, after playing nine holes of golf at Andrews Air Force Base. The Black Hawks departed from Jalalabad thirty minutes later. Just before four o’clock, Panetta announced to the group in the Situation Room that the helicopters were approaching Abbottabad. Obama stood up. “I need to watch this,” he said…Minutes after hitting the ground…team members began streaming out the side doors of helo one…SEALs rushed forward, ending up in an alley like driveway with their backs to the house’s main entrance…Until this moment, the operation had been monitored by dozens of defense, intelligence, and Administration officials watching the drone’s video feed…After blasting through the gate with C-4 charges, three SEALs marched up the stairs. Midway up, they saw bin Laden’s twenty-three-year-old son, Khalid…and killed him…The final person was bin Laden…Three SEALs shuttled past Khalid’s body and blew open another metal cage…The Americans hurried toward the bedroom door. The first SEAL pushed it open…A second SEAL stepped into the room and trained the infrared laser of his M4 on bin Laden’s chest. The Al Qaeda chief, who was wearing a tan shalwar kameez and a prayer cap on his head, froze; he was unarmed. “There was never any question of detaining or capturing him—it wasn’t a split-second decision. No one wanted detainees,” the special-operations officer told me…Nine years, seven months, and twenty days after September 11th, an American was a trigger pull from ending bin Laden’s life. The first round, a 5.56-mm. bullet, struck bin Laden in the chest. As he fell backward, the SEAL fired a second round into his head, just above his left eye. On his radio, he reported, “For God and country—Geronimo, Geronimo, Geronimo, “After a pause, he added, “Geronimo E.K.I.A.”—“enemy killed in action.” Hearing this at the White House, Obama pursed his lips, and said solemnly, to no one in particular, “We got him.”

### Contention 1: The Killing of Osama bin Laden and the War Against Natives

#### The logic behind the assassination of Osama Bin Laden can be traced back to the colonial logic that justified the assassination of Sitting Bull. The U.S. justified this assassination by constructing all Indian Chiefs as the “ultimate enemy” to the American way of life.

[Cook-Lynn](http://muse.jhu.edu/results?section1=author&search1=Elizabeth%20Cook-Lynn) ‘05

[Elizabeth, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn is a Crow Creek Lakota Sioux editor, essayist, poet, novelist, and academic, whose trenchant views on Native American politics, particularly tribal sovereignty, have caused controversy. “The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee,” <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/wicazo\_sa\_review/v020/20.1cook-lynn04.html>//wyo-hdm]

Not long ago I made a visit to the Museum of Wounded Knee at Wall, South Dakota, located on I-90 just north of the Badlands of South Dakota and just outside of two of the largest Sioux reservations in the Northern Plains: Pine Ridge and Rosebud. This is a new museum, put together by a well-meaning and affable white man from Colorado by the name of Steve Wyant. Entering the exhibits through a turnstile (Indians don't have to pay the $6.00), I [End Page 199] saw a chart entitled "Political Structure of the Sioux Nation" and noticed that the Isianti and Ihanktowan were not among the Seven Council Fires of the Sioux Nation—the English name of the Oceti Shakowan normally made up of those two large tribes, along with the Oglalas, Hunkpati, Sicangu, Sihasapa, and Minneconjou. I suggested (facetiously) that the museum curator should change it to the Five Council Fires of the Sioux Nation. This is an indication, of course, of how Indian histories are made and told, changed, manipulated, and obscured.¶ Strolling further along the walls of the museum, I noticed another collection of pictures with the explanation: "Custer Enters the Black Hills—1874 and 1876." This "entry," of course, was several years after the Treaty of 1868 was signed by the U.S. Government and the Sioux Nation, in which it is stated that "no white man shall enter the treaty lands without the express permission of the Indians." There is no historical evidence that George A. Custer had the permission of the Sioux. I asked the museum curator to change the explanation to "Custer Invades the Black Hills in 1874 and 1876." He looked pained. But unless one understands the Treaty of Fort Laramie of 1868, the 1876 invasion of the Black Hills by Custer and nine hundred men of the U.S. military, which brought about the Battle of the Little Big Horn and death, unless one understands the subsequent 1877 theft of the Black Hills by the U.S. Congress and eventual passage of the 1887 Allotment Act, one cannot understand the Massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890.¶ Jeffrey Ostler's The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee chronicles much of the history of that time and place and uses the same kind of apologetic and obfuscating language found in the Museum of Wounded Knee. On page 20, for example, he says: "The death—some would say murder—of yet another of the Lakotas' preeminent leaders deserves careful analysis." This is the way he introduces the assassination of Sitting Bull, the Hunkpapa, without ever using the word assassination. Instead, Ostler suggests that the reader must understand why U.S. officials ordered the Indian police to arrest Sitting Bull in the first place (Buffalo Bill Cody had orders and volunteered to arrest him because he was dangerous), then launches into several explanations: deep animosity between the police and Sitting Bull's people, hatreds and feuds among the Indians themselves, factionalism bound up in colonialism, and, of course, the inevitable Ghost Dance. Blaming the victims and blaming religion have long been the methods by which apologetic historians account for this crime. Ostler is no exception to this rule.¶ An entire chapter is devoted to this kind of internecine rationale for war and death in the Indian camp in 1890. There is no mention of the Allotment Act of 1887, the breaking up of the Sioux Treaty Homelands bitterly contested by Sitting Bull, as the major reason for the political assassination of this important leader. He had to be assassinated if Indian [End Page 200] lands were going to be occupied by whites. There is little reason to believe that religion was the major cause for the assassinations or the massacres of that period if one understands the function of colonial -intentions.¶ As I continue to read about the assassination of Sitting Bull in these kinds of histories, I am reminded of the assassination of Ahmed Yassin in 2004 by Israeli helicopter pilots, which was the deliberate assassination of a leader of a resistance movement called Hamas in the Palestinian Homelands. Both were the acts of aggressive colonists to acquire land and power. American historians and museum curators must not exempt themselves from such acts.¶ The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism is a reasonably comprehensive history, well documented with a useful bibliography, written in a flourishing prose style. It is divided into three parts: "Conquest," "Colonialism," and "Anticolonialism and the State." There is little examination of the use of the term "Conquest" itself, a term that always implies defeat on the battlefield—something that did not happen in the Sioux-U.S. war theater. Consequently, this text says, for the most part, nothing new in this regard. The defeat in the Sioux-U.S. war theater happened at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. A major criticism of this text is that it does nothing to examine the apologetic language that is always used in such histories. At the conclusion of the narrative, the ethnographic autobiography Black Elk Speaks by John G. Neihardt is trotted out so that the massacre can be called a "traumatic event" in Sioux history rather than a crime against humanity perpetrated by one of the most successful capitalistic democracies in the history of nations. Ostler tells an old and familiar story but does nothing to assist the people of the Sioux Nation in their present struggle toward autonomy and a future of well-being.

#### Our exploration of the similarities between these murders exposes the ways that colonialism has operated behind US killing policies. Western methods of thought are perpetuated through military operations, the targeted killing operation to kill Osama bin Laden was named operation Geronimo. The choice to frame bin Laden in the same method that indigenous people have been framed for assassination and extermination demonstrates the way that the logic that “Indians are enemies” still operates in our foreign policy today

Newcomb ‘11

[Steven Newcomb (Shawnee/Lenape) is co-founder and co-director of the Indigenous Law Institute, author of Pagans in the Promised Land: Decoding the Doctrine of Christian Discovery (Fulcrum, 2008), and a columnist for Indian Country Today Media Network, “Geronimo Again? The Indian Wars Continue Ad Nauseam,” 05.03.2011. <<http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/opinion/geronimo-again%3F-the-indian-wars-continue-%3Cem%3Ead-nauseam%3C/em%3E-32091>>//wyo-hdm]

In my book Pagans in the Promised Land(Fulcrum, 2008) I use the theory of the human mind (cognitive theory) to explain the "cognitive unconscious" of the United States. Certain ingrained traditions of thought, both conscious and unconscious, have been used for generations by U.S. government officials. Such thinking has resulted in the development of predominantly anti-Indian U.S. federal Indian laws and policies. The result has been laws and policies that have proven detrimental to Indian nations and peoples.¶ George Washington, in 1784, used the analogy “the savage as the wolf” to refer to our Indian ancestors as less-than-human “beasts.” As Henry Wheaton said in his Elements of International Law, “The heathen nations of the other quarters of the globe were the lawful spoil and prey of their civilized conquerors.” Thus, one of the normative American metaphors throughout the history of the United States has been "Indians Are Enemies." We’re ~~talking~~ about a U.S. tradition of dehumanization and dominance used against our nations and peoples.¶ From the perspective of non-Indian colonizers, our indigenous ancestors were enemies to be uprooted from the vast extent of our traditional lands and territories and con fined to “reservations” in remote areas, under U.S. control. Thus, off the reservation is a common idiom used by television journalists and commentators to refer to someone being a "renegade," with the connotation being an enemy “who chooses to live outside laws or conventions.” However, it is important to keep in mind that U.S. laws and conventions have been imposed on our nations and peoples. Someone who has gone off the reservationis considered to be an "outlaw,” which in our case is outside the bounds of imposed laws and policies of the United States.¶ Geronimo's life story is a direct result of the invasion of the Apache territory and attempts to subdue the free and independent Apache. After his family was massacred by Mexicans in 1851, Geronimo became a Chiricahua Apache leader who fit perfectly into the non-Indian metaphorical frame “Indians Are Enemies.” He and a small group of fellow Apaches brilliantly eluded capture by 5,000 United States Army soldiers, 500 Indian scouts, and 3000 Mexican soldiers. The desert terrain was steep and formidable. The temperatures were extreme: intense cold and blistering heat. Geronimo and his band had very little food or water. What those Apaches accomplished is very likely one of the most amazing physical feats of stamina in the history of the human race. He finally surrendered in 1886.¶ In the reported stories of Osama Bin Laden being killed by U.S. military forces, bin Laden was code-named “Geronimo.” According to a CBS news report, those who came up with that “inappropriate code name” apparently “thought of bin Laden as a 21st-century equivalent” of Geronimo. In other words, the code name was based on an extension of the metaphor “Indians Are Enemies” to “Geronimo was a Terrorist,” thus perpetuating the U.S. tradition of treating Indian nations and peoples as enemies.¶ Geronimo was fighting against the invasion of his country and the oppression of his people. He did not invade the United States. Rather, Spain, Mexico, and then the United States invaded the Apache Territory and the territories of hundreds of other Indigenous nations. Horrific atrocities were committed against the Apache, and men such as Geronimo, whose family was massacred by Mexicans, did not hesitate to retaliate. Geronimo died a “prisoner of war” in 1909.

