## K

#### As a Chinese female, I recognize my privilege and the opportunities my social location has given me. However, I also recognize how the state and the institution has oppressed minorities.

#### Mathematics – Mos Def

Yo, it's one universal law but two sides to every story

Three strikes and you be in for life, manditory

Four MC's murdered in the last four years

I ain't tryin to be the fifth one, the millenium is here

Yo it's 6 Million Ways to Die, from the seven deadly thrills

Eight-year olds gettin found with 9 mill's

It's 10 P.M., where your seeds at? What's the deal

He on the hill puffin krill to keep they belly filled

Light in the ass with heavy steel, sights on the pretty shit in life

Young soldiers tryin to earn they next stripe

When the average minimum wage is $5.15

You best believe you gotta find a new ground to get cream

The white unemployment rate, is nearly more than triple for black

so frontliners got they gun in your back

Bubblin crack, jewel theft and robbery to combat poverty

and end up in the global jail economy

Stiffer stipulations attached to each sentence

Budget cutbacks but increased police presence

And even if you get out of prison still livin

join the other five million under state supervision

This is business, no faces just lines and statistics

from your phone, your zip code, to S-S-I digits

#### Being ignorant of your privilege and success in relation to whiteness re-inscribes an unspoken and supplemental antiblackness.

Sullivan, 8

(Professor Philosophy, Women’s Studies, and African and African American Studies @ Pennsylvania State University (Shannon Sullivan, Spring 2008, “Whiteness as Wise Provincialism: Royce and the Rehabilitation of a Racial Category,” Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society: A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy, Vol. 44, No. 2, Project Muse)

