# K – Eurocentrism

## Notes

Eurocentrism is a worldview in which Western/European thought and agency is prioritized as central in the world while others are made peripheral resulting in the oppression of the global South and the formation of in groups and out groups. This justifies intervention and environmental destruction via the focus on capital and the conception of nature and the global South as resources. The alternative in the 1NC is to delink from Western structures as an all or nothing strategy of refusal to Eurocentric knowledge production to rethink education. The argument is that in delinking from western modernity there is potential for other understandings of education within the world as possibility for the future. In terms of the link debate, argue policy actions within a Eurocentric system will have cognitive and cultural biases ensuring other ways of perceiving the world are ignored resulting in knowledge being structured by western institutions.

# Neg

## Shells

### 1NC – General Policy

#### The education system is structured around modernity and nationalist ideology driving a violent and unsustainable Eurocentric paradigm that reinforces subjugation of indigenous populations

**Baker ’12** (Michael.; doctoral candidate at the Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester, USA. His dissertation situates the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century formations of modern western schooling among the German-speaking territories within the processes of confessionalization and the emergence of the modern/colonial world system. He plans to teach the historical sociology of modern/colonial education, and develop a multi-civilizational curriculum. Michael is a former high school and community college teacher in Seattle, USA, where he studied social theory of modernity at the University of Washington. He previously co-authored ‘Changing Spaces: urban school interrelationships and the impact of standards-based reform’ in Educational Administration Quarterly (2006). Correspondence: ruhlinbaker@frontier.com, “Modernity/Coloniality and Eurocentric Education: towards a post-Occidental self-understanding of the present”)

This recent analysis and critique of modernity from the perspective of the modern/colonial world system provides a critical, comprehensive, and relational (world-historical or planetary) interpretation of western modernity, with significant implications for rethinking the civilizational enclosures of modern western education. Modernity/coloniality is interpreted as a planetary phenomenon, understood here as a worldwide system, within which the plurality of non-western ways of knowing and being in the world are subordinately interlinked. The diverse pluralities of interlinked and interacting civilizational processes and conditions in the world today all coexist within a dynamic historical system characterized by modernity/coloniality (Dussel, 1998). Occidental modernity is interpreted here, in part, as a normative system of domination, oppression, and exploitation, rooted in the earliest stages of European colonial expansion and western civilizational identity formation. As the civilizational missions and designs have unfolded from salvation, to civilizing, to modernizing, and most recently, to marketizing, western educational institutions and their modern system of knowledge are maintained within this predatory model of civilization based upon a normative projection of humanity (Mignolo, 2006). Modern western education systems have been hugely successful at reproducing this Eurocentric macro-narrative of modernity (thoroughly naturalized) in part through Eurocentric curricula and nation-state centered thinking. Nation-state and disciplinary-centered approaches to teaching and learning overlook the systemic-historical structures (foundational preconditions) preceding and underlying the emergence of the modern state, disciplinary knowledges, and mass education systems, as well as the power/knowledge relations inherent in the project of Eurocentric modernity (Stasiulius & Yuval-Davis, 1995; Greene, 2007). Self-serving institutionalized academic disciplinary boundaries, unexamined nationalist ideologies, and insufficient interrelational research across the social sciences and humanities have all contributed to a lack of critical awareness of the presence and limits of this modern civilizational narrative in the historical consciousness of western modernity (Taylor, 1999; Agnew, 2003). The modern/colonial world system perspective articulates one of the most consequential critiques of Occidental modernity aimed at rethinking the modern social imaginary within which the self-understanding of modern education emerged and remains today. From this perspective the modern period and project have been misunderstood within a Eurocentric intellectual cultural/civilizational complex characterized by a totalizing epistemological framework, i.e. western metaphysics (Mignolo, 2000a, p. 328; Cabrera, 2004). The western and non-western critiques of dogmatic Eurocentrism at the heart of the modern worldview and corresponding educational project take aim at the ontological and epistemological framework and corresponding historical imaginary through which this project and the self-understanding of modernity were constructed (Taylor, 1995, 2001; Wallerstein, 1997; Bhambra, 2009). Modern western educated thought understands itself and the world through its own conceptual/epistemological framework, presumed to provide universal (valid and true) knowledge (Cabrera, 2008). Modern rational consciousness, self-understood as the most advanced or developed form of humanity, is now seen, in part, as an inherently violent and ecologically unsustainable Eurocentric projection (O’Sullivan, 1999). From this recognition comes the redesign of teaching and learning around the pluriversity of knowledges and corresponding ways of being in the world. Within the logic framed here as ‘epistemological pluralism’, the need for the pluralisation of knowledge is based on the understanding that the current system is inherently violent in its (mono)epistemic practices and unsustainable both in terms of exploitation of natural resources and human labour and in terms of how relationships are constructed. From this perspective, the local and the global problems societies currently face are complex, interdependent and reflect the effects and failure of the Enlightenment ideals which have been violently imposed and universalized through colonialism and market globalization, rendering other ways of knowing invisible, a process Santos calls ‘epistemicide’ (2007a:16). (Andreotti, 2010, pp. 8-9) A pluriversal vision of education is conceived initially as a process of epistemic delinking from Eurocentrism. Delinking from the modern formation of rationality and subjectivity involves the re- cognition, inclusion, and re-inscription of the principles and forms of knowledge and subjectivity that have been repressed or subalternized by modern reason in the ongoing redemptive- civilizational missions. The modern/colonial world system perspective recognizes and privileges the planetary diversity of intercivilizational processes and conditions that have been occluded within the conceptual/epistemological constructions of the modern/colonial world system. As a decolonial interpretation of modern civilization, the modern/colonial world system perspective initiates an alternative to the logic of coloniality within the modern worldview and project. According to Mignolo, the hegemony of ‘civilization’ and the subalternity of cultures would become ‘the multiple diversity of local histories’, but no longer subaltern to global designs. The perspective of the subaltern (‘border thinking’) in dialogue with a post-hegemonic, decentered Eurocentric perspective is one way to get beyond the limits of Eurocentric modernity. ‘To truly subvert the coherence of this system and its characteristic tactics of power one must not simply repudiate the modern disciplinary regime but develop a rearticulated relation to the Other’ (Alcoff, 2000, p. 255). This re-imagined modernity makes the structures of knowledge and the educational practices through which the modern Eurocentric world was constructed problematic in their complicity within an ongoing system of exploitation and domination (Willinsky, 1998). Problematizing the ways the modern Eurocentric world was conceptualized and divided through the structures of knowledge and institutions of education includes the entire range of western political philosophy, from left to right. From this perspective, modern western institutions, such as the structures of knowledge, social and political theory, the nation-state, and western education, are modern/colonial institutions and traditions of thought. From this decolonial perspective, the purposes of education would begin to include unlearning the cultural biases of the dominant Eurocentric cosmology, particularly the western system of knowledge, and opening the western imagination to the multiple ways of perceiving and conceiving the world that have been occluded within the Eurocentric imaginary (Pieterse & Parekh, 1995). The knowledge, critical insights, and political strategies produced from the subaltern side of the colonial different serve as point of departure to move beyond colonialist and nationalist discourses. Rather than underestimating the subaltern, we should take seriously their cosmologies, thinking processes, and political strategies as a point of departure to our knowledge production. (Grosfoguel, 2002, p. 209) Interpreting modern education from a planetary decolonial horizon is oriented by the ultimate goal of delinking educational practices from their containment within the western civilizational complex in order to include knowledge, understanding, and experience of the world subalternized within the cultural-epistemic hegemony of Eurocentric modernity. In the present era of increasing global interconnectedness and intercivilizational contacts and conflicts, western education can no longer be delimited within a naturalized or taken-for-granted Eurocentric cosmology (Des Jarlais, 2008). In the twenty-first century, the purposes of formal education should include the capacities for critical self-reflection on one’s own civilizational consciousness and inter- and intra-civilizational dialogue. ‘Dialogue can only take place once “modernity” is decolonized and dispossessed of its mythical march toward the future. Dialogue can only take place when the monologue of one civilization (Western) is no longer enforced’ (Mignolo, 2005, p. xix). As an alternative interpretation of western modernity, the modern/colonial world system offers a way toward denaturalizing the cultural narratives of western knowledge and modern education and points towards the reorganization of teaching and learning within an ‘ecology of knowledges’ (Santos, 2006, 2007a, b, 2009; Santos et al, 2007). Proposed by Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos, ‘ecology of knowledges’ brings together multiple different civilizational and cultural knowledge systems for students to learn, compare, and move back and forth in considering the cultural knowledge systems that best contribute to addressing particular problems or issues. Combining scientific and indigenous knowledges of nature for example might best address the concerns with preserving biodiversity. A concern with addressing forms of discrimination might include ways of knowing from the various social movements across cultures and historical contexts. The pedagogy of Gregory Cajete, in the southwestern United States, in designing and teaching indigenous knowledge systems is another example of decentering the Eurocentric curriculum (Cajete, 1994, 1999).

#### Their form of modernist politics privileges European culture at the center of world history subjecting the peripheral peoples to violence and genocides rendered inevitable and necessary - Only white bodies enter into utilitarian calculations as those outside of modernity become irrelevant or even non-human.

Mignolo 2000 (Walter, William H., Wannamaker Professor of Literature and Romance Studies at Duke University Local Histories/Global Designs, 0691001405 115-117)

Enrique Dussel, an Argentinian philosopher associated with the philosophy of liberation, has been articulating a strong countermodern argument. I quote from the beginning of his Frankfurt lectures: **Modernity is,** for many (for Jurgen Habermas or Charles Taylor, for example), **an essentially or exclusively European phenomenon**. In these lectures, I will argue that modernity is, in fact, a European phenomenon, but one constituted in dialectical relation with a non-European alterity that is its ultimate content. Modernity appears when Europe affirms itself as the "center" of a World history that it inaugurates; the "periphery" that surrounds this center is consequently part of its self-definition. The occlusion of this periphery (and of the role of Spain and Portugal in the formation of the modern world system from the late fifteenth to the mid-seventeenth centuries) leads the major contemporary thinkers of the "center" into a Eurocentric fallacy in their understanding of modernity**.** If their understanding of the genealogy of modernity is thus partial and provincial, their attempts at a critique or defense of it are likewise unilateral and, in part, false. (Dussel [19931 1995, 65) The construction of the idea of modernity linked to European expansion, as forged by European intellectuals, was powerful enough to last almost five hundred years. Postcolonial discourses and theories began effectively to question that hegemony, a challenge that was unthinkable (and perhaps unexpected) by those who constructed and presupposed the idea of modernity as a historical period and implicitly as *the* locus of enunciation—a locus of enunciation that in the name of rationality, science, and philosophy asserted its own privilege over other forms of rationality or over what, from the perspective of modern reason, was nonrational. I would submit, conse quently, that postcolonial literature and postcolonial theories are constructing a new concept of reason as differential loci of enunciation. What does "differential" mean? Differential here first means a displacement of the concept and practice of the notions of knowledge, science, theory, and understanding articulated during the modern period.® Thus, Dussel's region alization of modernity could be compared with Homi Bhabha's, both speak ing *from* different colonial legacies (Spanish and English respectively): "Driven by the subaltern history of the margins of modernity—rather than by the failures of logocentrism—I have tried, in some small measure, In *revise the known, to rename the postmodern from the position of the postcolo nial"* (Bhabha 1994, 175; emphasis added). I find a noteworthy coincidence between Dussel and Bhabha, albeit with some significant differences in accent. The coincidence lies in the very iui portant fact that the task of postcolonial reasoning (i.e., theorizing) is not only linked to the immediate political needs of decolonization (in Asia, Al rica, and the Caribbean) but also to the rereading of the paradigm of modi i n reason. This task is performed by Dussel and Bhabha in different, although complementary ways. After a detailed analysis of Kant's and Hegel's construction of the idea of I nlightenment in European history, Dussel summarizes the elements that i onstitute the myth of modernity: (1) Modern (European) civilization understands itself as the most developed, the superior, civilization**; (2)** This sense of superiority obliges it, in the form of a categorical imperative, as it were, to "develop" (civilize**, uplift, educate)** the more primitive, barbarous, underdeveloped civilizations**;** (3) The path of such development should be that followed by Europe in its own development out of antiquity and the Middle Ages; (4) Where the barbarians or the primitive opposes the civilizing process, the praxis of modernity must, in the last instance, have recourse to the violence necessary to remove the obstacles to modernization; (5) This violence, which produces in many different ways, victims, takes on an almost ritualistic character: the civilizing hero invests his victims (the colonized, the slave, the woman, the ecological destruction of the earth, etc.) with the character of being participants in a process of redemptive sacrifice; (6) from the point of view of modernity, the barbarian or primitive is in a state of guilt (for, among other things, opposing the civilizing process). This allows modernity to present itself not only as innocent but also as a force that will emancipate or redeem its victims from their guilt; (7) Given this "civilizing" and redemptive character of modernity, the suffering and sacrifices (the costs) of modernization imposed on "immature" peoples, slaves, races, the "weaker" sex, el cetera, are inevitable and necessary. (Dussel 119931 1995, 75) the myth of modernity is laid out by Dussel to confront alternative interpietations. While Horkheimer and Adorno, as well as postmodernist think• is such as Lyotard, Rorty, or Vattimo, all propose a critique of reason (a v iolent, coercive, and genocidal reason), Dussel proposes a critique of the enlightenment's irrational moments as sacrificial myth not by negating reason but by asserting the reason of the other—thai is, by identifying postcolonial reason as differential locus of enunciation. The intersection between tbi idea of a self-centered modernity grounded in its own appropriation of greco-Roman (classical) legacies and an emerging idea of modernity from the margins (or countermodernity) makes clear that history does not begin in Greece, and that different historical beginnings are, at the same time, anchored to diverse loci of enunciation. This simple axiom is, 1 submit, a bind.internal one for and of postsubaltern reason. Finally, Bhabha's project in lename the postmodern from the position of the postcolonial also finds lis niche in postsubaltern reason as a differential locus of enunciation.

