# Hei Ren Affirmative and Negative

## \*\*\*User Guide\*\*\*

This affirmative includes a defense of the performance and the method. The performance is the entire 8 minutes of the 1AC as you read it in a debate round. The purpose of the performance is to both bring attention to the issue of colorism in and Chinese communities but is also to add to the international pressure put on China to treat Hei Ren (Afro-Asians /Blacks) better. The figure of the interracial Asian and Black person represents the place where the two topic countries meet in terms of problems they share.

You are both criticizing the USFG and China in this 1AC. Neither country is let off of the hook for participating in the system of privilege that leave darker skinned people. Which country is more responsible or if we should even attempt to make that determination is up to you. Either choice will change the way your debates about power and privilege go down.

You have three major impacts. The black white binary, colorism, and coalitions. Your focus on the Afro Asian body allows you to break down the black white binary, to address colorism, and to push forward our epistemologies.

This affirmative uses a lot of terms to get to one specific goal of the method: to advocate for solidarity between people of Asian and African descent. The specific event that this affirmative identifies as an example of solidarity is the Badung Conference of 1955 that needs to be a starting point for conversation. Your evidence indicates that the knowledge and ways of understanding oppression of the darker people around the globe needs to be pushed further to create more coalitions and to decrease oppression.

The negative Kritik about speaking for others simply criticizes affirmative debaters for speaking on behalf of /erasing the voices of people in the 1AC. This criticism can apply to both of the debaters, the 1A, or the 2A. You can make your link specific to speaking on behalf of those at the Badung Conference, those who are Afro-Asian, those who are Chinese nationals, or those who are parts of the different social groups spoken about in the 1AC. The affirmative needs to win that they are as close to the alternative as possible and that they need to speak up about Afro-Asian oppression in debate specifically.

I suggest you read all of the cards all of the way through. There are a lot of historical events in the underlined and un-underlined parts of the cards. The more you know about the history of the groups of people you are talking about, the better you will do in debates.

## \*\*Glossary\*\*

**Performance**- performance refers to everything that we do. When we speak a certain language, act out certain gender norms, or act like part of our social class we can understand who we are by the way we act. Every action we take, big or small, constructs our identity and our arguments. Two people can never share the same performance.

**Method**— the way in which the affirmative or negative team hopes to bring about change. Policy affs engage in state-based reform mechanism to bring about some change to the status quos and performance affs represent an example of a mechanism to bring about change when used inside or outside of debate.

**Hei Ren**- the Chinese term for a black person. This term has a lot of historical weight and should be understood within a Chinese context and not a Western one.

**Whiteness**—a system of a privilege and power that benefits white/lighter-skinned people. It bestows unearned privileges upon some people and disadvantages others.

**Anti-Blackness**—the sentiment/feeling that produces specific violence that occurs against black people and those communities that are darker. Darker people are disadvantaged by the system of anti-blackness. Using this term allows us to focus on those who are disadvantaged rather than focusing on/re-centering those that are in power.

**Black/White Binary –** A way of understanding racism that puts whiteness and blackness in a dyadic relationship. There are arguments for why this focus on just whiteness and blackness is good and allows us to understand oppression at the extremes. There are argument for why the binary focus is bad because it erases particularities and other races and ethnic groups also oppressed by the system of whiteness.

**Afro-Asian** – refers to a person who is of both African and Asian descent.

**Miscegenation** – the process of race mixing through the production of a child where both parents have different racial backgrounds.

**Diaspora**- refers to people of a certain racial or continental origin that are spread out across the world through migration.

**Coalitions** – groups of people working together to achieve a common goal. These groups may have multiple goals and may not always agree on methods or priorities but are better able to achieve goals.

**Solidarity**- refers to identifying with and appreciating the struggle/movement of another person or group towards a specific goal. Those who are in solidarity with others can engage in activism, speak out against problems, or just agree with the goals of others.

**Colorism**- the specific privileging and dis-privileging of people based on skin tone/color. Those with lighter skin tones, regardless of their race, are treated better than those with darker skin colors.

**Social Location** – refers to the intersection of identities that make a person who they are. Your class, age, race, citizenship, gender, etc. all make up your social location. Your social location is very specific to you and how your experiences have positioned you within the world.

**Role of the Ballot**—a framework for evaluating the debate. It gives the debate a specific goal and the teams in the debate argue that they achieve the goal the best.

**Speaking for Others**—a criticism of people who, based on their social location, that erase or speak over those who have a grievance with the system of whiteness/ privilege and that can articulate that grievance for themselves.

### Hei Ren 1AC

**My life is a half-breed one with sad souvenirs**

**That nobody could understand…**

**Day by Day, I wander around**

**Searching for people like me**

**But I still find myself alone**

**A body of mixed race, but a soul that is not**

**My life of two bloodstreams led nowhere**

**Days went by so quick**

**I try to look back on my memories**

**That echo in my mind during the night**

**Songs I composed to sing to myself.**

#### ---Nia Nguyen’s poem My Life

#### The modern world has been fractured by a number of lines and divisions between racial and ethnic identities across the United States and The People’s Republic of China. When these bodies meet, both physically and theoretically, the usual conversations within policy discourse happen but those least well off can’t be moved forward until we resolve the prior issues of power and privilege and White Supremacy that frame the conversations of the resolution. The resolution calls for us to discuss relationships from two governments from two sides of the world but makes no room to ask the deeper question of ‘What happens when racialized bodies within these nations meet?” The Du Boisean diagnosis of the 20th century’s battle at the colorline was an important intervention into the conversation on white supremacy but is no longer useful to understand the full complexity of racial rule inside of the resolutional countries. We, then, evaluate what happens in and between the physical, psychic , and social bodies outside of a Black/White Binary by intensely analyzing the role of not only Chinese citizens abroad but those that complicate and rupture our notions of identity politics.

#### **Raphael-Hernandez and Steen 06**

Raphael-Hernandez, Heike and Steen, Shannon (2006) Introduction of “AfroAsian Encounters: Culture, History, Politics” New York University Press. [EJS] Accessed 6-9-16

**For a long time, many critics understood W. E. B. Du Bois’s famous diagnosis of the twentieth century as plagued by the problem of the color line as a description of white/nonwhite antagonisms**. However, **in the aftermath of identity movements on the part of a variety of racial and ethnic groups, as well as saddening clashes between them, it has become impossible to construe the twentieth century as riven by a single color line. Instead, we now conceive of the modern world as having been fractured by a network of lines dividing a range of racial and ethnic groups. How else can we comprehend the identity struggles of South Asian visual artists in the Caribbean, the treatment of the Vietnam War by African American novelists, or the absorption of hip-hop by Asian American youth culture?** **AfroAsian Encounters addresses an important connection that until recently has received only scant attention: the mutual influence of and relationships between members of the African and Asian diasporas in the Americas**. Across the Americas, **these two groups have often been thought of as occupying radically incommensurable cultural and political positions**. In this collection, we examine AfroAsian interconnections across a variety of cultural, political, and historical contexts in order to examine how the two groups have interacted, and have construed one another, as well as how they have been set in opposition to each other by white systems of racial domination. We build here on the burgeoning interest in AfroAsian cultural histories reflected in a number of venues. From the conferences hosted by Boston University’s African American studies department ( 2002 , 2003 , 2004 ), to special editions on AfroAsian studies in Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society ( 200 2 ) and p osit ions: East Asia cultures critique ( 200 3 ), to the numerous essays and 1 books generated by scholars across a number of disciplines from Gary Okihiro and Vijay Prashad to Claire Jean Kim and Frank Wu, as well as work by contributors we include here, research on black-Asian racial interactions and formations has expanded at a rapid pace during the last decade. 1 **We seek to widen the energetic investigations that AfroAsian studies have provided relative to histories of diasporic and racial formations and globalization across a variety of fields**, and with this book we hope to offer an important contribution to the ongoing scholarly debate. We have framed our treatment of black-Asian interactions within a neologism — rather, we have altered the typography for the term: AfroAsian. While there have been references to the “Afro-Asian” century and the “Afro-Asian” world, we have decided to drop the hyphen from the term in order to denote a unique, singular set of cultural dynamics that our authors analyze. This collection constitutes the first interdisciplinary anthology to treat AfroAsian encounters. In keeping with the systems of intellectual inquiry established within African American and Asian American studies, we have gathered here essays that reflect a wide disciplinary range, including literary studies, musicology, history, and performance and visual studies. With this array we follow the recent move in the scholarly academy to allow interdisciplinar y analysis to bridge the traditional divides that reflect the specialization of academic knowledge to the detriment of actual cultural and social processes. These essays provide rich, progressive, innovative directions in AfroAsian studies and invigorate the status of current thought on interracial encounters across multiple disciplines. **This work** **does not just present a medley of** essays with **AfroAsian encounters in the Americas as their only common denominator; rather, we have taken Claire Jean Kim’ s discussion of “ racial triangulation” in Asian American studies as an invitation to further the discourse of AfroAsian encounters.** **Moving beyond the traditional black/white binary**, the essays claim that **to understand historical and contemporary AfroAsian encounters, the third, white, signifier, cannot be separated from a discussion as this signifier has informed or influenced AfroAsian binary encounters in the Americas, often without being visibly or literarily present. Race in the past century and a half has not functioned within national or ethnic boundaries. The cultural and racial groupings examined by our contributors indicate the ways in which these groups do not exist in isolation but within complicated interactions, and they ask us to reevaluate how we define the category “race” itself. Perhaps the most important contribution of AfroAsian studies lies in its potential ability to disrupt the black/white binary that has so persistently characterized race and ethnic studies.** Within the last ten years or so, the stability of the term “race” has come under growing scrutiny**. Increasingly, race is considered to be not an ontological, coherent category but a dynamic system of affiliation, exclusion, and disavowal that is constantly being reinvented. This sense of “performing” race, of its contingent, assumed nature, has come to be understood in relation to processes of national self-conception, such that “race” is seen as a category produced by the nation itself**. As Paul Gilroy, Lisa Lowe, and Etienne Balibar have pointed out in different ways, national and racial boundaries are concomitant; race subtends dominant nationalist discourses—it extends underneath or functions in opposition to definitions of the nation. 2 **While the strategic, tactical fluidity of terms like race and nation in this formula are crucial to our understanding of their unstable, changing processes, the logic of opposition that has underwritten this conception of race has also had the unfortunate effect of reinscribing its terms within binary relations and has somewhat perniciously limited our understanding of “race” to dichotomous models largely cast in terms of black and white**. To this point, the great intervention in this binary system has been the assertion by postcolonial theorists of an “interstitial” position that occupies the spaces between these oppositions. 3 B u t this is not our only option. Scholars in Asian American studies have mounted energetic campaigns to move beyond the conceptual limitations of the racial binary in the last d e cade or so—we might think here of Claire Jean Kim’s above-mentioned discussion of “racial triangulation,” Gary Okihiro’s question “Is Yellow Black or White?,” and Frank Wu’s assertion that Asian American identities constitute something “beyond” either. For the most part, this work has demanded that we begin to understand race in terms of a polymorphous, multifaceted, multiply-raced immigration diaspora in combination with the histories of the African slave diaspora. However, race scholars still struggle to produce a flexible model that answers calls to move “beyond the binary.” In AfroAsian Encounters we contribute to this dialogue around racial formation by moving away from the focus on black-white interactions; moreover, we do so by examining the interactions of two racial groups now set up in opposition to one another within, for example, contemporary U.S. racial systems. We hope that the essays gathered here can intervene in these binary systems—methodologically, in terms of expanding the objects of race studies and, conceptually, through the expansion of the reigning paradigm of race studies away from blackness/antiblackness and whiteness/antiwhiteness schemas. **To understand contemporary U.S. racial systems, we must step more boldly into Europe’s past, as Paul Gilroy urges us. He writes: We must be prepared to make detours into the imperial and colonial zones where the catastrophic power of race-thinking was first institutionalized and its distinctive anthropologies put to the test, above all, in the civilizing storms of colonial war. . . . That redemptive movement must be able to pass beyond a compensatory acknowledgement of Europe’s imperial crimes and the significance of its colonies as places of governmental innovation and experiment. The empires were not simply out there—distant terminal points for trading activity where race consciousness could grow — in the torrid zones of the world at the other end of the colonial chain. Imperial mentalities w ere brought back home . . . and altered economic, social, and cultural relations**. . . . Europe’s openness to the colonial worlds it helped to make, might then be employed to challenge fantasies of the newly embattled European region as a culturally bleached or politically fortified space, closed off to further immigration. 4 **With this mindset, Europeans “created” their “New World,”** and the Americas became their dream, **their geographically locatable paradise**. **That their creation contained problematic cross-cultural and cross-racial encounters from the start was not problematic for white ideology and imagination; the European colonial color hierarchy was designed to regulate such problems**. 5 Racial divisions were arranged according to the white/ nonwhite binary. In his Letters from an American Farmer ( 1782 , 1793 ) John Crèvecoeur provided a definition of the only true American “race”: What, then, is the American, this new man? He is neither a European nor the descendant o f a European; hence that strange mixture of blood, which you will find in no other country. I could point out to you a family whose grandfather was an Englishman, whose wife was Dutch, whose son married a French woman, and whose present four sons have now four wives of different nations. He is an American, who, leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced . . . and the new rank he holds. . . . **Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men**. . . . The Americans were once scattered all over Europe; here they are incorporated into one of the finest systems of population which has ever appeared. 6 **As is quickly apparent, Crèvecoeur’s notion of “all nations” includes only all European countries — a generally accepted ideology that is also expressed in the Declaration of Independence’s “all men are equal,” thus all having the right to pursue happiness. Such a mindset saw no discrepancy between “all men” and African American slavery and Native American genocide. The entrance of the Asian migratory laborer, however, disrupted this ideology. As Ronald Takaki emphasizes, while Asian immigrants “were brought here to serve as an ‘internal colony’ — nonwhites allowed to enter as ‘cheap’ migratory laborers and members of a racially subordinated group, not future citizens of American society,**” 7 they came as dreamers, too. Asians perceived themselves as eligible for participation in the “New World” if only through hard work. Takaki argues: The context of the “modern world-system” and its economic forces only partly explains the Asian migrations to America. While the Asian immigrants did not choose the material circumstances of their times, most of them still made choices regarding the future of their lives. . . . Though driven by “necessity,” they were also stirred . . . by “dreams” . . . [and] “hopes.” 8 **Not only were they forced to experience racism and discrimination immediately, but also they faced a “triangulated” racial reality: in white perception, they were on the other side of the white/nonwhite spectrum; in their own perception, they did not view themselves as being in “coalition” with black people because they entered the United States as free migrant laborers, not slaves; in black perception, there was indeed no coalition because Asians had opportunities they did not have. This white triangulation forced them to interact—literally and theoretically. Key to the history of interaction between the two groups is the process by which their intermixing was made possible. The first AfroAsian contact can be traced back to antiquity through the great spice routes that we normally think of as a characteristic of the Greco-Roman cultural world. These routes also provided the conditions for cultural and economic exchange between what we now refer to as Tanzania, Somalia, Egypt, Persia, India, and China, as these empires traded precious commodities such as cinnamon and myrrh** (in fact, the archeological record is unclear as to Introduction 5 whether the AfroAsian routes preceded the Greco-Roman involvement in the spice trade). **Two millennia later, the early to mid-nineteenth-century abolition of the slave trade produced the context of AfroAsian encounters of modernity. In the wake of the British abolition of the trade in African lives, cheap labor sources were needed to fuel British colonial industries around the globe. Indians were transplanted to southern Africa to build railroads, and Chinese were taken to the Caribbean to work the sugar plantations. A similar economic necessity drove the importation of Asian labor to the United States.** As the national debate over slavery grew over the course of the early nineteenth century, and more states (especially w estern states) were added to the “free soil” roster, the need for cheap labor did not abate. The early development of new states like California happened to coincide with the massive displacement of peoples in Guangdong province in the wake of the Opium Wars. As John Kuo Wei Tchen has pointed out, prior to the construction of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 it took two to three months to travel overland to San Francisco from Boston or New York, but only two weeks to travel from Canton by clipper ship, creating circumstances that made Chinese immigrants the perfect candidates to step into the labor shortage caused by booming industries in mining, shipping, transportation, and agriculture in California. 9 **AfroAsian relations, then, are the issue and, potentially, the subversion of the European dream of “the new world**.” Given the extraordinary richness of AfroAsian interactions of modernity, particularly those created within the shadow and against the force of this colonialist history, we have chosen to focus the volume within the period beyond emancipation. The colonial processes that created the Americas made possible the very connections our authors investigate**. For these AfroAsian encounters in the Americas, the twentieth century invented another problematic triangulated concept—the “model minority” myth. This construct enabled white society to pit Asian Americans against many other groups, not just African Americans. Yet, for the AfroAsian mutual perspective of each other and for their encounters, the concept has carried additional problems: while Asian Americans have been constructed as model minorities, their economic success heralded as proof of the availability of the American Dream to all, African Americans have continued to be plagued by negative associations and to be systematically excluded from the American political economy. It would be a mistake to ignore the ways in which racial antagonisms have frequently been aligned along a black-white axis or to elide the histories of African slavery that produced the modern Euro-American economy**. **So, too, would it be a mistake to ignore the influence of East and South Asia on the making of the modern economic and cultural world. To do so would disregard how South and East Asian labor were key to the maintenance of U.S. and British economies in the wake of abolition, it would overlook the way Asian and African populations were played against one another to produce white supremacy, it would erase the distinct absorption of African versus Asian cultures in a range of national contexts, and it would obliterate the possibility of cross-racial political coalitions, as well as naïvely ignore the conflicts between racial groups.** These examples, sketched briefly here, form the basis for several of the essays in this volume. Regarding Takaki’s modern-world system of capitalism and the mig r ant lab orer movement, one might ask why we did not expand our discussion to a more global level and include south Asian labor migration to southern Africa, for example. However, as our focus is the triangulation of AfroAsian encounters in the construction of the Americas, we did not see an inclusion of such otherwise geopolitically highly important discussions necessary for this particular collection. This weight reflects the historical significance of the United States as a primary site of AfroAsian interactions. The North American continent, situated between the geopolitical units of the Black Atlantic and the Asian/Pacific, has seen a uniquely high concentration of AfroAsian cultural interactions. AfroAsian Encounters addresses a phenomenon that has been culturally active for well over a century. While much contemporary cultural influence between the African and Asian diasporas might be categorized as a result of globalization, our contributors suggest that the mutual imbrication of these two groups constitutes a longer historical phenomenon, with important roots and foundations that warrant examination. **This collection traces this history across multiple locations and attempts to trace these interactions, to “catch up,” as it were, with the racial dynamics of various national contexts that have been active for over a century now**. AfroAsian Encounters is comprised of a foreword, an afterword, and sixteen essays arranged within four thematic subtopics. Vijay Prashad launches the volume with “Bandung Is Done.” His essay frames the volume as a whole with a discussion of “AfroAsian Epistemology,” which, he argues, reached its apotheosis in the landmark Bandung Conference of 1955 . S w eeping back to the League against Imperialism meeting in Brussels in 192 8 and f o r ward to the present, Prashad traces the spirit of cooperation Introduction 7 and mutual support around anticolonialist struggles in both Asia and Africa, but he also acknowledges the ways in which the political projects of liberation animated by that spirit have been undermined in the period since Bandung. From the International Monetary Fund’s attempt to render newly independent nations dependent on their former colonial masters through the necessity of capital investment, to the commodification and aestheticization of AfroAsian relations in the Hollywood film and American music industries, the political possibilities forged in Bandung have been severely compromised. As a result, Prashad warns, the knowledge project of AfroAsian studies is similarly imperiled. He argues that area studies in U.S. universities were a direct outgrowth of Cold War politics and cautions us that while AfroAsian studies might mimic the form of Bandung, its content runs the risk of simply mirroring the corporate globalization and Cold War exploitation of newly independent countries that the leaders of the Bandung conference wished to inhibit. His essay demands that we reinvest our own epistemological projects with the spirit of independence and expressly anticolonial politics that energized Bandung, a spirit that we hope grounds this volume as well.