#### The use of “Geronimo” by the U.S. military is a act of neocolonialism that continues a tradition of cultural genocide through operations of power, this logic fuels the expansion of militarism and the global war on terror and colonial empire of the United States

Rogers ‘11

[Indiana, Ethnic Studies department at UCSD, “Geronimo and Neocolonial Naming: When Whiteness Never Offends,”10.06.2011. <http://factasyland.wordpress.com/2011/05/06/geronimo-and-neocolonial-naming-when-whiteness-never-offends/>//wyo-hdm]

European colonists brought disease, “advanced” weaponry, and hegemony with them when they encountered Native tribes on this land. The first decimated huge quantities of Indigenous populations, making the process of conquering easier, not making the tribes themselves easier to conquer; the second made considerable power possible for the colonists, as if the possession of certain technologies gives one the right to use them for violence; the third was a justification for genocide, by constructing Indigenous peoples as “uncivilized savages” on the brink of extinction that required elimination, removal, or “education.” Colonial hegemony has long endured into the contemporary moment. This is where the use of Geronimo, in name and legacy, becomes an act of neocolonialism and whiteness by ignoring the continued existence of Indigenous peoples, appropriating certain ancestors at the government’s will, and disregarding the offensive association of a respected historical figure with a man behind organized killings. The US has its own relationship with organized killings, particularly when it involves Indigenous peoples; however, Andrew Jackson, responsible for the Trail of Tears that resulted in over 4,000 American Indian deaths, would never be equated with Osama bin Laden. After finding and assassinating the target of the most expensive manhunt in history, Winona LaDuke, Indigenous author and activist writing from the White Earth Reservation in northern Minnesota, is right to notice that the military “sees this from its own perspective.” US desires and neocolonial interests were behind both the raid that killed bin Laden and the decision to call the raid “Geronimo.” In a video broadcast from [Democracy Now](http://www.democracynow.org/2011/5/6/native_american_activist_winona_laduke_on)!, hosts Amy Goodman and Juan Gonzalez interviewed LaDuke on the military appropriation. The use of what she calls “Native nomenclature” in the military not only desecrates the unique and diverse histories of Native peoples, but also the disproportionately high past and present levels of American Indian military service and enlistment.¶ “That is the reality of Native nomenclature, and how the military uses Native people and Native imagery to continue its global war and its global empire practices.”¶ The military continues to defend US sovereignty against Indigenous peoples, as the government continues to be absent in signing the [UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html); both phenomena are crucial to maintaining US empire, lacking in justice and recognition. Naming an assassination raid after Geronimo is an exercise of ownership and power, a violent seizure of a name in the tradition of violent seizure of Indigenous land. As Cheyenne/Hodulgee Muscogee activist Suzan Shown Harjo said while testifying at the same Senate Commission as Harlyn Geronimo, “Our names are not our own.” ¶ When Indigenous names undergo a military transformation into government property, the pattern of [cultural genocide](http://factasyland.wordpress.com/translations/) continues. This is not only a grave injustice to Indigenous peoples, but also a tremendous disservice to those who have been rendered systemically ignorant of tribal histories, struggles, leaders, and thinkers. While an apology from Obama would be a start, it would doubtfully be enough. Hope and change were useful as campaign platforms, but instances such as these demonstrate how these platforms have sometimes failed to translate into policy. In a [letter](http://www.fortsillapache-nsn.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=61:letter-to-president-about-geronimo&catid=7:tribal-news&Itemid=13) to President Obama, Chairman Jeff Houser of the Fort Sill Apache tribe made these concluding remarks:

#### The unlimited nature of presidential war powers, the flexible definition of terrorism and the frame that places Indians as enemies makes the possibility of unending war and violence against indigenous people possible

Newcomb ‘11

[Steve, co-founder and co-director of the Indigenous Law Institute, author of Pagans in the Promised Land: Decoding the Doctrine of Christian Discovery (Fulcrum, 2008), and a columnist for Indian Country Today Media Network <<http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/opinion/andrew-jackson-and-the-usa-global-war-bill-36691>>//wyo-hdm]

The U.S. government's attempt this past March to analogize al Queda with the Seminole people was a terrible distortion. Worse still is the parallel between Andrew Jackson charging and hanging Arbuthnot and Ambrister for "aiding the enemy" and current U.S. congressional legislation now moving quickly toward passage. Not only have US government attorneys wrongly converted Seminoles into al Qaeda, but the Congress is now about to pass legislation that would treat all humans on the planet as potential detainees for aiding those deemed by the United States to be "enemies."¶ The proposed legislation would make The Authorization for the Use of Military Force of September 2001 a permanent feature of U.S. law. It would make due process protections under the U.S. Constitution unavailable to anyone detained. The scope of the legislation appears to be anybody, anytime, anywhere.¶ A bill authorizing a regime of global war was added to the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011 (H.R. 1540) by House Armed Services Committee Chairman Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA). The Act passed the House last week and now moves to the U.S. Senate. Another such bill was recently put forward by U.S. Senator John McCain (R-AZ).¶ The new war authorization will allow the United States to wage war "wherever there are terrorism suspects in any country around the world without an expiration date, geographical boundaries or connection to the 9/11 attacks or any other specific harm or threat to the United States," the ACLU said recently.¶ According to a May 9 article by Laura Pitter in "The Hill" newspaper ("Proposed McKeon and McCain legislation won’t make us safer"), the bills put forward by congressman McKeon and Senator McCain "would expand who the U.S. says it is at war with and mandate military detention for broadly defined terrorist suspects based on scant evidence." Hearsay evidence will also be admissible.¶ By means of a permanent war authorization, indigenous peoples, and their allies, who advocate for self-determination and for the protection of Indigenous resources (lands, water, minerals, etc.) against colonial and corporate exploitation could be accused by the United States of "supporting terrorism," and thereby come under attack or be seized by the U.S. military and end up being held as detainees. The legislation would further ratify and intensify the U.S. policy of treating Indigenous peoples’ issues as a matter of national security

#### Colonial identity production has reduced Natives to a constant state of near-death. The impact is a state of racism and violence that is constantly renewed through forms of linguistic and physical control

Smith ‘03

[Andrea, “Not an Indian Tradition: The Sexual Colonization of Native Peoples”, Hypatia, Volume 18, Number 2, Spring, pp. 70-85]

Ann Stoler argues that racism, far from being a reaction to crisis in which racial others are scapegoated for social ills, is a permanent part of the social fabric. “[R]acism is not an effect but a tactic in the internal fission of society into binary opposition, a means of creating ‘biologized’ internal enemies, against whom society must defend itself” (1997, 59). She notes that in the modern state, the constant purification and elimination of racialized enemies within that state ensures the growth of the national body. “Racism does not merely arise in moments of crisis, in sporadic cleansings. It is internal to the biopolitical state, woven into the web of the social body, threaded through its fabric” (1997, 59). Similarly, Kate Shanley notes that Native peoples are a permanent “present absence” in the U.S. colonial imagination, an “absence” that reinforces at every turn the conviction that Native peoples are indeed vanishing and that the conquest of Native lands is justified. Ella Shoat and Robert Stam describe this absence as “an ambivalently repressive mechanism [that] dispels the anxiety in the face of the Indian, whose very presence is a reminder of the initially precarious grounding of the American nation-state itself . . . In a temporal paradox, living Indians were induced to ‘play dead,’ as it were, in order to perform a narrative of manifest destiny in which their role, ultimately, was to disappear” (1994, 118–19). This “absence” is effected through the metaphorical transformation of Native bodies into a pollution of which the colonial body must purify itself. As white Californians described in the 1860s, Native people were “the dirtiest lot of human beings on earth.” They wear filthy rags, with their persons unwashed, hair uncombed and swarming with vermin” (Rawls 1984, 195). The following 1885 Proctor & Gamble ad for Ivory Soap also illustrates this equation between Indian bodies and dirt: We were once factious, fierce and wild, In peaceful arts unreconciled Our blankets smeared with grease and stains From buffalo meat and settlers’ veins. Through summer’s dust and heat content From moon to moon unwashed we went, But IVORY SOAP came like a ray Of light across our darkened way And now we’re civil, kind and good And keep the laws as people should, We wear our linen, lawn and lace As well as folks with paler face And now I take, wherever we go This cake of IVORY SOAP to show What civilized my squaw and me And made us clean and fair to see. (Lopez n.d, 119) In the colonial imagination, Native bodies are also immanently polluted with sexual sin. Alexander Whitaker, a minister in Virginia, wrote in 1613: “They live naked in bodies, as if their shame of their sinne deserved no covering: Their names are as naked as their bodies: They esteem it a virtue to lie, deceive and steale as their master the divell teacheth them” (Berkhofer 1978, 19). Furthermore, according to Bernardino de Minaya: “Their [the Indians’] marriages are not a sacrament but a sacrilege. They are idolatrous, libidinous, and commit sodomy. Their chief desire is to eat, drink, worship heathen idols, and commit bestial obscenities” (cited in Stannard 1992, 211). Stoler’s analysis of racism in which Native peoples are likened to a pollution that threatens U. S. security is indicated in the comments of one doctor in his attempt to rationalize the mass sterilization of Native women in the 1970s: “People pollute, and too many people crowded too close together cause many of our social and economic problems. These in turn are aggravated by involuntary and irresponsible parenthood . . . We also have obligations to the society of which we are part. The welfare mess, as it has been called, cries out for solutions, one of which is fertility control” (Oklahoma 1989, 11). Herbert Aptheker describes the logical consequences of this sterilization movement: “The ultimate logic of this is crematoria; people are themselves constituting the pollution and inferior people in particular, then crematoria become really vast sewerage projects. Only so may one understand those who attend the ovens and concocted and conducted the entire enterprise; those “wasted”—to use U. S. army jargon reserved for colonial hostilities—are not really, not fully people” (1987, 144). Because Indian bodies are “dirty,” they are considered sexually violable and “rapable.” That is, in patriarchal thinking, only a body that is “pure” can be violated. The rape of bodies that are considered inherently impure or dirty simply does not count. For instance, prostitutes have almost an impossible time being believed if they are raped because the dominant society considers the prostitute’s body undeserving of integrity and violable at all times. Similarly, the history of mutilation of Indian bodies, both living and dead, makes it clear to Indian people that they are not entitled to bodily integrity, as these examples suggest: I saw the body of White Antelope with the privates cut off, and I heard a soldier say he was going to make a tobacco-pouch out of them. (cited in Wrone and Nelson 1982, 113) Each of the braves was shot down and scalped by the wild volunteers, who out with their knives and cutting two parallel gashes down their backs, would strip the skin from the quivering [ esh to make razor straps of. (cited in Wrone and Nelson 1982, 90) One more dexterous than the rest, proceeded to [ ay the chief’s [Tecumseh’s] body; then, cutting the skin in narrow strips . . . at once, a supply of razor-straps for the more “ferocious” of his brethren. (cited in Wrone and Nelson 1982, 82) Andrew Jackson . . . supervised the mutilation of 800 or so Creek Indian corpses—the bodies of men, women and children that he and his men massacred—cutting off their noses to count and preserve a record of the dead, slicing long strips of [ esh from their bodies to tan and turn into bridle reins. (Stannard 1992, 121) Echoing this mentality was Governor Thompson, who stated in 1990 that he would not close down an open Indian burial mound in Dickson, Illinois, because of his argument that he was as much Indian as are current Indians, and consequently, he had as much right as they to determine the fate of Indian remains.1 He felt free to appropriate the identity of “Native,” and thus felt justified in claiming ownership over both Native identity and Native bodies. The Chicago press similarly attempted to challenge the identity of the Indian people who protested Thompson’s decision by stating that these protestors were either only “part” Indian or were only claiming to be Indian (Hermann 1990).2 The message conveyed by the Illinois state government is that to be Indian in this society is to be on constant display for white consumers, in life or in death. And in fact, Indian identity itself is under the control of the colonizer, subject to eradication at any time. As Aime Cesaire puts it, “colonization = ‘thingi> cation’” (1972, 21). As Stoler explains this process of racialized colonization: “[T]he more ‘degenerates’ and ‘abnormals’ [in this case Native peoples] are eliminated, the lives of those who speak will be stronger, more vigorous, and improved. The enemies are not political adversaries, but those identified as external and internal threats to the population. Racism is the condition that makes it acceptable to put [certain people] to death in a society of normalization” (1997, 85). Tadiar’s description of colonial relationships as an enactment of the “prevailing mode of heterosexual relations” is useful because it underscores the extent to which U. S. colonizers view the subjugation of women of the Native nations as critical to the success of the economic, cultural, and political colonization (1993, 186). Stoler notes that the imperial discourses on sexuality “cast white women as the bearers of more racist imperial order” (1997, 35). By extension, Native women as bearers of a counter-imperial order pose a supreme threat to the imperial order. Symbolic and literal control over their bodies is important in the war against Native people, as these examples attest: When I was in the boat I captured a beautiful Carib women . . . I conceived desire to take pleasure . . . I took a rope and thrashed her well, for which she raised such unheard screams that you would not have believed your ears. Finally we came to an agreement in such a manner that I can tell you that she seemed to have been brought up in a school of harlots. (Sale 1990, 140) Two of the best looking of the squaws were lying in such a position, and from the appearance of the genital organs and of their wounds, there can be no doubt that they were first ravished and then shot dead. Nearly all of the dead were mutilated. (Wrone and Nelson 1982, 123) One woman, big with child, rushed into the church, clasping the alter and crying for mercy for herself and unborn babe. She was followed, and fell pierced with a dozen lances . . . the child was torn alive from the yet palpitating body of its mother, first plunged into the holy water to be baptized, and immediately its brains were dashed out against a wall. (Wrone and Nelson 1982, 97) The Christians attacked them with buffets and beatings . . . Then they behaved with such temerity and shamelessness that the most powerful ruler of the island had to see his own wife raped by a Christian officer. (Las Casas 1992, 33) I heard one man say that he had cut a woman’s private parts out, and had them for exhibition on a stick. I heard another man say that he had cut the fingers off of an Indian, to get the rings off his hand. I also heard of numerous instances in which men had cut out the private parts of females, and stretched them over their saddle-bows and some of them over their hats. (Sand Creek 1973, 129–30) American Horse said of the massacre at Wounded Knee: The fact of the killing of the women, and more especially the killing of the young boys and girls who are to go to make up the future strength of the Indian people is the saddest part of the whole affair and we feel it very sorely. (Stannard 1992, 127).