#### The alternative is to reject the aff in favor of a rewriting the past and imagination of the future away from Eurocentric domination through the rethinking of and reflection upon education

**Silova et al 17**(Iveta Silova is Professor and Director of the Center for the Advanced Studies in Global Education at Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at ASU, “Interrupting the Coloniality of Knowledge Production in Comparative Education: Postsocialist and Postcolonial Dialogues after the Cold War”, Coloniality of Knowledge after the Cold War, <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/690458>, pg. 80 – 86)

In What Was Socialism and What Comes Next? Verdery (1996) convincingly argues that the Cold War was “a form of knowledge and a cognitive organization of the world” (330). It shaped mutual perceptions and research practices in far-reaching ways, laying down “coordinates of a conceptual geography grounded in East vs. West and having implications for the further divide between North and South” (330). Stemming from the foundations of Western modernity/coloniality, these coordinates were primarily based on dichotomies—such as capitalism/socialism, religious/atheistic, imperialist/ liberationist, or good/evil—spatially partitioning the world according to the three-worlds ideology and thus further reinscribing imperial and colonial difference globally. While the Cold War is over and the “three worlds” no longer exist, the logic of partitioning the world along this epistemological axis perpetuated into the post–Cold War era, reflecting the enduring legacy of Western modernity/coloniality. This axis is also prevalent in the current knowledge hierarchizing scholarship and body politics of comparative education, materializing in practices that privilege Western epistemologies and humanist research ethical codes (Tikly and Bond 2013), reproduce the hegemonic discourses of “development” and “benchmarking” that reinforce the unequal standing of marginalized populations, contribute to the intellectual dependency of non-Western scholars, and put comparative education research at the service of development agencies.5 Such practices often exclude nonwhite, non-Western (female) academics from academic societies and editorial boards of field-specific journals (Hickling-Hudson 2007b) and disregard alternative epistemologies, while applying distinctively Western-developed theoretical traditions and categories as interpretative frames for empirical cases far removed from the locations where these vantage points were first developed (Takayama 2016). During the 1990s, this epistemological axis became instrumental in constructing a historical rupture between socialist past and capitalist present, using the narrative of “crisis” as a central rhetorical device. For example, research studies and policy reports pointed to the rapidly declining funding for education, the HIV/AIDS epidemic among youth, the declining status of the teaching profession, the erosion of values, and the growing socioeconomic stratification of societies through education.6 Often, the narrative of “crisis” invoked binary conceptual frameworks to understand postsocialist change, whereby Western neoliberal education reform “packages” would be positioned as ideals for emulation (Silova and Steiner-Khamsi 2008; Silova 2010; Takala and Piattoeva 2012). Reflecting on education policy documents in postSoviet Ukraine, for example, Fimyar (2010) explains how policies made use of “traditional binary oppositions such as authoritarian/humanistic, state/civil society, industrial/information-technological [knowledge] society, national nihilism/self-identification, monopoly/decentralization, and totalitarian/democratization” to emphasize the differences between the socialist and neoliberal systems of rule (82). In this context, the socialist pedagogy was constructed as authoritarian and serving a totalitarian state, concluding that it needed to be eradicatedin order to become trulymodern (and ultimately trulyWestern). Such starkly dichotomous representations of postsocialist education transformations have not been limited to particular countries but have rather been attributed to the whole postsocialist region. For example, Perry’s (2003) analysis of 220 policy documents and research studies in 13 countries reveals that most documents portray postsocialist education systems at the negative end of binaries.7 She explains that policy documents present the West as “tolerant, efficient, active, developed, organized, and democratic, and the East as intolerant, corrupt, passive, underdeveloped, chaotic, and undemocratic” (Perry 2009, 177). As such, these binary constructions reorient the postsocialist education space within the post–Cold War East/West conceptual map, contributing to the perception of the region’s marginality vis-à-vis Europe and the West: “The logic of progression embedded in such ‘maps’ builds upon oppositions between communist and neoliberal systems of rule. Conceptual binaries, which present two poles in the map of transition, give the actors a sense of direction and infuse a readily digested meaning into the process of educational reformation” (82). By referencing the past and the future of education at the same time, policy documents and research studies have thus established a singular path for postsocialist transformations. In this context, the West has been uncritically presented as the embodiment of progress, providing “the normative affirmation of the Western modernity project” (Blokker 2005, 504), while constraining possibilities for imagining other pasts and futures. In essence, we see the coloniality of knowledge production at play here: singular Western models, and abstract global universals more recently, are used as the yardsticks for understanding postsocialist transformations, often drawing on racialized hierarchies and epistemologies and subjugating alternative articulations of postsocialist pasts, presents, or futures. Coloniality of knowledge production has inadvertently shaped academic identities, simultaneously socializing the non-Western or not-so-Western scholars into the Western norms of thinking and marginalizing them in the knowledge production processes. The process of Western academic socialization primarily occurred through scholarship programs established by Western European and North American governments and foundations to “promote mutual understanding, build democracy, and foster the transition to market economies in Eurasia through intensive academic study and professional training” (IREX 2016). Since the early 1990s, such programs brought thousands of students from the former socialist countries to pursue degree programs in the United States with the expectation that the returning graduates would “share their first hand understanding of American culture and democratic values in their workplaces and communities and take leadership roles in the non-profit, private, and government sectors” (IREX 2016). Those students who were unable to go to the United States or Western Europe had an opportunity to pursue Western-type education closer to home. In 1992, for example, Central European University (CEU) was established to encounter the “research tradition of the great American universities” (CEU 2015). CEU was conceptualized as “an international university that would help facilitate the transition from dictatorship to democracy in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union” (CEU 2015). As in the US fellowship programs, CEU graduates were expected to return to their home countries, bringing with them a “new” imagination of democracy, democratic institutions, and the free market economy. As these Western-trained academics and practitioners returned to their home countries, they often found themselves unable to compete with Western “experts” who occupied dominant positions in the knowledge production field. As Tlostanova (2015) notes, the Global North simply refused “to accept the post-Soviet scholar in the capacity of a rational subject” (38). This epistemic asymmetry became clearly visible in the reports written by various international organizations on the status of education in different postsocialist countries. Whether commenting on education reforms in Latvia, Albania, Kosovo, or Tajikistan, Western “experts” consistently concluded that local policy makers and educators were incapable of independently conducting research, articulating policies, or implementing education reforms. Commenting on Kosovo, for example, an OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) report concluded that “there is a lack of professional capacity in, and strategic vision of, curriculum reform” (OECD 2003, 337). In Albania, “there is a lack of knowledge and skills to aid the reform in the governance of education” (52) and “a lack a meaningful educational research and policy development capacity important for improving the quality of teacher education” (67). In Latvia, “the OECD team is concerned that the MoES [Ministry of Education and Science] is seriously challenged in its capacity to accomplish its current legal mandate” (OECD 2001, 168–69). Rather than pointing to the challenges of postsocialist transformations, these reports incapacitate local efforts to engage in education reform and explicitly position postsocialist policy makers and educators as passive, ignorant, and incapable of meaningful thought and action. These narratives inadvertently reinforce the power of Western “experts,” enabling them to speak for those who supposedly lack the expert knowledge to independently determine their own futures (Silova 2010, 2014; Piattoeva 2015). Even when local expertise is called on, East European scholars are normally expected to provide empirical data and cases, while theorization, abstract thinking, or conceptual work is reserved for Western scholars (Salecl 2002; also Tlostanova et al. 2016). Mignolo (2015) refers to this relationship as “epistemic racism”: It is built on classifications and hierarchies carried out by actors and installed in institutions they have themselves created or inherited the right to classify and rank. That is, actors and institutions that legitimize the zero-point of epistemology as the word of God (Christian theology) or the word of Reason (secular philosophy and science). He who does the classifying classifies himself among the classified (the enunciated), but he is the only one who classifies among all those being classified. Those who are classified as less human do not have much say in the classification (except for dissent), while those who classify always place themselves at the top of the classification. (xv) It is not surprising then that such an epistemic relationship has triggered scholars to provocatively ask, “Can the post-Soviet think?” (Tlostanova 2015), joining the chorus of other postcolonial scholars defying the established epistemic asymmetry: “Can Asians think?” (Mahbubani 2001), or “Can nonEuropeans think?” (Dabashi 2015). While the unanimous answer is, “Yes, [they] can,” as convincingly argued by Walter Mignolo in a foreword to Dabashi’s (2015) book, the intellectual critique points out that delinking from a singular logic, process, and path established by modernity/coloniality offers the potential to simultaneously open up for various alternative histories and visions of education in postsocialist spaces. Our goal is to delink from this logic of coloniality by using three strategies. First, we engage in rethinking and rewriting the socialist past(s) through new and multiple frames to reveal potential possibilities for imagining multiple futures. Second, we move to outline some relations of assumedly “different worlds” to question the very logic of modernity/coloniality. Third, we attempt to reflect on and reclaim our own positions as epistemic subjects who are capable of looking at the world from our own origins and lived experiences. While such an approach would normally be considered “beyond the scope of analysis” in many research studies (Blokker 2005, 511), we believe that it is critical in the process of delinking from a singular logic and path established by modernity/coloniality, thus having the potential to simultaneously open up the possibility for multiple histories and alternative visions of education in postsocialist spaces.