Like critical conservationists regarding whiteness, Royce knows that he faces an uphill battle in convincing many of his interlocutors of the value of provincialism. Put positively, provincialism tends to connote a healthy fondness for and pride in local traditions, interests, and customs. More negatively, it means being restricted and limited, sticking to the narrow ideas of a given region or group and being indifferent, perhaps even violently hostile to the ways of outsiders. What connects these different meanings is their sense of being rooted in a particular cultural-geographical place. In Royce’s definition, which emphasizes conscious awareness of this rootedness (an important point to which I will return), a province is a domain that is “sufficiently unified to have a true consciousness of its own unity, to feel a pride in its own ideals and customs, and to possess a sense of its distinction from other(s).” And correspondingly, provincialism is, first, the tendency for a group “to possess its own customs and ideals; secondly, the totality of these customs and ideals themselves; and thirdly the love and pride which leads the inhabitants of a province to cherish as their own these traditions, beliefs and aspirations” (61). (End Page 238) Emphasizing unity, love, and pride, Royce’s definitions steer away from the negative connotations of provincialism. But in Royce’s day—and not much has changed in this regard—it was the negative, or “false,” form of provincialism that most often came to people’s minds when they thought about the value and effects of the concept. As Royce was writing in 1902, the false provincialism, or “sectionalism,” of the United States’ Civil War was a recent memory for many of his readers. In the Civil War, stubborn commitment to one portion of the nation violently opposed it to another portion and threatened to tear the nation apart. Provincialism, which appealed to regional values to disunite, had to be condemned in the name of patriotism, which united in the name of a higher good. Royce’s rhetorical strategy is to take the challenge of defending provincialism head-on: “My main intention is to define the right form and the true office of provincialism—to portray what, if you please, we may call the Higher Provincialism, —to portray it, and then to defend it, to extol it, and to counsel you to further just such provincialism” (65). Royce readily acknowledges that “against the evil forms of sectionalism we shall always have to contend” (64). But he denies that provincialism must always be evil. Going against the grain of most post-Civil War thinking about provincialism, Royce urges that the present state of civilization, both in the world at large, and with us, in America, is such as to define a new social mission which the province alone, but not the nation, is able to fulfil (sic) . . . .(T)he modern world has reached a point where it needs, more than ever before, the vigorous development of a highly organized provincial life. Such a life, if wisely guided, will not mean disloyalty to the nation. (64) Wisely developed, provincialism need not conflict with national loyalty. The two commitments can—and must, Royce insists—flourish together. Likewise, whiteness need not conflict with membership in humanity as a whole. The two identities can—and must—flourish together. The relationship between provincialism and nationalism, as discussed by Royce, serves as a fruitful model for the relationship of whiteness and humanity, and critical conservationists of whiteness should follow Royce’s lead by taking head-on the challenge of critically defending whiteness. Like embracing provincialism, embracing whiteness might seem to be a step backward for the modern world—toward limitation and insularity that breed ignorance, prejudice, and hostility toward others who are different from oneself. Like having a national rather than provincial worldview, seeing oneself as a member of humanity rather than of the white race seems to embody an expansive, outward (End Page 239) orientation that is open to others. But there is a “new social mission” with respect to racial justice that whiteness, and not humanity as a whole, can fulfill. Race relations, especially in the United States, have reached a point where humanity needs a “highly organized” anti-racist whiteness, that is, an anti-racist whiteness that is consciously developed and embraced. How then can we (white people, in particular) wisely guide the development of such whiteness so that it does not result in disloyalty to other races and humanity as a whole? Before addressing this question, let me point out two important differences between whiteness and provincialism as described by Royce. First, while Royce calls for the development of a wise form of provincialism, he is able to appeal to existing “wholesome” forms of provincialism in his defense of the concept. He addresses himself “in the most explicit terms, to men and women who, as I hope and presuppose, are and wish to be, in the wholesome sense, provincial,” and his demand that “the man of the future . . . love his province more than he does to-day” recognizes a nugget of wise provincialism on which to build (65, 67). The development of wise provincialism does not have to be from scratch. In contrast, it is more difficult to pinpoint a nugget of “wholesome” whiteness to use as a starting point for its transformation. Instances of white people who helped slaves and resisted slavery in the United States, for example, certainly can be found—the infamous John Brown is only one such example—but such people often are seen as white race traitors who represent the abolition, not the transformation of whiteness.9 The task of critically conserving whiteness probably will be more difficult than that of critically conserving provincialism since there is not a straightforward or obvious “right form and true office” of whiteness to extol. Second, true to his idealism, Royce describes both provincialism and its development as explicitly conscious phenomena. Royce notes the elasticity of the term “province”—it can designate a small geographical area in contrast with the nation, or it can designate a large geographical, rural area in contrast with a city (57–58)—but it always includes consciousness of the province’s unity and particular identity as this place and not another. Put another way, probably every space, regardless of its size, is distinctive in some way or another. What gives members of a space a provincial attitude is their conscious awareness of, and resulting pride in, that space as the distinctive place that it is. On Royce’s model, someone who is provincial knows that she is, at least in some loose way. The task of developing her provincialism, then, is to develop her rudimentary conscious awareness of her province, to become “more and not less self-conscious, well-established, and earnest” in her provincial outlook (67). In contrast—and here lies the largest difference between provincialism and whiteness—many white people today do not consciously think of themselves as members of this (white) race and not another, not even loosely. Excepting members of white militant groups such as the Ku (End Page 240) Klux Klan or the Creativity Movement, contemporary white people do not tend to have a conscious sense of unity as fellow white people, nor do they consciously invoke or share special ideals, customs, or common memories as white people. They often are perceived and perceive themselves as raceless, as members of the human species at large rather than members of a particular racial group. This does not eliminate their whiteness or their membership in a fairly unified group. Just the opposite: such “racelessness” is one of the marks and privileges of membership in whiteness, especially middle and upper class forms of whiteness. White people can feel a pride in the ideals and customs of whiteness and possess a sense of distinction from people of other races without much, if any conscious awareness of their whiteness and without consciously identifying those ideals and customs as white. To take one brief example, styles and customs of communication in classrooms tend to be raced (as well as classed and gendered), and white styles of discussion, hand-raising, and turn-taking tend to be treated as appropriate while black styles are seen as inappropriate.10 White students often learn to feel proud and validated by their teachers as good students when they participate in these styles, and this almost always happens without either students or teachers consciously identifying their style (or themselves) as white. Such students appear to belong and experience themselves as belonging merely to a group of smart, orderly, responsible students, not to a racialized group. In the United States and Western world more broadly, unconscious habits of whiteness and white privilege have tended to increase after the end of de jure racism.11 Unlike provincialism as described by Royce, whiteness tends to operate more sub- and unconsciously than consciously. But I do not think that this fact spoils wise provincialism as a fruitful model for wise whiteness. First, and reflecting a basic philosophical disagreement that I have with Royce’s idealism, I doubt that provincialism always functions as consciously as Royce suggests it does. The unity, pride, and love that are the hallmarks of provincialism could easily function in the form of unreflective beliefs, habits, preferences, and even bodily comportment. In fact I would argue that many aspects of our provincial loyalties—whatever type of province is at issue—operate on sub- or unconscious levels. In that case, provincialism and whiteness would not be as dissimilar in their operation as Royce’s description implies. Second, even if provincialism tends to consciously unify people while whiteness does not, Royce’s advice that people should attempt to become more, rather than less self-conscious in their provincialism still applies to white people with respect to their whiteness. Given whiteness’s history as a racial category of violent exclusion and oppression, one might think that white people need to focus less on their whiteness, to distance themselves from it. But just the opposite is the case. Given (End Page 241) that distance from racial identification tends to be the covert modus operandi for contemporary forms of white privilege, white people who wish to fight racism need to become more intimately acquainted with their whiteness. Rather than ignore their whiteness, which allows unconscious habits of white privilege to proliferate unchecked, white people need to bring their whiteness to as much conscious awareness as possible (while also realizing that complete self-transparency is never achievable) so that they can try to change what it means.