#### There is large scale and incalculable violence that Blasian people face in China and the United States. In America, being anti-black gives coherence to American identity for Asian families and communities. The fusion of class based and racial beliefs against interracial children isn’t a theoretical impact but is manifest against Blasian children as Asian immigrants are bombarded with racist images from the West.

#### Chang 16

Sharon H Chang , activist and scholar (2016)” Raising Mixed Race: Multiracial Asian Children in a Post-Racial World” Routledge Press. [EJS] Accessed 8-11-2016

But **though all groups of color are oppressed in a white racist system and encouraged to dislike each other**, **it does not then mean those groups move on a level playing** **field and that their conflicts play out equally or fairly. They do not**. There is an important power differential. **Asians truly are positioned by whites higher than Blacks and frequently leverage white –complicit anti-blackness to maintain their position. One of my most prominent racial memories as a young teenager was my Taiwanese father telling me bluntly that if I ever married a Black man he would disown me**. “**Growing up my dad was very racist,” a Chinese mother recalled, “[He] often told us , “If you don’t want to end up like Black people then you got to study hard and work hard’”. Intermediate groups on the racial hierarchy often oppress those below them to assert that their own group, though subordinated, is still better than those considered lower**. **And positioning one’s own group close to whites implicitly involves the articulation of strongly anti-Black views and participation in anti-Black discrimination. Discriminations against multiracial Asians of Black descent then become painfully amplified by rejection from their own Asian communities, “Because [my kids] have brown skin and curly hair,” said a mother of her Black/ Asian/white children. “People don’t consider them Asian**s.” Another Black/Asian mother recounted her Chinese grandfather’s very strained relationship with her Black father: “You know my [Chinese] mom was the first one to marry outside of her race. And then my uncle did as well. You know once my mom did it then he did it. But he married white. And I think at that time my grandfather was just one of those, you know, like I said he came from China. So you know here you are, you have on of your oldest daughters marrying a Black guy and he really didn’t care for my father to begin with… my father and grandfather always had an estranged relationship. I mean we went over there for Christmas but him and my dad barely spoke.” **Certainly it is a well-known but little spoken –upon fact that anti-Blackness is very prevalent in Asia and Asian America. People silently understand that lighter skin, straight, smooth hair, wide eyes, with double lids and aquiline noses are considered preferable. “In Chinese,” explained one mother, “Black is a word almost exclusively of negative association.” This impulse toward lightness and whiteness is rooted strongly in the intersection-fusion of class ideas from Asia (darkness comes from being poor, working in the sun all day) and white racial framing pushed by Western colonization (whiteness equals power and supremacy conflated with moral goodness). “Those beliefs are already ingrained,” says Nitasha Tamar Sharma, professor of African American and Asian American studies and author of Hip Hop Desis: South Asian Americans, Blackness, and a Global Race Consciousness, “And then for [Asian] immigrants who arrive in America and are bombarded with anti-black images, being racist against Black people can subconsciously feel like a way to be American**—**and unfortunately, it kind of is**. “ In interviewing, a Black/Asian woman admitted to me that she and her Black husband routinely avoid the city of Bellevue, Washington, which is highly populated with Asians, because of how frequently they are discriminated against: “My husband and I, we even went to—there was a Chinese restaurant in Bellevue that we were going to. And it was really crowded that day. And it was a young girl helping everybody. And once my husband and I got to the counter to put our name on the list, she just kind of walked off and didn’t even give him the opportunity to say whatever. And I think we were like maybe on or two other American couples that were sitting in the waiting area. But it was really, really crowded and I don’t know if she just had too much going on but (trails off). My husband was so irritated he said, “Let’s just go.” And I said “Well what happened?” And he told me what happened and I was like oh, okay. I get it. So.” **For Blasian children, anti-Blackness within the Asian community undeniably bears on their performative racial identity development. A Black/ Korean mother told me , while she expected her daughter would be prized in the Korean community for having big eyes and long , thick eyelashes, she did not expect her daughter to be prized for having dark skin. A Black/ Chinese woman said she went to an Asian church growing up, but the church never accepted her, her sister, or their father for being Black. “ It seemed like were were outsiders, “ she recalled sadly, “ I actually remember as a kid playing with other Asian kids…and the [Asian] parents would be a little but put off by it.”** Another Black/Chinese mother told me she does not bring her daughter into the Chinese community because of how many discriminatory experiences she herself has had doing the same. She remembered once going to a Chinese grocery store to buy a duck and while the Asian butcher was very friendly to the Asian customer in front of her , when it was her turn ,” He just had this look in his eye like, you don’t belong here… I don’t want my daughter to catch that flack.” A Chinese mother felt her black/Chinese toddler was already “showing obvious signs she is of African descent” in response to anti-blackness in their Asian circles. And a Filipina mother relayed with frustration her parents’ initial negative reactions to her Black partner and speculations upon the appearance of a future mixed race Black child:

#### Our criticism is not solely of the United States. Anti-blackness is a global system with particular manifestations in China just as it has particular manifestations here at home. In China, black people and their children are, before anything else, marked as Hei Ren. Although China has not been as brutal to Hei Ren as the United States, they are also complicit in propagating violence.

#### Chang 16

Sharon H Chang, activist and scholar (2016)” Raising Mixed Race: Multiracial Asian Children in a Post-Racial World” Routledge Press. [EJS] Accessed 8-11-2016

**Like in the United States, Blacks in China are defined primarily by their skin color. No matter whether a black person is from Africa or the United States, he or she is first and foremost a hei ren** (black person). **Since China has a much shorter history of contact with blacks, Chinese knowledge of Africans and African Americans has largely come from Western sources. Consequently, western racial prejudice against black skin color dovetailed with traditional Chinese aesthetic values in the construction of Blackness as a marked racial identity in China.** While China has a longer history of contact with Westerners, its encounter with Africa is a more recent phenomenon. According to Philip Snow, from the mid-nineteenth centuries, **Chinese knowledge about Africa mainly came from Western traders and missionaries who landed on China’s coast. For example in 1848 Xu Jiyu, the governor of Fujian province, published an influential book on world geography, largely based on” oral reports and writings of Western missionaries”. Xu’s depiction of Africa reproduces the familiar Western picture of a continent lacking a history or culture of its own. It was from Xu’s book that reformers like Kang Youwei and Tang Caichang gained their initial knowledge about “blacks”. Despite the spread of Western racial ideology in China in late-nineteenth century, there were also important complication in the Chinese prejudice against “blacks”. For example, in 1901 Lin Shu, a famous Chinese translator, published “A Black Slave’s Cry to Heaven,” the Chinese translation of Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin. In the preface and afterword of the book, Lin pointed out parallels between the plight of “blacks” and early Chinese immigrant laborers in the United States. He also warned his countrymen of the prospect of enslavement in the absence of a strong Chinse government. In his 1903 tour of the United States, Liang Qichao denounced lynching’s as “cruel and inhuman acts” and expressed his disappointment at the hypocritical nature of American freedom. “ The American Declaration of Independence says that people are all born free and equal. Are blacks alone not people? Alas, I now understand what it is that is called ‘civilization’ these days! Although Liang accepted what he learned in the U.S. about “despicable” behaviors of “blacks” as true** , **he still could not accept the dehumanization of “blacks” by brutal punishments like lynching. Liang’s questioning of the American ideals of freedom and equality came very close to questioning racism against blacks in the United states.**

#### Colorism is the specific mechanism by subordination is enacted within white supremacy. A focus on colorism is key to map the complex relationship between race and identity politics

#### Chanbonpin 15

Kim D. Chanbonpin @John Marshall Law School (2015) “Between Black and White: The Coloring of Asian Americans”, 14 Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev. 637 [EJS] Accessed 8-12-16