## Alternatives

### 1NC - Alienation

#### The alternative is to repoliticize action from the incomprehensible character of colonial rule to the alienating actions to those who are objects of power

**Sabaratnam ’13** (Meera.; Lecturer in International Relations at SOAS, University of London. She has previously taught at the University of Cambridge and at the LSE, from which she received her PhD and MSc degrees in IR, “Avatars of Eurocentrism in the critique of the liberal peace,” http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0967010613485870)

As recognized earlier, of course, not all writers in the debate ignore the exteriority of interventions. Richmond (2010) has advocated the use of ethnographic methods, combined with principles of empathy and care, as a means of engaging with ‘everyday’ relations and practices outside the vista of international interventions. These methods provide a clear counterweight to the habituated closures of some research, and opens up the possibility of engaging with the ‘critical agency’ or ‘resistance’ of those targeted by intervention. Yet, as earlier elaborated, it has a tendency to prioritize cultural difference, understood through traditions and customs, as the principal site of this politics. As Balibar (1991) has argued, however, we must be wary of accounts and explanations that work on ontologies of ‘cultural difference’, which can functionally replicate ontologies of civilization and race. Many anti-colonial thinkers were also suspicious of using ‘culture’ as a basis for political claim-making, recognizing that more often than not it had become an instrument of political imprisonment and alienation (Fanon, [1967] 2008), or a means of depoliticizing colonial dominance (Said, 1994). Indeed, within anthropology itself there have been strident critiques of the use of ‘culture’ as a framework that persistently reinscribes the ‘West’/‘non-West’, ‘self’/‘Other’ distinction (Abu-Lughod, 1991). The notion of ‘colonial difference’ forwarded by Mignolo and Quijano, emergent from these considerations, can be understood in this respect to repoliticize the distinctions and hierarchies made in assertions of ‘cultural difference’ as the constitutive ontology of the international (see also Neumann, 1996). It does this through conceptualizing the condition of ‘coloniality’ as a complex hierarchy of epistemic, political and material dynamics that have continuously fed into the sustenance of racialized imperial power over the last five centuries (Quijano, 2000). This intellectual move can be understood as the equivalent of moving from understanding gender as a function of biology to understanding it as a function of social powers that are not only constructed but maintain a complex, shifting hierarchy of masculinity over femininity. The alternative to the culturalist framework is to repoliticize the field of action in which different peoples operate. One key strategy in anti-colonial thought was not to focus on the ‘alien’ (i.e. incomprehensible, inauthentic) character of colonial rule, but on its ‘alienating’ character – that is, its displacements, violence, silencing, humiliations and dispossessions, which accrued to people as individuals and as a group. These included the epistemic violence done to symbols, social orders and knowledge. The point is that this becomes a positional, and thus political, story rather than a ‘culturalist’ one about ‘difference’. As a strategy, a positional critique requires a careful engagement with the experiences and critical political consciousness of those who are rendered as ‘objects’ of power, but who were never only silent and/or ‘co-opted’ through their involvement with particular structures. In research, in large part this means engaging with the ways in which different people politicize various aspects of their experiences, narrate the terms of their situations and critically interpret the world around them (Abu-Lughod, 1991). Moreover, while it requires a reflexivity about the limits of one’s own gaze (see Mac Ginty, 2011: 4), it also requires a commitment to the possibility of substantive engagement with the particular politics of the situation (Ortner, 1995). This shift in emphasis I have sketched from ‘alienness’ to ‘alienation’, broadly understood, is an important one in the decolonizing project because it refuses to organize the world into boxes primarily defined by ‘culture’, which tends to limit rather than deepen understanding. Rather, by emphasizing the political content and context of human consciousness, meaning and agency, it repositions the analytic gaze towards a fuller appreciation of the politics of the international. Indeed, there is an important radicality to the refusal of this ordering. This does not mean that ‘culture’ is epiphenomenal to consciousness, meaning and agency (Ortner, 1995: 181–182), but that ‘cultures’ are not the most important subdivisions in international politics, and that ‘individuals’ themselves may never belong to them stably (Walley, 1997).

### 1NC – Decolonizing

#### Decolonizing Political Economy Alt

**Sabaratnam ’13** (Meera.; Meera Sabaratnam is Lecturer in International Relations at SOAS, University of London. She has previously taught at the University of Cambridge and at the LSE, from which she received her PhD and MSc degrees in IR, “Avatars of Eurocentrism in the critique of the liberal peace,” http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0967010613485870)

Lastly, a fundamental means of repoliticizing our understanding of phenomena is to try to understand their distributive impact. Important critiques of political economy have been made in the context of the liberal peace debate, particularly by Pugh (2005) and Duffield (2007), who have drawn attention to the structural effects of neoliberalism in reducing state-provided social insurance, and the forms of elite corruption to which this contributes. Bringing considerations of political economy to the study of the liberal peace has also been an increasingly important trend in the wider scholarly community (see Pugh et al., 2008), and there is a growing discussion about questions of labour economics (Cramer, 2008), economic reconstruction policy (Mac Ginty, 2011: 115–133), trade (Willett, 2008), shadow economies (Pugh, 2004) and the place of businesspeople in reconstruction (Woodward, 2010). These insightful and detailed engagements have, however, largely operated as analyses at arm’s length from the peoples whose experiences are being studied. Even where they go beyond the broad structural level and into the details of particular economic spaces or systems, there is a tendency in the writing to skip over the interpretations given by people of their own situations, and to narrate these issues with the voice and gaze of the economist. In one particular article, Divjak and Pugh (2008) do exceptionally go beyond this through engaging aspects of Bosnian public opinion around corruption. In keeping with the strategies of recovering historical political presence and politicizing interpretations of intervention, it is also important to extend this awareness to discussions of the ‘economic’ or ‘material’ dimensions of intervention, which are co-constituted in important ways with the epistemic and political dimensions. This was strongly emphasized by anti-colonial materialists such as Cabral (1979). These political dimensions are as intrinsic to such seemingly mundane problems as differentials in aid salaries between internationals and nationals (McWha, 2011) as they are to the ‘bigger’ problems of chronic and deep public indebtedness in postconflict states. To decolonize the way we think about the political economy of liberal peace interventions, then, means two things. First, it requires an engagement with how those targeted by an intervention experience and interpret the material effects of that intervention. This means that accounts that base their analyses of intervention primarily on the structural tendencies of capitalism miss the multiple ways in which intervention itself constitutes a politics of distribution. Emerging work on the significance of aid fortresses in the political landscape, embodying the structure of aid entitlements, is thus to be welcomed (Duffield, 2010). Second, it requires an analysis that politicizes the various forms of entitlement, dispossession and accumulation that characterize the rationales for intervention and its distributive effects. This must avoid entangling itself in the language of ‘development’ – already widely recognized as a fundamentally colonial and depoliticizing approach to poverty and economic policy (Escobar, 1995; Ferguson, 1990) – and begin to challenge the historical terms on which this dysfunctional political economy is made thinkable.

### **1NC – Recovering Political Presence**

#### The alternative if to recognize and appreciate the historical presence of societies of intervention as an analysis of knowledge production to challenge Eurocentric agency

**Sabaratnam ’13** (Meera.; Meera Sabaratnam is Lecturer in International Relations at SOAS, University of London. She has previously taught at the University of Cambridge and at the LSE, from which she received her PhD and MSc degrees in IR, “Avatars of Eurocentrism in the critique of the liberal peace,” http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0967010613485870)

As noted earlier, habits of methodological and analytic exclusion of target societies have also characterized some of the critiques of the liberal peace. While there are clearly many differences between these and older colonial thinking, this iterated habit of exclusion is nonetheless a problematic one. It does seem to uphold the overall sensibility that nothing worth engaging with is going on outside the interventions themselves. Relatedly, even when this exclusion is avoided, it is often the case that there is little if any historical grounding of the people targeted by an intervention beyond the conflict that preceded the intervention (see Chandler, 2000; Duffield, 2007; Richmond and Franks, 2009). This also compounds the erroneous impression – one that is sometimes formed by students reading the critical literature as well as countless practitioners – that the very ideas of peace and democracy are somehow ‘new’ imports of the peacebuilders to benighted post-conflict environments. If critical scholars are to displace this habit of analytic negation and the errors it produces, it must be in part through an extended appreciation of the historical political presence of societies targeted by interventions, and of forms of rule, power and resistance that existed in the territories concerned. This is important both in terms of the peoples and spaces themselves, and in terms of their broader coeval connections to the constitution of global modernity. This appreciation was an important dimension of 20th-century anti-colonial thought, of which one key strand was the recovery of ongoing pre- and postcolonial ‘presence’ (see Cabral, 1979). On the one hand, this recovery of presence can substantially contribute to repositioning the analytic gaze through fleshing out a knowledge of different ideas, values, issues and solidarities that constitute the pluralities of human political life. For example, Ayers’ (2006) work on African political forms elaborates other historical modalities of authority and participation that sought to manage conflicts and inequalities between groups. This work challenges the Eurocentric sensibility that it is only Western or ‘international’ actors who have valuable political ideas and exercise meaningful political agency in the world. On the other, however, the appreciation of presence draws out the longstanding connections of mutual constitution between different societies that are so often buried by intervention discourses. This is crucial for undoing the Eurocentric presumption that ‘modernity’ itself emerged miraculously in one geographic-cultural locale and is only now in the process of spreading across the world (see Bhambra, 2010). This is important, because past encounters of colonization and empire, which are for some not in the very distant past, come to have a much more direct influence and impact on contemporary interventions (Sabaratnam, 2013). This historical appreciation must also be coupled with an understanding of contemporary political presences, including an engagement with key political concerns, oppositions, motifs, discourses and patterns of action. These are central to being able to read intervention in a multi-sited way, and in terms of understanding its complex impacts on the political life of the target society. This awareness counteracts the tendency to read intervention as something that generally floats above or is separate from other dynamics, regrounding our conception of the political in public experience.

### 1NC – Rethink Education

#### The alternative is to rethink education – only reimagining education from the perspective of indigenous knowledge resolves Eurocentric prejudice

**Battiste and Henderson ‘9** (Marie.; Mi'kmaw educator from Potlotek (pronounced Boht-loh-deck) First Nations, Nova Scotia and full professor in the Department of Educational Foundations at the University of Saskatchewan, James.; an international human rights lawyer, advocate, and educator. He was born in Oklahoma to the Bear Clan of the Chickasaw Nation and also has heritage from the Cheyenne Nation. Currently, he works in Canada as the Research Director of the Native Law Center and as a professor of Aboriginal law at the University of Saskatchewan College of Law, “Naturalizing Indigenous Knowledge in Eurocentric Education”)

All these achievements have made the education of Indigenous peoples a highly contested terrain and their knowledge one of those contested is-sues. Social justice, equity, and antiracist education have inspired the first generation of Indigenous scholars and professionals to expose successful-ly the Eurocentric prejudices against IK and contribute to the activation of a renewed interest in IK in every Eurocentric discipline and profession. From their work with their communities and Elders, they are transforming their research into transformative writings that engage IK and seek respectful processes for continued engagement (Bastien, 2004; Smith, 1997, 1999). In addition, Indigenous lawyers in Canada are forcing the courts to accept concepts of Aboriginal law and legal traditions as foundations of Aboriginal and treaty rights and contributing to constitutionalizing these rights into the supreme law of Canada. In so doing they have displaced white supremacy with constitutional supremacy. Similarly, in the arts, sciences, and education, Indigenous scholars and professionals are animating these same concepts into Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy to explore new ways of creating sustainable living. Their research and insights are unfolding the global Indigenous renaissance in education. The Indigenous renaissance has deconstructed and discredited the traditional Eurocentric view of Indigenous peoples and their heritage as exotic objects that have nothing to do with knowledge, science, or progress. However, it has not displaced the educational empire of EK, which remains resistant to the Indigenous renaissance. Now EK competes with IK and a developing intellectual nexus of trans-systemic theories of knowledge that underscore the importance of IK and its perspectives. The immediate challenge in higher education is how to balance colonial legiti-macy, authority, and disciplinary capacity with IK and pedagogies. Such rethinking of education from the perspective of IK animates the unfolding Indigenous renaissance, worldwide ecological movement, and trans-sys-temic synthesis.