#### Whiteness is performed. Within debate space it is not simply enough to be ‘antiracist,’ but rather changing the way we perform ourselves in the debate space is the only way to combat whiteness.

Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley et al, 13

(Dr. Shanara R. Reid-Brinkley, PhD, Assistant Professor of Public Address and Advocacy, Director of Debate, William Pitt Debating Union, Amber Kelsie, M.A., Nicholas Brady, 2013, http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/, Accessed 1/25/14, NC)

There is no racism without bodies coded and trained through practice. There are subjectivities that are raced which means that there are bodies that “look white” that are implicated in whiteness. White privilege in this frame can be recognized as an unearned benefit while offering a position of redemption when privilege is used toward anti-racist efforts. Yet, one can simultaneously be engaged in good anti-racist work as a white person, while engaging in political and social actions that reproduce privilege. And yet, we already recognize that whiteness is not just about skin color, though we cannot deny the existence of white-skin privilege. Whiteness is normative—it produces behavioral and performative patterns that sustain the significance of whiteness as a signifier. Bankey critiques what he calls “Reid-Brinkley’s model for resistance in the flesh” as a failed political project with dangerous implications for contemporary debate practice.

#### Traditional knowledge production in debate leads to epistemological myopia, The Alt offers an alternative method of the three-tier process.

Dr. Reid-Brinkley, University of Pittsburgh Department Of Communications, 8

("THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE" pages 81-83) (\*\*\*Edited for ablist language)

The process of **signifyin**’ engaged in by the Louisville debaters **is not simply designed to critique the use of traditional evidence; their goal is to “challenge the relationship between social power and knowledge.”** In other words, **those with social power within the debate community are able to produce and determine “legitimate” knowledge. These** legitimating **practices** usually **function to maintain the dominance of normative knowledge-making practices,** while crowding out or directly excluding alternative knowledge-making practices**.** The Louisville “framework looks to the people who are oppressed by current constructions of power.” Jones and Green offer **an alternative framework for drawing claims**in debate speeches, they refer to it as a three-tier process: A way in which you can validate our claims, is through the three-tier process. Andwe talk about personal experience, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals. Let me give you an analogy. If you place an elephant in the room and send in three ~~blind folded~~ [masked] people into the room, and each of them are touching a different part of the elephant. And they come back outside and you ask each different person they gone have a different idea about what they was talking about. But, if you let those people converse and bring those three different people together then **you can achieve a greater truth.”** Jones argues that without the three tier process debate claims are based on singular perspectives that privilege those with institutional and economic power. The Louisville debaters do not reject traditional evidence per se, instead they seek to augment or supplement what counts as evidence with other forms of knowledge produced outside of academia. As Green notes in the double-octo-finals at CEDA Nationals, “Knowledge surrounds me in the streets**,** **through my peers, through personal experiences, and everyday wars that I fight with my mind.**” The thee-tier process: personal experience, organic intellectuals, and traditional evidence, provides a method of argumentation that taps into diverse forms of knowledge-making practices. With the Louisville method, **personal experience and organic intellectuals are placed on par with traditional forms of evidence.** While the Louisville debaters see the benefit of academic research, they are also critically aware of the normative practices that exclude racial and ethnic minorities from policy-oriented discussions because of their lack of training and expertise. Such exclusions prevent radical solutions to racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia from being more permanently addressed. According to Green: bell hooks talks about how **when we rely solely on one perspective to make our claims, radical liberatory theory becomes rootless.** That’s the reason why we use a three-tiered process. **That’s why we use alternative forms of discourse such as hip hop.** That’s also how we use traditional evidence and our personal narratives so you **don’t get just one perspective** **claiming to be the right way.** **Because it becomes a more meaningful and educational view as far as how we achieve our education.**The use of **hip hop and personal experience function as a check against the homogenizing function of academic and expert discourse.** Note the reference to bell hooks, Green argues that without alternative perspectives, “radical libratory theory becomes rootless.” The term **rootless** seems to **refer to a lack of grounded-ness in the material circumstances** that academics or experts study. In other words, academics and experts by definition represent an intellectual population with a level of objective distance from that **which they study.** For the Louisville debaters, **this distance is problematic as it prevents the development of a social politic that is rooted in the community of those most greatly affected by the status of oppression.**¶

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the team that best performatively and methodologically challenges the dominant normative structures of debate.

#### This Alternative form of knowledge production leads to a double conscious. The inclusion of personal narratives allows us to reflect on out own social location, while alternate forms of knowledge allow us to understand the oppression of others. By teaching code switching we allow intra-communal discussion.

Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley et al, 13

(Dr. Shanara R. Reid-Brinkley, PhD, Assistant Professor of Public Address and Advocacy, Director of Debate, William Pitt Debating Union, Amber Kelsie, M.A., Nicholas Brady, 2013, http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/, Accessed 1/25/14, NC)

Bankey’s positioning of himself at the borderland while excluding (multiply situated) black people in debate from that same space makes little sense to those familiar with the history of race in America. Black people have never not had to be in close relation to whiteness. This is Dubois’ theory of double consciousness (which, though especially emblematic of black experience, is a way of understanding the world that can be learned by non-blacks). Black people have always existed in an in-between space of blackness and whiteness with anti-blackness serving as the context for this relationship. Black folks in America are always already in an interracial relationship with whiteness; this is especially true in the context of debate. The tone of Bankey’s criticism assumes black people exclude white people from their space, but MPJ and other debate practices demonstrate the direct manner in which white people exclude black people from interracial dialogue in the debate space. An even more recent example of how structural racism functions is the exclusion of Elijah Smith, the reigning NDT champ, from the Kentucky Round Robin, and the attempt to change the rules pertaining to transfer students. We are disappointed by this addition to the consistent complaint made by whites that black people must be constantly accessible to whites even while white people disavow the structure of policed segregation in supposedly common spaces. In fact, it seems quite likely that this thesis will inspire debate arguments that produce exclusions of black students rather than an inclusive space of participation. We find it highly unlikely that it will produce an authentic communication or disalienation. There are countless examples of the manner in which black people attempt to meet the communicative and bodily expectations of dominant culture and dominant debate. Code-switching is part and parcel of our interracial romance with debate, an example of our commitment to compromise. Black people often code-switch into “white-people speak” when dealing with white people while using black language and tonal intonations (regionally specific) when in majority black spaces (in fact, it seems that it is when we “speak authentically” in the presence of whites—share ourselves with whites—that we are charged with the crime of being “intentionally” unintelligible). Within debates, (vis-à-vis framework for example) there is a denial or a disavowal of even the possibility of an engagement across rhetorical difference, which is the move Bankey makes. He refuses to code switch in the thesis by not attempting to understand the kinship networks in debate for black people or to engage in rhetorical practices to demonstrate a commitment to engaging difference at the level of method and performance.[9] How often do we encounter white people who can code-switch (and no we don’t mean the latest hip hop slang) into the communicative and socio-political practices of black culture? The black is always already at the borderland. But double consciousness is something that for most people—especially non-blacks—must be learned and practiced. We believe that these kinds of practices and attempts on the part of black people to meet whites more than half-way are evident for those who choose to see. But also we must point out that in communication studies code-switching, the vernacular, counter-publics, and many other concepts evoke the double-sidedness of rhetorical practice in ways that complicate the very notion that there could ever be a pure communication. We therefore invite Bankey to read the Communication Studies section of the library as well as the Black Studies section.

## Case Dump

#### Constant usage and consumption of nature depletes nature – culminating in extinction.

Nhanenge, 7

[Jytte: Master of Arts at the development studies at the University of South Africa “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the concerns of women,, poor people and nature into development” http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/570/dissertation.pdf?sequence=1].

Nature is by the economic individual perceived as being a heap of dead parts laying idle for his profit making. It is therefore rational to make nature productive by exploitation. However, due to lack of holistic awareness and his ever-increasing greed the maximizing individual overlooks the reproductive necessities of nature and the natural limits this brings to his profit making. Hence economic man's greedy and limitless resource exploitation results in increased scarcity of natural resources and degradation of the environment. Since people need food, shelter, clothing, medicine and other necessities provided by nature, increased scarcity means that less resources are available to sustain the lives of women, Others and nature. Thus, when the political system and its economic market direct natural resources to profit-maximization of rational man, women and Others cannot produce food, clothing and shelter for themselves and their families. This gives a vicious circle of hunger, malnutrition, ill health and poverty that ends in death. Thus, the crises of poverty suffered by women and Others are mainly caused by economic man's greed for natural resources. Economic man also makes nature poor. The continuous exploitation and pollution of the environment will eventually lead to nature becoming as dead as science perceives it to be. That may then be called a self-fulfilling prophecy, however, with one logical blunder: when nature dies, also humanity will perish.

#### The hospitality of the affirmative’s economic engagement is inherently gendered – the gift giver is always master of the house marginalizing the feminine

Hamington in 2010

Maurice Hamington “Toward a Theory of Feminist Hospitality” Feminist Formation. Vol 22, Num 1. Pp 21-38. Spring 2010.