**The prevailing paradigm for understanding and discussing race relations in the United States is the Black/White binary**. Although many have embraced the binary as a valuable tool for framing contemporary discussions about race relations, several legal scholars have decried the dichromatic model as inaccurately representing the nation’s numerous and varied racial and ethnic groups.24 **One development which the existing critiques of the Black/White binary have not yet fully accounted for, however, is the growing body of literature on colorism. Colorism is a useful intervention into the existing discourse of Asian American identity construction because it complicates prevailing understandings of the Black/White binary of race relations. Furthermore, because color preferences are likely to change subject to time and geographical contingencies,25 colorism discourse offers an alternative, perhaps more agile, method of mapping the complex interactions of race and identity politics**. Racism and colorism are distinct, but related forms of subordination. Sociologist Margaret Hunter defines colorism as “a process that privileges light-skinned people of color over dark in areas such as income, education, housing, and the marriage market.”26 Colorism, therefore, is a particular manifestation of the broader, systemic problem of racism.27 As Hunter notes: “**The hierarchy employed in colorism, however, is usually the same one that governs racism: light skin is prized over dark, and European facial features and body shapes are prized over African features and body shapes.”28 In the Asian American community, colorism is the product of a complex set of social and historical interactions with gender, immigrant, generational, and class dimensions.29 Within Asian ethnic groups, differences in skin color frequently determine social standing and marriageability.30 Colorism is a multifaceted system of subordination and influences not only the way that in-group members treat each other, but also how outsiders treat in-group members, and how in-group members treat outsiders.31 Investigating how colorism operates in the Asian American community yields important insights about how anti-Black prejudice is formed and deployed**. Therefore, it is necessary to acknowledge how Asian American groups assert agency both in constructing their own identities and also in “redeploy[ing] structures of racial oppression against others.”32 In the Asian American community,33 colorism exists as a result of an ideology of White supremacy imposed by European colonialists, but also because of a pre-existing preference for white skin that predates sustained contact with Europeans.34 Ancient Japanese believed that light skin was an indicator of spiritual purity.35 In China, the association between wealth and fair skin dates back to before the Qin Dynasty.36 In countries with long histories of European and U.S. colonialism, the Philippines, India, and Vietnam, for example, preference for light skin is closely connected to social and cultural values enforced by White colonial regimes.37 Whatever its origin, colorism persists in Asia today. In the melodramatic world of Filipino teleseyres (soap operas), for example, color prejudices play out on the small screen with alarming frequency.38 One of the highest-rated series in GMA Network history was titled, *Nita Negrita*.39 The show’s lead actor played the role of the dark-skinned title character in blackface.40 “Negrita” in the Tagalog vernacular is not a neutral descriptor. Though diminutive, the word “negrita” is meant to denigrate the person whom it describes.41 The general societal distaste for dark skin is a factor in ordering the social hierarchy in the Philippines as well as in the formation of racial attitudes when Filipinos migrate to the United States.42 Colorism as practiced in the Philippines predisposes immigrants to developing negative stereotypical views of Black Americans and other dark-skinned people of color. The author Toni Morrison summarizes the choice that all immigrants confront: “Whatever the ethnicity or nationality of the immigrant, his nemesis is understood to be African American. . . . It doesn’t matter anymore what shade the newcomer’s skin is. A hostile posture toward resident blacks must be struck at the Americanizing door before it will open.”43 Upon arrival to the United States, latent anti-Black ideology is immediately reinforced by interactions within the extant color and racial hierarchy. **Colorism also impacts intra-racial and inter-ethnic relationships between and among different Asian American sub-groups. Darker-skinned Asian groups are widely considered to be at the bottom of the Asian American social hierarchy.44 They are often the punch line of crude ethnic jokes which trade on negative stereotypes.45 External markers of success, such as educational achievement, occupation, and income are not shared evenly throughout the Asian American community. In Hawai‘i, for example, light-skinned East Asian groups (i.e., Chinese and Japanese) along with their White counterparts, are overrepresented in white-collar industries.46 This group’s socially and economically powerful position in the islands has aided in the subordination of other, typically darkerskinned ethnic groups**.47 Dark-skinned Asian Americans, including Pacific Islanders, are overrepresented in low-wage blue-collar industries.48 Differences in socioeconomic class contribute to stratification along racial and ethnic lines, and the resulting hierarchical power structure is reproduced and maintained through cultural practices such as ethnic jokes.49 **Further, colorism informs the ways in which Asian Americans perform race and racial identity.50 Chinese American Chrissy Lau reports receiving the following admonition from her mother after swimming outside: “[she] yelled at me with disgust and said, ‘Look how dark you are! You’re becoming black!’”51 For many Asian American women and men, Lau’s mother’s rebuke is perhaps familiar.52 It is not unusual for Asian American women to take steps to maintain light skin by avoiding the sun53 or to purchase expensive skin lighteners or brighteners54 to obtain the benefits that accompany a light-skinned appearance. Lau notes that her mother’s disapproval of dark Asian skin permeated her attitudes towards other people of color: “I began to form a prejudice that I found light skin to be more attractive than dark skin, not only within the Asian race, but the Black race and the Hispanic race.**”55 Colorism is not merely an intra-ethnic phenomenon, but also impacts relationships across different racial groups**. Although the preference for fair skin is the central feature of colorism, phenotypical traits such as hair texture, nose width, and eye shape are other markers of one’s color.56 Cosmetic surgery has made it possible for individuals to alter the presentation of their color on an even deeper level. The most common cosmetic surgery for Asian American women is a blepharoplasty, or double-eyelid surgery,** which promises to make the eyes appear bigger, rounder, and more alert.57 The outpatient surgery costs between $2500–5000 and lasts less than an **hour.58 When asked, blepharoplasty patients frequently deny that they seek surgery to look more “White.”59 Through her ethnographic research, however, Eugenia Kaw carefully deconstructs these denials, concluding “the conscious or unconscious manipulation of gender and racial stereotypes . . . influence [] Asian American women to alter their features through surgery.”60 Exercising the choice (when available) to display a lighter-skinned appearance or to deemphasize phenotypical markers of difference can yield material benefits for the agent of that choice. As discussed above, light skin may signal belonging in a dominant economic class. These physical features can elevate one’s social status and reputation for beauty. Cosmetic surgery is not always about beauty, however. For Fred Korematsu, undergoing an eyelid surgery was a risky attempt to maintain his freedom from unjust incarceration.61 To avoid imprisonment in an internment camp for Japanese Americans during World War II, Korematsu underwent surgery, changed his name to Clyde Sarah, and claimed to be of Spanish and Hawaiian descent**

Thus we advocate the 1AC as a method of unearthing Afro-Asian solidarity

#### The affirmative is a hailing of the shock waves sent into the international community by the Badung conference of 1955. The Darker Peoples of the world have to come together in order to destroy the history of colonial rule between and within our communities that plague our knowledge production. We have a history of learning about and engaging “areas” like China based on an outdated logic of the Cold War where we don’t attempt to actually know those who are oppressed but to contain and to modernize and use them for their strategic positions against anti-capitalist mods of thought.The call for Afro-Asian solidarity is not a push for a particular action but gives rise to new epistemologies for liberation

#### **Prashad 06**

Vijay, Prashad (2006)“Bandung is Done: Passages In AfroAsian Epistemology” AfroAsian Encounters: Culture, History, Politics New York University Press. [EJS] Accessed 6-11-16

**One evening in early 1955, the African American writer Richard Wright picked up his evening newspaper. He casually glanced over the items but was stopped by one notice. In far off Indonesia, representatives from twenty-nine newly liberated countries in Africa and Asia planned to gather for a conference.** Wright rushed to tell his wife, the Communist Ellen Poplar, that he wished to attend the conference and write about it. When Poplar read the article, she exclaimed, "Why, that's the human race," for, indeed, not only did the twenty-nine nations include a vast amount of humanity but also its agenda (disarmament and cooperation) articulated the hopes of the majority. Wright agreed. He wanted to write about it because he knew that writers from the advanced industrial states frequently displaced the actual voices of liberation from the new nations. The journalists spoke of the new nations, often even against them, but they did not give them room to speak themselves. Wright wanted to remedy that: "I know that people are tired of hearing of these hot, muddy faraway places filled with people yelling for freedom. But this is the human race speaking." The book that Wright produced from his trip, The Color Curtain, inauguratesour tradition of AfroAsian studies? **Richard Wright was no stranger to the dynamic that would unfold at Bandung. He understood the desire of a people for freedom from his own life and experiences, and he already had contacts with the leaders from the darker nations who would meet at Bandung**. Indeed, Wright's political life after he removed himself from the United States in July 1947 intersected frequently with the dynamic of Bandung. In Paris, Wright met the major figures of negritude, Aline Cesaire and Leopold Senghor, and the two main political figures of Pan-Africanism, George Padmore and Kwame Nkrumah. When it had become clear that Nkrumah's political movement would wrest power in Ghana (the Gold Coast), Wright traveled to western Africa, and in the year before Bandung he published his reflections on the possibilities of postcolonialism, tempered by the lure of suppressed traditions (Black Power: A Record of Reactions in a Land of Pathos). Wright's own biography intersects partly with that of the Bandung dynamic that developed in the byways of the struggle against colonialism. At the League against Imperialism meeting in Brussels in 1928, leaden from three continents (Africa, Asia, and South America) had already discussed their discrete ailments and had crafted common dreams. They had heard of each other's struggles and had found that they had come to discuss their discrete ailments and had crafted common dreams. They had heard of each other's struggles and had found that they had come to similar strategic and ideological conclusions. When independence finally dawned in the 1940s and 1950s, the leaders of the various national liberation movements took comfort in the successes of each other. At Bandung, these leaders met and forged an agenda for the international arena in opposition to the "freedom" of advanced capitalism (the First World) and to the "leadership" of the Soviet Union (the Second World). As the Third World, these regimes sought to produce international cooperation for the widest possible development over narrow economic profit and for peace over nuclear confrontation. This energy appealed to Richard Wright; **As the host of the Bandung Conference, Indonesia's President Achmet Sukarno welcomed the delegates and reminded them of the basis for AfroAsian unity: "We are of many different nations, we are of many different social backgrounds and cultural patterns. Our ways of life are different. Our national characters, or colors or motifs—call it what you will —are different. Our racial stock is different, and even the color of our skin is different." All this is true, but "what does that matter?" What united Africa and Asia, Sukarno noted, was "a common detestation of colonialism in whatever form it appears ... a common detestation of racialism ... a common determination to preserve and stabilize peace in the world."**2**Richard Wright sat in the hall, mesmerized by the proceedings. As he listened to Sukarno, he later wrote, "I began to sense a deep and organic relation here in Bandung between race and religion, two of the most powerful and irrational forces in human nature. Sukarno was not evoking these twin demons; he was not trying to create them; he was trying to organize them.... The reality of race and religion was there, swollen, sensitive, turbulent."/ Social traditions and identities had to be worn through, dealt with, reorganized. They could not be ignored or discarded.** For Sukarno, and Wright, the foundation of AfroAsian solidarity could not be in these skins, for they had to be the carapace to be outgrown. **The displacement from the Bandung political quake flooded over into political movements within the advanced industrial states, as well as across the formerly colonized world. Examples within the United States of this are abundant: there is the fierce attemnt to forge commonality among the Black Panthers, the Red Guard, and the Young Lords, and there is the example of the Third World Women's Alliance (TWWA). These movements identified themselves as the "Third World" in political solidarity with that dynamic of national liberation, whether it emerged from the Bandung currents or the courage of the barefoot Vietnamese and Guinean-Bissau liberation warriors.5- Yuri Kochiyama, the radical activist, offers the history of AfroAsian connection on this very platform, to learn each other's combined histories to break down "barriers, obstacles and phobias.'4 Bandung provided a major inspiration as well as an epistemological framework for those early scholars and activists who worked both to forge connections across lines of artificial, but historical, race and to study the history of these interactions. In chapbooks and in political journals, in solidarity marches and in the margins of books, these interactions became important for their union in a planetary anticolonialist struggle.** Fifty years have passed since Bandung, and much has changed since then. If Freedom's future lay within the project of the national liberation state. With the cannibalization of the state under dictates from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the national liberation agenda has been largely compromised. Most of the formerly colonized and subjugated nations produced minimally processed raw materials for the world mark and because of the unfair term of trade that would prevail as a result of historical disadvantage, these countries would always be indebted to the former colonial and now current imperial overlords. To break out of this vise, the new nations needed capital. With few resources, these countries first had to borrow and then went into debt. Into the breech came the III with an agenda not simply to create fiscal stability but to overturn the national liberation and Third World agenda of state construction and to subjugate the darker nations to capitalist globalization. A major consequence of the disembowelment of the state was that "nationalism" itself became transformed. The secular anticolonial Bandung era nationalism fell before the rise of a cruel cultural nationalism that drew on forms of social solidarity provided by either religion, reconstructed racism, **AfroAsian solidarity emerged in that Bandung epoch as a political platform both against the cruelty of the past and against colonialism "in its modern dress."2 The foundation for that solidarity is now largely eroded, with Africa and Asia interested in each other's resources and capital, where the bold pronouncements for a radical reconfiguration of the international political economy has vanished. In this atmosphere, the excavations of AfroAsian solidarity might be nostalgic, anachronistic, or even aesthetic. My initial impulse a decade no to write about these interactions drew largely from nostalgia for a type of political platform that had been available in an earlier time. I recognize that it was a platform flawed in many ways, as national liberation itself is suffused with all manner of limitations, but it is certainly true that motion existed then where history does not seem to move now. In the epoch of structural adjustment, where struggle against it in the advanced industrial states is episodic, the consideration of AfroAsian interaction might lean toward a nostalgic pessimism. But nostalgia is a far better entry point into the world of AfroAsian traffic than the process of commodification. From the late 1990s onward, Hollywood has provided a series of products that marry an African American with an Asian artist—whether Rush Hour with Chris Tucker and Jackie Chan or Martial Law with Arsenio Hall and Sammo Hung. This sort of interaction is premised almost entirely on the colorblind capitalists' desire to make the most of two ethnic niche markets. When Truth Hurts and Missie Elliot draw songs and rhythms from Bollywood, their producers do not necessarily want to make the most of two markets as much as they follow the hip-hop ethos to mine cultural worlds for the phat beat. These links are made opportunistically or aesthetically, but not politically. Scholarship on AfroAsian worlds emerged in the late 1970s after the era of Bandung had ended.** **It did not take place in departments of area studies —those that had been set up in the first five decades of the twentieth century to study "areas" of the world such as Africa, East Asia, Near East, South Asia, and Latin America. The epistemology of these area studies had its roots in the U.S. strategy during the Cold War to study these regions of the world for their potential for modernization and for alliances against the spread of communism**:Is' **Bewildered by the loss of their raison d'être at the end of the Cold War, area studies practitioners hunkered down to do the same sorts of things as they always did: textual work of the ancient world and international relations of the new. The field continued to operate with a modernization theory narrative, even as the political economy of the theory had somewhat disappeared. One fragment of area studies adopted the idea of transnationalism, or diaspora, to try to locate itself in the new "globalized" framework, although it did not attempt to articulate its work with that of the Bandung dynamic. Rather, it attempted to be the mirror of corporate globalization and to offer marginal liberal criticisms of the post–Cold War international political economy**. Interest in AfroAsian traffic within the United States did not develop in these area studies programs during the heyday of Bandung. To be fair, the only English-language nonofficial collection of speeches from the Bandung Conference did come from the precincts of an area studies program; it was edited by the Indonesia specialist George McTuran Kahin, the associate director of the Southeast Asia program at Cornell University. Nevertheless, little had been written about the fallout from this conference, and few of the studies that came from the pen of area studies researchers followed the implications of the Bandung dynamic. **Area studies in the United States ignored what could have been a fertile area of investigation—the cultural and political intersections across the artificial geopolitical and academic areas that had come to divide the world**. Instead, the study of AfroAsia within the United States emerged in ethnic studies programs, either in African American (Black) studies or in Asian American studies. From the late 1960s to the mid-1990s, however, the output in ethnic studies was motivated by an epistemology that suffered from similar "area" problems as area studies. To understand why and how AfroAsian matters entered ethnic studies, it behooves us to trace the contours of this field of study. Forged in the late 1960s with a social justice ethos, ethnic studies had become victim to its own epistemology. Early texts in Black studies and Asian American studies had worked on the terrain of inclusion: the scholarship sought to include the contributions of the excluded peoples into the narrative of the nation, and it sought to win its adherents inclusion into the institutions of the state and society as equalparticipants. Tremendous feats of scholarship produced high-quality work that unearthed buried stories. Pioneers created festivals, museums, textbooks, and other special artifacts to highlight this work, to knock hard on the doors of the academy and of society to let in the complex stories that had been written out of it. The work bore fruit, but not without student revolts across the country to demand ethnic studies. From the 1968 Third World strike at San Francisco State University to the 1996 hunger strike for ethnic studies at Columbia University, students went at administrations to demand that the curriculum open itself up to worlds and epistemologies outside the studies authorized by white supremacy. Some student organizations recognized the enormous stakes of what they demanded. At San Francisco State, for instance, the Black Students' Union proposed that the Black studies department be autonomous from the structure of the rest of the departments because, otherwise, it would be prone to incorporation. Their proposal wanted to give the Black studies faculty power over themselves, both in the hiring of faculty and in their firing. They "knew that black studies could not be complacent," wrote Robert Allen in his Black Awakening in Capitalist America, "that it must be consciously disruptive, always seeking to expose and cut away those aspects of American society that oppress black people; that it could not be modeled after other departments and accept the constraints imposed on them, because one function of these departments is to socialize students into a racist and oppressive society."11 The students wanted a department, and they wanted it on revolutionary terms. They wanted to create a department based on a culture of solidarity, in a way similar to what had been envisioned by proponents of women's studies, who argued that "changes in the content of the curriculum ... be correlated with changes in the form of instruction," and indeed of the institution.I2 Power naturally denied these terms. Instead of this autonomous anti-subordination, power adopted a milquetoast version, which we now know as bureaucratic multiculturalism. The university authorities reinterpreted antiracism as the promotion of diversity and shook out any epoch-changing elements as it institutionalized difference. It threw money at students of color to finance our canalized organizations and our various cultural festivals. The content of these festivals would often be highly bourgeois and generally patriarchal and heterosexist. Radical traditions within the world of color would be cast out in favor of traditional social forms that appealed to authority and order. The curriculum began to adopt a pleasant attitude toward the discrete cultural histories of different parts of the world—but, like the older area studies, the new ethnic studies had to operate with the assumption that "European" or "White" culture and history had a separate dynamic than that of the rest of the world. Africa could be taught in schools only if one did not get too obsessive about its contributions to the world, about European colonialism, and about corporate imperialism. Multiculturalism embraced bourgeois cultural diversity as long as white supremacy and corporate power could be set aside and generally left out of any discussion. Colleges would learn to be tolerant of differences, while social movements would have to forgo any demand for substantial change in the system. Bureaucratic multiculturalism, in the main, operated entirely within the institutional culture of hierarchy. since the university is a crucial institution for the creation and reproduction of culture, and given the role of bureaucratic multiculturalism, students of color on campus increasingly began to experience the discourse of diversity in upward mobility terms. In 1969, Robert Allen prophetically warned in terms that might be archaic but with a vision that is meaningful in our context: "The black student is crucial to corporate America's neocolonial plans. It is the educated and trained blacks who are slated to become the new managers of the ghetto, the administrators of the black colony."U What Allen wrote then is banal now, for in its 2001 deposition on behalf of affirmative action, a group of Fortune 500 companies made just this point. For them, "today's global marketnlace and the increasing diversity in the American normlation demand the cross-cultural experience and understanding gained from such an education."11 Why must businesses hire a section of managers of color? [As the population becomes diverse,] the individuals who run and staff the [Fortune 500] businesses must be able to understand, learn from, collaborate with, and design products and services for clientele and associates from diverse racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. American multinational businesses ... are especially attuned to this concern because they serve not only the increasingly diverse population of the United States, but racially and ethnically diverse populations around the world:U. The desire for the student of color to become the comprador figure for global capital is now established. On college campuses, indeed, this has immense implications for ethnic studies. The culture of upwardly mobile racialism runs counter to the values of ethnic studies, and yet the epistemology of pluralism in the latter tends to facilitate the former. Our classes fill up with brave students who read longingly about the origins of the social movements of identity, but whose own social location makes those struggles romantically distant. The students carry an enormous load when they walk into ethnic studies classes: they are burdened by vast amounts of debt, by the indignity of everyday prejudice, and by the expectations from a family that is so happy to see them in college (often as the first generation in college). These pressures drive our students to turn to subjects with a higher rate of return than antisubordination theory. Often these students are double majors, hard at work in both engineering and ethnic studies. These pressures are complex, and while they move our students toward the logic of inclusion into the system, this dynamic is not always pleasantly accepted. The multi-cultural academy in our neoliberal world has let down this generation of young students, whose own instincts are not being enabled by these burdens. What has happened on the college campus is venally replicated at the highest political levels. During the Clinton administration, people of color entered high government offices and the national story learned to incorporate the efforts of our ancestors. But the inclusion had come at a significant price: while a few individuals entered high office, the structures of white supremacy largely remained. The systematic racism against people of color was not altered by the inclusion of a small elect class of color, or by the inclusion of migrants who came with state-produced skills from elsewhere. Indeed, it can be argued that George W. Bush recruited a number of people of color into his cabinet not simply for their skills (for they are skillful people), nor to attract their ethnic constituency, but to ensure that wavering white voters not see him and his circle as the epitome of white supremacy. Outright racism is now illegitimate, so the window dressing allows the racist agenda of Bush to be cloaked for the white suburban voter. This limited inclusion presented all that the system could provide without major social transformation, and the minimal is all that occurred. The doctrine of pluralist inclusion ran its course by the early 1990s: to document suffering and striving did not necessarily touch on the fundamental elements of subordination, as the symbolic gains of some could be used by power to dissuade any movement demands on the system. It is in this context of the incorporation of multiculturalism that scholars in ethnic studies turned to the interaction between subordinated groups (although this work had been done before in small circles, and without much fanfare). An early approach, by Asian American literary critic Yen Le Espiritu, investigated the phenomenon of "pan-ethnicity," which developed the idea of "racial formations" proposed by sociologists Howard Winant and Michael Omi. These epistemological frameworks vrovosed that scholars look at "racial" categories as political projects that emerge due to a host of reasons and that are mobilized for a variety of purposes. "Asian American" and "Latino" are very good examples because here we have terms that have little historical resonance and yet take on a life of their own. "Panethnic groups," Espiritu notes, "are products of political and social processes, rather than cultural bonds."U The Vietnamese and Burmese might not share much in terms of cultural heritage and practice, but in the United States, Vietnamese Americans and Burmese Americans have a conceptual unity (as having ancestors from "Asia") and an organizational unity (in Asian American groups) that produce them as Asian American. This epistemological move on the part of ethnic studies scholars allowed the idea of "culture" to be seen as political, something refused by mainline multiculturalism. For Espiritu, the concept of pan-ethnicity allows Asian Americans to "contest systems of racism, and inequality in American society ... in contrast to ethnic particularism or assimilation."a The problem and possibility of internal heterogeneity provides the pan-ethnic concept with a combustible charge—no one can rest easy within a category that is always already "un-natural." That instability does not allow the category to become reduced to "culture." To insist that identity categories are political and not natural-cultural opens many possibilities, but this is not a sufficient exit from the traps set by the ideology of bureaucratic multiculturalism. Self-consciously constructed communities could also operate for inclusion and upward mobility at the cost of others. The most painful example of this is in how Asian Americans frequently mobilize the discourse of the "model minority" to our benefit. In the 1960s, as the U.S. government welcomed highly skilled Asian immigrants into the country (and kept out Asians with fewer technical skills), the media, egged on by elected officials, compared the experiences of Asians to African Americans. The specific context for this comparison was the provision of social welfare schemes for the newly enfranchised populations of color, who had only now been allowed entry into the five-decade-long social wage schemes. Since the Civil Rights Act had made it impossible to block people of color, notably African Americans, from access to the aspects of the welfare state, the media and the politicians began to denigrate them for their use of these services. Asians did not usethem, so why should African Americans? The Asian American, like the Jewish American ten years before, had become the "model minority" for those who would deign to access their rights. That Asians had benefited because of state selection (and not natural selection) did not interfere with this racist narrative. To champion Asian America without a well-developed understanding of this scenario would result in a collapse of one's multicultural pride in anti-Black racism. This is why one has to tread carefully in the discourse of bureaucratic multiculturalism. Is it capable of being cognizant of such slippages? The interrogation of the relations between African Americans and Asian Americans, both seen as political-cultural identities, occurred after two major conflagrations inflamed their communities: the so-called Black-Korean riots of 1991 and 1992 in Crown Heights and Los Angeles. In the aftermath of these very complex phenomena, scholars mined the histories of both Blacks and Koreans (as well as Asian Americans in general) to understand their roots and to see if such confrontations were to be expected. At the same time, spectacularly in 1992 at Lowell High School in San Francisco and in the 1990s fiasco over college admission, debates over entry into school set African American students against Asian American students. This debate over affirmative action on campus provoked discussions in already beleaguered ethnic studies programs: the upwardly mobile ambitions of certain minority groups began to impinge on the values of solidarity that had created ethnic studies. Because **AfroAsian traffic came to be interrogated in this vise, it had to disavow the bureaucratic multiculturalism upon which it grew, and it argued feverishly against pluralist inclusion. Scholars who began to research AfroAsian interaction, and this volume holds a very broad representative sample of their work, demanded that ethnic studies shift its epistemological horizon from pluralist inclusion within a culture of hierarchy to solidarity based on scrupulous attention to the interests of different pan-ethnic formations in the rat race of bureaucratic multiculturalism.** **Scholars built an archive of interactions at the same time they had to read against the grain of pluralist historical narratives. The work is necessary, and it is on the verge of providing a different epistemological framework than that of pluralist inclusion. What we have before us is a framework in the making, an archive almost ready to be theorized. Toward the end of his book on Bandung, Richard Wright considered the task ahead for the leadership of the new nations. They had taken power of two-thirds of the world, but Wright worried that "they did not know what to do with it."11 Such a harsh and overgeneralized verdict came without an engagement with the manifold challenges posed by the social orders where the new nations emerged, and without a sense of the many projects already under way to reorder the former colonial societies. Yet, Wright is correct in one respect, which is that the Bandung meeting simply inaugurated a dynamic of international cooperation against the onslaught of neocolonialism,** and in this respect, at Bandung, the powers did not have a carefully honed platform (that would come by the 1961 Belgrade meeting, where they formed the Non-Aligned Movement). Wright's question was appropriate for the advanced industrial states, however, which, he recognized, had little idea how to deal with the sertion of the darker nations. The European and the U.S. media laminated against Bandung, and Wright saw that Bandung posed a problem for the region of the world that bore him and now bears with him.the choice for the advanced industrial states is clear: "Either he ["the rerage white Westerner"] accepts [the freedom of the darker nations] or he will have to seek for ways and means of resubjugating these newly freed hundreds of millions of brown and yellow and black people." If the former, real freedom, is accepted, then the advanced industrial states will also have to accept "a much lower standard of living."12 There is no other way, for Wright does not go into the latter, the resubjugation. We live in the resubjugated world, where it is "culture" that does much of the ideological work to justify inequality. Africa is poor because it has something to do with the pathologies of African tradition. Asia is unequal because population growth is a drag on the otherwise genius of Asian scientific development. These are the kinds of cultural arguments that post-colonial theory works against, just as **AfroAsian work tries hard to cultivate the epistemological and historical archive of solidarity. The memory of the interactions, now being erased by neoliberal culturalism, has to be unearthed. This will allow us to better analyze the way in which ethnicities are mobilized by power to rub against each other. The only interest served by this conflict is the culture of hierarchy, for the masses of people suffer from these ahistorical generalities. Our task is to reframe conflict into solidarity, to show how conflict is ever present and yet ephemeral if its roots are better understood.**