## Impacts

### 2NC – Intervention

#### Eurocentric domination justifies interventions in the name of liberal peace denying agency to local communities

**Sabaratnam ’13** (Meera.; Meera Sabaratnam is Lecturer in International Relations at SOAS, University of London. She has previously taught at the University of Cambridge and at the LSE, from which she received her PhD and MSc degrees in IR, “Avatars of Eurocentrism in the critique of the liberal peace,” http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0967010613485870)

In a recent piece defending liberal peacebuilding, Roland Paris accuses its critics of failing to come up with alternatives to it, arguing that mostly they endorse variants of liberalism, or just nothing at all (Paris, 2010: 354–357; see also Begby and Burgess, 2009). Indeed, in terms of the defence he offers, this is one of the most biting counter-critiques: There Is No Alternative. Paris is partially right, but, I will argue, for the wrong reasons. The problems emerge not because there is nothing ultimately better than liberalism, but because the deeper framework of philosophical Eurocentrism denies the possibility of any real political exteriority to this broad category of ideas. Thus, for Paris it becomes relatively easy to claim that anything short of self-declared and non-consensual totalitarian colonialism enforced through naked violence is actually some form of – implicitly acceptable – ‘liberalism’, because there is an intellectual conflation of ‘Western’ activity with liberal action. This leaves critiques trapped in a ‘paradox of liberalism’, which on the one hand problematizes its biopolitics, cultural inappropriateness, neoliberal economic policies and unaccountability, but on the other responds to these problems through either some kind of middle ground or some kind of ‘proper’ liberalism of the past. This is the circle in which intervention and its critics find themselves enclosed, with interventions themselves apparently softening their edges and filling the space through emphases on ‘local ownership’, ‘participatory governance’, multidimensional approaches to poverty reduction and political ‘partnership’ with aid-recipient countries. These reforms in intervention practice accordingly overlap with critiques to such an extent that it is unclear whether critiques themselves have only become descriptive, rather than critical, of the present directions in intervention policy. Overall, Duffield is consistently more conscious and sceptical of these colonial dimensions of the present security–development nexus (Duffield, 2005), and of the longer entanglements of ‘liberal’ intervention practices with racism, imperialism and attempts to control the colonial frontier (Duffield, 2007). Others seem to recognize these continuities, yet both Mac Ginty and Richmond cite the creation of the Tribal Liaison Council in Afghanistan as an indication of ‘hybridity’ between the international and local, and the emergence of the ‘post-liberal peace’. But, is this really something to be celebrated as more ‘culturally appropriate’, or does it rather represent a more efficient instrument of neocolonial governance? Hutchings (2008a) has argued that while ‘masculinity’ and ‘war’ are both unstable categories, they are nonetheless mutually constitutive because they render each other intelligible as categories of social practice. A similar relationship can be understood to exist between the intellectual frameworks of Eurocentrism and the liberal peace. This means that the liberal peace itself only makes sense when the philosophical frames of Eurocentrism – that is, Western distinctiveness – have already been accepted. Conversely, it also means that practices such as those of the liberal peace continue to reinvigorate the basic tenets of intellectual Eurocentrism. Subsequently, it is because we are so used to thinking of the world through Eurocentric perspectives that anything truly different from the liberal peace as a response to conflict, poverty and political crisis becomes itself unthinkable – we see this through the calls of the critics for the liberal peace to become either more liberal or more culturally appropriate. However, we also see it in the most systemic of the critiques – that of Duffield, for whom few alternatives are seriously forwarded other than a fairly empty Foucaultian solidarity among the governed. This does not forward an alternative critical vision, because it sees very little from which such an alternative might be constructed. The paradox of liberalism is one that is thus borne more or less directly out of its Eurocentrism, which takes Western agency and ideas as the only serious site of politics.

### 2NC – Environmental Degradation/Racism

#### Eurocentrism makes nature into commodity and allows for destruction of the environment and reinforces environmental racism to indigenous communities

**Zachariah ‘11**(Geroge.; Professor in the department of Theology and Ethics at the United Theological College, Bangalore, India., The Ecological Crisis: Eurocentric Morals and Subaltern Alternatives, “Eurocentrism and its Construction of the Environment,” https://www.academia.edu/2644256/The\_Ecological\_Crisis\_Eurocentric\_Morals\_and\_Subaltern\_Alternatives)

Knowledge production is a social and political activity embedded in particular cultures and worldviews. Knowledge produced in the colonial enterprise reduces reality into a thing or a commodity, rather than a living organism, and legitimizes the domination and abuse of nature. Colonial gaze thingified and commodified nature, and in our times this gaze is continued through development, globalization, and modern science and technology. While unleashing a violent regime of technological interventions and social engineering on nature and communities, manipulating and desecrating life forms to appease the ungod of market, neo-colonialism uses the rhetoric of pure environmentalism to portray its commitment to protect and preserve nature. From a postcolonial perspective, the violence that is unleashed by science and technology is primarily an epistemological violence. Dismissing the knowledge systems and scientific practices of the colonies and the subaltern communities as superstitions and “ethnoscience,” and excluding them from the cognitive processes of research and policy making, dominant science projects claim messianic power and agency in fixing the problems of the world. De-legitimization of the organic knowledge systems of the communities erased culturally embedded technologies and knowledge systems. Along with indigenous technological practices, a great variety of traditional seeds also are being sacrificed in the ritual called epistemological violence. Traditional practitioners of indigenous knowledge systems are being excommunicated from their sacred land with the consecration of the expert technocrats and scientists as the new priests of growth and progress. Discerning the violence of science and technology as an epistemological violence initiates a perspectival shift in the prevailing discourse on the impact of science and technology. It is not merely an engineering of life that is taking place; rather it is an engineering of social relations. In that process nature and society are being reproduced. The earliest manifestation of Eurocentric environmentalism can be traced back to the emergence of national parks and protected areas, starting as early as 1872 with the Yellowstone National Park in the USA. National parks are the products of an environmentalism which considers nature as the “other” of human beings, and hence nature needs to be protected from indigenous communities who have been living in communion with nature from time immemorial. For Eurocentric environmentalism, nature is wilderness, which should either be protected through enclosures from the indigenous communities or should be exploited sustainably for the common good. Wilderness activism and conservationism critique antrhopocentrism and proppose biocentrism as the right attitude towards nature. Ramachandra Guha, the historian of environmentalism nuances it futher juxtaposing stories of two anti-dam movements. The Friends of the River organization in its opposition to the construction of the New Melones dam in the Stanislaus River in California was motivated by the bio-centric perspective of environmentalism. The rationale for their struggle was clear. “All the life of this canyon, its wealth of archaeological and historical roots to our past, and its unique geological grandeur are enough reasons to protect this canyon just for itself. But in addition, all spiritual values with which this canyon has filled tens of thousands of folks should prohibit us from committing the unconscionable act of wiping this place off the face of the earth.” On the other hand, in the case of the anti-dam movement against the construction of mega dams in the Narmada River in India, the motivation is not just to save the river; but also and more crucially, the tens of thousands of people—mostly indigenous communties, dalits, and farmers to be displaced by the dam being built on the river. Both are anti-dam movements. The former is in line with the Eurocentric environmentalism which strives towards “the protection of pristine, unspoilt nature: a reservoir of biological diversity and enormous aesthetic appeal which serves as an ideal haven from the urban workday world.” But the latter is a movement towards the ultimate goal of a socially just and ecologically sustainable model of development. Differently said, “’No Humanity without Nature!’ the epitaph of the Eurocentric environmentalist is here answered by the equally compelling slogan ‘No Nature without Social Justice.’” The imperialist and fascist nature of biocentrism is evident from the campaign for national park and wildlife sanctuaries all over the world, and the demand for a drastic reduction of human population. Eurocentric environmentalism does not recognize the integral relationship between the non-human beings and the subsistence communities. Their flourishing is interrelated. However, for the wilderness activists, tribals and indigenous communities who live in forests in harmony with the animal world should be ousted from their traditional and natural habitats in order to preserve the wildlife. This approach stems from a worldview which does not even consider such communities as human beings. Black theologian, James Cone in his article, “Whose earth is it, anyway?,” addresses this issue powerfully from an African American perspective. “It is important to ask, however, Whose problems define the priorities of the environmental movement? Whose suffering claims attention?... If it is important to save the habitats of birds and other species, then it is at least equally important to save black lives in the ghettos and prisons of America.” The Native American theologian George Tinker extends this critique of Eurocentric environmentalism further to specific issues in biocentrism. According to him, the American Indian understanding of creation as sacred and the source of all life goes far beyond the worldview of the Sierra Club or Greenpeace. “It embraces far more than concern for harp seals or a couple of ice-bound whales. It embraces all of life from trees and rocks to international relations… Respect for creation must result in an ongoing concern for economic balance and resistance to economic injustice that leave many poor and oppressed while their white American and European relatives or even Japanese relatives live in wealth at the expense of others.” The Amazon, according to Leonardo Boff, is the place that refutes modernity’s development paradigm—unsustainable development full of capital sins. But it is also the place of testing a possible alternative, in keeping with the rhythm of its lush natural endowment, by respecting the ecological wisdom of the primordial peoples who have been living there for centuries, drawing out riches without destroying the forests, rivers, and soils, and thus engaging in activity that benefits nature and humankind. Environmental racism is part and parcel of Eurocentric environmentalism. As the women in South Africa categorically affirms: “Earth-healing praxis requires an understanding of the interconnectedness of the different manifestations of violence. The violence of poverty, racism, sexism and classism, of social dislocation, of militarism, of battering and rape are not unrelated to the violence against the environment. They are all rooted in the abuse of power as domination over the exploitation of the other.” When it comes to the United States of America, “Millions of African Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans are trapped in polluted environments because of their race and color. Inhabitants of these communities are exposed to greater health and environmental risks than is the general population. Clearly, all Americans do not have the same opportunities to breathe clean air, drink clean water, enjoy clean parks and playgrounds, or work in a clean, safe environment.” Eurocentric environmentalism continues to perpetuate and perpetrate such violence and injustice. Vandana Shiva, the Indian physicist and environmentalist provides an insightful re-reading of the concerns of affirming the life of all living beings in the light of September 11. The animals and birds used in factory farming tend to become “cannibals” and attack each other. The animal liberation movements accuse the violent methods of factory farming as the reason for animals becoming violent. The industry’s solution to “cannibalism” is through “disarming” the animals; in the case of pigs, remove the teeth, chop off the tails and remove the testicles, and in the case of chickens, debeak them. According to Shiva, “the problem, clearly, is the factory cage—not the teeth and tails of pigs, the beaks of chicken, the horns of cattle…When animals are denied their basic freedoms to function as a species, when they are held captive and confined, they turn to ‘cannibalism’.” Shiva further expands this analogy to interpret terrorism and “war against terrorism.” “Could the lasting solution to violence induced by the violence of captivity and enslavement for humans be the same as that for other animals—giving them back their space for spiritual freedom, ecological freedom, for psychological freedom and for economic freedom.” The imperial onslaught on third world communities still continue in the era of globalization through diverse forms, robbing of subsistence communities their right and freedom to live in harmony with nature, and alienating the land, water and forest from them. “If the past enclosures have already precipitated so much violence, what will be the human costs of new enclosures being carved out for privatization of living resources and water resources, the very basis of our species survival? Intellectual property laws and water privatization are new invisible cages trapping humanity.” So Shiva calls for a new “animal liberation movement for humans”, which is sensitive to the captivity of neo-colonialism through corporate globalization. As animals are not meant to live in cages, human beings are not destined to be wasted and disposed off in the global market. So war against terrorism and violence is not a war against the feeble yet determined survival instincts of the victims; rather it is a war against enclosures and cages which alienate communities from their sacred communion with nature, and their determination to be different. The primary victims of the ecological crisis are hence the indigenous communities, people of color, women and the poor. Industrialization, big dams, expressways, mining, agro-business, the green revolution, biological parks all these add new layers of oppression to these communities. Survival is the greatest ecological crisis that they face today. The colonization of the lifeworld through development and globalization alienates them from their common property resources such as land, forest and water, and thereby makes them environmental refugees. Today they are bold enough to contest the Eurocentric environmentalism by raising new questions such as who has control over common property resources, who determines national interest when the subaltern landscapes and livelihoods are snatched away from them in the name of progress and national interest, and who decides what is progress and development. Unfortunately these voices are silenced in our public discourses. As we have analyzed Eurocentric environmental discourse oscillates between nature as a resource pile waiting to be plundered and engineered, and nature as wilderness to be fenced off from subaltern communities. It is in this context that the observation of C. K. Janu, the leader of the indigenous communities in India, of the semiotic metamorphosis of “jungle” into “forest” becomes poignant. Jungle, the organic abode of the tribals became forest—a stockpile of resources under state control—thanks to the intervention of the state and the market forces through various forest acts and development projects. In India, right from the colonial period, in the name of conservation, deforestation, social forestry, biological reserves and national parks, the state enacted various forest acts which resulted in the exclusion of the forest people from their traditional habitats. When jungle became forests and “conservation enclaves,” the forest dwellers were perceived as potential destroyers of the forests and they were “excluded” and “evicted” to protect the forests. The bureaucratic state thus became the savior of the forest. The state in its commitment to “progress” and “development,” unleashed a regime of ethnocide displacing millions from their homelands. “Eighty percent of the nation’s mineral wealth and seventy two percent of the forests, water, and other natural resources are found in tribal lands. Thus, mines, industrial estates, hydroelectric projects, urban centers, and planned population transfer signaled the internal colonization of tribal homelands.” Campaign for survival and dignity was a campaign initiated by the collective of various movements of forest people from India in the context of the debates on the Wild Life (Protection) Amendment Act, 2006. Several of the wildlife conservation groups in India argued for converting the surviving forests into “conservation enclaves” claiming that coexistence between forest people and wild animals "is a myth, based on utopian visions, deriving its sustenance on folklore.” We see the impact of Eurocentrism on the Indian conservationsts here. The net message of the Eurocentric conservationists was that “the rights of the forest people are dispensable (even where they are fundamental rights) in the interests of the absolute power of forest and wildlife authorities, which is equated with conservation.” In an open letter to the conservationists, the collective of the forest people affirmed: “We firmly believe that, in the long run, the struggle of forest dwellers for their rights and the fight for conservation cannot be separated. Without the forest, forest dwellers and tribals cannot survive; and without a common alliance against the mafias and industrial interests attacking our forests, conservation cannot succeed. We know from our experience, of thousands of communities that are protecting their forests and wildlife against destruction, often in the face of brutal government repression. You may disagree with these positions, but you cannot dismiss them as irrelevant – unless millions of people's lives are also to be deemed irrelevant.”