Hospitality is a performative act of identity: To give comfort or make welcome the stranger, the host must act; to resettle displaced people, a host nation must act. In the process of this action, the performance of hospitality, the host— whether it is an individual or a nation-state—is instantiating identity. There must be an “I” who gives, welcomes, and comforts, and that “I” is only known through action. As Levinas (1969) describes it, subjectivity is created through “welcoming the Other, as hospitality” (27). Acts of hospitality actualize identity. Connecting the personal and the political, Tracy McNulty (2007) suggests that hospitality has a twofold implication for identity formation: Acts of hospitality constitute the identity of the host, as well as the identity of the group, culture, or nation for which the host acts. Nevertheless, McNulty observes that the actualization of this identity has rendered women invisible: An identity that negates the self. For example, she finds that in the early religious traditions and archaic practices “the host is almost invariably male,” and concludes that in these contexts, “feminine hospitality is almost an oxymoron” (xxvii). Women are denied opportunities to hold a valued position of host and are thus denied opportunities to participate in these acts of self-assertion. Women have been historically associated with hospitality, but as a marginalized self in society. Obviously, feminist hospitality must consciously resist forms of disempowering caregiving. Judith Butler’s (1988) notion of the performative self is useful here. She describes gender as “an identity instituted through a stylized repetition of acts” (519; emphasis in original). This is a performative, constructed, and fluid iden- tity. The acts of gender formation are not entirely freely chosen; rather, they are done to the body within prescribed social frameworks: “My suggestion is that the body becomes its gender through a series of acts which are renewed, revised, and consolidated through time” (523). Despite social discipline placed on behavior, Butler (1999) leaves open the possibility of subversive performativity: Rather than repeat acts that maintain gender identity, one can choose to “displace the very gender norms that enable the repetition itself” (148). Significantly, Butler (1999) is primarily concerned with subverting compulsory heterosexual- ity, but her analysis can be applied to the identity of the “master of the house” created by hospitality. Subversively, the feminist host can remain cognizant of not recreating acts that constitute identity through positions of power over others, but instead attempt to foster the atmosphere for lateral exchanges.2 The implication is that acts of feminist hospitality can contribute to an alternative identity, one that is less restrictive and more empowering than is offered through traditional understandings of hospitality. Women who help other women, not in the spirit of charity or to alleviate class guilt but with a generous disposition and for mutual benefit, exemplify acts of feminist hospitality.

#### US-Mexico relations are inherently gendered – the U.S. acts as the paternal father figure over Mexico. The Chicana feminist is constantly ignored in these discussions and remain invisible in international politics.

Flores, 2k

Lisa A. Flores. PhD. Univ of Utah – Department of Communication. “Reclaiming the “Other”: toward a Chicana Feminist critical perspective.” International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 24:5, Sept 2000.