#### Asian Americans are an important community to start conversations about coalitions—The 1AC is a necessary tool to spur a Race consciousness among the Asian community that can articulate the belief that Black Lives Matter from the higher rungs of the Pigmentocracy.

#### Chanbonpin 15

Kim D. Chanbonpin @John Marshall Law School (2015) “Between Black and White: The Coloring of Asian Americans”, 14 Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev. 637 [EJS] Accessed 8-12-16

**Under the pigmentocracy model described above, as Honorary Whites grow in number and status, the intermediary group will more readily serve as a buffer of interracial conflict.160 As the Model Minority Myth demonstrates, the success of those groups holding intermediary status will provide fertile ground for allowing colorblind ideology to take root and flourish.161 Bonilla-Silva fears that entrenchment of colorblind ideology will produce the same effects in the rest of civil society, potentially leading to Latin American-like disgust for discussions about “race,”162 and concludes: “We need to short-circuit the belief in near-whiteness as the solution to status differences and create a coalition of all ‘people of color’ and their White allies**.”163 **Yet, it is not a fait accompli that Asian Americans will leave the ranks of people of color for the privileges of Honorary Whiteness.164 Asian American groups continue to champion the cause of affirmative action165 and humane immigration law reform.166 After 9/11, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) was one of the first national organizations to publicly oppose the indefinite detention of suspected terrorists**.167 The JACL remains a staunch defender of civil liberties, and opposed the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act that codifies the Executive’s powers to indefinitely detain U.S. citizens.168 **Each of these events has important implications about the future of interracial coalitions for race equality and social justice. Interracial coalitions for racial justice are impossible, however, “so long as each group constantly seeks to improve its position in the racial hierarchy by appeasing Whites.”169 Asian Americans are strategically poised to credibly articulate a racial justice narrative that exposes historical race-based deprivations and, on this platform, to advocate for appropriate remedial measures for ourselves and for other peoples of color. Asian Americans were historically excluded by racial segregation, but have materially benefited from the Black-led civil rights struggles to integrate educational institutions.170** Yet some Asian American groups—Hmong, Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese—remain underrepresented in higher education and stand to gain ground through race-based affirmative action programs.171 In accessing higher education through affirmative action policies, Asian Americans will not lose ground to Blacks and Latinos.172 **The same is true of race-conscious hiring practices in private businesses and in government. Honorary White identity offers only the illusion of the power and status associated with Whiteness because, in the pigmentocracy, the superordinate group always maintains its dominant position. Taking a stance in favor of affirmative action would necessarily mean rejecting the invitation to Honorary White status in favor of interracial coalition building with Black Americans and other peoples of color.173 It is a recognition that the intermediate status accorded to Honorary Whites is not really about access to the privileges of Whiteness, but is instead complicity in a color and race hierarchy that devalues Blackness**. **When Asian Americans reject this formulation, it is one way to communicate the belief that Black and Brown lives have value; that Black lives matter.**

#### Our affirmative speech act solves independently of the method. Bringing attention to the issue of Black and Asian and Blasian oppression creates pressure for change. Both the United States and China attempted to purge and exclude black people who are reduced to entertainment, hypersexualized and criminalized, and denied access to education and social groups around the world. Where legal reforms have failed, creating the opportunity for counter –cultural struggle and making Blasian struggles visible are an important mechanism for change.

#### **Reicheneker 11**

Reicheneker, Sierra (2011) "The Marginalization of Afro-Asians in East Asia: Globalization and the Creation of Subculture and Hybrid Identity”," *Global Tides*: Vol. 5, Article 6. [EJS] Accessed 6-9-16