### 2NC – Epistemic Violence

#### Modernity institutes a cultural paradigm in which those on the periphery are expected to assimilate and enter into the neoliberal system resulting in epistemic violence

**Heleta ’16** (Savo.; works as the manager of Internationalisation at Home and Research at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University’s Office for International Education (OIE). He is also researcher in OIE’s Research Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World, Decolonisation of Higher Education: Dismantling Epistemic Violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa, Eurocentrism and epistemic violence in ‘new’ South Africa, https://libya360.wordpress.com/2016/11/13/decolonisation-of-higher-education-dismantling-epistemic-violence-and-eurocentrism-in-south-africa/)

After 1994, epistemological transformation was supposed to entail a ‘reorientation away from the [colonial and] apartheid knowledge system, in which curriculum was used as a tool of exclusion, to a democratic curriculum that is inclusive of all human thought.’ However, universities have failed to do much, if anything, to decolonise the curriculum since the demise of apartheid. More than two decades later, the curriculum at South African universities is still largely Eurocentric, rooted in the colonial and apartheid dispossession, looting and humiliation of Africa and its people. The Eurocentric curriculum focuses on ‘the idea of Europe, as a metaphor, and turns all others into bit players or loiterers without intent on the stage of world history, either too lazy to do anything ourselves or always late, and running behind to catch up with Western modernity.’ What we have in most fields of study (and particularly in the humanities and social sciences) is Eurocentric indoctrination, which marginalises Africa and is often full of patronising views and stereotypes about the continent. ‘European and white values are [still] perceived as the standards on which the country’s education system is based and rooted.’ This kind of education ensures that the students end up ‘ignorant of most of the world [and particularly Africa] and arrogant about our ignorance.’ This is nothing but ‘epistemic violence’ imposed on the students by the South African academia. Gayatri Spivak defines epistemic violence as the Eurocentric and Western domination and subjugation of the [former] colonial subjects and misconception of their understanding and perception of the world. This is a result of ‘violence of imperialistic epistemic, social and disciplinary inscription.’ Epistemic violence erases the history of the subaltern and also convinces them that they do not have anything to offer to the ‘modern’ world; their only option is to blindly follow the ‘enlightened’ colonisers, learn from them, adopt their worldviews and fit into the periphery of their world as second-class citizens. Epistemic violence persists in post-apartheid South Africa, where the higher education system, rooted in colonial and apartheid exploitation and racism, has obliterated nearly all the linkages that black students may have with the prescribed texts, propagated narratives, debates and learning on the one side and their history, lived experiences and dreams on the other side. In the old colonial fashion, they are the ‘other’ in their country of birth, not recognised and valued unless they conform. Through education, they are expected to learn to ‘speak well’ and gain skills and Eurocentric knowledge that will allow them to enter the marketplace but not allow them to fundamentally change the status quo in society and the economy.

### **2NC – Patriarchy**

#### Eurocentrism facilitates patriarchical structures and results in hegemonic masculinity globally

**Tickner ‘14** (J. Ann.; A feminist international relations (IR) theorist. She is a distinguished scholar in residence at the School of International Services, American University, Washington DC, which she recently joined after fifteen years as a Professor of International Relations at the University of Southern California, Reading Hobson through Feminist Lenses, “A Feminist Reading of Hobson,” http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0305829813515041)

In his introduction, Hobson states that his take on IR theory is but one among a range of what he terms ‘metanarratives’.3 Another metanarrative, he suggests, is patriarchy, which, he notes, overlaps with the discourse of Eurocentrism. Suspicious of ‘metanarratives’, feminists would be especially sceptical of the possibility of separating them. Feminists have pointed to the co-constitution of a dominant form of masculinity and what Eurocentric theory assumes to be self-generated modernisation, a developmental path taken by the West which, as Hobson notes, the ‘East’ must emulate if it is to become ‘civilised’.4 Characteristics associated with being modern, such as rationality and autonomy, are characteristics that are also associated with what feminists have called ‘hegemonic masculinity’.5 The power of the empire was epitomised by the prototypical English gentleman portrayed in Hobson’s use of the words of Alfred Zimmern, a British theorist of the interwar period who argued for the need to restore the empire: ‘The English gentleman represents a specific and clearly marked type of civilized humanity … [he] has been, in fact, an unrivalled primary teacher of peoples.’6 In contrast to Zimmern’s portrayal of this wise, calm and self-controlled coloniser, primitive and savage people are infantilised and feminised in order to justify their conquest and colonisation.7 Beyond these obviously gendered metaphors that abound in 19th and early 20th century imperial scholarship, post-colonial feminists have suggested that, in spite of its claim to objectivity and universality, the creation of modern knowledge more generally went hand in hand with the imperial project. Sandra Harding has tied the development of modern Western science to the history of European expansion. Western (almost exclusively) men asked questions of science – about navigation and how to survive in harsh tropical environments – that they needed answering in order to undertake colonial projects.8 Geographer John Willinsky has linked the way we have constructed modern knowledge more generally to European imperialism. Like Hobson, he claims that five centuries of learning have divided it in ways that give certain people and places agency while denying it to others. The Cartesian revolution of the 17th century shifted knowledge based on resemblances to knowledge based on difference – such as the differences between mind and body, men and women, West and East, and colonisers and colonised – differences that all have gendered connotations. Studying, classifying and ordering humanity within an imperial context gave rise to peculiar and powerful ideas about race, culture and nation that were conceptual instruments that the West used to divide up and educate the world. Willinsky claims that knowledge, based on difference, is at the root of gendered and racial structures of inequality that still exist today.9 In light of these observations, feminists would question the possibility of separating narratives about gender and imperialism; rather, they would see patriarchy, imperialism and Eurocentrism as mutually constituted.

### 2NC – Turns Case

#### K turns case – Western forms of education overemphasize universals and are maintained through competition meaning the 1AC can’t solve

**Mellow ‘15** (J. Dean.; Taught at the University of South Carolina and Northern Arizona University. He studies both the second language acquisition of English and the first language acquisition of Anihshininiimowin (spoken in northern Ontario). He studies language from linguistic, cognitive, cultural (i.e., non-colonial), and pedagogical perspectives. His studies of the effects of instruction on second language acquisition have led him to explore diverse approaches to measurement and research design. His work has appeared in journals such as Applied Linguistics, Lingua, Native Studies Review, Second Language Research, and Studies in Second Language Acquisition. “Decolonizing Western Science, Research, and Education: Valuing Linguistic Diversity”, Practices involving competition to achieve domination rather than humble collaboration, <https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/jar/HOE/HOE4.pdf>)

As noted in the introduction, Indigenous scholars such as Battiste (2013, p. 120) have argued that genuine knowledge and understanding will emerge only when all voices and perspectives are heard and considered. Both Battiste (2013, pp. 69-73) and Smith (2012, p. xii) argued that inquiry and research need to be collaborative. They have also argued that ethical and valid progress will be made when research is humble, sympathetic, compassionate, respectful, inclusive, inter-disciplinary, and open to possibilities (Battiste, 2013, p. 72; Battiste & Henderson, 2000, p. 133; Smith, 2012, pp. xii, 5, 9). In contrast, these Indigenous scholars have observed that Western science often involves competition to achieve domination rather than humble collaboration. Battiste and Henderson (2000, pp. 26-28) discussed Kuhn’s (1970) observation that some scientists or researchers tend to work exclusively within one approach to research rather than examining and comparing a range of possible methods and explanations for phenomena. Kuhn (1970) described these restrictive approaches to scientific inquiry as paradigms. According to Kuhn (1970, pp. 10, 11), a paradigm is a coherent tradition of scientific research that has attracted an enduring group of adherents and that has a restricted set of research topics and methods that is unequivocal and binding. Kuhn (1970, pp. 150-159) observed that some researchers are so strongly committed to a single paradigm that no amount of evidence or argumentation will lead them to change their assumptions and worldviews. Kuhn argued that this adherence to one paradigm is normal for science and is successful in certain respects because it leads researchers to fully and efficiently test the limits of an approach and prevents them from abandoning a paradigm when a problem only seems to be difficult, but can be solved within the approach. However, adherence to a single-paradigm is problematic. Battiste and Henderson (2000, p. 118) explained how this strategy does not lead to neutral scientific findings: “Eurocentric science is based on observations and interpretations that take place within a context of assumptions, ideas, and beliefs. Within this context, strong personal and social motivations influence what a person does and sees.” The discussion of the overemphasis on universals illustrates how specific assumptions can lead to narrow and biased research. In addition, rather than comparing theoretical alternatives, these single-paradigm researchers may boldly seek to dominate the research landscape by aggressively attempting to obtain as many scholarly resources as possible. Because universities are institutions in which scholars compete for limited public funding, scholars who work in just one paradigm may attempt to achieve or maintain the dominance of their paradigm by hiring only faculty who follow the same paradigm; by teaching students that their paradigm is best, sometimes not even providing students with adequate knowledge about alternative theories; and by competing for grant money, presence in publications, and honorary awards. Within this competition for domination, Smith (2012, pp. 68, 161) observed that Western academic disciplines may be “antagonistic to other belief systems” and that Western science “has been hostile to indigenous ways of knowing.” Within a Western context in which aggressive competition is perceived as normal (e.g., in politics, sports and business), some linguists have reported that an adversarial battle for domination is part of the scientific practice. Carnie (2002, pp. 5, 371-372) explained how the proponents of the UG approach behave while attempting to make it the “dominant” theory of linguistics, especially in relation to sentence patterns (or syntax): The dominant theory of syntax is due to Noam Chomsky and his colleagues, starting in the mid 1950s and continuing to this day…. We briefly turn now to the very thorny question of which theoretical approach is right. If you ask this question at any major syntax conference you are likely [to be reprimanded]. Most linguists hold to their theories the way religious fanatics follow their beliefs or the way nationalists feel about their countries. I admit that I am personally guilty of this at times. As you can see from the number of chapters in this book devoted to P&P [Principles and Parameters, a version of UG, jdm] compared to the number of chapters devoted to other approaches, my heart lies squarely in the P&P/Minimalist camp. Unfortunately, there is rarely rational dialog on the question of what theoretical approaches are the best. This aggressive and confrontational style of theoretical debate has been part of linguistics for the past 50 years, as explained by Newmeyer (1986, p. 81; UG is a type of generativist theory rather than an empiricist theory): It must be admitted, however, that the confrontational style many early generativists adopted in their writing and in their behavior at public conferences was also very effective at winning over the young…. No paper or presentation that betrayed an empiricist orientation to linguistics could get by unscathed. Some of these attacks were nothing less than vicious, going well beyond the norms of scholarly criticism, and were felt to impugn their opponents’ intelligence and character as well as their ideas about linguistic research. This aggressive competition for domination has many negative effects. It discourages researchers from interacting with scholars who offer additional or different perspectives and thus encourages researchers to isolate themselves within a community that has a narrow worldview and set of values. This confrontational behavior also discourages many people from participating in learning and research. Because they are aware of the colonialist history of educational institutions, Indigenous students may be especially deterred by this hostile and unprofessional rhetoric. Some Western philosophers and linguists have criticized the single-paradigm approach and the competition for domination associated with it. Feyerabend (1968, pp. 14, 33) argued for theoretical pluralism: I shall also try to give a positive methodology for the empirical sciences which no longer encourages dogmatic petrification in the name of experience…. You can be a good empiricist only if you are prepared to work with many alternative theories rather than with a single point of view and ‘experience.’ This plurality of theories must not be regarded as a preliminary stage of knowledge which will at some time in the future be replaced by the One True Theory. Theoretical pluralism is assumed to be an essential feature of all knowledge that claims to be objective…. Any such method [that encourages uniformity] is in the last resort a method of deception. It enforces unenlightened conformism, and speaks of truth; it leads to a deterioration of intellectual capacities, of the power of imagination, and speaks of deep insight; it destroys the most precious gift of the young, their tremendous power of imagination, and speaks of education. (emphasis in original). Building from Feyerabend and other work within the philosophy of science, Derwing (1973, pp. 17, 234) argued that linguists should regularly and systematically compare competing explanations following a “method of alternative hypotheses.” Some linguists have followed this pluralistic approach that allows all voices to be heard. For example, Hawkins (2008) edited a special issue of a journal that systematically compared the UG analyses to emergentist analyses. In a valuable overview article, Scholz, Pelletier, and Pullum (2011) compared and contrasted three alternative theoretical approaches: essentialism (which includes UG), externalism, and emergentism. With respect to the choice of a scientific research strategy, the insights of Indigenous scholars are valuable because they encourage humble, collaborative and pluralistic research.