Narratives are a central part of Chicana feminism and Chicana feminists, across disciplines and methods, turn to narratives as sources of knowledge and insight. Given the importance of narratives, I offer a **Chicana feminist critical perspective** that **outlines both general principles and critical practices that can guide the Chicana feminist scholar**. **Each** of these critical practices **highlights ways of thinking about, identifying, and assessing narratives.** Recognizing that what I offer is not complete, I maintain that two general principles inform a Chicana feminist critical perspective. The first principle, **decolonization, includes the goal of using academic and personal writings to challenge the neo-colonial practices which shape the lives of Chicanas**/os. **Working in tandem with decolonization is intersectionality, or a practice of recognizing the interconnectedness of gender, race, class, and heterosexuality.** While there are numerous possible ways of advancing these two principles, I identify three critical practices: voice(s), personal experience, and naming. These three critical practices are among the many that advance a Chicana feminist critical perspective aimed at decolonization and intersectionality. Because the two main principles inform and shape each other, I discuss them together throughout my explanation of voice(s), personal experience, and naming. In doing so, I hope to model the practices as I review them. **The lives of Chicanas are marked by a history of colonization.** **Beginning with the Spanish conquest of the Americas, to the forced inclusion in the US after the US — Mexican war, people of Indian and Mexican descent have seen their land, their culture, and their lives controlled by others** (Elenes, 1997, Gutiérrez, 1995 and Meier & Ribera, 1997). **Citizenship within the US did not bring the end of colonization, as Mexican Americans and Chicanas**/**os have been denied their language and their histories and have been segregated through economic deprivation. Existing** often **as** “los olvidados” or the “**invisible people**,” **Chicanas**/os **and Mexican Americans have been situated at the margins of society** (Perea, 1995). **Chicana feminism responds to this history through** a principle I label **decolonization**. **One important practice of decolonization is replacing silence with voice. Because Chicana feminists have had few traditional outlets in which to be heard, central of focus to a Chicana feminist critical perspective is creating and maintaining voice**. As hooks (1989) notes, “**Oppressed people resist by identifying themselves as subjects, by defining their reality, shaping their new identity, naming their history, telling their story**” (p. 43). Thus, **the subjects of Chicana feminist critical analyses are often the voices of Chicanas**. For instance, Rebolledo (1988) argues that **the Chicana feminist critic is a “facilitator: reproducing and making known the texts of our authors”** (p. 132). For Rebolledo, this function is carried out by including large sections of the work she is analyzing in her writing, thus creating a dialogue between herself and the writer she is studying. Rebolledo is not alone in her desire to allow the voice of Chicana authors to speak through her work. Indeed much of Chicana feminism is designed to assert Chicana identities, in part by recognizing and sharing the voices of Chicanas (Alarcón, 1988, Chabram-Dernersesian, 1992, Herrera-Sobek, 1988 and Sánchez, 1985). **These voices and stories are often used as a means to create a sense of community with other Chicanas and other women of color**. Moraga (1981) says to her sister writers in *This Bridge Called My Back*, “We are a family who first knew each other only in our dreams, who have come together on these pages to make family a reality” (p. 19). The Chicana identities that are expressed and built in their writings are often formed in part through relationships with other Chicanas. These writings reflect a deep sense of love for other Chicanas that provides a feeling of stability and community ( Alarcón, 1988, Anzaldúa, 1981, Anzaldúa, 1987, Anzaldúa, 1990a, Littlebear, 1981, Viramontes, 1989 and Yarbro-Bejarano, 1988). Roses (1984) argues, “**The legacy of [Chicana and Latina authors] … can be said to constitute a counter cultural voice which offers a testimony that the critical literature must validate. That voice deserves to be heard by an audience as numerous as that commanded by men”** (p. 103). For Ochoa (1999), **this goal can be met by turning to the “everyday” strategies of resistance among Mexican American women.** Including the testimony of a number of Mexican American women living in a small suburb of Los Angeles, Ochoa centers the voices and lives of Mexican American women as they describe the ways in which they create life amidst racism and economic struggle. This sharing of voice reveals the commitment of Chicana feminists to profess their identity through their eyes. **It places Chicana feminists, marginalized by dominant and Chicano societies, at their own center, and thus disrupts the colonial practices which have erased Chicanas** (Chabram-Dernersesian, 1993). **When Chicana feminists share voice with each other in their works, they bring more Chicana feminist perspectives into the public domain, thus enhancing societal awareness of Chicana culture. Claiming and offering multiple voices**, English, Spanish, personal, academic, poetic, **provide not only instances of the diversity among Chicanas, but also of the ability of Chicanas to share their own narratives** (Davalos, 1998 and Rebolledo & Rivera, 1993). In telling stories, whether their own or other Chicanas, Chicanas become speaking subjects. The Indian woman can wail, the Chicana activist can march, the Anglicized woman can speak theory. As Chicana feminism works to embrace the *mestizaje* heritage, it calls out for an accounting of all cultures ( Anzaldúa, 1987 and Saldı́var-Hull, 1991). This fluctuation can be seen in the common Chicana feminist practice of speaking in multiple tongues. Segura and Pesquera (1999) offer examples of the diversity that comprises Chicanisma. Introducing us to three women they interviewed, Segura and Pesquera (1999) highlight the overlap and the differences in these women’s lives and beliefs. Arguing for the importance of what she calls *sitios y lenguas* (sites and discourses), Pérez (1998) calls for cultural specificity and multiplicity as survival strategies that mark Chicanas as Chicanas while still noting the problematics of essentialism. **By shifting languages, from English to Spanish to Spanglish and dialects of Indian, and tones, from prose to poetry to academic discourse, the different selves that comprise Chicanas surface and speak. These voices and stories come forth as acts of political resistance that further the larger process of decolonization** (Chabram-Dernersesian, 1993). **The inclusion of multiple voices in the conversation serves to disrupt essentialist ideas of Chicana**. Garcia (1990) notes that the label Chicana feminist incorporates a number of different beliefs. **As Chicana feminism grew out of the constraints of a monolithic cultural identity defined by the Chicano nationalist movement and an overly Anglo representation of women by the women’s movement, the need to recognize diversity and differences among Chicana feminists has remained** (Fregoso & Chabram, 1990). **The Chicana feminist scholar can become one voice among many. Her position and her analysis may ring true for some Chicana feminists, but each study is one possible study and one possible interpretation.** For instance, in the anthology *Chicana Creativity and Criticism*, Rebolledo, 1988 and Yarbro-Bejarano, 1988 argue with Alarcón (1988) over the extent to which Chicana feminism should draw on nonChicana/o theory. Their debate, and other similar ones, become a part of the growth of Chicana feminism.