**The growing presence of an Afro-Asian population in Asia, particularly in Korea, Japan and China, has recently come to light in the global media.2 The homogenous nature of these countries exposes its biracial citizens to psychological marginalization**. **Despite the frequent trend within marginalized groups to create solidarity through a viable counter-culture, the Afro- Asian populations have not done so. However, with the increase in globalization**, **leading to larger numbers of biracial people born in these states**, **as well as their ability to connect through the Internet, this small minority will begin to form a group identity. This is furthered by iconstatus Afro-Asians leading the way and acting as beacons of aspiration for all Afro-Asians. In addition, with the help of the international community in applying pressure on governments to change racist policies, an Afro-Asian subculture and hybrid identity is likely to emerge.** A Brief History**.** **The first Afro-Asians were the product of American G.I.s during World War II.3 Starting in 1946, with the occupation of Okinawa and later mainland Japan, as well as the temporary military government of South Korea, Amerasian—including Afro-Asian—children became a visible reality in East Asia. The products of both prostitution and legally binding marriages, these children were largely regarded as illegitimate. When the military presence returned to America, the distinction between the two was, for all practical purposes, null**. As the American military departed, any previous preferential treatment for biracial people ended, and was replaced with a backlash due to the return of ethnically-based national pride.4 Korea has the largest Afro-Asian population in the Far East, due to increased interracial relationships during the Korean War (1950-1953).5 Once again, children were the product of both legitimate marriages and prostitution. **After the war, the United States Congress passed acts to allow for immigration of biracial children, including the Amerasian Homecoming Act of 1987. The Korean government strongly supported the emigration of Amerasian children to the United States, considering it a “cost-effective way of dealing with social welfare problems,” as they viewed the children, particularly those from Black fathers, as “institutional burdens.”6 However, American military men looking to bring their Asian families to the states were heavily discouraged from doing so by their superiors; Marines in particular were threatened with court martial**.7 Despite overwhelming support and willing adoptee families in the United States, the majority of Amerasian children remained in Korea. A staggering amount of mothers abandoned their babies, especially Afro-Asian offspring, either to be raised by distant, maternal relatives or to be sent to orphanages—though this is not the case for all of the Amerasian Koreans.8 **In China, the Afro-Asian people group is a newer phenomenon.9 They first began to appear beginning with African-American and African students coming to study in China,** first in the city of Beijing and later in other larges cities, such as Nanjing,10 Hangzhou, and Shanghai.**11 Prominent Afro-Chinese have recently been featured in international news, helping to bring to light the growing Afro-Asian population in China and in East Asia, as a whole.** Current Marginalization **In the United States and the Caribbean, interracial relationships and multi- and biracial children have become an everyday occurrence, with one in forty people self-identifying as multi- or biracial.13 In addition, the public is inundated with iconic Afro-Asian figures who fill the media like pro-golfer, Tiger Woods, fashion model Kimora Simmons14, entertainer Amerie, and football player Hines Ward. It is hard to imagine the stigmatization that Afro-Asians face in primarily ethnically homogenous nations, such as Korea, Japan, and China. In these countries, people of biracial descent are seen as oddities and automatically designated as “foreign” by their own cultures, strictly as a result of their unique and different appearance**. There are several models for analyzing the marginalization of ethnic minorities. The Afro-Asian population exemplifies Park’s definition of marginalization, in that they are the “product of human migrations and socio-cultural conflict.”15 Born into relatively new territory in the area of biracial relations, there entrance into the culture of these Asian states often causes quite a stir. They also fit into Green and Goldberg’s definition of psychological marginalization, which constitutes multiple attempts at assimilation with the dominant culture followed by continued rejection. **The magazine *Ebony*, from 1967, outlines a number of Afro-Asians in Japan who find themselves as outcasts, most of which try to find acceptance within the American military bubble, but with varying degrees of success.16 Many mention struggles with hair care products and skin bleaching agents**. The darkest tale is that of a sixteen year old who was arrested after raping and murdering three Japanese women, the motive stemming from internalized racism. The youth confessed to committing the crime because the girls had laughed “at his color and his hair.”17 In addition to lashing out at the dominant culture, another case is that of a young man’s suicide due to his feelings of being alone and an outcast from society.18 However, according to this model, the treatment of Afro-Asians does not constitute cultural marginalization. **Despite the fact they are considered foreigners, they have more in common culturally with their fellow Asians than they do with pure-blooded Americans: Afro-Asians “are far closer in language, values and life-style” to their home country, however, they have been “marginal[ized] to the normal social world around them [that of their Asian birth-home].**”19 **Though these people speak the language, as well as dress and act appropriately Asian, it is only their appearance that sets them apart—they are entirely Korean, Japanese, or Chinese by culture, 3 and yet are still ostracized**.20 However, it is important to note that Afro-Asians have had a few members reach prominence despite marginalization: “**those who are especially attractive or talented—have become economically successful, through careers in popular music, dancing, acting, the [crime] industry or even as bar hostess.**”21 It **seems that only a few lucky members are able to enter those selective avenues to economic triumph. Unfortunately, most resort to petty crimes, or mundane, low-income, menial work upon which to survive. In Korea, the majority of Amerasian and Afro-Asian children left behind after the Korean War are orphans. In Korea’s society, like most in East Asia, success hinges on the family, particularly on the father, due to the emphasis placed upon and legacy of Confucian values. Growing up without parents, or in many situations with only a mother, has left Afro-Asians ostracized by society. Low educational levels and unemployment run rampant. In his work on Black Koreans, Won Moo Hurh outlines four specific common problems they face: first, their illegitimate status, which is still heavily stigmatized in Korea.22 Second, their mother’s presumed prostitute and low economic status is looked down upon, even though many women were legally married to their military husbands.23 Korean society has absorbed the stereotype that all mothers of biracial children are low-class, “sexual pariahs.”24 Third, without a strong family background, there is usually a lack of higher education and subsequent difficulty in finding work. Lastly, Hurh describes their discrimination based on appearance.25 Facing these problems of marginalization, Black Koreans have naturally taken on a negative self-image. Hurh says they “carry the heaviest… burden of stigmas.”26 For Black Japanese, life is just as difficult**. Once again, most are orphans or fatherless, the majority offspring of foreign military servicemen and businessmen. This poses a problem socially, but also institutionally, even though they were technically granted equal rights in 1947, this is not the *de facto* practice.27 Without fathers, the Afro-Asian children do not have access to the *koseki,* or a record of the father’s family background. This *koseki* is necessary for entrance into most schools, job applications, and even to obtain marriage licenses.28 Simply by being illegitimate or even legitimate but having a non-Japanese father, Afro-Asian children are entirely 4 *Global Tides, Vol. 5 [2011], Art. 6* http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol5/iss1/6 cut out of Japanese society and the possibility of moving up the economic and social ladder. Also, the Afro-Japanese citizenship is often in a limbo status.29 While the Japanese government places citizenship with that of the American fathers, the United States government puts a number of restrictions on immigration and citizenship rights, and many of the American fathers have no intention of recognizing their biracial children.30 In effect, the stateless Black Japanese are treated as *gaijin*, or “foreigners,” within their own country.31 **In China,** though the situation for the Afro-Asians is still difficult, the government has a less negative influence**. Biracial persons are often marginalized in the workforce because of employers who only choose the “best” applicants—“best ” being equivalent to the applicant who best fits into the Han Chinese homogeneous identity.** Though all Chinese minorities struggle with finding work,32 schooling is provided without official prejudice to most urbanized Afro- Asians.33 **Socially, however, Afro-Asians can face strong racism amongst their peers. There are a number of prevalent stereotypes that accompany the half black Chinese, including being strong, as well as good singers and dancers.34 The more negative stereotypes include generalized notions of Afro-Asians as having violent and sexualized nature**s. **Besides the individual difficulties the various nationalities face, all can agree that marginalization for the Afro-Asian is difficult to overcome by conventional means. Marginalization has historically been “transcended” by two main avenues: “passing” as the dominant ethnicity when possible, and emigrating.35 For Afro-Asians, passing remains out of the question, and emigration (usually to the United States), has complications of its own.**36 Afro- Asians are culturally assimilated enough in terms of language to their fellow Koreans, Japanese, and Chinese that immigration to the United States can be very difficult. **As minorities, they often lack extensive education and therefore any English language skills. In addition, the cost involved is usually well beyond their means. For many Afro-Asians, their economic and social marginalization appears to be a situation from which there is no escape**.

## 2AC Speaking for Others Answers

### Perm: Reject epistemic dichotomies

Perm text: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Hartsock 89**

Hartsock, Nancy “Postmodernism and Political Change: Issues for Feminist Theory” No. 14, The Construction of Gender and Modes of Social Division II (Winter, 1989-1990), pp. 15-3 [EJS] Accessed 8-18-16

My argument here, however, is that **at the level of epistemology there are a number of similarities that can provide the basis for differing groups to understand each other and form alliances. In addition, attention to the epistemologies of situated knowledges can allow for the construction of important alternatives to the deadend oppositions set up by postmodernism's rejection of the Enlightenment**. Rather than attempt the godtrick or reject the possibility of knowledge altogether, these alternatives to Enlightenment thought recognize themselves, as well as Enlightenment and postmodernist theories, as views from somewhere. **They recognize that the knowledge we claim is conditioned by the locations we occupy. Second, rather than insist on the false dichotomy of the neutrality of reason as opposed to bias, these views from below recognize the multiple and contradictory nature of their reality. Lack of neutrality need not mean lack of knowledge; indeed, when self-conscious, these knowledges can help us recognize how doctrines of the neutrality of reason have been used to distort, deny, and erase realities other than that of the dominant group**. Third, the oppressed have experienced the murderous effects of the exclusive universalities promulgated by the West, which are predicated on the disembodied status of reason. The situated knowledges of the oppressed make no claim to the disembodied universality of reason. Because of their embodied, social, and collective nature, they can also avoid the opposite problem of a descent into a particularistic relativism. Fourth, rather than accept the false choice of omnipotence or impotence, these knowledges can be recognized as limited and changing, as ongoing achievements of continuing struggles. Finally, as engaged knowledges, born of struggle and survival against the odds, they must give close attention to issues of power. Fear, vulnerability, struggles to survive, and thus issues of power and empowerment are at the heart of these knowledges. **Therefore, to develop an alternative account of the world requires both the changing of power relations and the development of subjectivities grounded in the experience of the dominated and marginalized. Those of us who have been constituted as sets of negative qualities need to engage in the historical, political, and theoretical process of constituting ourselves as subjects as well as objects of history, subjects who inhabit multiple, superimposed, and opposed realities. We must recognize ourselves as both makers of history and the objects and victims of those who have made history**. Our nonbeing was the condition of being of the One, the center, of the taken-for-granted ability of one small segment of the population to speak for all. Our various efforts to constitute ourselves as subjects (through struggles for colonial independence, racial and sexual liberation struggles, etc.) were fundamental to creating the preconditions for the current questioning of claims to universality. Attention to the epistemologies contained in our various subjugated knowledges can allow us to shift the theoretical terrain in fundamental ways and to exit from the false dichotomies that define and limit both Enlightenment thought and postmodernist efforts to reject it.

### No Displacement

**Speaking out against oppression of others in a responsible way doesn’t have to displace their leadership or desire for liberation. Those with privilege have to work to make spaces like debate and our communities safer so the oppressed can be heard.**

**Utt 15**

Utt, [Jamie](http://everydayfeminism.com/author/jamieutt/)  “When Privilege Goes Pop: How Today’s Mainstream Conversations on Privilege Can Hurt Justice Movements” web: Everyday Feminism .March 3, 2015 [EJS] Accessed 8-18-16

**A Call for a Different Privilege Discourse** **None of these problems mean that we should never name or discuss privilege. Privilege discourse is one tool among many in the wider movement to dismantle systems of oppression**, but we have to reclaim privilege discourse from the pop cultural abyss. But how do we do that? **First, we need to practice actual accountability to our privileges. In one way or another, almost everyone has some form of identity privilege – from ability or neurotypical privilege to class privilege to White privilege**, citizenship privilege, religious privilege, or cisgender privilege. We must work to be accountable to the ways that our unchecked expressions of privilege marginalize and oppress others, and when called out, we need to listen, reflect, and work to do better. **Second, we need to call one another in to complex conversations about decentering our privileged identities.** And in doing so, **we need to step aside so that oppressed people and identities are centered in movements**. No, we can’t just claim our privilege, but continue exerting it in privilege-dominated spaces. No, we can’t keep asserting our marginalizations into spaces where they are not the focus. We have to join in the difficult conversations currently taking place around identity, and in doing so, [we have to listen](http://everydayfeminism.com/2013/04/the-importance-of-listening-as-a-privileged-person-fighting-for-justice/). And we have to work to create space where the complexities of privilege can actually be acknowledged, discussed, and dissected if we want privilege discourse to effectively act as a tool for ending oppression. And as Paulo Freire so well argued in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, **we must recognize, follow, and trust the leadership of marginalized people who know what’s best for their own liberation.** And sometimes that’s really hard, as it can mean really giving something up**. Trusting the leadership of oppressed people means stepping out of our own roles of leadership and creating space for others to step** in. Trusting the leadership of oppressed people means calling on others to reconsider what leadership actually looks like, as most dominant models of leadership are based in scripts written by and for a privileged few. But to actually address privilege accountably means that we have to be willing to step aside. **Third, we need to work to engage those who share our privileged identity in working for justice**. Obviously it would be great if people of privilege just would listen to marginalized and oppressed people when they speak truth to power. Sadly, though, we know that isn’t the reality in which we live – or oppression would have ended a long time ago. **Thus, we have a responsibility to** [**call in those who share our privileges**](http://www.blackgirldangerous.org/2013/12/calling-less-disposable-way-holding-accountable/) **to consider the ways that their privilege (even in the context of their oppression) informs their and our positionalities. When we call in those who share our identity, they may actually listen, and we can open the door for more accountable participation in movements for justic**e. Part of what this means, then, is more than just “calling out” people’s privilege. My general rule is this: While it’s fantastic for oppressed people to simply tell someone to “check their privilege” because the learning of the privileged is not the responsibility of the oppressed, I have no right to just “call out” those who share my identity. My privilege mandates that I do more than just flippantly tell someone off (no matter how often I still do that or how satisfying it may feel). **I need to work from a place of love to call in my people to change**

### Speaking for Others Good

**Those in privileged social locations must speak up**

**Ayvazian 95**

The Rev. Dr. Andrea Ayvazian “Interrupting the Cycle of Oppression: The Role of Allies as Agents of Change” From Fellowship, January-February 1995, pp, 7-10)[ EJS] Accessed 8-18-16

**We also need to consider our role as allies. In our own communities, would young people, if asked the same questions, call out our names as anti- racists**? In areas where we are dominant, is our struggle for equity and justice evident? When we think about our potential role as allies, we need to recall a Quaker expression: "Let your life be your teaching." The Quakers understand that our words carry only so much weight, that it is our action s, our daily behaviors that tell the true story. In my own life I struggle with what actions to take, how to make my beliefs and my behaviors congruent. **One small step that has had interesting re percussions over the last decade is the fact that my partner (who is male) and I have chosen not to be legally married until gay and lesbian couples can be married and receive the same benefits and legal protection that married heterosexual couples enjoy. A small step, but it has allowed us to talk with folks at the YMCA ab out their definition of "family" when deciding who qualifies for their "family plan"; to challenge people at Amtrak about why some "family units" receive discounts when traveling together and others do not; and to raise questions in the religious community about who can receive formal sanction for their loving unions and who cannot. These are not earth-shattering steps in the larger picture, but we believe that small steps taken by thousands of people will eventually change the character of our communities. 5 When we stop colluding and speak out about the unearned privileges we enjoy as members of a dominant group -privileges we have been taught for so long to deny or ignore-we have the potential to undergo and inspire stunning transformation**. Consider th e words of Gandhi: "As human beings, our greatness lies not so much in being able to remake the world, as in being able to remake ourselves." In my own community, I **have been impressed by the efforts of three middle-aged males who have remade themselves into staunch allies for women. Steven Botkin established the Men's Resource Center in Amherst, Massachusetts twelve years ago and put a commitment to eliminating sexism in its very first mission statement. Another Amherst resident, Michael Burkart, travels nationwide and works with top executives in Fortune 500 companies on the issue of gender equity in their corporations.** And Geoff Lobenstine, a social worker who identifies as an anti-sexist male, brings these issues to his work in Holyoke, Massachusetts. Charlie Parker once said this about music: "Music is your own experience, your thoughts, your wisdom. If you don't live it, it won' t come out of your horn." I think the same is true about us in our role as allies -it is our own experience, our thoughts, our wisdom. If we don't live it, it won't come out of our horn.