## 2NC – Links

### Link – Charter Schools Bad

#### The 1AC reform of Charter Schools supports a model that increasingly fails non-Eurocentric curricula yearly through competition and bureaucracy using cultural affirmation as justification for profit driven segregation

**Cohen ’16** (Rachel M.; The American Prospect's senior writing fellow, The Afrocentric Education Crisis - How charter schools—including many that claim to be “culturally affirming” the black experience—have weakened Afrocentric education, http://prospect.org/article/afrocentric-education-crisis)

Growing up in the 1960s, Bernida Thompson always knew she wanted to be a teacher. Attending high school and college during the civil-rights movement and the Black Power days, she says her dream was to work some day at an African-centered school. “A school for black children to learn who they are, where they are, what they must to do liberate themselves and their people to be successful in the world,” she explains. After graduating college and getting a master’s, she taught in public and Catholic schools for a decade, all the while developing her own curriculum for the school she dreamed of one day opening. That day came in 1977, when Thompson became the founding principal of Roots Activity Learning Center—a private school in Washington, D.C., designed to “serve the specific needs of children of African heritage.” She served as its principal from 1977 to 1999. Such schools began cropping up in black communities around the country, but their birthplace is widely recognized to be Washington, D.C. The first full-time independent African school—Ujamaa—opened up in 1968, founded by one of the organizers of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and a graduate of Howard Law School. Four Howard student activists founded NationHouse in 1974. And three years later came Roots. Exact numbers are hard to come by, but those working within the field say African-centered schools peaked at around 400 in 1999, and have been on the decline ever since. When charter schools first emerged in the 1990s, some private school leaders decided to convert their African-centered institutions into charters, sacrificing their independent status in exchange for the increased financial stability that comes from receiving state and federal dollars. Today, however, many Afrocentric charter schools are being shut down for poor academic performance and financial mismanagement. “The [charter] rules and regulations get worse and worse every year,” says Thompson, who opened up an Afrocentric charter in 1999—Roots Public Charter School—but didn’t close down her private school, as many others did. “First they lead you on and tell you can just do your thing. But that was a come-on, and every year they’ve got more bureaucratic red tape.” The remaining Afrocentric private schools have also suffered, as families left for less expensive charters. While Roots Activity Learning Center offered schooling from infancy up until the eighth grade, and always had a waiting list, Thompson says enrollment demand has dropped significantly over the past decade. It has become so difficult to attract students that this past school year Roots Activity Learning Center had fewer than ten students of elementary age, forcing the school to announce that it will provide only preschool education. Conditions are similarly stressful for the Afrocentric public charter schools that still exist, which now face steep competition from all the other charter networks families can choose from. Two years ago, Roots Public Charter School had to shut down three grades due to decreased enrollment demand, switching from a K-8 school to a K-5 school. “When you haven’t had choices all your life and all of a sudden you have 85 different choices, you walk away from your culture and heritage,” Thompson says of the families that aren’t choosing her school. WHILE THE RISE OF charter schools may once have seemed a blessing to champions of Afrocentric education, it has brought with it a host of problems. Public charters’ emphasis on standardized testing has jeopardized the standing and existence of numerous Afrocentric schools. A number of non-Afrocentric large charter chains have also taken to defending their overwhelmingly black schools as “culturally affirming” and “ethnocentric” even though their curricula aren’t Afrocentric at all. In these schools, their critics allege, “culturally affirming” is really just a cover for segregation. Afrocentric education is not just about teaching African American history and culture, but also about centering the school’s pedagogy and curriculum on what its advocates term the values and traditions of African people. It was created, Molefi Asante, chair of Temple University’s African American Studies department, tells me, to challenge the “Eurocentric” hegemony of American public education. (Afrocentricity, Asante’s 1980 volume, is widely regarded as the bible of the Afrocentric school movement; Thompson says everyone on staff at her schools read his work.) “The African American child must not be renters of Eurocentric information, they must be owners,” Asante says. “They have to be owners of math, owners of language arts, owners of geography.” When teaching biology, for instance, an Afrocentric school would want to connect it to Ernest Just, a pioneering black biologist who recognized the role of the cell surface in the development of organisms. “This way, the children immediately feels kinship to the subject, the child is not outside biology, biology becomes part of the child’s experience,” Asante says. In his view, the cost of not centering Africa for an African American student is great. “If we don’t, then our children don’t have the kind of aspiration, the kind of attention and discipline that is necessary for them to advance in society,” Asante tells me. “They will learn, because children are bright, but they will not have the kind of attachment to a subject that is necessary.” “People want to know why the children are so angry in the streets of D.C.—well, they don’t know who they are!” says Thompson. “They don’t know the power within their genes! They don’t understand that they are the chosen people; they don’t understand that, they don’t know that. They are in poverty, their parents don’t know that, and they need schools to help them know that.” Thompson says her two schools—both the private school and the public charter—are committed to Afrocentricity, a model, she believes, that instills confidence and resilience.

### Link – Desegregation

#### The 1AC one shot solution fails to address white supremacist structures in education policy – any reform forces students of color to model the behaviors of white America and must rather be viewed through white supremacy and capitalism

**Keisch and Scott ’15** (Deborah.; cultural anthropologist who has worked in the field of education for over two decades as a practitioner, researcher and activist; Tim.; psychotherapist at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. He worked for a number of years in NYC, first as a school counselor in a public junior high school, then as a youth harm reduction clinician with the Special Health Outreach to Urban Teens program, “Current Context: Separate and Unequal”, <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1055&context=lov>, pg. 3-5)

U.S public schools are more segregated today than they have been since before the desegregation efforts that followed the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education case (Kozol, 2005; Mullins, 2013; Rothstein, 2013; Strauss, 2014; UCLA, 2014). Many education scholars have noted the simultaneous widening of the gap between resourced and under-resourced schools over the same time period that the marketbased education reforms, heralded by their proponents as addressing this inequity, have been implemented. Education activist and author Jonathan Kozol reminds us that the travesty lies not just with segregation of schools but within the combination of segregation and inequity - and remarks that if we had separate but equal schools we would at least be living up to the Plessy vs. Ferguson, the landmark 1896 U.S. Supreme Court case that upheld state segregation laws but required those segregated public spaces to be “separate but equal.” However, as Kozol laments, U.S. schools are decidedly separate and unequal. Despite the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education case, education looks very different for many Black and Brown children than it does for many white children. But in addition to integrating students of different races, desegregation must also address the racist and white supremacist structures institutionalized within U.S. education policy and practices. As education activist and author Soloman Comissiong writes, “After all, has desegregation cleansed the black community of the infestation of American racism and white supremacy? Integration only truly works when the integratee is allowed the same rights, respect, and overall privileges as the integrator” (Comissiong, 2009, para. 2). Half-century after Brown, racial segregation in U.S. schools is intensifying, while the current desegregation practices that do exist require children of color to assimilate to and model the behaviors, values and appearances of middle-class white America (Comissiong, 2009). Even if mandates are followed, the threat of structural racism continues and equality of opportunity and equality of outcome remains elusive. The reality that children are living their lives in vastly segregated spaces—both in and outside of school—shapes how both white and Black students view themselves and their world. In a talk that New York City public school teacher and education activist Brian Jones gave to a group of parents and teachers during Black History Month in February 2012, he describes the way his 6th grade students understood their schooling environment through the lens of segregation and how current policies and rhetoric ignore what it would take to truly address issues of segregation. A theme in Jones’s stories are the repeated contradictions he points out—that in his class discussion of Ruby Bridges and the success of desegregation—he is speaking to a completely segregated room of Black students, that the schools named after Black civil rights leaders are almost always the most segregated schools and in the most segregated urban areas, and that current education policies—driven by notions of excellence rather than equity—ignore the issues that have the potential to actually address segregated schooling (i.e., resources). No matter how conspicuous the segregation of schooling, it seems to remain hidden from policymakers who choose to omit it from their discourse. This standpoint of ignoring race, of ignoring struggles related to poverty and equity in public education—of ignoring any policy that might lead to greater social and economic equity for students and communities of color—must be explored within a wider historical context of white supremacy and neoliberal capitalism.

#### Desegregation misidentifies the crux of achievement gaps to minority populations – it recalculates urban land values at the expense of minority populations

**Keisch and Scott ’15** (Deborah.; cultural anthropologist who has worked in the field of education for over two decades as a practitioner, researcher and activist; Tim.; psychotherapist at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. He worked for a number of years in NYC, first as a school counselor in a public junior high school, then as a youth harm reduction clinician with the Special Health Outreach to Urban Teens program, “Current Context: Separate and Unequal”, <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1055&context=lov>, pg. 9-11)

All of what we have outlined thus far has set the stage for the implementation of corporate education reform policies, which by design, are intended to restructure public education to exist outside of public control and instead serve private profit generating interests (Scott, 2011). Accordingly, journalist Stephanie Simon, reporting at an education investors gathering in 2012, wrote, “The K-12 market is tantalizingly huge: The U.S. spends more than $500 billion a year to educate kids from ages five through 18: The entire education sector…represents nearly 9 percent of U.S. gross domestic product, more than the energy or technology sectors...investors are signaling optimism that a golden moment has arrived. They're pouring private equity and venture capital into scores of companies that aim to profit by taking over broad swaths of public education” (para. 5 & 7). Moving from ideology to policy, we will examine the ways in which corporate education reform is carried out through a similar formula across the U.S. This formula is enacted in ways that are subtle as well as obvious, but consistently employs the notion of the “free-market” as well as inherently embeds a white supremacy worldview. Something to keep in mind, as we describe particular instruments employed, is that the children of the wealthy (and usually white) do not have to navigate this formula. Across the board, the children of the elite, including the children of those who are dictating these reforms such as Arne Duncan, Barack Obama, Bill Gates, Michelle Rhee, the Walton Family, etc., attend schools that look nothing like those that corporate education reform mandates require. Those children attend private schools with no high-stakes testing, with small classes, with projectbased learning and authentic assessment. Those are schools where music and the arts flourish, where learning is approached holistically, and is often self-directed (Cohen 2013; Davies, 2013; Davis, 2014, Sirota, 2012). It is useful to return to the question we posed in the introduction - if these are the schools that are working for the children of the wealthy, why do the schools for the children of the poor look so incredibly different? There are many instruments used to implement the formula of corporate education reform, which is being carried out in different cities and towns across the U.S. As we articulated in Education Inc., Within the scheme of corporate education reform, there is a formula repeatedly being enacted - on state, city and district levels - to institutionalize education reform policies. While slight variations in the formula exist, there are shared elements within several main areas: standardized testing, the market notion of ‘choice,’ privatization, union-busting, profiteering and workforce development - meaning students as future workers are trained to have the vocational aptitudes required by private sector industries (Scott & Keisch, 2014, para. 8). Before we examine the specific instruments, it is important to note the coupling of corporate education reform policies and the neoliberalization of cities, which reinforces the displacement of low-income people of color and the gentrification of their communities. Neoliberal education policies contribute to this through “racialized discourses of pathology that legitimate racial exclusion and expropriation of their communities for capital accumulation” (Lipman, 2011, p. 231). Large portions of poor Black and Brown urban communities that have been subjected to neoliberal austerity measures for decades are now being eyed as valuable real estate, for commercial and housing development that serves white middle-class and upper middle-class people (Lipman, 2011, Fenwick, 2013). Historically, education and housing policy have been closely linked in the structural landscape of racial apartheid in the U.S. Schools have long been a major selling point in terms of housing markets in specific neighborhoods. Realtors will promote a house in a so-called “good” school district, with corresponding higher home prices. In this case “good” is code for high-performing schools (i.e., high test scores) with college preparatory curriculum, which infers schools with a majority of affluent white children. The relationship between racially segregated neighborhoods and racially segregated schools is also inherent to the neoliberal design. In line with this, policies in cities around the country that seek to disinvest from, close, “flip” or “turnaround” neighborhood public schools in poor communities are contributing to the displacement of low-income Black and Brown residents, replacing these schools with incentivized charter schools that appeal to white middle-class families— essentially greasing the wheels of gentrification. This process is also being encouraged by current federal policy found in the 2009 federal stimulus that authorized states to allocate billions of dollars in Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCBs), allowing under resourced schools to access interest-free bond financing. Charter schools conveniently have access to more flexible bond resources than public school districts. “By allocating millions of dollars in little-known bonds exclusively to charters while imposing austerity on public facilities, the state has quietly stacked the deck for charters, leaving neighborhood schools to molder in decline” (Davis, 2014, para. 4). Additionally, many states that receive federal QSCB bonds are primarily allocating them to charter schools. Nationally, charters are being creative, if not notorious, for using their political capital, large financial reserves and leveraging their flexible federal bond resources to “flip” dilapidated public schools, and in some cases other buildings located in poor communities, into charter schools that fit within the larger gentrification plans of cities (Davis, 2014; Fenwick, 2013; Lipman, 2011; Paschall, 2014; Scott, 2013). Leslie Fenwick, Dean of the Howard University School of Education, adds: Whether they are solidly middle- or upper-income or poor, neither group of blacks controls the critical economic levers shaping school reform. And, this is because urban school reform is not about schools or reform. It is about land development...black inner-city residents are suspicious of school reform (particularly when it is attached to neighborhood revitalization) which they view as an imposition from external white elites who are exclusively committed to using schools to recalculate urban land values at the expense of black children, parents and communities (Fenwick, 2013, para. 4). In the following pages we will focus on three primary instruments used to implement the formula of corporate education reform: the notion of “choice” and charters, high-stakes testing, and discipline and criminalization