#### Therefore Hunter and I affirm the resolution through epistemic disobedience

### Contention 2: Our Politics

#### Disobedience is the only ethical response to the west’s hegemony on knowledge production. To be an ethical agent one must delink from western knowledge as a means of being outside hegemonic knowledge

Mignolo 09

[Walter D. Mignolo, *Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom*, Theory and Culture 2009, published 2009]

ONCE UPON a time scholars assumed that the knowing subject in the disciplines is transparent, disincorporated from the known and untouched by the geo-political configuration of the world in which people are racially ranked and regions are racially configured. From a detached and neutral point of observation (that Colombian philosopher Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007) describes as the *hubris of the zero point*), the knowing subject maps the world and its problems, classifies people and projects into what is good for them. Today that assumption is no longer tenable, although there are still many believers. At stake is indeed the question of racism and epistemology (ChukwudiEze, 1997; Mignolo, forthcoming). And once upon a time scholars assumed that if you ‘come’ from Latin America you have to ‘talk about’ Latin America; that in such a case you have to be a token of your culture. Such expectation will not arise if the author ‘comes’ from Germany, France, England or the US. In such cases it is not assumed that you have to be talking about your culture but can function as a theoretically minded person. As we know: the first world has knowledge, the third world has culture; Native Americans have wisdom, Anglo Americans have science. The need for political and epistemic delinking here comes to the fore, as well as decolonializing and decolonialknowledges, necessary steps for imagining and building democratic, just, and non-imperial/colonial societies. Geo-politics of knowledge goes hand in hand with geo-politics of knowing. Who and when, why and where is knowledge generated (rather than produced, like cars or cell phones)? Asking these questions means to shift the attention from the enunciated to the enunciation. And by so doing, turning Descartes’s dictum inside out: rather than assuming that thinking comes before being, one assumes instead that it is a racially marked body in a geo-historical marked space that feels the urge or get the call to speak, to articulate, in whatever semiotic system, the urge that makes of living organisms ‘human’ beings. By setting the scenario in terms of geo- and body-politics I am starting and departing from already familiar notions of ‘situated knowledges’. Sure, all knowledges are situated and every knowledge is constructed. But that is just the beginning. The question is: who, when, why is constructing knowledges (Mignolo, 1999, 2005 [1995])? Why did eurocentered epistemology conceal its own geo-historical and bio-graphical locations and succeed in creating the idea of universal knowledge as if the knowing subjects were also universal? This illusion is pervasive today in the social sciences, the humanities, the natural sciences and the professional schools. Epistemic disobedience means to delink from the illusion of the zero point epistemology. The shift I am indicating is the anchor (constructed of course, located of course, not just anchored by nature or by God) of the argument that follows. It is the beginning of any epistemic decolonial de-linking with all its historical, political and ethical consequences. Why? Because geo-historical and bio-graphic loci of enunciation have been located by and through the making and transformation of the colonial matrix of power: a racial system of social classification that invented Occidentalism (e.g. IndiasOccidentales), that created the conditions for Orientalism; distinguished the South of Europe from its center (Hegel) and, on that long history, remapped the world as first, second and third during the Cold War. Places of nonthought (of myth, non-western religions, folklore, underdevelopment involving regions and people) today have been waking up from the long process of westernization. The anthropos inhabiting non-European places discovered that s/he had been invented, as anthropos, by a locus of enunciations self-defined as humanitas. Now, there are currently two kinds or directions advanced by the former anthropos who are no longer claiming recognition by or inclusion in the humanitas, but engaging in epistemic disobedience and de-linking from the magic of the Western idea of modernity, ideals of humanity and promises of economic growth and financial prosperity (Wall Street dixit). One direction unfolds within the globalization of a type of economy that in both liberal and Marxist vocabulary is defined as ‘capitalism’. One of the strongest advocates of this is the Singaporean scholar, intellectual and politician Kishore Mahbubani, to which I will return later. One of his earlier book titles carries the unmistakable and irreverent message: Can Asians Think?: Understanding the Divide between East and West (2001). Following Mahbubani’s own terminology, this direction could be identified as de-westernization. Dewesternization means, within a capitalist economy, that the rules of the game and the shots are no longer called by Western players and institutions. The seventh Doha round is a signal example of de-westernizing options. The second direction is being advanced by what I describe as the decolonial option. The decolonial option is the singular connector of a diversity of decolonials. The decolonial paths have one thing in common: the colonial wound, the fact that regions and people around the world have been classified as underdeveloped economically and mentally. Racism not only affects people but also regions or, better yet, the conjunction of natural resources needed by humanitas in places inhabited by anthropos. De colonial options have one aspect in common with de-westernizing arguments: the definitive rejection of ‘being told’ from the epistemic privileges of the zero point what ‘we’ are, what our ranking is in relation to the ideal of humanitas and what we have to do to be recognized as such. However, decolonial and de-westernizing options diverge in one crucial and in disputable point: while the latter do not question the ‘civilization of death’ hidden under the rhetoric of modernization and prosperity, of the improvement of modern institutions (e.g. liberal democracy and an economy propelled by the principle of growth and prosperity), decolonial options start from the principle that the regeneration of life shall prevail over primacy of the production and reproduction of goods at the cost of life (life in general and of humanitas and anthropos alike!). I illustrate this direction, below, commenting on ParthaChatterjee’s re-orienting ‘eurocentered modernity’ toward the future in which ‘our modernity’ (in India, in Central Asia and the Caucasus, in South America, briefly, in all regions of the world upon which eurocentered modernity was either imposed or ‘adopted’ by local actors assimilating to local histories inventing and enacting global designs) becomes the statement of interconnected dispersal in which decolonial futures are being played out. Last but not least, my argument doesn’t claim originality (‘originality’ is one of the basic expectations of modern control of subjectivity) but aims to make a contribution to growing processes of decoloniality around the world. My humble claim is that geo- and body-politics of knowledge has been hidden from the self-serving interests of Western epistemology and that a task of decolonial thinking is the unveiling of epistemic silences of Western epistemology and affirming the epistemic rights of the racially devalued, and decolonial options to allow the silences to build arguments to confront those who take ‘originality’ as the ultimate criterion for the final judgment.1

#### Our advocacy allows us to unthink our colonial roots and the way they frame social life today – The 1ac embodies our response to the topic as an example of epistemic decolonization

Grande ‘08

[Sandy, Associate Professor of Education at Connecticut College, Ph.D., Kent State University, Fellow in the Holleran Center for Community Action and Public Policy, member of the EPA’s National Environmental Justice Advisory Council’s Indigenous People’s Work Group, “Red Pedagogy” in Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies, pg. 242-3//wyo-hdm]

From the standpoint of Red pedagogy, the primary lesson in all of this is pedagogical. In other words, as we are poised to raise yet another generation in a nation at war and at risk, we must consider how emerging conceptions of citizenship, sovereignty, and democracy will affect the (re)formation of our national identity, particularly among young people in schools. As Mitchell (2001) notes, "The production of democracy, the practice of education, and the constitution of the nation-state" have always been interminably bound together. The imperative before us as citizens is to engage a process of unthinking our colonial roots and rethinking democracy. For teachers and students, this means that we must be willing to act as agents of transgression, posing critical questions and engaging dangerous discourse. Such is the basis of Red pedagogy. In particular, Red pedagogy offers the following seven precepts as a way of thinking our way around and through the challenges facing American education in the 21st century and our mutual need to define decolonizing pedagogies: 1. Red pedagogy is primarily a pedagogical project. In this context, pedagogy is understood as being inherently political, cultural, spiritual, and intellectual.¶ 2. Red pedagogy is fundamentally rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis. It is particularly interested in knowledge that furthers understanding and analysis of the forces of colonization.¶ 3. Red pedagogy is informed by critical theories of education. A Red pedagogy searches for ways it can both deepen and be deepened by engagement with critical and revolutionary theories and praxis.¶ 4. Red pedagogy promotes an education for decolonization. Within Red pedagogy, the root metaphors of decolonization are articulated as equity, emancipation, sovereignty, and balance. In this sense, an education for decolonization makes no claim to political neutrality but rather engages a method of analysis and social inquiry that troubles the capitalist-imperialist aims of unfettered 5. Red pedagogy is a project that interrogates both democracy and indigenous sovereignty. In this context, sovereignty is broadly defined as "a people's right to rebuild its demand to exist and present its gifts to the world... an adamant refusal to dissociate culture, identity, and power from the land" (Lyons, 2000).¶ 6. Red pedagogy actively cultivates praxis of collective agency. That is, Red pedagogy aims to build transcultural and transnational solidarities among indigenous peoples and others committed to reimagining a sovereign space free of imperialist, colonialist, and capitalist exploitation.¶ 7. Red pedagogy is grounded in hope. This is, however, not the future-centered hope of the Western imagination but rather a hope that lives in contingency with the past—one that trusts the beliefs and understandings of our ancestors, the power of traditional knowledge, and the possibilities of new understandings.¶In the end, a Red pedagogy is about engaging the development of "community-based power" in the interest of "a responsible political, economic and spiritual society. "That is, the power to live out "active presences and survivances rather than an illusionary democracy." Vizenor's (1993) notion of survivance signifies a state of being beyond "survival, endurance, or a mere response to colonization" and of moving toward "an active presence ... and active repudiation of dominance, tragedy and victimry." In these post-Katrina times, I find the notion of survivance—particularly as it relates to colonized peoples—to be poignant and powerful. It speaks to our collective need to decolonize, to push back against empire, and to reclaim what it means to be a people of sovereign mind and body. The peoples of the Ninth Ward in New Orleans serve as a reminder to all of us that just as the specter of colonialism continues to haunt the collective soul of America, so too does the more hopeful spirit of indigeneity.

#### We must decolonize debate practice itself—Education based on Western thought continue forms of colonial schooling designed to reproduce neoliberal empire. Our epistemic resistance creates the possibility for decolonizing education and challenging the processes of eurocentrism and the colonial legacy of power and knowledge

Shahjahan ‘11

[Riyad Ahmed, Assistant Professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (HALE) at Michigan State University. Ph.D. at the OISE/University of Toronto in Higher Education. “Decolonizing the evidence-based education and policy movement:¶ revealing the colonial vestiges in educational policy, research, and¶ neoliberal reform” Online publication date: 22 March 201, Journal of Education Policy, 26: 2,¶ 181 — 206 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.508176>]