#### Pursuit of hegemony is a fantasy of control that relies upon construction of threatening Otherness- this prompts resistance and create a permanent state of conflict

Chernus, 6

(Ira, Professor of Religious Studies and Co-director of the Peace and Conflict Studies Program – University of Colorado-Boulder, Monsters to Destroy: The Neoconservative War on Terror and Sin, p. 53-54)

The end of the cold war spawned **a tempting fantasy of imperial omnipotence on a global scale**. The neocons want to turn that fantasy into reality. But reality will not conform to the fantasy; it won’t stand still or keep any semblance of permanent order. So the neocons’ efforts **inevitably backfire**. Political scientist Benjamin Barber explains that **a nation with unprecedented power has** “**unprecedented vulnerability**: for it must repeatedly extend the compass of its power to preserve what it already has, and so is almost by definition always overextended.” Gary Dorrien sees insecurity coming at the neoconservatives in another way, too: “For the empire, **every conflict** is a local concern that **threatens** its **control**. **However secure** it maybe, **it never feels secure enough**. The (neocon) unipolarists had an advanced case of this anxiety. . . . Just **below the surface** of the customary claim to toughness **lurked persistent anxiety**. This anxiety was inherent in the problem of empire and, in the case of the neocons, heightened by ideological ardor.”39 **If the U.S. must control every event everywhere**, as neocons assume, **every act of resistance looks like a threat to the very existence of the nation**. There is no good way to distinguish between nations or forces that genuinely oppose U.S. interests and those that don’t. Indeed, change of any kind, in any nation, becomes a potential threat. **Everyone begins to look like a threatening monster that might have to be destroyed**. It’s no surprise that a nation imagined as an implacable enemy often turns into a real enemy. **When the U.S. intervenes** to prevent change, **it** **is likely to provoke resistance**. Faced with an aggressive U.S. stance, any nation might get tough in return. Of course, the U.S. can say that it is selflessly trying to serve the world. But why would other nations believe that? **It is more likely that others will resist, making hegemony harder to achieve**. **To** the **neocons**, though, **resistance only proves** that **the enemy** really **is a threat that must be destroyed**. **So the likelihood of conflict grows, making everyone less secure**. Moreover, the neocons want to do it all in the public spotlight. In the past, any nation that set out to conquer others usually kept its plans largely secret. Indeed, the cold war neocons regularly blasted the Soviets for harboring a “secret plan” for world conquest. Now here they are calling on the U.S. to blare out its own domineering intentions for all the world to (end page 53) hear. That hardly seems well calculated to achieve the goal of hegemony. But it is calculated to foster the assertive, even swaggering, mood on the home front that the neocons long for. Journalist Ron Suskind has noted that neocons always offer “a statement of enveloping peril and no hypothesis for any real solution.” They have no hope of finding a real solution because they have no reason to look for one. Their story allows for success only as a fantasy. In reality, they expect to find nothing but an endless battle against an enemy that can never be defeated. At least two prominent neocons have said it quite bluntly. Kenneth Adelman: “We should not try to convince people that things are getting better.” Michael Ledeen: “The struggle against evil is going to go on forever.”40 This vision of endless conflict is not a conclusion drawn from observing reality. It is both the premise and the goal of the neocons’ fantasy. Ultimately, it seems, endless resistance is what they really want. Their call for **a unipolar world ensures a permanent state of conflict, so that the U.S. can go on forever proving its military supremacy and promoting** the “manly virtues” of **militarism**. They have to admit that the U.S., with its vastly incomparable power, already has unprecedented security against any foreign army. So they must sound the alarm about a shadowy new kind of enemy, one that can attack in novel, unexpected ways. They must make distant changes appear as huge imminent threats to America, make the implausible seem plausible, and thus find new monsters to destroy. The neocons’ story does not allow for a final triumph of order because it is not really about creating a politically calm, orderly world. It is about creating a society full of virtuous people who are willing and able to fight off the threatening forces of social chaos. Having superior power is less important than proving superior power. That always requires an enemy. Just as neocons need monsters abroad, they need a frightened society at home. Only insecurity can justify their shrill call for a stronger nation (and a higher military budget). The more dire their warnings of insecurity, the more they can demand greater military strength and moral resolve. Every foreign enemy is, above all, another occasion to prod the American people to overcome their anxiety, identify evil, fight resolutely against it, and stand strong in defense of their highest values. Hegemony will do no good unless there is challenge to be met, weakness to be conquered, evil to be overcome. The American people must actively seek hegemony and make sacrifices for it, to show that they are striving to overcome their own weakness. So the quest for strength still demands a public confession of weakness, just as the neocons had demanded two decades earlier when they warned of a Soviet nuclear attack through a “window of vulnerability.” The quest for strength through the structures of national security still demands a public declaration of national insecurity. Otherwise, there is nothing to overcome. The more frightened the public, the more likely it is to believe and enact the neocon story.

#### The reification of hegemony and dedication to international systems perpetuates colonialism and genocide

Levene, 2K

2000 (Mark, 11.2.2000, U Warwick, Why is the Twentieth Century the Century of Genocide?)