### Link – Development

#### The 1AC's discourse of development imposes Western modes of thought onto the Global South - the impact is the extermination of "non-Western" modes of thought

**Nilsen ’16** (Alf Gunvald Nilsen is Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Bergen. His research focuses on social movements in the global South. He is the author of Dispossession and Resistance in India (2012) and co-editor of Social Movements in the Global South (2011) and Marxism, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10767-016-9224-8>, “Power, Resistance and Development in the Global South: Notes Towards a Critical Research Agenda - National Development Versus Popular Development”)

As I have already pointed out, the 1990s witnessed the emergence of a particular form of radical critique in the field of development research. Scholars like Gustavo Esteva, Arturo Escobar, Majid Rahnema and Gilbert Rist went far beyond earlier radical interventions in questioning the meaning of ‘development’ as an idiom with any relevance to political projects for progressive social change. The nature of the critique is aptly summed up in a recent re-statement of Esteva’s famously harsh verdict on the development project: ‘If you live in Rio or Mexico City today, you need to be very rich or very numb to fail to notice that development stinks’ (Esteva et al. 2013, p. 261). The critique was centred on the claim that development was an idiom that converted the modernisation of the western world into a universal model of and yardstick for social change, which was then imposed upon peoples and societies in the South through powerful institutions in which western powers predominate, thus enabling the North to exercise power over the South, and in doing so, erasing the specific character of these peoples and these societies (see Rahnema and Bawtree 1997). It was arguably in the work of Arturo Escobar—and especially his book Encountering Development, which set the terms of debate in the field of critical development research for a considerable period of time after its publication in 1995—that this critique was developed to its fullest extent. Drawing on Foucault’s theories of discursive power, Escobar (1995, p. 10) argued for the need to understand how forms of knowledge about what development is, systems of institutional power through which those forms of knowledge come to operate on the world, and the subjectivities through which people come to understand themselves are fused in a ‘development discourse’ that ultimately constitutes ‘an efficient apparatus that systematically relates forms of knowledge and techniques of power’. The development discourse, Escobar argues, originated in the post-war era—its arrival was signalled by Harry S. Truman’s inaugural address as president of the USA in 1949—and, due to its strict reliance on Western forms of knowledge, it has disqualified and marginalised ‘non-Western knowledge systems’ (Escobar 1995, p. 13). For Escobar, a progressive future is not to be forged through the construction of ‘development alternatives, but in alternatives to development, that is, the rejection of the entire paradigm altogether’ (Escobar 1995, p. 215). And it is social movements that will craft these alternatives to development: ‘Social movements and anti-development struggles may contribute to the formation of nuclei of problematised social relations around which novel cultural productions might emerge’ (Escobar 1995, p. 216). Escobar’s critique of the development discourse—and, in extension of this, the post-development perspective more generally—has been subjected to wide-ranging critiques since the publication of Encountering Development. There is no need to revisit those critiques in any great detail here, but I wish to highlight two key points in this debate that will shape the argument that I am making in this article. The first point relates to an observation that many scholars have made about how subaltern groups and social movements relate to discourses and practices of development: a wide range of studies—both of the micropolitics of everyday development encounters (see, for example, Moore 1998, 1999; Li 1999; Gidwani 2002; Shakya and Rankin 2008) and of large-scale social movements (see, for example, Rangan 2000; Sinha 2003; Nilsen 2010; Vergara-Camus 2014)—have established that subaltern groups do not oppose or reject development in its entirety, but rather seek to negotiate and change the direction and meaning of development. In extension of this, and drawing on Cooper and Packard’s (1997, p. 4) argument, the second point is that development is not a simply a monolithic discursive regime through which dominant social forces exercise power over subaltern social forces, but rather an inherently multivalent idiom that can be at the centre of both ‘a discourse of control’ (in a hegemonic inflection) and ‘a discourse of entitlement’ (in an oppositional inflection)—and the encounter between such discourses in and through conflicting political projects in turn give shape and form to development as a trajectory of sociohistorical change. These insights may be simple in and of themselves, but it is nevertheless my contention that they can help us to understand development—both as a discourse and as a trajectory of sociohistorical change—in a far more nuanced way than what post-development theory allows for. Towards that end, I want to propose that discourses of control in which development constitutes the semiotic locus are best thought of as an integral dimension of what David Ludden (1992, p. 252) has referred to as ‘development regimes’—that is, the ‘institutionalized configuration within a state system ideologically committed to progress that draws its material sustenance from the conduct of development’. Drawing on Ferguson’s (1990) crucial arguments, I also want to suggest that the exercise of power in and through development regimes occurs above all through depoliticisation—that is, by constructing a universe of meaning in which the specific deficiencies that are to be rectified by development are portrayed as purely technical problems and the interventions through which this is to be done as purely technical solutions. ‘Questions that are rendered technical’, Li (2007, p. 7) rightly notes, ‘are simultaneously rendered nonpolitical’—and this is precisely the point: as soon as poverty, for example, becomes a technical problem that is primarily understood in terms of the shortcomings of the poor individual or the poor household rather than the relations of power that generate impoverishment for some social groups and enrichment for others, the form and direction that social change assumes in a specific spatiotemporal context is removed from the sphere of political contestation and situated within the safe - that is, apolitical - parameters of scientific expertise and bureaucratic management (see Mosse 2010; Hickey and Du Toit 2014; Harriss 2007). Conversely, discourses of entitlement woven around development as a locus of oppositional meaning- and claims-making are best thought of as the outcome of subaltern assertions that range from quotidian subversions of development interventions to counterhegemonic movements that seek to advance systemic transformations (see Rankin 2009, p. 224). Such meaning- and claims-making is animated by the concrete ways in which subaltern groups appropriate ‘the rhetoric of development’ (Gupta 2000, p. 16) and inflect it with meanings that express their grievances, needs, interests and aspirations in order to make claims on dominant groups—whether these are NGOs, governments, or multilateral institutions. What is crucial about this dynamic is the fact that it repoliticises the meaning of development: the claims that are made by subaltern groups will tend to revolve around demands for redistribution or recognition in some form or the other and with these demands the contours of the power relations that dominant inflections of the idiom have occluded will start to reappear and to be called into question. Indeed, as Moore (1998) has ably demonstrated, subaltern demands often delegitimise dominant meanings of development by calling attention to discrepancies between state ideologies and lived realities (see, also, Nilsen 2010, Chap. 8). Dominant groups will more often than not be compelled to accommodate such challenges through concessions that respond to subaltern demands to lesser or greater extents—if only to ensure the reproduction of hegemony.2 Such concessions can take the form of adjustments in the ways that development interventions are carried out in specific locales—as has been chronicled by Li (1999) in Indonesia and Sharma (2008) in India—or of reforms that are substantial enough to alter the political economy of national developmental trajectories (see Sandbrook et al. 2010). The point is that development reemerges as a contested idiom and a conflictual trajectory (see Motta and Nilsen 2011). In sum, this proposed orientation retains the concern with the dynamic relations of power and resistance that has been central to the radical critique of development since the 1990s, but modifies it in two crucial ways. Firstly, it understands power in less absolute and unitary terms than what post-development theory does: whereas power is constantly exercised through discourses of development, it is also constantly challenged and as a result reshaped—the power of development does not simply mould the global South in its own Eurocentric image. Secondly, it also understands resistance in less absolute and unitary terms that what post-development theory does: resistance is not simply an assertion of otherness that rejects development; rather, it is a practice of meaning- and claims-making that hinges on oppositional appropriations of dominant symbols and idioms. I would emphasise that to think of resistance in this way is not to belittle its character or significance. As heroic and therefore appealing as the figure of the autonomous subaltern may be, she ultimately pales into insignificance when compared with the actually existing subaltern and her tenacious capacity for turning instruments of domination into weapons of struggle. Thus, when we confront subalterns who construct their imaginaries of a tomorrow that is different from today through inversions of the dominant meanings of development, the genuinely radical position, as De Vries (2007, p. 27) proposes, is to take these imaginaries seriously as expressions of ‘the capacity to desire a different kind of society that is not yet defined’.

### Link – Hegemony

#### Hegemony marginalizes the global South through dependence upon western institutions and is complicit in the domination of Eurocentric ideals

**Nilsen ’16** (Alf Gunvald Nilsen is Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Bergen. His research focuses on social movements in the global South. He is the author of Dispossession and Resistance in India (2012) and co-editor of Social Movements in the Global South (2011) and Marxism, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10767-016-9224-8>, “Power, Resistance and Development in the Global South: Notes Towards a Critical Research Agenda - National Development Versus Popular Development”)