**Allies aren’t perfect, but they can advocate in ways that break down oppression**

**Ayvazian 95**

The Rev. Dr. Andrea Ayvazian “Interrupting the Cycle of Oppression: The Role of Allies as Agents of Change” From Fellowship, January-February 1995, pp, 7-10) [ EJS] Accessed 8-18-16

Now I would be the first to admit that personally and professionally the role of ally is often exhausting. I know that it involves challenges -being an ally is difficult work, and it can often be lonely. We must remember to take care of ourselves along this journey, to sustain our energy and our zest for those ongoing challenges. We must also remember that it is hard to go it al one: allies need allies. As with any other struggle in our lives, we need supportive people around us to help us to persevere. Other allies will help us take the small, daily steps that will, in time alter the character of our communities. We know that allied behavior usually consists of small steps and unglamorous work. As Mother Teresa once said: "I don't do any great things. I do small things with great love." Finally two additional points about us in our role as **allies: First, we don’t always see the results of our efforts. Sometimes we do, but often we touch and change lives without ever knowing it. Consequently, we cannot measure our success in quantitative terms. Like waves upon the shore, we are altering the landscape - but exactly how, may be hard to discern. D**oubts inevitably creep up about our effectiveness, about our approach, and the positions we assume or the actions we take. But we move forward, ignoring the doubts, the uncertainty, and often the lack of visible results. In our office we have a famous William James quote on the wall to sustain us: "I will act as if what I do makes a difference." And, speaking personally, although I may sometimes be rattled, I try to act as though what I do does make a difference. **Second, there is no such thing as a perfect ally. Perfection is not our goal. When I asked my colleague Kenneth Jones what stood out for him as the most important characteristic of a strong ally, he said simply: "being consistently conscious."** He didn 't say, “Never stumbling," or “Never making mistakes." He said, ”Being consistently conscious. " **And so we do our best: taking risks, being smart, making errors, feeling foolish. doing what we believe is right, based on our best judgment at the time. We are imperfect, but we are steady. We are courageous but not faultless**. As Lani Guinier said, "It is 6 better to be vaguely right than precisely wrong." If we obsess about looking good instead of doing good, we will get caught in a spiral of ineffective action. Let's not get side-tracked or defeated because we are trying to be perfect. And so we move ahead, pushing ourselves forward on our growing edge. We know that although none of us are beginners in dealing with issues of oppression and empowerment- none of us are experts either. These issues are too complex, too painful, and too pervasive for us to achieve a state of clarity and closure once and for all. **The best we can hope for is to strive each day to be our strongest and clearest selves, transforming the world one individual at a time, one family at a time, one community at a time. May we summon the wisdom to be devoted allies today.** May we walk the walk, living as though equity, justice and freedom for all have already arrived. Like most activists. I carry a dream inside me. As I travel nationwide for my work, I can actually see signs of it becoming true. The dream is that we will create in this country a nonviolent army of allies that will challenge and break the cycle of oppression and usher in a new era of liberation, empowerment, and equity for persons historically targeted by systemic oppression. Within each individual is the potential to effect enormous change. **May we move forward, claiming with pride our identities as allies interrupting the cycle of oppression, and modeling a new way of behaving and believing.**

### Speaking for Others Good (Debate Specific)

**Debate is good because it trains us to fulfill our responsibility to speak on behalf of those don’t have a voice.**

**Polson 12**

Dana Polson (2012)” Longing For Theory:” Performance Debate In Action.” Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of PhD in Language, Literacy, and Culture. [EJS] Accessed 8-19-2016

 “Debate becomes critical.” Again, **we see debate not as game-playing but as part of the real world. Debate trains people to “articulate their oppression persuasively to gain resources to change.” Another respondent echoed this importance of voice and indeed, the responsibility to use that voice on behalf of the community: When you have the privilege as most people do not, to have access to certain information and certain breadths of knowledge, and being around people who can develop you, not just intellectually but culturally too, that you have a responsibility to speak for the communities or people from communities who don’t have a voic**e. People from the inner city. People who are young. People who are poor. People who are without role models or without leadership ... I think that that purpose is what drives the performance aspect of debate for most Black people. Which is different from the purpose for most privileged white people. (Andre Rubens, group interview, p. 14)

### Failure of Identity

**Their postmodern Kritik represents the type of theorizing that causes identity politics to fail--- they ignore their own situatedness, divide subaltern groups, and erase the conversation of the 1AC in favor of bickering about process.**

**Nealon 98**

[Jeffrey Nealon](https://www.dukeupress.edu/Catalog/ProductList.php?viewby=author&lastname=Nealon&firstname=Jeffrey&middlename=&aID=686205&sort=) (1998) Alterity Politics: Ethics and Performative Subjectivity. Duke University Press. [EJS] Accessed 8-18-16

**Of course, no discourse of otherness can hope to map the entire conflicted terrain of alterity in the postmodern world(s),** where total-izing theories have fallen out of favor for very good theoretical and practical reasons. **History continually reminds us that such totalizing theoretical and political systems are dangerous for marginal groups, and hence constitute the wrong place to start thinking about a multiculturalist politics of the other**. “However, although the postmodern inability or unwillingness to produce an all-encompassing theory of otherness has been an enabling factor for the multiculturalist project at large, the inability to locate and attend to a series of specific others has not, it seems, proven to be similarly empowering. **In fact, this inability to treat multiple subject positions—the inability to attend to more than one specific alterity at a time—has come to be the dominant critique of so-called identity politics' The well-known failures of identity politics—its disintegration into partisan bickering, its inability to forge links among subaltern groups, its tendency to situate others while resisting its own situatedness—are often treated (by both its proponents and its critics) as a symptom of Butler's "embarrassed 'etc.**'":2 identity politics as a project is doomed to fail because every specific identity likewise fails to be complete, falls short of some kind of plenitude. The specific "I" that lacks wholeness is symptomatic of a generalized "we" that lacks whole-ness, and vice versa. In an attempt to redescribe or reencounter this seeming "failure" of identity, theorized reinscriptions of identity politics—ones that eschew simple appeals to the asocial authenticity of subjective experience—argue that any particular identity is actually predicated upon (and thereby inextricable from) the differences that form Butler's "horizontal trajectory of adjectives." As William Connolly argues in Identity/Difference, for example, "Identity requires difference in order to be, and it converts difference into otherness in order to secure its own self-certainty" (64). If we've learned any-thing at all from the so-called linguistic turn in the human sciences, we've learned that any state of sameness actually requires difference in order to structure itself. Identity is structured like a language: we can only recognize the so-called plenitude of a particular identity insofar as it differentiates itself from (and thereby necessarily contains a trace of) the ostensible non-plenitude of difference. Like Saussure's famous characterization of language, subjective identity knows only “differences without positive terms” (course 120: italics in original)

## \*\*\*Negative\*\*\*

## Speaking for Others 1NC

### Link- Speaking For Others

**The affirmative team’s method might be good in the abstract but it is important for those who are oppressed to speak for themselves. [X- fill in the blank] group of people have a specific social location from which they speak and the debaters on the other team from [Y-fill in the blank] social location obscure and erase their voices In this debate.**

**Alcoff 91**

Alcoff, Linda (1991) “The Problem of *Speaking for Others*.” Cultural Critique 20 (Winter 1991-92)[EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

**Consider the following true stories**: Consider the following true stories: 1. Anne Cameron, a very gifted white Canadian author, 1**. Anne Cameron, a very gifted white Canadian author, writes several semi-fictional accounts of the lives of Native Canadian women. She writes them in first person and assumes a Native identity. At the 1988 International Feminist Book Fair in Montreal a group of Native Canadian writers decided to ask Cameron to, in their words, "move over" on the grounds that her writings are disempowering for Native authors. She agrees.' 2. After the 1989 elections in Panama are overturned by Manuel Noriega, President Bush of the United States declares in a public address that Noriega's actions constitute an "outrageous fraud" and that "the voice of the Panamanian people has spoken." "The Panamanian people," he tells us, "want democracy and not tyranny, and want Noriega out." He proceeds to plan the invasion of Panama**. 3. At a recent symposium at my university, a prestigious theorist was invited to give a lecture on the political problems postmodernism. Those of us in the audience, including many white women and people of oppressed nationalities and races, waited in eager anticipation for what he has to contribute to this important discussion. To our disappointment, he introduced his lecture by explaining that he could not cover the assigned topic, because as a white male he did not feel that he could speak for the because as a white male he did not feel that he could speak for the feminist and postcolonial perspectives that have launched the crit- feminist and postcolonial perspectives that have launched the critical interrogation of postmodernism's politics. He went on to give us a lecture on architecture. **These examples demonstrate some of the current practices and discussions around speaking for others in our society. As type of discursive practice, speaking for others has come under increasing criticism, and in some communities it is being rejected. There is a strong, albeit contested, current within feminism which holds that speaking for others is arrogant, vain, unethical, and politically illegitimate**. In feminist magazines such as Sojourner it is common to find articles and letters in which the author states that she can only speak for herself. In her important paper, "Dyke Methods," Joyce Trebilcot offers a philosophical articulation of this view. She renounces for herself the practice of speaking for others within a lesbian feminist community and argues further that she "will not try to get other wimmin to accept my beliefs in place of their own" on the grounds that to do so would be to practice a kind of discursive coercion and even a violence (1).2 In anthropology there is also much discussion going on about whether it is possible to adequately or justifiably speak for others. **Trinh T. Minh-ha explains the grounds for skepticism when she says that anthropology is "mainly a conversation of 'us' with 'us' about 'them,' of the white man with the white man about the primitive- nature man ... in which 'them' is silenced. 'Them' always stands on the other side of the hill, naked and speechless . . 'them' is only admitted among 'us,' the discussing subjects, when accompanied or introduced by an 'us' . .." (65, 67).3 Given this analysis, even ethnographies written by progressive anthropologists are a priori regressive because of the structural features of anthropo logical discursive practic**e. The recognition that there is a problem in speaking for oth- ers has arisen from two sources. First, there is a growing recognition that where one speaks from affects the meaning and truth of what one says, and thus that one cannot assume an ability to 7 transcend one's location. In other words, **a speaker's location** (which I take here to refer to their social location, or social identity) **has an epistemically significant impact on that speaker's claims and can serve either to authorize or disauthorize one's speech. The creation of women's studies and African-American studies departments was founded on this very belief: that both the study of and the advocacy for the oppressed must come to be done principally by the oppressed themselves, and that we must finally acknowledge that systematic divergences in social location tween speakers and those spoken for will have a significant effect on the content of what is said. The unspoken premise here simply that a speaker's location is epistemically salient**. I shall explore this issue further in the next section. The second source involves a recognition that, not only location epistemically salient, but certain privileged locations discursively dangerous.4 In particular, **the practice of privileged persons speaking for or on behalf of less privileged persons actually resulted (in many cases) in increasing or reinforcing oppression of the group spoken** for. This was part of the argument made against Anne Cameron's speaking for Native Canadian women: Cameron's intentions were never in question, but effects of her writing were argued to be counterproductive regard to the needs of Native women. Thus, the work of ileged authors who speak on behalf of the oppressed is coming more and more under criticism from members of those oppressed groups themselves.5

### Link-Neutrality

**They perform the 1AC as if their speech act is neutral but it is not. The rituals of speaking involved the meaning that the speakers intend as well as the meaning that a person with a subjective understanding of the issue has to realize changes that meaning. Falsely objective narratives change the entire meaning of a message because they detach them from the bodies of those that created the message in the first place.**

**Alcoff 91**

Alcoff, Linda (1991) “The Problem of *Speaking for Others*.” Cultural Critique 20 (Winter 1991-92)[EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

**A plethora of sources have argued in this century that the neutrality of the theorizer can no longer, can never again, be sustained, even for a moment. Critical theory, discourses of empowerment, psychoanalytic theory, post-structuralism, feminist, and anticolonialist theories have all concurred on this point. Who is speaking to whom turns out to be as important for meaning and truth as what is said; in fact what is said turns out to change ac- cording to who is speaking and who is listening**. Following according to who is speaking and who is listening. **Following - Foucault, I will call these "rituals of speaking" to identify discursive practices of speaking or writing that involve not only the text or utterance but their position within a social space including the persons involved in, acting upon, and/or affected by the words**. Two elements within these rituals will deserve our attention: the positionality or location of the speaker and the discursive context. We can take the latter to refer to the connections and relations of involvement between the utterance/text and other utterances and texts as well as the material practices in the relevant environment, which should not be confused with an environment spatially adjacent to the particular discursive event. **Rituals of speaking are constitutive of meaning, the meaning of the words spoken as well as the meaning of the event. This claim requires us to shift the ontology of meaning from its location in a text or utterance to a larger space, a space that includes the text or utterance but that also includes the discursive context.** And an important implication of this claim is that meaning must be understood as plural and shifting, since a single text can engender diverse meanings given diverse contexts. **Not only what is emphasized, noticed, and how it is understood will be affected by 13 the location of both speaker and hearer, but the truth-value or epistemic status will also be affected. For example, in many situations when a woman speaks the presumption is against her; when a man speaks he is usually taken seriously (unless he talks "the dumb way," as Andy Warhol accused Bruce Springsteen of doing, or, in other words, if he is from an oppressed group).** **When writers from oppressed races and nationalities have insisted that all writing is political the claim has been dismissed as foolish, or grounded in ressentiment, or it is simply ignored; when prestigious European philosophers say that all writing is political it is taken up as a new and original "truth**" (Judith Wilson calls this "the intellectual equivalent of the 'cover record.'")9 The rituals of speaking that involve the location of speaker and listeners affect whether a claim is taken as a true, well-reasoned, compelling argument, or a significant idea. **Thus, how what is said gets heard depends on who says it, and who says it will affect the style and language in which it is stated, which will in turn affect its perceived significance (for specific hearers). The in turn affect its perceived significance (for specific hearers). The discursive style in which some European poststructuralists have made the claim that all writing is political marks it as important and likely to be true for a certain (powerful) milieu; whereas the style in which African-American writers made the same claim marked their speech as dismissable in the eyes of the same milieu. This point might be conceded by those who admit to the political mutability of interpretation**, **but they might continue to maintain that truth is a different matter altogether**. And they would be right that the establishment of location's effect on meaning and even on whether something is taken as true within a particular discursive context does not entail that the "actual" truth of the claim is contingent upon its context. However, this objection presupposes a particular conception of truth, one in which the truth of a statement can be distinguished from its interpretation and its acceptance. This concept of truth would make truth by definition independent of the speakers' or listeners' embodied and perspectival location (except in the trivial case of a speaker's indexical statements, e.g., "I am now sitting down"). Thus, the question of whether location bears simply on what is taken to be true or what is really true, and whether such a distinction can be upheld, involves the very difficult problem of14 Linda Alcoff the meaning of truth. In the history of Western philosophy, there have existed multiple, competing definitions and ontologies of truth: correspondent, idealist, pragmatist, coherentist, and con- sensual notions. The dominant view has been that truth represents a relationship of correspondence between a proposition and an extra-discursive reality. In this view, truth is about a realm completely independent of human action and expresses things "as they are in themselves," that is, free of human interpretation. Arguably since Kant, more obviously since Hegel, it has been widely accepted that an understanding of truth which requires it to be free of human interpretation leads inexorably to skepticism, since it makes truth inaccessible by definition. This creates an impetus to reconfigure the ontology of truth, or its locus, from a place outside human interpretation to one within it. Hegel, for example, understood truth as an "identity in difference" between subjective and objective elements. **Thus, within the variety of views working in the Hegelian aftermath, so-called subjective elements, or the historically specific conditions in which human knowledge occurs, are no longer rendered irrelevant or even obstacles to truth**.. For example, in a coherentist account of truth, which is held by such philosophers as Rorty, Donald Davidson, Quine, Gadamer, and Foucault, **truth is defined as an emergent property of what is essentially a discursive situation, when there is a specific form of integration between various elements. Such a view has no necessary relationship to idealism. In terms of the topic of this paper, the social location of the speaker can be said to bear on truth to the extent that it bears on the full meaning of any speech act.** This claim will be fleshed out further as we go along. Let me return now to the formulation of the problem of speaking for others. There are two premises implied by the articulation of the problem, and unpacking these should advance our understanding of the issues involved. Premise 1: The "ritual of speaking" (as defined above) in which an utterance is located, always bears on meaning and truth such that there is no possibility of rendering positionality, location, or context irrelevant to content. The phrase "bears on" here should indicate some variable amount of influence short of determination or fixing. One important implication of this first premise is that we can no longer determine the validity of a given instance of speaking for others simply by asking whether or not the speaker has done sufficient research to justify his or her claims. Adequate research will be a necessary but insufficient criterion of evaluation. Now let us look at the second premise. Premise 2: Certain contexts and locations are allied with structures of oppression, and certain others are allied with resistance to oppression. Therefore all are not politically equal, and, given that politics is connected to truth, all are not epistemically equal. The claim here that "politics is connected to truth" follows necessarily from premise 1. Rituals of speaking are politically situated by power relations of domination, exploitation, and ordination. Who is speaking, who is spoken of, and who listens result, as well as an act, of political struggle. Simply put, the cursive context is a political arena. **To the extent that this context bears on meaning, and meaning is in some sense the object truth, we cannot make an epistemic evaluation of the claim out simultaneously assessing the politics of the situation**.. According to the first premise, though we cannot maintain neutral voice we may at least all claim the right and legitimacy speak. But the second premise dis-authorizes some voices grounds which are simultaneously political and epistemic. The conjunction of premises 1 and 2 suggest that the speaker loses some portion of his or her control over the meaning truth of his or her utterance. Given that the context of hearers is partially determinant, the speaker is not the master or mistress of the situation. Speakers may seek to regain control here by taking into account the context of their speech, but they can never know everything about this context and with written and electronic communication it is becoming increasingly difficult to know any- thing at all about the context of reception. This loss of control may be taken by some speakers to mean 1516 that no speaker can be held accountable for their discursive actions. However, a partial loss of control does not entail a complete loss of accountability. Clearly, **the problematic of speaking for has at its center a concern with accountability and responsibility. Acknowledging the problem of speaking for others cannot result in eliminating a speaker's accountability.**

### Link- Researcher

The positioning of the affirmative debaters replicates the power of the academic researcher who has the ability to collect and destroy the meaning of the stories of others.