Revisiting histories of colonial educational policy in schooling helps us contextualize¶ and demonstrate how evidence-based education, tied to high-stakes testing and¶ neoliberalism, reproduces past colonial ideologies with respect to developing colonized¶ labor. Throughout European colonialism, schooling was not only used to colonize¶ the minds to force cultural assimilation or acceptance of colonial rule, but also to¶ produce a reservoir of subservient labor that would harvest and mine commodities for¶ the imperial economy. For instance, in North America, colonial schooling ‘introduced¶ the concept of forced labor as part of Indian education, transforming the ostensibly¶ “moral project” of civilizing Indians into a for-profit enterprise’ (Grande 2004, 13). In¶ boarding schools, part of the most important feature of the colonialist curriculum ‘was¶ the inculcation of the industrial or “Protestant” work ethic’ (13). In the Belgian¶ Congo, Darwin’s scientific racism was the dominant discourse among Belgian colonizers,¶ and it influenced their colonial educational policy. For the Belgian government¶ and leaders of industry, the Congolese was to learn in school a work ethos that clearly¶ catered to the economic endeavor, and to mold the Congolese playfulness and laziness¶ into a life of ‘progress,’ order and discipline (Seghers 2004, 465). In Hawaii, colonial¶ schools ‘became less a means of religious conversion and more a site for socializing¶ Hawaiian and immigrant children for work on the plantation’ (Kaomea 2000, 322). In¶ Africa in general, Urch notes: The demand for skilled native labor by the white settlers and commercial leaders caused¶ the colonial administrators to reevaluate the educational program of the missions.¶ Education solely for proselytization was not considered sufficient to enable the colonies’¶ economy to expand. Government officials saw the need for an educational process that¶ would help to break down tribal solidarity and force the African into a money economy.¶ (1971, 252)¶ In short, colonial schooling played a significant role in disciplining the minds and¶ bodies of the colonized for imperial profit.¶ Interestingly, when it came to ‘pillars of the curriculum,’ what was common¶ among many colonial environments, ‘were religion and the legendary “3Rs”¶ [Reading, (W)riting and “Rithmetic”]’ (Sjöström 2001, 79). These pillars of the¶ curriculum very much parallel, with a slight change, the curriculum that is tested via¶ PISA and TIMSS which concentrates on reading, math, and science. In the contemporary¶ context, science has replaced the pillar of religion in the curriculum. Also, in the¶ present context, the neoliberal economy has replaced the old imperial economy, but¶ the objective for schooling still stays the same, which is to produce a labor force for¶ the global economy. As Lipman points out, these accountability reforms ‘certify that¶ students that graduate from’ schooling ‘will have [the] basic literacies and disciplined¶ dispositions’ needed for a global workforce (2003, 340). International organizations¶ such as the OECD and the World Bank, have replaced the old adage ‘protestant work¶ ethic’ of colonial schooling, with the knowledge and skills to function in the knowledge¶ economy, such as literacy to manipulate information, problem solving, math, and¶ science (Spring 2009). In other words, like colonial schooling, education via neoliberal¶ reform is working towards reproducing a labor force and objectification of the¶ colonized. Ceasire’s argument of ‘thingification’ fits very well with the colonizing of¶ bodies in neoliberal educational reform. Teachers, students, and education in general¶ are all objectified and reduced to commodities to serve the global economy. To this¶ end, Lipman states: Students are reduced to test scores, future slots in the labor market, prison numbers, and¶ possible cannon fodder in military conquests. Teachers are reduced to technicians and¶ supervisors in the education assembly line – ‘objects’ rather than ‘subjects’ of history.¶ This system is fundamentally about the negation of human agency, despite the good¶ intentions of individuals at all levels. (2004, 179)¶ Global colonialism continues with the evidence-based education movement, as education¶ is increasingly reduced into standardized packages that can be sold in the global¶ marketplace, while at the same time promoting a system of education that is focused¶ on training a skilled workforce that will operate in the global labor market (Lipman¶ 2004; Berry 2008; Spring 2009; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). To this end, Fanon states:¶ I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled¶ with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found that I was an object¶ in the midst of other objects. (1967, 109).¶ The desires and agencies of many teachers, students, and educational leaders are being¶ stripped away, while at the same time they are turned into ‘an object in the midst of¶ other objects’ through the neoliberal logic of evidence-based education. In summary,¶ the neoliberal agenda, currently dominant in education systems around the world, reproduces¶ colonial educational policies. Within the evidence-based education movement, the epistemic and material are not separate but are intertwined in colonial discourse¶ and history. As this section demonstrates, evidence-based education not only colonizes¶ education epistemologically, but also perpetuates materialist power relations and¶ disciplines bodies of the colonized to serve the global economy.¶Concluding remarks and implications¶ [U]nless educational reform happens concurrently with analysis of the forces of colonialism,¶ it can only serve as a insufficient Band-aid over the incessant wound of imperialism.¶ (Grande 2004, 19)¶ Grande eloquently summarizes the intention behind this article, which is to offer a¶ conceptual map linking events of the colonial past with a present movement that¶ continues to perpetuate colonial discourses and practices within educational policy.¶ My hope is that the analysis presented in this paper provides an alteration in terms on¶ what is unsaid or left out in educational policy and bolsters a critical analysis of power¶ in educational policy. I argue in this paper that the evidence-based education movement¶ is very much tied to multiple colonial discourses, which can be traced back to a¶ colonial history that has simply been ignored in the literature. In other words, this article¶ challenges us to move beyond the confines of Eurocentrism and historical amnesia¶ to critically examine evidence-based education and to contextualize this movement¶ within colonial discourses and histories. It is my hope that this article demonstrates the usefulness of the anticolonial lens¶ in examining educational policy. This framework foregrounds the intersections¶ between knowledge, power, Eurocentrism, colonial history, and political economy, in¶ educational policy. The epistemic, cultural, and material perspectives in anticolonial¶ thought are applicable to policy analysis. This is evident in the way that ‘educational¶ research,’ ‘evidence,’ ‘curriculum,’ and ‘learning outcomes’ are being defined and¶ re-imagined in evidence-based education, as these are ultimately shaped by material¶ relations of power that are colonizing. For instance, common to any colonial¶ discourse is the rationale for purifying administration in the name of efficiency, and a¶ binaristic civilizing narrative is used in this regard. By naming and representing¶ education as a field in chaos, evidence-based education proponents, with good intentions,¶ are justifying actions and measures to make education systems more evidencebased¶ and in turn standardize and rationalize complex educational processes. As this¶ paper demonstrates, many proponents of evidence-based education profess an¶ educational policy with the intention of improving learning for all students (which¶ may be their full intent), but their discourse continues to perpetuate colonized power¶ relationships. In other words, they are unknowingly striving to control and ‘tame’¶ education through evidence-based education. An anticolonial lens also reminds us how social hierarchies and knowledge¶ systems were used to justify colonial interventions with the objective of reshaping¶ society in order to exploit the labor and material resources of the colonized, and allow¶ for certain power relations to be legitimized. In the evidence-based education movement,¶ we ~~see~~ the mobilization of colonial discourse with regard to the way ‘evidence’¶ and ‘learning’ is being constructed and used to purify the production of knowledge to¶ meet neoliberal ends of education. Furthermore, the anticolonial lens reveals the¶ commodification, objectification, and dehumanization of bodies and knowledge¶ systems in colonial processes. This article demonstrates how this ‘thingification’ occurs in evidence-based education for teachers, students, and educational leaders. An¶ anticolonial lens cannot separate the political economy from the epistemic issues. To¶ this end, this paper demonstrates how evidence-based education is part of a neoliberal¶ agenda which is also tied to global colonialism and the production of colonized labor.¶ In short, an anticolonial lens helps to bring forward the social–historical–political¶ processes that stem from colonial relations of power and informs contemporary¶ knowledge production, validation, and dissemination in educational policy. An anticolonial lens also stresses that colonial discourses and material relations of¶ power are not absolute, and that the colonized also have discursive and material¶ agency. To this end, one of the limitations of my analysis is that it overlooks the¶ agency among the colonized, and has presented evidence-based education as a monolithic¶ discourse with homogenizing effects, rather than a partial discourse that is¶ contested and lived differently from its intentions. Historically, and in present¶ contexts, imperialism and colonialism were never monolithic or unidirectional, and¶ the boundaries between colonizers and colonized were not clearly demarcated (see¶ Cooper and Stoler 1997; Young 2001; Bush 2006). Similarly, evidence-based education¶ is not an absolute, unidirectional discourse. From an anticolonial lens, we need to¶ look for those sites of resistance and discrepancies to highlight the limitations/¶ inequities of evidence-based education and bring those struggles to the foreground. To¶ this end, I will now discuss some examples of the ‘tensions’ and resistances to¶ evidence-based education. For instance, in Canada, the British Columbia Teacher’s¶ Federation has led a campaign to resist the Foundations Skills Assessment instituted¶ by the provincial government (http://www.bctf.ca/fsa.aspx). In Ontario, African-¶ Canadian parents are frustrated with the Toronto public schooling system failing to¶ respond to the needs of Black youth and are demanding Africentric schools from the¶ Toronto District School Board (Adjei and Agyepong 2009). In the USA, Fine et al.¶ (2007) describe, how schools, communities, parents, and grandparents are engaged in¶ active resistance to such accountability measures and schooling. Chicago residents of¶ Little Village have launched an organizing campaign for a local high school dedicated¶ to culture, community, and activism, which culminated in a 19-day hunger strike by¶ Latino high school students, educators, community organizers, residents, and even¶ grandmothers. Similarly, in a California community, largely populated by migrant¶ families, the school district, joined by nine other districts and civil rights organizations,¶ sued the state over the improper use of English-language assessments to test¶ English Language Learners and the sanctions they face under NCLB (Fine et al.¶ 2007). Teachers also have the agency to interpret, disseminate, and act on the information¶ based on such accountability policies (Lipman 2002; Ball 2003; Sloan 2007). Some¶ teachers have left the profession as an act of resistance because these accountability¶ trends no longer reflect their critical educational philosophy (McNeil 2000; Lipman¶ 2002; Ball 2003). Other teachers enact resistance by subverting the official test-based¶ curriculum. For instance, as one Chicago school teacher put it:¶ I think that we are having a rough time, that sometimes we may lean a little bit more¶ towards CPS policies and other times we lean a little bit more to ‘screw CPS’ and focus¶ on critical thinking skills. (Lipman 2002, 392)¶ Some still display ambivalence towards teaching for the test for the purpose of¶ surveillance: I have mixed feelings about it … I think it’s how we interpret the results. If we use it to¶ say our school is better than yours, then I don’t want to do it. If we use it so that we can¶ help the teachers program better for the kids, then that is more useful as a tool. (Canadian¶ Grade 3 teacher, cited in Childs and Fung 2009, 9)¶ In short, teachers, students, parents, families, and community activists have demonstrated¶ the agency to negotiate and contest these colonial discourses in every day¶ practice. Accountability reforms, tied with evidence-based education, depending on¶ context, have also had multiple effects on schools and curricula, and also have critics¶ from within. Scholars have noted how the colonizing effects of accountability reform¶ on schooling and resistance to these reforms depend on the context and the questions¶ of race, class, language, and localized policies (Lipman 2002, 2003; Earl and Fullan¶ 2003; Maxcy 2006). For instance, in her study on the impact of accountability reform¶ for four Chicago schools, Lipman notes how these ‘schools’ responses to accountability¶ are closely linked to past and present race and class advantages, the relative political¶ power of their communities, and new forms of racialization’ (2003, 338).¶ Moreover, in a significant minority of cases, high-stakes testing has led to curricular¶ content expansion, the integration of knowledge, and more student-centered, cooperative¶ pedagogies, such as in secondary social studies and language arts (Au 2007).¶ Hence, the nature of high-stakes-test-induced curricular control is highly dependent¶ on the structures of the tests themselves (Au 2007). In summary, high-stakes testing¶ does not produce a monolithic effect, but has heterogeneous results depending on¶ questions of social difference and context. Furthermore, proponents of evidence-based¶ education ‘are not monolithic and that at least some of them are open to dialog on the¶ issues on which we disagree’ (Maxwell 2004, 39). In short, an acknowledgment of the¶ colonial historical legacy of the evidence-based education movement may help us¶ move beyond a discourse of sameness in colonial discourse, and start thinking about¶ the possibilities, interruptions, contestations, and resistances to the colonizing effects¶ of evidence-based education. Recently, there has been growing ethnographic studies¶ that examine such sites of resistance and contradictions at the ground level. These¶ spaces are where future studies and dialog could focus their attention. In terms of policy and educational practice, an anticolonial lens motivates us to ask¶ a different set of questions and re-imagine educational research, practice, and policy.¶ For instance, what is being left out in the discussion of evidence-based education¶ movement is the glaring systemic inequities that are privileging some bodies¶ (students, teachers, and administrators) and knowledge systems (language, curricula,¶ and culture) over others (see McNeil 2000; Lipman 2004; Valuenzela 2005; Maxcy¶ 2006), that are tied to the global economy (Stewart-Harawira 2005). Rather than blaming¶ students, teachers, and administrators for progress in public tests, and working¶ from a deficit model, we need to shift our attention towards deploying significant¶ material and intellectual resources to serve diverse needs and minoritized bodies¶ (Lipman 2002, 2003), and challenge global economic systems. Furthermore, instead¶ of looking for the pitfalls of educational practice, we could ask and explore the following¶ questions (see Asa Hilliard cited in Lemons-Smith 2008; Hood and Hopson 2008):¶ How does academic excellence flourish in schools attended mostly by minoritized¶ students? How do teachers who reject the status quo and define excellence as responding¶ to community needs, find ways to promote excellence for all students regardless¶ of their circumstances? ‘Student achievement at what cost’ [Michael Dantley, personal communication]? What ideological paradigms underlie teacher education?¶ What is the role of teacher preparation programs in perpetuating and promoting these¶ values of equity and social justice?¶ Finally, in terms of educational policy, we may ask: whose cultural assumptions¶ and histories inform such accountability systems, ‘evidence,’ ‘data,’ and ‘learning¶ outcomes?’ ‘Whose notions of evidence matter most? And to whom does evidence¶ matter most?’ (Hood and Hopson 2008, 418). According to Stanfield (1999) and¶ Gillborn (2005), educational policy and research continue to impose the standards and¶ products of White supremacy on the racially minoritized. As Stanfield states:¶ Implicit White supremacy norms and values contribute … to Eurocentric concepts and¶ measurement epistemologies, techniques, and interpretations … Concretely, in the¶ United States and elsewhere in the West, … it has been considered normative to consider¶ Eurocentric notions and experiences as the baseline, as the yardstick to compare and¶ contrast the notions and experiences of people of color. This is … most apparent in¶ designing, implementing, and interpreting standardized tests and survey instruments.¶ (1999, 421)¶ I would argue that we need to ‘reappropriate’ evidence-based education to include a¶ broader array of evidence, experiences, and cultural knowledges (Luke 2003, 98; see¶ also Stanfield 1999; Valuenzela, Prieto, and Hamilton 2007). Finally, borrowing the¶ words of Asa Hilliard III, we need to ask, ‘do we have the will to educate all children’¶ (cited in Lemons-Smith 2008, 908), to respond to the needs, survival, self-determination,¶ and sovereignty of their respective communities and the planet? (see also Dei 2000;¶ Grande 2004). In an era of transnational capital, where ‘[g]lobalized discourses and agendasetting¶ and policy pressures now emerge from beyond the nation’(Rizvi and Lingard¶ 2010, 14–15), we need to have transnational dialogs (Mohanty 2003) on the impact of¶ evidence-based education and neoliberal reform across borders and social institutions.¶ This is because such transnational alliances and solidarity are needed to contest global¶ forces informed by transnational corporations as well as international organizations¶ such as the World Bank and OECD. What is noteworthy and rarely discussed, are the¶ similarities and differences in the discourses and effects of evidence-based education¶ movement across the three nation-states analyzed in this paper. Future research could¶ speculate and study how these ideas of evidence-based education circulate and move¶ across borders (see Rizvi and Lingard 2010).¶ Finally, as someone who has had the privilege to teach research methodology to¶ graduate students (including teachers, teacher educators, principals, and superintendents),¶ I am alarmed by how many of my students grumble about standardized testing,¶ and some even focus their research on such topics. What is also disconcerting is how¶ many of my students have a hard time imagining research and evidence that go¶ beyond numbers because of the ‘numbers game’ they must play in their daily working¶ lives. These trends are not a reflection of my students’ inabilities to see beyond¶ numbers, but a testament to the hegemony of the structural environment that reminds¶ them of what constitutes valid knowledge every day. Also of great concern is the¶ speed at which educational leaders, students, and teachers are being rushed through¶ standardized processes that leave little time for reflection, authenticity, and healing.¶ Many of my students have shared these accounts in my classroom, with me in person,¶ and in their reflection papers. For instance, one student who is currently a high school¶ teacher commented in a recent email: ‘The standards and objectives themselves work to eliminate any third space or anticolonial space. We read, write, process for the sole¶ purpose of testing and not for liberation.’¶ In this regard, I propose that we need to ‘slow down’ in educational practice and¶ policy. To this end, I am reminded of the words of Malidoma Some, an African Shaman¶ healer, who stated ‘while that the indigenous world looks, the industrial world over¶ looks’ (emphasis added). Educators, teachers, students, and policy-makers need time,¶ not to be given more information for decision-making or learning, but more importantly¶ to assess what we are overlooking in educating future generations. For instance, we¶ need more time to come together, dialog, heal, build reciprocity, understand difference,¶ and re-imagine educational policy and practice for the benefit of future generations. It¶ is only by slowing down that we will realize that our students, educational researchers,¶ teachers, and administrators are not ‘uncultivated soil,’ in the words of La Casas, but¶ rather seeds with the power within to germinate on their own if they are provided the¶ freedom, resources, and time. Slowing down is what I believe decolonizing education¶ means in this era of neoliberal policies and transnational capital!