But why should this be? The answer, on one level, is closely enmeshed with what Marxist or neo-Marxist analysis would call "the dynamics of uneven historical development." 11 Thus, **the international** (End Page 308) **system was not created all of a piece but was primed and taken forward by a small coterie of western polities. Their** economic and political **ascendancy determined the system's ground rules and ensured that its expansion and development would be carried forward and regulated primarily in their own hegemonic interests.** As a result, not only have "international relations been co-eval with the origins of the nation-state" but this process from its eighteenth-century origins was peculiarly dependent upon the fortunes of its leading players, most notably Britain, France, and the United States. 12 **We do not ourselves have to be westernocentric to acknowledge this problematic reality or the essential thrust of Immanuel Wallerstein's developmental thesis in terms of a dominant western core surrounded by semi-peripheral and peripheral zones.** 13 Yet Wallerstein himself would be the first to acknowledge that **this development was not naturally preordained, nor did it have to lead to the permanent ascendancy of specific states. Rather, it was the outcome of a long series of inter-European power struggles fought increasingly in a global arena**, in which some proto-modern states, such as Spain, fell by the wayside while others, notably Prussia and Russia, came into frame as serious contenders for primacy. If all this had and continues to have something of a social Darwinian quality about it, nevertheless, "**the intersection of capitalism, industrialism and the nation-state," which were the primary ingredients enabling western state supremacy in the first place, remain the enduring features of the system as globalized, while also ensuring the continuing hegemony of a somewhat broader but still relatively small group of states** (with a number of key western institutions and corporations also now involved), even though the relative position of these may be quite different from that of the late eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. 14 This relationship between genocide and an emerging international system demands further scrutiny. Was it, for instance, the avant-garde states who committed genocide in their drive for hegemony, or latter-day contenders? And whichever it was, where do we locate our first modern example? Aspects of the Iberian thrust to the Canaries, the Caribbean, and then the New World mainland are horribly suggestive, as are, in the Spanish and Portuguese domestic frames, the disgorging or forcible integration of Jews and Moriscos. Similar early modern trends are perhaps to be found in the destruction of Albigensians and (End Page 309) Anabaptists en route to the consolidation of French and German state-religious unities and later still in the English or Anglo-Scottish campaigns to "clear" Catholic Irish and Gaelic Highlanders from their frontier hinterlands. **The process could be said to have been carried forward in a still wider global frame with the** British **onslaught on the native peoples of Australasia, the American expulsions, subjugations, and massacres of their remaining unsubdued Indian nations, closely replicated in Latin American countries, notably Argentina**, not to say in the Russian anti-Circassian drive to consolidate the Caucasus firmly within the Czarist empire. Yet while the scale of these killings, particularly in the case of the sixteenth-century Americas, not only equals but arguably surpasses instances of twentieth-century mass murder, **the specificity of "genocide" cannot be confirmed or denied from this litany.** If the co-relationship to the emerging system is the critical issue, a possibly more authentic first contender might be the 1793-94 revolutionary Jacobin onslaught on the Vendée region. Here we can observe a premeditated, systematic, if albeit geographically limited attempt at people-destruction closely linked to rapid nation-state building within the context of a much broader crisis of interstate relations. But if the Vendee is an important signpost for a type of mass murder which has become particularly prevalent and persistent in the twentieth century, its inclusion as a case study has to contend with objections that Frenchmen killing other Frenchmen cannot be "genocide." 15 **Interestingly, this contrasts with a contention from an entirely different quarter which protests at any attempt to pick and choose between which mass killings are genocides and which are not.** 16 Even were we to put aside this perfectly understandable, ethically grounded restraint, the bewildering diversity of the situations that perpetrator and victim groups outlined so far confronts this writer, no less than others, with the obstinate question: what exactly is it that we are discussing?

#### Hegemony is expressed through the slaughter of Native Americans in order to achieve cultural growth and technological advancement

Gray ’99

(Dale M. Space Policy Volume 15, Issue 3, Historical Consultant, “Space as a frontier – the role of human motivation, MDA)

**The motivation of nations to expand their spheres of influence has historically been expressed in terms of imperialism, colonialism, hegemony and outright military conquest.** In America in the 19th century it was most often expressed in terms of Manifest Destiny – **the belief that the United States of America should extend across the continent from the Atlantic to Pacific.** The movement was personified by folk heroes such a Daniel Boone, Kit Carson and Davy Crockett. However, on a larger **scale it was expressed in a generationally driven agrarian and mining expansion from east to west until the Civil War and then a rebound back to the east into the interior from the Pacific**in the post-War eras. In the 19th century and first half of the 20th century, the idea of a steady-state society was anathema to national prestige. **Nations competed in a global land-rush with little regard for the indigenous societies.The American frontiersmen perceived the land to be empty and brushed away the native populations who could not compete with the technology, organizational structures and aggressive ideologies of the Euro-American society. Indeed, national ambition expressed in the expansion of physical borders continues to produce war and the threat of war.**