**Fielding 2004**

Fielding, Michael “Transformative Approaches to Student Voice: Theoretical Underpinnings, Recalcitrant Realities.” British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 295-311 [EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

 (1) Problems of speaking about others: shaping persons as research objects **The dangers of speaking for or on behalf of others have an initial resonance that is widely recognized** in many countries and cultures. Perhaps less immediately apparent Transformative approaches to student voice 297 are the companion dangers of speaking about others. In her seminal paper, 'The problems of speaking for others' (Alcoff, 1991/92), Linda Alcoff argues that there is substantial overlap between speaking for others and speaking about others. Whilst her claim that in speaking for others you are necessarily speaking about others is unproblematic, more contentious, and **arguably even more important, is the claim that in speaking about others, even in the sense of describing what you take to be the case, you may, in effect, be speaking in their place that is, speaking for them. The very language you use in your description is likely to be saturated with values, frequently your own**. No descriptive discourse is, or can be, value-free; advocacy or interpretation is thus, to some degree and inevitably, part of your account. For Alcoff: In both the practice of speaking for as well as the practice of speaking about others I am engaging in the act of representing the other's needs, goals, situation, and in fact, who they are. I am representing them as such and such; or, in post-structuralist terms, I am participating in the construction of their subject positions. (Alcoff 1991/92, p. 9) **The construction of the research subject is thus a central problematic in social research and it is in helping us to understand three manifestations of its attendant dangers** that the work of Beth Humphries (Humphries, 1994) turns out to be so illuminating. Drawing substantially, but by no means exclusively, on the work of Edward Said (Said, 1989), Humphries argues that **there are three characteristic forms which the covert construction of the less powerful research subject often takes in the hands of the more powerful. They are what she calls 'accommodation', 'accumulation' and 'appropriation' and between them, severally and in combination, they help us to understand the way oppressive structures are produced and reproduced**. Accommodation: reconstruction, reaffirmation, reassurance. **One of the most insidious ways in which research undermines rather than enhances empowerment is through 'the accommodation of challenging and "dangerous" (dangerous that is, to the status quo) ideas to ensure they conform to already established vocabularies and beliefs'** (Humphries, 1994, p. 191) **Citing Hall's research on African-American prejudice towards fellow social workers, Humphries shows how, having purported to establish prejudice among people of colour towards peers with darker skins, blame is internally located and counselling recommended as one of the most fruitful ways of addressing what is seen as essentially a matter of individual pathology. The problem of racism is thus not only conveniently confined to the black community itself, the means of its resolution is both individualistic and professionally self-interested.** Said's motifs of 'reconstruction' and 'repetition' are pertinent here: the problem on which the research focused-prejudice about skin colour-is reconstructed in such a way that it reaffirms or repeats existing prejudices and forces of domination. Furthermore, as Humphries points out, 'It is the professionals who gain most in all this, by a call for a development of their repertoire of professional skills to include an "understanding" of conflict within black communities' (1994, p. 194). Taking a lead from the insight which underlies Humphries' point, it is interesting to reflect on whether or not such processes of accommodation operate at the 298 M. Fielding macro-level of research trends as well as the micro-level of particular research projects. For example, to what degree are some of those within school effectiveness research engaged in an undertaking in which (a) problems which are essentially to do with the nature of education and the good life are redescribed and redefined in terms of a narrow notion of schooling and a morally thin notion of effectiveness, before (b) the model of education as social control is reaffirmed, and (c) school effectiveness experts are either invited in to sort things out or encouraged to develop strategies and approaches which enable schools to do it for themselves (see Fielding, 1997, p. 12)? Accumulation: constructing the calculus of control. If accommodation is primarily about the defusing of potentially disruptive perspectives by processes of redescription and ideological incorporation, accumulation aspires to similar ends through a deepening knowledge of those who need to be managed or marginalized; here attentive- ness to the standpoint of the researched rests upon a desire to control, rather than empower. **Borrowing the notion of 'accumulation' from Edward Said, Humphries suggests that a significant danger of disempowering research studies lies in their 'accumulation of information about the lives of oppressed groups, communicated through a specific language which in turn results in surveillance and regulation rather than empowerment'** (Humphries, 1994, p. 198). Whether accumulation is used in Said's sense of a cultural process of gathering, domesticating and controlling information because of some perceived threat to the established view of things, or whether accumulation is used in Humphries' more overtly custodial way, the object and force of its manipulative intent remains the same. One interesting feature of both accommodation and accumulation is the central place of language in the processes of control. Here the language of the researcher is often used either to redescribe or reshape the language of the researched. This can either take the form of exclusion or metamorphosis. Examples of metamorphosis are cited by Humphries in Frank Mort's work on the link between health, disease and moral or immoral notions of sex. **For Humphries, what becomes apparent is the capacity of research to incorporate moral overtones in what purport to be accumulated facts about the lives of the poor and oppressed. Examples of exclusion are central to Carter's suggestion that 'the extent to which the languages of researchers not only deny teachers the right to speak for and about teaching but also form part of a network of power that functions for the remote control of teaching practice by policy makers and administrators' (Carter, 1993, p. 8) and echo more widely held feelings of exclusion and metamorphosis instanced by Andy Hargreaves in his suggestion that 'Teachers' voices have frequently been silenced by policy and suppressed or distorted within educational research'** (Hargreaves, 1996, p. 12). Less immediately obvious, but if anything more insidious, is the shaping of respondent views through the control of what is included and excluded in the text. Thus, in Kum-Kum Bhavnani's often cited critique of the UK Community Relations Commission, which to some degree parallels Humphries' interrogation of Hall above, the selected views of black respondents are shown to have been used to produce an Transformative approaches to student voice 299 image of black residents as victims or problems, thereby reinforcing existing stereo- types. Yet, as Bhavnani argues, 'Such research may be given considerable credibility because not only is there the implicit assumption that it is empowering because it is supposed to have "given a voice" for the black residents, but, also the use of direct speech extracts confers an added, and often seen as desirable, dimension of authenticity' (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 146). Whilst letting informants 'speak for themselves' is not always as deceptive or deceiving as Bhavnani's example suggests, even in benign hands the editorial power of the ethnographer remains. As Margaret LeCompte reminds us, the discourse selected may be powerful, truthful and authentic, 'But it is, in fact, still a partial discourse ... (which) often leaves the researcher as "an absent presence"' (LeCompte, 1993, p. 12). Appropriation: knowing and accepting our place. **The process of appropriation uses both accommodation and accumulation as means to further a particular view of the less dominant group by the group in power. Appropriation is essentially about the construction or furtherance of the idea of a black person, woman, teacher, student or whatever subjugated group is under consideration in such a way that it supports, firstly, the way those groups are currently conceived of and treated and, secondly, the validation of the dominant group's position and the consolidation of its power**. Interestingly, Humphries cites Mohanty's critique of some western feminists who 'appropriate power by their representation of third world women, a representation which assumes implicitly the west as the primary referent in theory and praxis' (Humphries, 1994, p. 201).

### Impact-Turns Case

**Speaking on behalf of [Asians, Blacks, or interracial people] in a debate round for the sake of a ballot is not a legitimate form of advocacy. The affirmative team champions the cause of their research subjects to achieve the “glory and praise” of the ballot. Turns the case-reinscribes every form of structural violence**

**Alcoff 91**

Alcoff, Linda (1991) “The Problem of *Speaking for Others*.” Cultural Critique 20 (Winter 1991-92)[EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

In conclusion, I would stress that **the practice of speaking for others is often born of a desire for mastery, to privilege oneself as the one who more correctly understands the truth about another's situation or as one who can champion a just cause and thus achieve glory and praise.** **And the effect of the practice of speak-ing for others is often, though not always, erasure and a reinscription of sexual, national, and other kinds of hierarchies**. I hope that this analysis will contribute to rather than diminish the important discussion going on today about how to develop strategies for a more equitable, just distribution of the ability to speak and be heard. But this development should not be taken as an absolute dis-authorization of all practices of speaking for. It is not always the case that when others unlike me speak for me I have ended up worse off, or that when we speak for others they end up worse **off. Sometimes, as Loyce Stewart has argued, we do need a "messenger" to advocate for our needs. The source of a claim or discursive practice in suspect motives or maneuvers or in privileged social locations, I have argued, though it is always relevant, cannot be sufficient to repudiate it. We must ask further questions about its effects, questions that amount to the following: will it enable the empowerment of oppressed peoples,**

### Alternative – Speak With/Not For

**The alternative is to engage in a dialogic relationship where we speak with the oppressed and not for them.**

**Fielding 2004**

Fielding, Michael “Transformative Approaches to Student Voice: Theoretical Underpinnings, Recalcitrant Realities.” British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 295-311 [EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

The dialogic alternative: speaking with rather than speaking for Many of us will find ourselves in positions where the best we can hope to do is be as attentive and committed as we can to applying these six questions to our daily work with young people. There are, however, at least two alternatives. The first, championed in Alcoff's view by writers like Foucault and Deleuze, is to let students1 speak for themselves. The second, championed by writers like Gayatri Spivak (Spivak, 1988) and Alcoff herself, argues that merely to allow groups like students to speak for themselves is to assume that they can do just that in ways which presume a transparency and self-knowledge that may not be justified: 'to promote "listening to" as opposed to speaking for essentializes the oppressed as non-ideologically constructed subjects' (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 22). For Alcoff and Spivak, **the most promising way forward is one in which the advocates of the oppressed (or, in this case, students) retain their discursive role and work for the construction of dialogic encounters which allow for 'the possibility that the oppressed will produce a "countersentence" that can suggest a new historical narrative'** (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 23) **The intention is to avoid the equally mistaken polar opposites of, on the one hand, ignoring or excluding the speech of the marginalized group, and, on the other hand, treating its inclusion as unproblematically insightful and liberating. The first is not merely a wasted opportunity, but a denial of what Hargreaves calls 'humanity, democracy and sound sociology'** (Hargreaves, 1996, p. 16). The second instantiates the almost adulatory delusion which Spivak and Alcoff oppose: the presumption of insight in the oppressed is as foolish as its a priori denial by those in positions of power. **For a number of writers the central hope and justification of dialogic encounters lie more in the act of dialogue itself than the content of what is said. The very act of speaking within these kinds of context encourages** an epistemic agency, a capacity to construct legitimate knowledge. It is this act which challenges a central imperative of oppressive projects which invariably seek to keep apart the knowing agent and the object of knowledge. **For Alcoff it turns out that 'The problem with speaking for others exists in the structure of discursive practice, no matter its content, and there- fore it is this structure itself that needs alteration' (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 23). The exploration and transformation of existing discursive sites needs to be partnered by the construction of new opportunities for 'dialogic encounter'. The kind of argument for the development of dialogic encounters between researcher and researched which Alcoff begins to develop has been taken up by a number of researchers in the last decade**, in particular, by Yvonna Lincoln and Margaret LeCompte in McLaughlin and Tierney's important collection, Naming Silenced Lives (McLaughlin & Tierney, 1993). Four points emerge from their work which are particularly pertinent here. Firstly, the development of dialogic research is educative for those being researched. Lincoln suggests **that potential benefits include collaborative agenda setting**, discussion about appropriate methods of collecting data, debate about overall research design, involv- ing relevant others at key points, the production and analysis of collective research knowledge, the probing nature of its display, and the degree to which the solidarity of the group and its capacity to solve problems is enhanced. In sum, 'Only with dialogue, dialectic and criticism will collaborators in research come to a new under- standing, both more sophisticated and more informed, about the circumstances of their lives' (Lincoln, 1993, pp. 42-43). Secondly, **dialogic research is similarly educative for those conducting the research. The marginalization of particular groups is, for Lincoln, a 'diminution of civic life', not only for the excluded, but also for those 'whose lives are constricted and abridged by virtue of ignorance and the absence of meaningful social critique'** (Lincoln, 1993, p. 39). For LeCompte, this exclusion of the 'counter-hegemonic' (LeCompte, 1993, p. 10) is diminishing for similar reasons. **Thirdly, in its richest manifestation, dialogic research is essentially a partnership whose particular potential is well caught by LeCompte's advocacy of 'double description' and 'double consciousness', a process which 'requires the consciousness, or embrace of the "other" in ways that change researchers and those they study so that their destinies are inextricably linked and shared'** (LeCompte, 1993, p. 17). Fourthly, and finally, the kind of dialogic research which involves the genuine partnership of the researcher and the researched has the potential to change more than an aspect of their lives which happened to be identified by a particular enquiry. Those who have in the past so often been the mere objects of investigation, themselves become the agents of their own transformation: 'the silenced in becoming producers, analysts, and present- ers of their own narratives, cease to be the objects of their histories and knowledge. **They are enabled instead to become the agents of the stories which are produced and consumed about them, and the agents and instruments of their own change processes'** (Lincoln, 1993, p. 43).