#### This debate should be solely about the question of colonialism and its impact on indigenous peoples. A focus on other methodological priorities makes the task of dismantling western knowledge impossible

Byrd ‘11

[Jodi A., (Chickasaw), assistant professor of American Indian studies and English at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism, pg. xvii//wyo-hdm]

There is more than one way to frame the concerns of The Transit of Empire and more than one way to enter into the possibilities that transit might allow for comparative studies. On the one hand, I am seeking to join ongoing conversations about sovereignty, power, and indigeneity— and the epistemological debates that each of these terms engender— within and across disparate and at times incommensurable disciplines and geographies. American studies, queer studies, postcolonial studies, American Indian studies, and area studies have all attempted to apprehend injury and redress, melancholy and grief that exist in the distances and sutures of state recognitions and belongings. Those distances and sutures of recognitions and belongings, melancholy and grief, take this book from the worlds of Southeastern Indians to Hawai‘i, from the Poston War Relocation Center to Jonestown, Guyana, in order to consider how ideas of “Indianness” have created conditions of possibility for U. S. empire to manifest its intent. As liberal multicultural settler colonialism attempts to flex the exceptions and exclusions that first constituted the United States to now provisionally include those people othered and abjected from the nation-state’s origins, it instead creates a cacophony of moral claims that help to deflect progressive and transformative activism from dismantling the ongoing conditions of colonialism that continue to make the United States a desired state formation within which to be included. That cacophony of competing struggles for hegemony within and outside institutions of power, no matter how those struggles might challenge the state through loci of race, class, gender, and sexuality, serves to misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism that made the United States possible as oppressor in the first place. As a result, the cacophony produced through U.S. colonialism and imperialism domestically and abroad often coerces struggles for social justice for queers, racial minorities, and immigrants into complicity with settler colonialism. This book, on the other hand, is also interested in the quandaries poststructuralism has left us: the traces of indigenous savagery and “Indianness” that ~~stand~~ a priori prior to theorizations of origin, history, freedom, constraint, and difference.³ These traces of “Indianness” are vitally important to understanding how power and domination have been articulated and practiced by empire, and yet because they are traces, they have often remained deactivated as a point of critical inquiry as theory has transited across disciplines and schools. Indianness can be felt and intuited as a presence, and yet apprehending it as a process is difficult, if not impossible, precisely because Indianness has served as the field through which structures have always already been produced. Within the matrix of critical theory, Indianness moves not through absence but through reiteration, through meme, as theories circulate and fracture, quote and build. The prior ontological concerns that interpellate Indianness and savagery as ethnographic evidence and example, lamentable and tragic loss, are deferred through repetitions. How we have come to know intimacy, kinship, and identity within an empire born out of settler colonialism is predicated upon discourses of indigenous displacements that remain within the present everydayness of settler colonialism, even if its constellations have been naturalized by hegemony and even as its oppressive logics are expanded to contain more and more historical experiences. I hope to show through the juridical, cultural, and literary readings within this book that indigenous critical theory provides alternatives to the entanglements of race and colonialism, intimacy and relationship that continue to preoccupy poststructuralist and postcolonial studies.

#### And, our method is a necessary first step before any other political or critical project

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

In this article, Sandy Marie Anglas Grande outlines the tensions between American Indian epistemology and critical pedagogy. She asserts that the deep structures of critical pedagogy fail to consider an Indigenous perspective. In arguing that American Indian scholars should reshape and reimagine critical pedagogy, Grande also calls for critical theorists to reexamine their epistemological foundations. Looking through these two lenses of critical theory and Indigenous scholarship, Grande begins to redefine concepts of democracy, identity, and social justice. Until Indians resolve for themselves a comfortable modern identity that can be used to energize reservation institutions, radical changes will not be of much assistance. (Deloria & Lytle, 1984, p. 266) Our struggle at the moment is to continue to survive and work toward a time when we can replace the need for being preoccupied with survival with a more responsible and peaceful way of living within communities and with the everchanging landscape that will ever be our only home. (Warrior, 1995, p. 126) Broadly speaking, this article focuses on the intersection between dominant modes of critical pedagogy' and American Indian intellectualism.2 At present, critical theories are often indiscriminately employed to explain the sociopolitical conditions of all marginalized peoples. As a result, many Indigenous scholars view the current liberatory project as simply the latest in a long line of political endeavors that fails to consider American Indians as a unique populations Thus, while critical pedagogy may have propelled mainstream educational theory and practice along the path of social justice, I argue that it has muted and thus marginalized the distinctive concerns of American Indian intellectualism and education. As such, I argue further that the particular history of imperialism enacted upon Indigenous peoples requires a reevaluation of dominant views of democracy and social justice, and of the universal validity of such emancipatory projects - including critical pedagogy. It is not that critical pedagogy is irrelevant to Indigenous peoples, as they clearly experience oppression, but rather that the deep structures of the "pedagogy of oppression" fail to consider American Indians as a categorically different population, virtually incomparable to other minority groups. To assert this is not to advocate any kind of hierarchy of oppression but merely to call attention to the fundamental difference of what it means to be a sovereign and tribal people within the geopolitical confines of the United States.

## 2AC

#### Permutation do both- the projects should be combined because the positionality of the black body and the red body are mutually constituted

Wilderson ‘10

[Frank B. III, Ph.D., Associate Professor at UC Irvine, Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms, pages 29-31//wyo-hdm]