## Speaking for Others 2NC

### 2NC Overview Evidence

**Fielding 2004**

Fielding, Michael “Transformative Approaches to Student Voice: Theoretical Underpinnings, Recalcitrant Realities.” British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 295-311 [EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

Problems of speaking for others: who do we think we are? If the **central problem of speaking about others lies in our tendency, by default or by design, to mistake or betray the realities and interests of those about whom we speak in favour of our own or those to whom we defer, the problem of speaking for or on behalf of others compounds rather than alleviates those same difficulties and dilemmas.** Alcoff identifies two different kinds of difficulty in speaking for others. Firstly, there is the extent to which the social location or identity of the speaker shapes the way they see and understand the world. In other words, 'a speaker's location is epistemically significant' (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 7), a view borne out in a very tangible way through the rise of African-American and Women's Studies in universities and elsewhere. For Yvonna Lincoln, this epistemic significance has substantial consequences for the conduct of educational research and leads her to suggest that if we are to adequately or convincingly research the lives of those who are silenced we will need to develop alternative epistemologies and methods because 'Traditional epistemologies and methods grounded in white androcentric concerns, and rooted in values which are understood to be inimical to the interest of the silenced, will fail to capture the voices needed' (Lincoln, 1993, p. 32) **Part of the difficulty of speaking on behalf of others thus turns on the epistemic inadequacy of traditional research methods. We can only hesitantly speak on behalf of others significantly unlike ourselves because we lack, not only understanding, but the means to understand those whose interests and causes we would represent.** A second difficulty Alcoff identifies picks up on the extent to which the nature of the differences that characterize different standpoints is intertwined with issues of power. **The degree to which a particular location is epistemically salient seems to carry with it the implication that those who do not share that location cannot presume to speak on behalf of those who do because, as Lincoln points out, 'certain privileged locations are discursively dangerous.** In particular, the practice of privileged persons speaking for or on behalf of less privileged persons has actually resulted (in many cases) in increasing or reinforcing the oppression of the group spoken for' (1991/92, p. 7). **One example Alcoff cites concerns the attacks on the work of Anne Cameron, a white author whose gifted, semi-fictional accounts of the lives of Native Canadian women received some acclaim. Alcoff points out that although Cameron's intentions were never in question, the effects of her writing were seen by a group of Native Canadian writers as disempowering and 'counterproductive in regards to the needs of Native women'** (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 7). A third difficulty concerns the problematic nature of group identity. The intricacies of identity in a multi-layered, constantly shifting world make it difficult to be clear about what constitutes a group with a particular standpoint. Given our membership of many different, sometimes divergent groups, problems may arise about specific group identification and allegiance. These kinds of difficulties, which arise, in part, from the re-emergence of standpoint epistemologies, are not, of course, without a companion set of problems, which Alcoff readily acknowledges. Just as there are difficulties of speaking for others, so there are difficulties of not doing so. What, for example, are we to do with a persistent desire to hold on to issues of social justice? In choosing not to speak on behalf of those who are excluded or marginalized am I abandoning my responsibilities to name and confront political oppression? (3) Getting heard: deconstructing discursive contexts Following Foucault, Alcoff argues for the importance of the 'rituals of speaking', that is to say, the different facets of social reality which constitute the discursive context within which meaning is made. **The key point here is that issues of voice are not circumscribed by verbal or written texts; they are embedded in historically located structures and relations of power. 'Who is speaking to whom turns out to be as important for meaning and truth as what is said; in fact what is said turns out to change according to who is speaking and who is listening' (1991/92, p. 12) Texts can mean different things to different people in different contexts. In a number of situations, who is speaking makes a considerable difference as to whether they are taken seriously or not. In many circumstances, in the UK as well as North America, a white, middleaged, middle-class man is more likely to be given a hearing than a young, workingclass, black woman. 'How what is said gets heard depends on who says it, and who says it will affect the style and language in which it is stated, which will in turn affect its perceived significance'** (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 13). Epistemology turns out to be Transformative approaches to student voice 301 politically located and, if not politically contested, then politically implicated. 'Who is speaking, who is spoken of, and who listens is a result, as well as an act, of political struggle' (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 15). **Thus, according to Alcoff, in the USA, European post-structuralists have to date been taken more seriously than similarly oriented African-American researchers. None of this is to say that one can or ought to read off the truth of an utterance simply by reference to its origins and its discursive context. However, it is to say that discursive context plays a hugely important role in the emergence or otherwise both of the articulation and consequence of what is said, by whom, to whom, and to what effect**. Whilst location does not determine meaning and truth, it certainly has a bearing on both. **The historical location of the structures and relations of power to which Alcoff refers is also important. It is not just a question of who is speaking to whom, but the historical context in which that encounter takes place. For Hargreaves, the richness of this historical context is an essential prerequisite to any attempts to understand the voices of teachers: 'What matters is that these voices are interpreted with reference to the contexts of teachers' lives and work that help to give them meaning'** (1996, p. 16). **For Lincoln, understanding and awareness of historical context is a necessary precursor to the emerging agency of the oppressed. Thus, she argues that 'Some means must be provided whereby the silenced can come to terms with the social, historical, and cultural contexts in which the research effort is embedded'** (1993, p. 43) For Bhavnani, too, historical context is important, not just as an aid to understanding, but as an agent of interrogation. **She argues that to include hitherto silenced voices in research is not of itself empowering or liberating, not only (as we have already seen) because such inclusion may be manipulative, but also because unless we are clear who is listening, whether such attentiveness is customary or spasmodic, an entitlement or a dispensation, then the power of those who speak and those who hear cannot be properly understood**. Such an incomplete picture is inaccurate and unhelpful because the processes which led to the initial silencing and then the permission to speak are absent and therefore not open to interrogation. 'If the presentation of an explicit political framework is avoided and the unstated voices are the voices of reaction, then these come to be celebrated in the same way as the voices of the dispossessed' (Bhavnani, 1990, pp. 146-147).

### 2NC Alt Solvency

**The alternative solves the impact to the Kritik and the case turn**

**Alcoff 91**

Alcoff, Linda (1991) “The Problem of *Speaking for Others*.” Cultural Critique 20 (Winter 1991-92)[EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

In rejecting a general retreat from speaking for, I am advocating a return to an un-self-conscious appropriation of other, **but rather that anyone who speaks for others should do so out of a concrete analysis of the particular power relations and discursive effects involved. I want to develop this through elucidating four sets of interrogatory practices that meant to help evaluate possible and actual instances of speaking** for. In list form they may appear to resemble an algorithm, we could plug, in an instance of speaking for and factor analysis and evaluation. However, they are meant only to suggest a list of the questions that should be asked concerning any discursive practice. These are by no means original: they been learned and practiced by many activists and theorists. 1. **The impetus to speak must be carefully analyzed and, many cases (certainly for academics!), fought against. This seem an odd way to begin discussing how to speak for, point is that the impetus to always be the speaker and to speak all situations must be seen for what it is: a desire for mastery domination**. If one's immediate impulse is to teach rather listen to a less-privileged speaker, one should resist that impulse long enough to interrogate it carefully. Some of us have taught that by right of having the dominant gender, class, letters after our name, or some other criterion we are more to have the truth. Others have been taught the opposite, and speak haltingly, with apologies, if they speak at all.12 At the same time, we have to acknowledge that the very to "move over" or retreat can occur only from a position privilege. Those who are not in a position of speaking at all retreat from an action they do not employ. Moreover, making The Problem of Speaking for Others 25 decision for oneself whether to retreat is an extension or application of privilege, not an abdication of it. Still, it is sometimes called for. 2. **We must also interrogate the bearing of our location and context on what it is we are saying, and this should be an explicit part of every serious discursive practice we engage in. Constructing hypotheses about the possible connections between our location and our words is one way to begin. This procedure would be most successful if engaged in collectively with others, by which aspects of our location less highlighted in our own minds might be revealed to** us.13 One deformed way in which this is too often carried out when speakers offer up in the spirit of "honesty" autobiographical information about themselves usually at the beginning of their discourse as a kind of disclaimer. This is meant to acknowledge their own understanding that they are speaking from a specified, embodied location without pretense to a transcendental truth. as Maria Lugones and others have forcefully argued, such an serves no good end when it is used as a disclaimer against one's ignorance or errors and is made without critical interrogation the bearing of such an autobiography on what is about to be said. It leaves for the listeners all the real work that needs to be done. For example, if a middle-class white man were to begin a speech by sharing with us this autobiographical information and then using it as a kind of apologetics for any limitations of his speech, this would leave those of us in the audience who do not share his social location to do the work by ourselves of translating his terms into our own, appraising the applicability of his analysis to our diverse situation, and determining the substantive relevance of his location on his claims. This is simply what less-privileged persons have always had to do when reading the history of philosophy, literature, etc., making the task of appropriating these discourses more difficult and time-consuming (and more likely to result in alienation). Simple unanalyzed disclaimers do not improve on this familiar situation and may even make it worse to the extent that by offering such information the speaker may feel even more authorized to speak and be accorded more authority by his peers. 3. **Speaking should always carry with it an accountability and responsibility for what one says. To whom one is accountable is a political/epistemological choice contestable, contingent, and, as 26 Linda Alcoff Donna Haraway says, constructed through the process of discursive action. What this entails in practice is a serious and sincere commitment to remain open to criticism and to attempt actively, attentively, and sensitively to "hear" (understand) the criticism**. A quick impulse to reject criticism must make one wary. 4. Here is my central point. **In order to evaluate attempts to speak for others in particular instances, we need to analyze the probable or actual effects of the words on the discursive and material context**. **One cannot simply look at the location of the speaker or her credentials to speak, nor can one look merely at the propositional content of the speech; one must also look at where the speech goes and what it does there. Looking merely at the content of a set of claims without looking at effects of the claims cannot produce an adequate or even meaningful evaluation of them, partly because the notion of a content separate from effects does not hold up.** The content of the claim, or its meaning, emerges in interaction between words and hearers within a very specific historical situation. Given this, we have to pay careful attention to the discursive arrangement in order to understand the full meaning of any given discursive event. For example, in a situation where a well-meaning First World person is speaking for a person or group in the Third World, the very discursive arrangement may reinscribe the "hierarchy of civilizations" view where the United States lands squarely at the top. This effect occurs because the speaker is positioned as authoritative and empowered, as the knowledgeable subject, while the group in the Third World is reduced, merely because of the structure of the speaking practice, to an object and victim that must be championed from afar, thus disempowered. Though the speaker may be trying to materially improve the situation of some lesser-privileged group, the effects of her discourse is to reinforce racist, imperialist conceptions and perhaps also to further silence the lesser-privileged group's own ability to speak and be heard.'4 This shows us why it is so important to reconceptualize discourse, as Foucault recommends, as an event, which includes speaker, words, hearers, location, language, and so on. All such evaluations produced in this way will be of necessity indexed. That is, they will obtain for a very specific location and cannot be taken as universal. This simply follows from the fact that the evaluations will be based on the specific elements of historical discursive context, location of speakers and hearers, and so forth. When any of these elements is changed, a new evaluation is called for**. Let me illustrate this by applying it to the examples I gave at the beginning. In the case of Cameron, if the effects of her books are truly disempowering for Native Canadian women, they are counterproductive to Cameron's own stated intentions, and she should indeed "move over." In the case of the white male theorist who discussed architecture instead of the politics of postmodern-ism, the effect of his refusal was that he offered no contribution an important issue and all of us there lost an opportunity to and explore it.** Now **let me turn to President Bush. When Bush claims that Noriega is a corrupt dictator who stands in the way of democracy in Panama, he repeats a claim that has been made almost word for word by the Opposition movement in Panama. Yet the effects of the two statements are vastly different because the full meaning the claim changes radically depending on who states it. When the president of the United States stands before the world passing judgement on a Third World government, and criticizing it onThe basis of corruption and a lack of democracy, the full meaning of this statement, as opposed to the Opposition's, is to reinforce the prominent Anglo view that Latin American corruption is the pri-mary cause of the region's poverty and lack of democracy, that the United States is on the side of democracy in the region, and that the United States condemns corruption and tyranny**. **Thus, the effect of the president's speaking for Latin America is to re-consolidate U.S. imperialism by obscuring its true role in the region in torturing and murdering hundreds and thousands people who have tried to bring democratic and progressive governments into existence**. And this will continue to be its effect unless and until he radically alters U.S. foreign policy and admits its history of international mass murder.

### 2NC Perm Answers

**Our performances need to avoid manipulative incorporation of the voices of others. The permutation still links to the disads and is the co-option of the alt that was performed on the stories/voices of the oppressed.**

**Fielding 2004**

Fielding, Michael “Transformative Approaches to Student Voice: Theoretical Underpinnings, Recalcitrant Realities.” British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 295-311 [EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

**There is now a rapidly growing literature that describes an exciting range of student voice activities that hold out** the possibility, not only of these developments contributing significantly to the current debate about the future of formal schooling, but also of **pre-figurative practice offering hope and inspiration for something more challenging and more transformative than the twentieth century**, with a few exceptions, was able to produce. Given the richness of many of these developments and the range of parties now interested, for very different reasons, in the rise of student voice initiatives, it is surprising that only a very small proportion of the literature has taken us back to theoretical foundations that underpin both the advocacy and the emerging realities of student voice in school and community renewal. And yet, **if student voice initiatives are to resist the constant pull of either 'fadism' or manipulative incorporation, then it is important to be clear about what kinds of arguments and dispositions are likely to support more democratic or transformative intentions**. **Fadism leads to unrealistic expectation, subsequent marginalization, and the unwitting corrosion of integrity; manipulative incorporation leads to the betrayal of hope, resigned exhaustion and the bolstering of an increasingly powerful status quo. To build a sustainable future we need intellectual tools to help us expose duplicity, forestall betrayal, and demystify the presumption and arrogance of an inevitably persistent managerialism**. **This article offers one attempt to ask some fundamental questions of those who would use student voice for ends quite other than those to which much of it aspires; it also asks of those who intend a future that is more engaging, more imaginative, more just, more democratic, and significantly and sustainably different to the one we are likely to inherit whether the methodologies and developments they advocate are able to bear the weight of aspiration they embody. Too much contemporary student voice work invites failure and disillusion, either because its methodologies and contextual circumstances reinforce subjugation, or because its valorization pays too little attention to the extent to which young people are already incorporated by the practices of what is cool or customary.** Transformation requires a rupture of the ordinary and this demands as much of teachers as it does of students. Indeed, it requires a transformation of what it means to be a student; what it means to be a teacher. In effect, it requires the intermingling and interdependence of both. It requires an explicitly intended and joyfully felt mutuality, a 'radical collegiality' (Fielding, 1999).

**The permutation is a promise of good intentions that ignores the violence done in favor of a return to the 1AC without considering the impacts of their performance.**

**Fielding 2004**

Fielding, Michael “Transformative Approaches to Student Voice: Theoretical Underpinnings, Recalcitrant Realities.” British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 295-311 [EJS] Accessed 8-17-16

(vi) Understanding the dangers of unwitting disempowerment Are we aware that, **despite our best intentions, our interventions may reinforce existing conceptions of students that tend to deny their agency and capacity** **to take responsibility for what they do 'and perhaps also silence [their] own ability to speak and be heard'**? (Alcoff 1991/92, p. 26). The key question to ask of our intervention is 'Will it enable the empower- ment of [the group on whose behalf we speak i.e. students]?' (Alcoff, 1991/92, p. 29). **One of the most striking things that one of Leora Cruddas's students said about the highly successful student voice work she had experienced was, 'I think it's sad that we have to have this group just to voice our opinions. Don't teachers realise we've got opinions?'** (Cruddas, 2001, p. 63). No doubt there were caring, highly committed staff at that young woman's school who worked in a dedicated way with girls with emotional and behavioural difficulties. **No doubt staff did speak up on their behalf in the genuine belief that their interests were better served via staff intervention than by enabling students to voice their own concerns and aspirations. Nonetheless, the question posed by that young woman is both humbling and inspiring and is a fitting exemplification of the wisdom of Linda Alcoffs remarks.**