What are we to make of a world that responds to the most lucid enunciation of ethics with violence? What are the foundational questions of the ethico-political? Why are these questions so scandalous that they are rarely posed politically, intellectually, and cinematically—unless they are posed obliquely and unconsciously, as if by accident? Return Turtle Island to the “Savage.” Repair the demolished subjectivity of the Slave. Two simple sentences, thirteen simple words, and the structure of U.S. (and perhaps global) antagonisms would be dismantled. An “ethical modernity” would no longer sound like an oxymoron. From there we could busy ourselves with important conflicts that have been promoted to the level of antagonisms: class struggle, gender conflict, immigrants rights.¶ When pared down to thirteen words and two sentences, one cannot but wonder why questions that go to the heart of the ethico-political, questions of political ontology, are so unspeakable in intellectual meditations, political broadsides, and even socially and politically engaged feature films. Clearly they can be spoken, even a child could speak those lines, so they would pose no problem for a scholar, an activist, or a filmmaker. And yet, what is also clear—if the filmographies of socially and politically engaged directors, the archive of progressive scholars, and the plethora of Left-wing broadsides are anything to go by—is that what can so easily be spoken is now (five hundred years and two hundred fifty million Settlers/Masters on) so ubiquitously unspoken that these two simple sentences, these thirteen words not only render their speaker “crazy” but become themselves impossible to imagine.¶ Soon it will be forty years since radical politics, Left-leaning scholarship, and socially engaged feature films began to speak the unspeakable.[[1]](#endnote-1) In the 1960s and early 1970s the questions asked by radical politics and scholarship were not “Should the U.S. be overthrown?” or even “Would it be overthrown?” but rather when and how—and, for some, what—would come in its wake. Those steadfast in their conviction that there remained a discernable quantum of ethics in the U.S. writ large (and here I am speaking of everyone from Martin Luther King, Jr., prior to his 1968 shift, to the Tom Hayden wing of SDS, to the Julian Bond and Marion Barry faction of SNCC, to Bobbie Kennedy Democrats) were accountable, in their rhetorical machinations, to the paradigmatic zeitgeist of the Black Panthers, the American Indian Movement, and the Weather Underground. Radicals and progressives could deride, reject, or chastise armed struggle mercilessly and cavalierly with respect to tactics and the possibility of “success,” but they could not dismiss revolution-as-ethic because they could not make a convincing case—by way of a paradigmatic analysis—that the U.S. was an ethical formation and still hope to maintain credibility as radicals and progressives. Even Bobby Kennedy (a U.S. attorney general and presidential candidate) mused that the law and its enforcers had no ethical standing in the presence of Blacks.[[2]](#endnote-2) One could (and many did) acknowledge America’s strength and power. This seldom, however, rose to the level of an ethical assessment, but rather remained an assessment of the so-called “balance of forces.” The political discourse of Blacks, and to a lesser extent Indians, circulated too widely to credibly wed the U.S. and ethics. The raw force of COINTELPRO put an end to this trajectory toward a possible hegemony of ethical accountability. Consequently, the power of Blackness and Redness to pose the question—and the power to pose the question is the greatest power of all—retreated as did White radicals and progressives who “retired” from struggle. The question’s echo lies buried in the graves of young Black Panthers, AIM Warriors, and Black Liberation Army soldiers, or in prison cells where so many of them have been rotting (some in solitary confinement) for ten, twenty, thirty years, and at the gates of the academy where the “crazies” shout at passers-by. Gone are not only the young and vibrant voices that affected a seismic shift on the political landscape, but also the intellectual protocols of inquiry, and with them a spate of feature films that became authorized, if not by an unabashed revolutionary polemic, then certainly by a revolutionary zeitgeist.¶ Is it still possible for a dream of unfettered ethics, a dream of the Settlement and the Slave estate’s destruction, to manifest itself at the ethical core of cinematic discourse, when this dream is no longer a constituent element of political discourse in the streets nor of intellectual discourse in the academy? The answer is “no” in the sense that, as history has shown, what cannot be articulated as political discourse in the streets is doubly foreclosed upon in screenplays and in scholarly prose; but “yes” in the sense that in even the most taciturn historical moments such as ours, the grammar of Black and Red suffering breaks in on this foreclosure, albeit like the somatic compliance of hysterical symptoms—it registers in both cinema and scholarship as symptoms of awareness of the structural antagonisms. Between 1967 and 1980, we could think cinematically and intellectually of Blackness and Redness as having the coherence of full-blown discourses. But from 1980 to the present, Blackness and Redness manifests only in the rebar of cinematic and intellectual (political) discourse, that is, as unspoken grammars.¶ This grammar can be discerned in the cinematic strategies (lighting, camera angles, image composition, and acoustic strategies/design), even when the script labors for the spectator to imagine social turmoil through the rubric of conflict (that is, a rubric of problems that can be posed and conceptually solved) as opposed to the rubric of antagonism (an irreconcilable struggle between entities, or positionalities, the resolution of which is not dialectical but entails the obliteration of one of the positions). In other words, even when films narrate a story in which Blacks or Indians are beleaguered with problems that the script insists are conceptually coherent (usually having to do with poverty or the absence of “family values”), the non-narrative, or cinematic, strategies of the film often disrupt this coherence by posing the irreconcilable questions of Red and Black political ontology—or non-ontology. The grammar of antagonism breaks in on the mendacity of conflict.¶ Semiotics and linguistics teach us that when we speak, our grammar goes unspoken. Our grammar is assumed. It is the structure through which the labor of speech is possible.[[3]](#endnote-3) Likewise, the grammar of political ethics—the grammar of assumptions regarding the ontology of suffering—which underwrite Film Theory and political discourse (in this book, discourse elaborated in direct relation to radical action), and which underwrite cinematic speech (in this book, Red, White, and Black films from the mid-1960s to the present) is also unspoken. This notwithstanding, film theory, political discourse, and cinema assume an ontological grammar, a structure of suffering. And the structure of suffering which film theory, political discourse, and cinema assume crowds out other structures of suffering, regardless of the sentiment of the film or the spirit of unity mobilized by the political discourse in question. To put a finer point on it, structures of ontological suffering stand in antagonistic, rather then conflictual, relation to one another (despite the fact that antagonists themselves may not be aware of the ontological positionality from which they speak). Though this is perhaps the most controversial and out-of-step claim of this book, it is, nonetheless, the foundation of the close reading of feature films and political theory that follows.¶ The difficulty of writing a book which seeks to uncover Red, Back, and White socially engaged feature films as aesthetic accompaniments to grammars of suffering, predicated on the subject positions of the “Savage” and the Slave is that today’s intellectual protocols are not informed by Fanon’s insistence that “ontology—once it is finally admitted as leaving existence by the wayside—does not permit us to understand the being of the black man [sic]” (Black Skin, White Masks 110). In sharp contrast to the late 60s and early 70s, we now live in a political, academic, and cinematic milieu which stresses “diversity,” “unity,” “civic participation,” “hybridity,” “access,” and “contribution.” The radical fringe of political discourse amounts to little more than a passionate dream of civic reform and social stability. The distance between the protester and the police has narrowed considerably. The effect of this upon the academy is that intellectual protocols tend to privilege two of the three domains of subjectivity, namely preconscious interests (as evidenced in the work of social science around “political unity,” “social attitudes,” “civic participation,” and “diversity,”) and unconscious identification (as evidenced in the humanities’ postmodern regimes of “diversity,” “hybridity,” and “relative [rather than “master”] narratives”). Since the 1980s, intellectual protocols aligned with structural positionality (except in the work of die-hard Marxists) have been kicked to the curb. That is to say, it is hardly fashionable anymore to think the vagaries of power through the generic positions within a structure of power relations—such as man/woman, worker/boss. Instead, the academy’s ensembles of questions are fixated on specific and “unique” experience of the myriad identities that make up those structural positions. This would fine if the work led us back to a critique of the paradigm; but most of it does not. Again, the upshot of this is that the intellectual protocols now in play, and the composite effect of cinematic and political discourse since the 1980s, tend to hide rather than make explicit the grammar of suffering which underwrites the US and its foundational antagonisms. This state of affairs exacerbates—or, more precisely, mystifies and veils—the ontological death of the Slave and the “Savage” becomes (as in the 1950s) cinematic, political, and intellectual discourse of the current milieu resists being sanctioned and authorized by the irreconcilable demands of Indigenism and Blackness—academic enquiry is thus no more effective in pursuing a revolutionary critique than the legislative antics of the loyal opposition. This is how Left-leaning scholars help civil society recuperate and maintain stability. But this stability is a state of emergency for Indians and Blacks.

#### And their WIlderson evidence doesn’t say that narrative through identity politics is bad, it only says that the slave is the only identity that matters in the face of violence but focusing on the black body and the centrality of the slave occludes the dispossession of indigenous populations that made slavery in the U.S. possible in the first place

Moreton-Robinson 8

(Aileen, Queensland University Prof of Indigenous Studies, Transnational Whiteness Matters)kh

Morrison further suggests in " Black Matters" that the African American presence has also "shaped the body politic, the Constitution, and the entire history of the [USA] culture." Indigenous peoples are outside the scope of Morrison's analysis. Through the centering of the African American presence, Native American texts that have challenged, resisted and affected the American literary imagination, politics, history and the Constitution remain invisible. This silence is an interesting discursive move considering that the best-selling novels within the USA in the late eighteenth century were captivity narratives. And as Native American legal scholar Raymond Williams argues it was the positioning of Indians as incommensurable savages within the Declaration of Independence that enabled " ' the Founders' vision of America's growth and potentiality as a new form of expansionary white racial dictatorship in the world."ll The most valuable contribution of Morrison's work for my purposes is her thesis that "blackness," whether real or imagined, services the social construction and application of whiteness in its myriad forms. In this way it is utilized as a white epistemological possession. Her work opens up a space for considering how this possessiveness operates within the whiteness studies literature to displace Indigenous sovereignties and render them invisible. WHITE POSSESSIVENESS Most historians mark 1492 as the year when imperialism began to construct the old world order by taking possession of other people, their lands and resources. The possessive nature of this enterprise informed the development of a racial stratification process on a global scale that became solidified during modernity. Taking possession of Indigenous people's lands was a quintessential act of colonization and was tied to the transition from the Enlightenment to modernity, which precipitated the emergence of a new subject into history within Europe. Major social, legal, economic and political reforms had taken place changing the feudal nature of the relationship between persons and property in the 16th and 18th centuries. "These changes centered upon the rise of 'possessive individualism,' that is, upon an increasing consciousness of the distinctness of each self-owning human entity as the primary social and political value. "12 Private ownership of property both tangible and intangible operated through mechanisms of the new nation state in its regulation of the population and especially through the law. By the late 1700s people could legally enter into different kinds of contractual arrangements whereby they could own land, sell their labor and possess their identities all of which were formed through their relationship to capital and the state. A new white property owning subject emerged into history and possessiveness became embedded in everyday discourse as "a firm belief that the best in life was the expansion of self through property and property began and ended with possession of one's body."13 Within the realm of intra-subjectivity possession can mean control over one's being, ideas, one's mind, one's feelings and one's body or within inter-subjectivity it can mean the act or fact of possessing something that is beyond the subject and in other contexts it can refer to a state of being possessed by another. Within the law possession can refer to holding or occupying territory with or without actual ownership or a thing possessed such as property or wealth and it can also refer to territorial domination of a state. At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one's will-la-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed. This enables the formally free subject to make the thing its own. Ascribing one's own subjective will onto the thing is required to make it one's property as " willful possession of what was previously a will-less thing constitutes our primary form of embodiment; it is invoked whenever we assert: this is minc."14 To be able to assert ' this is mine' requires a subject to internalize the idea that one has proprietary rights that are part of nonnative behavior, rules of interaction and social engagement. Thus possession that forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity is reinforced by its sociodiscursive functioning. WHITE WRITING A number of texts have been written historicizing the acquisition of white identity and the privileges conferred by its status through a trope of migration, which is based on the assumption that all those who came after the white people had taken possession are the immigrants. White possession of the nation works discursively within these texts to displace Native American sovereignties by disavowing that everyone else within the USA are immigrants whether they came in chains or by choice. The only displacement that is theorized is in relation to African Americans. Theodore Allen's work on how the Irish became white in America illustrates that the transformation of their former status as the blacks of Europe relied on their displacement by African Americans in the new country. IS David Roediger di scusses how the wages of whiteness operated to prevent class alliances between working class whites and African Americans. 16 Karen Brodkin 's excellent book on how Jews became white demonstrates that the lower status of African American workers enabled Jewish class mobility.17 Jacobsen illustrates that European migrants were able to become white through ideological and political means that operated to distinguish them from African American blackness.18 The black/white binary permeates these analyses enabling tropes of migration and slavery to work covertly in these texts erasing the continuing history of colonization and the Native American sovereign presence. Blackness becomes an epistemological possession that Allen, Roediger, Brodkin and Jacobsen deploy[ed] in analyzing whiteness and race, which forecloses the possibility that the dispossession of Native Americans was tied to migration and the establishment of slavery driven by the logic of capital. Slaves were brought to America as the property of white people to work the land that was appropriated from Native America tribes. Subsequently, migration became a means to enhance capitalist development within the USA. Migration, slavery and the dispossession of Native Americans were integral to the project of nation building. Thus the question of how anyone came to be white or black in the United States of America is inextricably tied to the dispossession of the original owners and the assumption of white possession. The various assumptions of sovereignty beginning with British 'settlers' the formation of individual states and subsequently the United States of America all came into existence through the blood-stained taking of Native American land. The USA as a white nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders, it is the legally defined and asserted territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identifications of whiteness. In this way I argue Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of white national identity. Ruth Frankenberg acknowledges in the introduction to her edited collection Displaying Whiteness that whiteness traveled culturally and physically, impacting on the formation of nationhood, class and empire sustained by imperialism and global capitalism. She wrote that notions of race were tied "to ideas about legitimate 'ownership' of the nation, with 'whiteness' and' Americanness' linked tightly together" and that this history was repressed. After making this statement she then moves on to discuss immigration and its effects. 19 Her acknowledgement did not progress into critical analysis that centered Native American dispossession, instead Frankenberg represses that which she acknowledges is repressed . Repression operates as a defense mechanism to protect one's perception of self and reality from an overwhelming trauma that may threaten in order to maintain one's self image. Repressing the history of Native American dispossession works to protect the possessive white self from ontological disturbance. It is far easier to extricate oneself from the history of slavery if there were no direct family and material ties to its institution and reproduction. However, it is not as easy to distance one's self from a history of Indigenous dispossession when one benefits everyday from being tied to a nation that has and continues to constitute itself as a white possession. Within the whiteness studies literature whiteness has been defined in multiple ways. It is usually perceived as unnamed, umnarked and invisible, and often as culturally empty operating only by appropriation and absence .20 It is a location of structural privilege, a subject position and cultural Praxis. Whiteness constitutes the norm operating within various institutions influencing decision making and defining itself by what it is not. 22 It is socially constructed and is a form of property that one possesses, invests in and profits from.2..1 Whiteness as a social identity works discursively becoming ubiquitous, fluid and dynamic24 operating invisibly through pedagogy.25 What these different definitions of whiteness expose is that it is something that can be possessed and it is tied to power and dominance despite being fluid, vacuous and invisible to white people. However, these different conceptualizations of whiteness, which use blackness as an epistemological possession to service what it is not, obscure the more complex way that white possession functions sociodiscursively through subjectivity and knowledge production. As something that can be possessed by subjects it must have ontological and epistemological anchors in order to function through power. As a means of controlling differently racialized populations enclosed within the borders of a given society, white subjects are disciplined, though to different degrees, to invest in the nation as a white possession that imbues them with a sense of belonging and ownership. This sense of belonging is derived from ownership as understood within the logic of capital and citizenship. In its self-legitimacy, white possession operates discursively through narratives of the home of the brave and the land of the free and through white male signifiers of the nation such as the Founding Fathers, the 'pioneer' and the 'war hero.' Against this stands the Indigenous sense of belonging, home and place in its sovereign incommensurable difference.

#### Imagining the black body as unable to generate an ontology, subjectivity or history essentializes and recreates colonialism

Maty Ba 11

(Saer, Professor of Film Studies at Portsmouth University in the UK, researches race, postcolonialism, diaspora, the transnational and film ‘genre’, African and Carribean Cinemas and Film Festivals. “The US Decentred: From Black Social Death to Cultural Transformation,” Cultural Studies Review 17:2, September,)

Red, White and Black is particularly undermined by Wilderson’s propensity for exaggeration and blinkeredness. In chapter nine, ‘“Savage” Negrophobia’, he writes: The philosophical anxiety of Skins is all too aware that through the Middle Passage, African culture became Black ‘style’ ... Blackness can be placed and displaced with limitless frequency and across untold territories, by whoever so chooses. Most important, there is nothing real Black people can do to either check or direct this process ... Anyone can say ‘nigger’ because anyone can be a ‘nigger’. (235)7 Similarly, in chapter ten, ‘A Crisis in the Commons’, Wilderson addresses the issue of ‘Black time’. Black is irredeemable, he argues, because, at no time in history had it been deemed, or deemed through the right historical moment and place. In other words, the black moment and place are not right because they are ‘the ship hold of the Middle Passage’: ‘the most coherent temporality ever deemed as Black time’ but also ‘the “moment” of no time at all on the map of no place at all’. (279) Not only does Pinho’s more mature analysis expose this point as preposterous (see below), I also wonder what Wilderson makes of the countless historians’ and sociologists’ works on slave ships, shipboard insurrections and/during the Middle Passage,8 or of groundbreaking jazz‐studies books on cross‐cultural dialogue like The Other Side of Nowhere (2004). Nowhere has another side, but once Wilderson theorises blacks as socially and ontologically dead while dismissing jazz as ‘belonging nowhere and to no one, simply there for the taking’, (225) there seems to be no way back. It is therefore hardly surprising that Wilderson ducks the need to provide a solution or alternative to both his sustained bashing of blacks and anti‐ Blackness.9 Last but not least, Red, White and Black ends like a badly plugged announcement of a bad Hollywood film’s badly planned sequel: ‘How does one deconstruct life? Who would benefit from such an undertaking? The coffle approaches with its answers in tow.’ (340) —PINHO AS FRESH AIR: AFRO-MYTHS AND BLACK ATLANTIC IDENTITIES Pinho favours detailed and measured presentation of an idea, term or argument, followed by an equally in‐depth and careful critique. Her book is a breath of fresh air because, for one thing, Pinho knows that what blacks must breathe is called air and that it shall keep them alive. Metaphorically, of course, breathing means being aware that for scattered blacks Africa is not necessarily a nation‐state or place of return. Rather, Africa can be an ‘imaginary community’, (25) albeit one which entails mythic connections to Africa‐as‐place. Lucid and fair, Pinho unambiguously identifies and critiques such linkages through the myth of ‘Mama Africa’. Thus, Pinho focuses on what the term ‘myth’ means and three reasons for choosing it to study the blocos afro’s (Carnival Afro) reinventions of Mama Africa. Myth embodies the subtleties and power of narratives explaining and interpreting the world. Myth carries ‘values, messages, and ideals’ and is therefore crucial to dispersed peoples’ self‐produced stories and representations (2) while connected to and contaminating ‘reality’. (20) For example, Mama Africa generates and is in turn generated by identities, and only at the zones of contact between myth and identity can one hope to grasp its meaning. Bahia’s own version is a ‘metaphysical’ nourishing body at once ‘source of [racial] purity’ and ongoing dispenser of the essence of black life. (30) Bahia activates this myth through different means: music, aesthetics and religion (32–3); the blocos afro’s Africa as ‘the “place of origin” of Afro‐Brazilian ancestors’; and how it extends to countries in the African diaspora, such as Jamaica, Cuba and the USA, envisioned ‘as branches of Mama Africa’. (39) Crucially, Pinho notes that the Bahian Mama Africa does not own her body, while the myth itself echoes problematic representations of black womanhood. (30) Invoking such representations signals Pinho’s serious commitment to seriously examining blackness as diasporic. For example, she investigates the role agency plays in embracing Afro‐aesthetics (86) while arguing that a deeper meaning of such embrace comes from both an ongoing process of imagining and reinventing Africa (121) and that, in Brazil, adopting Afro‐aesthetics changes according to age, gender, geography and political commitment to ‘the black social movement’. (125) But what does the ‘Afro’ of Afro‐Bahian identities mean? Several things, according to Pinho: to embody Mama Africa through difference and by manipulating the body (89); tradition, for example, ‘rhythms believed to originate from Africa’; ‘purity’, such as the ability to remain faithful to African roots (90) or, as Nelson Mendes of the bloco Olodum states in an interview, to defend ‘the proposal of moving beyond boundaries’. (95) Therefore ‘Afro’ seems to signify an acknowledgement that race and blackness cannot exist separately while black identities must be mutable. (96–7) And yet, the blocos’ anti‐racist discourse keeps on retreating (in)to the body, and consequently undermines both the race‐blackness connection and mutability of black identities: why? —‘AFRICA’ IN BODY AND SOUL: PINHO AGAINST POLICING THE BLACK BODY Why? Because in Brazil the ‘alleged smell of the slaves’ bodies became an additional excuse for classifying them closer to animals than to humans’. (105) Attitudes resulting from this mindset permeate ways in which the body remains a place in which to reinscribe Africa as source of beauty and restoration of dignity. Additionally, nowadays black bodies are present(ed) positively in Brazil’s shopping malls, magazines, TV/soap operas, advertisements, and education. The blocos afro, created in the 1970s ‘under the influence of’ the US Black is Beautiful movement, can take credit for this presence’. (115) In other words, blocos afro develop a black identity through stories of ‘Africanness and representations of blackness’, an identity aligned with their ‘strategies of social promotion [connecting] discourse and practice ... culture and politics’. (117) It would be preposterous to talk about black Brazilians as socially or ontologically dead. At the same time, to take issues with Afro‐Brazilian activists’ and blocos’ anti‐racist discourse seems an arduous task. This is because it is grounded in engagement with history, place, federal and local government race policies (or race denials), and day‐to‐day anti‐black racism. Nevertheless, as Pinho rightly remarks, this anti‐racist discourse overlooks gender analysis: seldom do activists and blocos make reference to how ‘racism affects men and women differently’ while they fail ‘to question’ their own sexism, which leads to the female black body remaining ‘the preferred locus for performing the pedagogy of blackness’ through black beauty pageants for example. (136) Pinho objects to the policing of black women’s bodies, opposes notions of ethnic black identities and Mama Africa (158) at the same time as she finds linkages between biology, culture and politics problematic. Her suggested alternatives are most enlightening: one must remember that identities ... are constructed in the context of late capitalism, in which liberalism and discipline, coupled with bureaucracy, impinge on the most subjective conditions of identities ... we need to envision the possibility of constructing identities that are not based on the same terms that emerged out of colonialism and that circulated as a means to legitimize subordination and power. (175) —SOUR MILK AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION: PINHO AGAINST AFROCENTRISM Pinho’s above suggestions can be, but are not easily, achieved. At the time of (her) writing it was no longer a question of if, but one of how, to see the fusion of black culture with baianidade/Bahian culture. Aware of this issue, she suggests that we step out of ‘Manichean and superficial’ Afrocentrism so as to see the largely ‘artificial’ character of classifications ‘black culture’ and ‘Bahian culture’ and to take into account ‘the agency of cultural producers’. (1989) Accordingly, I find stimulating Pinho’s courage to declare that to objectify identities does not necessarily create estrangement; without objectification cultures cannot expand and reproduce, (209) and cultural transformation needs to be promoted. In turn, to transform culture demands a re‐thinking of what equality means because: Equal should not be understood as same ... To see equality as sameness is like viewing racelessness as whiteness. It is a formulation that allows ‘white’ to be the neutral standard from which black differs; or ‘man’ to be the neutral standard against which women are compared. (220–1) Put simply, I welcome the above statement and Pinho’s overall thesis. I wish Wilderson paid attention to books like Pinho’s, Cedric J. Robinson’s Black Marxism (1983) or W.E.B. DuBois’s Black Reconstruction in America (1935), and to the ideas of Kwame A. Appiah, Cornel West, Marc Reed, Simone de Beauvoir, Eric Robert Taylor, to name but a few. Had Wilderson done so, his book could have been balanced. Red, White and Black is of almost no use to film studies scholars. I find it additionally useless because I believe that the USA is not the world’s centre, and that US antagonisms, related to cinema or not, are always‐already multiply outer‐ national.

#### 3. Aff is key to affirm indigenous scholarship here, in an academic space in which it is regularly excluded- the kritik is more assimilation in disguise

Maldonado-Torres 11 (Nelson, PhD, Religious Studies with a Certificate for Outstanding Work in Africana Studies, Brown University¶ BA, Philosophy, University of Puerto Rico: ”THE LATINA/O ACADEMY OF ARTS¶ AND SCIENCES: DECOLONIZING¶ KNOWLEDGE AND SOCIETY IN THE¶ CONTEXT OF NEO-APARTHEID” Harvard Latino Law Review, Vol 14, 2011)

To be sure, there are many Latina/o scholars and allies who take the¶ challenges outhned above seriously and already have a strong record of research¶ and institufion-building in much needed areas." At the same time, it¶ is not strange for many of these scholars and others to confront exclusion,¶ misunderstanding, and marginahzation, not only in society at large, but also¶ in the academy itself. They find that normative university culture tends to¶ demand as much assimilation from scholars who belong to non-normadve¶ groups or who specialize in the study of problems or issues that are particularly¶ relevant to non-normative groups, as normative society demands assimilation¶ from its multiple minoritized populations.^"\* Just like in society, in the¶ university there is a system of penalties and rewards supported by skewed¶ forms of democracy, appeals to equality, and shared governance." It is not strange for these scholars to have to jusdfy their objects of¶ study and research quesdons repeatedly and be pressured to comply with¶ what is considered the established norm.^^ This is a major problem for Latina/¶ o scholars as the serious consideradon of the history, memories, cultural¶ acdvism, knowledge, polidcal dynamics, and social and economic condidons¶ of minoridzed populadons often results in the introducdon of quesdons¶ and methods that challenge the boundaries of established disciplines, fields,¶ and the division of knowledge in the academy." While Latina/os are under¶ siege in society, the situadon in the academy is not dissimilar—at least not¶ for those who are most interested in addressing issues that particularly affect¶ Ladna/os and other minoridzed populadons or groups, or who raise quesdons¶ from muldple minoritized perspecdves. The connecdon among the status of Ladna/os in society, the consideradon¶ of their history, memory, and knowledge in the academy, and the condidons¶ within which progressive scholars who focus on quesdons relevant to¶ Latina/os have most recendy been made obvious by the attack on Raza Studies¶ by the passing of Proposidon H.B. 2281 in Arizona,^\* H.B, 2281 was¶ passed shortly after S,B, 1070,^9 While the latter targets "illegal immigrants"¶ in the state of Arizona, H.B. 2281 focuses on Raza and Mexican¶ American Studies in public schools.^" Combined, the two proposidons¶ demonstrate the perspecdve that neither certain migrants (and by extension¶ people who look like them), nor the memories, historical perspecdves, and¶ knowledge of that populadon, are fit to be included in the public or the¶ public realm. In the face of actual demographic shifts in the inhabitants of¶ the state, the response is to further delimit the sphere of the public by excluding¶ people and their histories, memories, cultures, and understandings of¶ it. The only routes left in this context would seem to be voluntary departure,¶ forced removal, condnued persecudon, exclusion and minoritizadon, unidirecdonal¶ assimiladon, and resistance in response to the nadvist menaces.¶ The social and pohdcal climate in Arizona is particularly significant¶ because it dramadzes a reality that has already existed and that is growing in¶ other states in the nation.^' It is a response to rapid demographic change,where traditionally undesirable communities are growing in number and¶ where a variety of groups respond, not only by Hmiting the possibilities for¶ citizenship but also by limifing the scope of what is considered public."¶ This situation leads to a more numerous population being considered out of¶ the boundaries of the "people" and closer to that of the "damned."" The¶ banning from belonging to the pubhc focuses on bodies as much as it also¶ targets minds, or consciousness and knowledge, thereby reducing the possibilities¶ for diversity even among those who can claim to be an authentic¶ part of the public. While privatization and the expectation of unilateral assimilation erode¶ the strength of the public, Latina/os are increasingly relegated to the space of¶ the "under-public" or "damned;" and if Latina/os make it to the sphere of¶ the public, or rise to the position of managerial private compensation (or any¶ other position in society), the idea is that only their bodies make it there, but¶ not their minds.^"\* It is in this context that it is particularly important to assert¶ the presence of Lafina/os in bodies and in mind in society and public institutions,¶ including the academy. It is important to challenge problematic tendencies¶ in society and in each of those institutions, while also formulating¶ goals and ideals that can help to create a larger and healthier sense of the full¶ extent of the pubhc in all its richness and diversity. Although Latina/os and¶ their allies have been working on this for a long time," and their productive¶ efforts should be valued and supported, there is a need to continue conceiving¶ and creating projects and institutions that can complement the work that¶ is already being done and contribute to make more powerful and visible the¶ collective strength of those who wish to evade new forms of social and epistemological apartheid and their consequences. The idea for creating a Latina/¶ o Academy of Arts and Sciences was bom out of this wish and need.

#### 4. The kritik allows Western Knowledge to perpetuate hierarchal typologies of humanity- Justification for colonial practices and world domination.

Smith 99 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Associate professor of education and director of the international research institute for Maori and Indigenous Education at the University of Auckland, “Decolonizing Methodologies Research and Indigenous Populations”, 1999

The development of scientific thought, the exploration and 'discovery' by Europeans of other worlds, the expansion of trade, the establishment of colonies, and the systematic colonization of indigenous peoples-in-the-eighteenth-and-nineteenth centuries are all facets of the modernist project. Modernism is more than a re-presentation of fragments form the ‘new’ world expanded and challenged ideas the West held about itself. The production of knowledge, new knowledge and transformed ‘old’ knowledge, ideas about the nature of knowledge and the validity of specific forms of knowledge, became as much commodities of colonial exploitation as as other natural recourses. Indigenous peoples were classified alongside the flora and fauna; hierarchal typologies of humanity and systems of representation were fuelled by new discoveries; and cultural maps were charted and territories claimed and contested by the major European powers. Hence some indigenous peoples were ranked above others in terms of such things as the belief that they were 'nearly human', 'almost human' or 'sub-human'. This often depended on whether it was thought that the peoples concerned possessed a 'soul' and could therefore be 'offered' salvation and whether or not they were educable and could be offered schooling. These systems for organizing, classifying and storing new knowledge, and for theorizing the meanings of such discoveries, constituted research. In a colonial context, however, this research was undeniably also about power and domination. The instruments or technologies of research were also instruments of knowledge and instruments for legitimating various colonial practices.¶ The imaginary line between 'east' and 'west', drawn in 1493 by a Papal Bull, allowed for the political division of the world and the struggle by competing Western states to establish what Said has referred to as a 'flexible positional superiority' over the known, and yet to become known, world.6 This positional superiority was contested at several levels by European powers. These imaginary boundaries were drawn again in Berlin in 1934 when European powers sat around the table once more to carve up Africa and other parts of 'their' empires. They continue to be redrawn. Imperialism and colonialism are the specific formations through which the West came to 'see', to 'name' and to 'know' indigenous communities. The cultural archive with its systems of representation, codes for unlocking systems of classification, and fragmented artefacts of knowledge enabled travellers and observers to make sense of what they saw and to represent their new-found knowledge back to the West through the authorship and authority of their representations.

#### 5.Visibility is good even if there’s some commodification—1 risk means you vote aff

Kleinman et al 96

(Arthur and Joan Kleinman. “The appeal of experience; the dismay of images: Cultural appropriations of suffering in our times,” Daedalus. Winter 1996. Vol.125, Iss. 1; pg. 1-24)

It is ¶ necessary ¶ to balance the account of the ¶ globalization ¶ of ¶ commercial and ¶ professional images ¶ with a ¶ vastly ¶ different and ¶ even more ¶ dangerous ¶ cultural ¶ process ¶ of ¶ appropriation: ¶ the totali ¶ tarian state's erasure of social ¶ experiences ¶ of ¶ suffering through ¶ the ¶ suppression ¶ of ¶ images. ¶ Here the ¶ possibility ¶ of moral ¶ appeal through ¶ images ¶ of human ¶ misery ¶ is ¶ prevented, ¶ and it is their absence that ¶ is the source of existential ¶ dismay. ¶ Such is the case with the massive starvation in China from 1959 ¶ to 1961. This ¶ story ¶ was not ¶ reported ¶ at the time even ¶ though ¶ more ¶ than ¶ thirty ¶ million Chinese died in the aftermath of the ruinous ¶ policies ¶ of the Great ¶ Leap Forward, ¶ the ¶ perverse ¶ effect of Mao's ¶ impossible ¶ dream of ¶ forcing ¶ immediate industrialization on ¶ peas ¶ ants. Accounts of ¶ this, ¶ the world's most ¶ devastating famine, ¶ were ¶ totally suppressed; ¶ no stories or ¶ pictures ¶ of the ¶ starving ¶ or the ¶ dead were ¶ published. ¶ An internal ¶ report ¶ on the famine was made ¶ by ¶ an ¶ investigating ¶ team for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist ¶ Party. ¶ It was based on a detailed ¶ survey ¶ of an ¶ extremely poor region ¶ of ¶ Anwei Province that was ¶ particularly brutally ¶ affected. The ¶ report ¶ includes this ¶ numbing ¶ statement ¶ by ¶ Wei ¶ Wu-ji, ¶ a ¶ local ¶ peasant ¶ leader from Anwei: ¶ Originally ¶ there were ¶ 5,000 people ¶ in our ¶ commune, ¶ now ¶ only ¶ 3,200 ¶ remain. When the ¶ Japanese ¶ invaded we did not lose this ¶ many: ¶ we at least could save ourselves ¶ by running away! ¶ This ¶ year ¶ there's no ¶ escape. ¶ We die shut ¶ up ¶ in our own houses. Of ¶ my ¶ 6 ¶ family members, ¶ 5 are ¶ already dead, ¶ and I am left to ¶ starve, ¶ and I'll ¶ not be able to stave off death for ¶ long.30 ¶ Wei ¶ Wu-ji ¶ continued: ¶ Wang Jia-feng ¶ from West ¶ Springs County reported ¶ that cases of ¶ eating ¶ human meat were discovered. ¶ Zhang Sheng-jiu said, "Only ¶ an evil man could do such a ¶ thing!" Wang Jia-feng said, ¶ "In ¶ 1960, ¶ there were 20 in our ¶ household, ¶ ten of them died last ¶ year. My ¶ son ¶ told his mother Til die of ¶ hunger ¶ in a few ¶ days.'" ¶ And indeed he ¶ did.31 ¶ The ¶ report ¶ also includes a ¶ graphic image by ¶ Li ¶ Qin-ming, ¶ from ¶ Wudian ¶ County, Shanwang Brigade: In ¶ 1959, ¶ we were ¶ prescheduled ¶ to deliver ¶ 58,000 jin ¶ of ¶ grain ¶ to the ¶ State, ¶ but ¶ only 35,000 jin ¶ were ¶ harvested, ¶ hence we ¶ only ¶ turned ¶ over ¶ 33,000 jin, ¶ which left ¶ 2,000 jin ¶ for the commune. We ¶ really ¶ have ¶ nothing ¶ to eat. The ¶ peasants ¶ eat ¶ hemp leaves, anything they ¶ can ¶ possibly ¶ eat. In ¶ my ¶ last ¶ report ¶ after I ¶ wrote, ¶ "We have ¶ nothing ¶ to ¶ eat," ¶ the ¶ Party ¶ told me ¶ they ¶ wanted to remove ¶ my ¶ name from the ¶ Party ¶ Roster. Out of a ¶ population ¶ of ¶ 280, ¶ 170 died. In our ¶ family ¶ of ¶ five, ¶ four of us have died ¶ leaving only myself. ¶ Should I ¶ say ¶ that ¶ I'm not broken hearted?32 ¶ Chen ¶ Zhang-yu, ¶ from ¶ Guanyu County, ¶ offered the ¶ investigators ¶ this terrible ¶ image: ¶ Last ¶ spring ¶ the ¶ phenomenon ¶ of cannibalism ¶ appeared. ¶ Since Com ¶ rade Chao Wu-chu could not come ¶ up ¶ with ¶ any good ways ¶ of ¶ prohibiting it, ¶ he ¶ put ¶ out the order to ¶ secretly imprison ¶ those who ¶ seemed to be at death's door to combat the rumors. He ¶ secretly ¶ imprisoned ¶ 63 ¶ people ¶ from the entire ¶ country. Thirty-three ¶ died in ¶ prison.33 ¶ The official ¶ report ¶ is ¶ thorough ¶ and detailed. It is classified ¶ neibu, ¶ restricted use ¶ only. ¶ To distribute it is to reveal state secrets. Pre ¶ sented ¶ publicly ¶ it would have ¶ been, especially ¶ if it had been ¶ pub ¶ lished in the ¶ 1960s, ¶ a fundamental ¶ critique ¶ of the Great ¶ Leap, ¶ and ¶ a moral and ¶ political delegitimation ¶ of the Chinese Communist ¶ Party's ¶ claim to have ¶ improved ¶ the life of ¶ poor peasants. ¶ Even ¶ today ¶ the authorities ¶ regard ¶ it as ¶ dangerous. ¶ The official silence is ¶ another form of ¶ appropriation. ¶ It ¶ prevents public witnessing. ¶ It ¶ forges ¶ a secret ¶ history, ¶ an act of ¶ political ¶ resistance ¶ through keep ¶ ing ¶ alive the ¶ memory ¶ of ¶ things ¶ denied.34 The totalitarian state rules ¶ by ¶ collective ¶ forgetting, by denying ¶ the collective ¶ experience ¶ of ¶ suffering, ¶ and thus creates a culture of terror. ¶ The absent ¶ image ¶ is also a form of ¶ political appropriation; ¶ public ¶ silence is ¶ perhaps ¶ more ¶ terrifying ¶ than ¶ being ¶ overwhelmed ¶ by public images ¶ of ¶ atrocity. ¶ Taken ¶ together ¶ the two modes of ¶ appropriation ¶ delimit the extremes in this cultural ¶ process.35 ¶ CODA ¶ Our ¶ critique ¶ of ¶ appropriations ¶ of ¶ suffering ¶ that do harm does not ¶ mean that no ¶ appropriations ¶ are valid. To conclude that would be o undermine ¶ any attempt ¶ to ¶ respond ¶ to human ¶ misery. ¶ It would ¶ be much more destructive than the ¶ problem ¶ we have ¶ identified; ¶ it ¶ would ¶ paralyze ¶ social action. We must draw ¶ upon ¶ the ¶ images ¶ of ¶ human ¶ suffering ¶ in order to ¶ identify ¶ human needs and to craft ¶ humane ¶ responses.

1. For examples of Pre-1980 Settler/Master films see Haskell Wexler’s *Medium Cool* (1970), L. Cohen’s *Bone* or *Housewife* (1972), [Alan J. Pakula](http://us.imdb.com/name/nm0001587/)’s *The Parallax View* (1974),Hal Ashby’s *Coming Home* (1978), and James Bridges’ *The China Syndrome* (1979). For examples of Pre-1980 Slave films see Charles Burnett’s *Killer of Sheep* (1972), Hugh Robertson’s *Melinda* (1972), Michael Campus’ *The Mack* (1973),Ivan Dixon’s *The Spook Who Sat by the Door* (Ivan Dixon 1973),and Haile Gerima’s *Bush Mama* (1977). [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. After the Watts Rebellion, RFK observed: “There is no point in telling Negroes to observe the law…It has almost always been used against them…All these places—Harlem, Watts, South Side [of Chicago]—are riots wating to happen.” Quote in: Clark, Kenneth B. “The Wonder is There Have Been So Few Riots.” *New York Times Magazine*, September 5, 1965. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. See Emile Benveniste. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Trans. Mary Elizabeth Meek. Coral Gables: Univ. of Miami Press, 1971. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)