With decolonisation, the collective oppositional project of anti-colonial nationalism gave way to national development regimes that were shaped in significant ways by important realignments of social forces at both national and global scales (Silver and Slater 1999; Patel and McMichael 2004; Desai 2004). At the national level, the newly independent countries witnessed the demobilisation of the mass movements that had carried forth anti-colonialism as an oppositional project; in exchange for political acquiescence, subaltern groups were offered greater access to expanded public employment and public services, as well as a minimal social wage guarantee through various forms of subsidised consumption (Walton and Seddon 1995). Simultaneously, at the global level, the world-system under US hegemony was restructured in such a way that the newly independent states of the Third World were in a position to articulate and implement development strategies geared towards modernisation that were characterised by a degree of separation between ‘national and global market priorities’ (Ludden 2005, p. 4046; see also Arrighi 1994). Through this process, the idiom of development was repositioned as a central element in a new discourse of control and inflected with new meanings that diverged in crucial ways from its anti-colonial incarnation. Above all, development was once again depoliticised. As I argued above, development in its anti-colonial avatar had been construed as an objective that had to be fought for by popular movements in order to achieve social justice and an end to poverty. However, in the context of postcolonial nation-building, development increasingly came to be equated with what Timothy Mitchell (2002) has referred to as ‘the rule of experts’—that is, as a goal that is to be achieved through policy interventions that are designed according to scientific expertise and selected according to objective criteria to drive non-partisan progress towards a putative national common good (see also Chatterjee 1993, pp. 201–205). At the scale of the nation-state, coalitions of state managers, industrial capital and landed elites retained the prerogative of giving form and direction to efforts in development planning that sought to fuse agricultural modernisation and import-substituting industrialisation in a drive towards modernisation (see Chibber 2003; Patel and McMichael 2004). At the international level, development was recast as a matter of ‘democratic fair dealing’ between a developed North and an underdeveloped South—predicated above all upon the former assisting the latter in ‘a wider and vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge’ in the economic realm (Truman cited in Silver and Slater 1999, p. 208). Development assistance, however, came to constitute an integral element of the USA’s Cold War armoury, coupled—as is evidenced in the bloody arc of US-backed military coups that stretches from Iran in 1953 (via Guatemala, Congo and Indonesia) to Chile in 1973—by vigorously repressive policing to constrain transgressions of the narrow limits of capitalist nation-building (see Silver and Slater 1999). The initial decades of the postcolonial era witnessed states in the Third World register some significant achievements in terms of the objectives of modernisation and growth: ‘Between 1950 and 1975 income per person in the developing countries increased on an average by 3 per cent p.a., accelerating from 2 per cent in the 1950s to 3.4 per cent in the 1960s. This rate of growth was historically unprecedented for these countries and in excess of that achieved by the developed countries’ (Glyn et al. 1991, p. 41). However, the structural underpinnings of these growth rates were riddled with contradictions and unevenness. In agriculture, some headway was made in terms of promoting land reform and technological innovation to boost capitalist farming and food production, but as Friedmann (1982) and McMichael and Raynolds (1994) have pointed out, countries in the global South remained dependent on importing food from the global North (see also Araghi 1995). Similarly, import-substituting industrialisation yielded mixed results: East Asian countries like Taiwan and South Korea experienced the emergence of potent industrial sectors, while other regions—for example, Latin America and South Asia—witnessed an economic trajectory in which domestic capitalists could socialise their risks and losses and privately appropriate the gains of growth: ‘The end result was that there was development and growth—but at enormous cost to the public’ (Chibber 2004, p. 239; see also Chibber 2003; Evans 1995; Kohli 2004; Kiely 2007a). And finally—as Colin Leys (1996) has pointed out—it was painfully evident that the global South still occupied a dependent and subordinate position in the political economy of the world system. These contradictions finally came home to roost in the Southern moment of the global revolt of 1968 (see Wallerstein 2006) – a moment in which the regnant discourse of depoliticised development was fundamentally destabilised. This was a profoundly multi-faceted moment, in which subaltern groups mobilised around oppositional projects that challenged both the contradictions of national development regimes and the continued subordination of Third World countries in the capitalist world system (Watts 2001; Berger 2004; Prashad 2007). A very significant facet of the 1968 revolt in the global South was the emergence of popular movements that targeted ‘the nationalism and institutionalized elite politics … of the first generation of independent Third-World states’ (Watts 2001, p. 172). In India, for example, Adivasis, women, Dalits and informal sector workers mobilised outside the domain of electoral politics to challenge the centralisation of political power in an elite-dominated state apparatus as well as the prevailing form and direction of development, which had dispossessed marginal peasants and subsistence producers, and failed to curtail the gendered and caste-based violence to which women and Dalits were still subjected (see Omvedt 1993). Parallel to the emergence of new social movements in the first generation of independent states in the Third World, protracted wars of national liberation gave rise to what Mark Berger (2004, p. 19) has called second-generation Bandung regimes.6 Cutting across the differences between these regimes was ‘a more radical, more unambiguously socialist, Third Worldism’ (Berger 2004: pp. 24-25) that resonated with the radicalism that was being espoused on the global arena through the call for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) articulated by the Non-Aligned Movement (see Prashad 2012). The Southern moment of the global revolt of 1968, then, was one in which social movements created a new discourse of entitlement centred on subaltern groups and popular classes within the independent states of the Third World who posited themselves as being entitled both to dignified livelihoods and political recognition and participation. In making these claims, social movements destabilised national development as a discourse of control by laying bare how developmental interventions that were claimed to serve a common national good systematically served the interests of dominant social forces, and at the same time—often in the form of ‘oppositional populisms’ (Gupta 2000, p. 34)—sought to vindicate alternative forms of development that would reflect and promote genuinely popular needs, interests and aspirations (see Nilsen 2015a, b). Similarly, the radicalised Third Worldism of the second-generation Bandung regimes and the NIEO project indicted the persistent subordination of Southern countries in the capitalist world-system, and thus challenged the legitimacy of the claim to fair dealing and development cooperation between North and South. And in arguing for a radical restructuring of the world economy in order to enable the Third World to break free from its subordinate and dependent position, the NAM articulated an alternative vision of global development—a vision in which the needs, interests and aspirations of Third World peoples would prevail over the power of Northern states in the world system (see Prashad 2012, pp. 24–34).

### Link – Languages

#### Foreign Language education is structured by Eurocentric ideals of market rationality in which multilingualism is encouraged for proficiency and represents a form of cultural capital that marginalizes minorities by making them to be perceived as socioeconomic hindrances

**Davis ’99** (Kathryn.; Associate professor in the Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Educational Studies at Winthrop. She has taught in higher education for 30 years prior to joining the faculty at Winthrop, including North Carolina State University, Slippery Rock University, Middle Tennessee State University, and East Carolina University. RETHINKING FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION: POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE PROFESSION, <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED451702.pdf>, Pg. 34 – 46)

In the processes of professional development and institutional change, it is often beneficial to reflect on the goals and aims of one's profession and of the institutions associated with it. If teaching practitioners, educators, and scholars can agree that one of the main goals of education is the realization of true multilingualism and multiculturalism in schools and in society at large, then it may be possible for the different second language professional bodies to join efforts towards the achievement of that goal. When it comes to language education, two inextricably embedded realities shape professional goals and identities are societal attitudes towards languages at large and ownership of a language and culture by particular groups. These two aspects of our daily endeavors as language teachers and educators are all too often obviated or taken for granted. In particular, the foreign language (FL) teaching profession has traditionally assumed an understanding of language and education premised on the alleged neutrality of FLs regarding the relative power and status of languages within the larger society. This may be partly because, in contrast with English as a Second Language (ESL) and Bilingual Education (BE) teachers, who are concerned with the language education needs of minority students (e.g., Ovando & Collier, 1985), FL teachers have traditionally associated themselves with the educational needs of native English-speaking students. Tis apolitical stance can only be understood through a critical appraisal of the history of the FL profession. Its negative consequences for minority language education are far reaching but seldom examined in FL mainstream scholarly and professional discussions. Furthermore, the lack of political awareness also harms the FL profession itself, in that the linguistic and cultural resources that minority students bring to educational settings remain untapped in most FL programs. This chapter will review the main areas of conflict between the mainstream ethos of the FL profession and the goals of multilingualism and language equality for minority language students. It is argued that critical changes within the field of foreign language education can only begin to happen if teachers, educators, and scholars acknowledge and act upon the political dimensions of language education POLITICS AND THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFESSION The dismissal of the political nature of second language teaching within the FL profession is one of the biggest problems when attempting to formulate changes to serve the (foreign) language education needs of minority students. For instance, McKay and Wong (1988) surveyed journal articles from 1974 to 1987 which appeared in one TESOL and two FL major journals (TESOL Quarterly, The Modern Language Journal, and Foreign Language Annals) and found that sociopolitical awareness and professional topics were the least reflected in all three professional journals. FL scholarly writing appears to be unconcerned with issues of changing language attitudes, government language policy, the relationship between the profession and the community, and political action on language-related events and issues to be taken by language professional organizations. Similarly, in her nation-wide survey of 1,136 high school, college, and university FL teachers, Lamb (1994) found that many FL professionals declared having limited interaction with the ESL and BE professions in terms of networking, teaching, and research. They tended to consider FL as apolitical and impartial regarding issues of language education, bilingual education, and language policy and, in fact, "appeared no better informed about bilingual education than the general public" (Lamb, 1994, p. 183). FL teachers often believed FL programs to be neutral and to exist as academic subjects independently of potential official English policies and of the funding processes affecting ESL or BE (Lamb, 1994, p. 130). Those within FL education who view multilingualism as a true resource for every individual and for society at large explicitly reject the widely held conviction that foreign language teaching, unlike other second language teaching, can be politically neutral (see especially Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Byrnes, 1992; Lange, 1987; McKay & Wong, 1988; Tedick & Walker, 1994, 1995; Tedick, Walker, Lange, Paige, Jorstad, 1993; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). These scholars have urged FL professionals to position themselves politically and to "embrace a broad cultural context for language and culture learning that assumes that all students can develop both linguistic and cultural literacy beyond that of their first language and primary culture" ( Tedick et al., 1993, p. 58; emphasis in the original). These voices attest to an unprecedented disposition in the FL education literature to acknowledge the sociopolitical and ideological nature of language education and to bridge the fields of FL education and minority language education (e.g., Byrnes, 1992; Kramsch, 1995; Padilla, Fairchild, & Valadez, 1990; Tedick & Walker, 1995; Valdes, 1991, 1995; Wilberchied & Dassier, 1995). The lack of political awareness among FL professionals not only fails the needs and goals of multilingualism and multiculturalism among minority students, but it also harms the FL profession itself, in that the linguistic and cultural resources that minority students bring to educational settings remain untapped in most FL programs. Yet, these bilingual resources can play an important role in the improvement of FL instruction through explicit curricular connections between the FL classroom and community resources, as the programmatic five Cs (communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities) of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning, established in 1995, reflect (see Lafayatte, 1996; for examples of curricular implementation, see Overfield, 1997). From the perspective of SLA theory, the resources of bilingual students may prove crucial for quality foreign language instruction in two other respects. First, conversation partners with higher competence in the L2 are crucial in providing quality opportunities for pushed output which are thought to facilitate and maximize language development (M. H. Long, 1996; Swain, 1995; Yule, Powers, & Macdonald, 1992). In addition, integrative motivation and valued instrumentality (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Wen, 1997) are powerful predictors of FL achievement, and the connections between FL learning and US-based communities of speakers of the target language can only make the foreign language more immediate and relevant to majority English-speaking students in FL classrooms. Nevertheless, the belief systems of FL teachers and educators, as well as professional legitimization tensions within FL institutions, continue to perpetuate elitist views of foreign language education as the restricted realm of the elite, keeping minority students and minority teachers away from the FL profession. Without an explicit understanding of context and the politics of teaching languages, teachers are left without tools to resist hegemonic practices in language education that discriminate against minority language students. ARE FOREIGN LANGUAGES A RESOURCE FOR ALL? Three societal and institutional orientations towards language diversity have been identified by Ruiz (1988): language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-asresource. Language-as-problem manifests itself in conventional wisdom which connects non-English language heritage and circumstantial bilingualism with social problems, and which has its most threatening articulation in English-Only sentiments that call for official English policies. The language-as-right orientation, on the other hand, capitalizes on the natural and legal right for minority groups to fight discrimination on the basis of language and finds its strongest articulation in advocacy for bilingual education. Finally, language-as-resource acknowledges the value of knowledge of and competence in languages in the social, educational, and economic spheres of our modern, multicultural world. The educational reform movements of the mid-1980s and beginning of the 1990s seemed to adopt this latter approach and called for changes in language education to address national needs for a bilingual work force for international business purposes (e.g., the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; the Holmes Group, 1986, 1990; the National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; and the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1979). What is the position of the FL profession given these three possible orientations toward language? FL education would seem to be typically associated with a language-as-resource perspective, in that it traditionally provides for multilingual training for diplomatic, military, business, and educational needs in the United States. However, as voices from the fields of sociolinguistics and language planning (e.g., Fishman, 1966; Lambert, 1987; Tucker, 1984, 1990) have strongly argued, efforts to address national economic needs for a bilingual work force are cost- and time-inefficient when they concentrate on developing second language competence in monolingual English speakers, while the enormous language resources of the growing ethnic non-English populations in the country are wasted. In other words, foreign language education can no longer confine itself to serving majority English speakers, but needs to be responsive to the language education needs of (circumstantial) bilingual students, in order to respond to the alleged market demands of the US. Indeed, the rapid changes in the makeup of language classrooms in urban settings in most parts of the world confront language educators with serious challenges, as changing patterns of language use and social identity complicate old definitions of 'bilingualism' (cf. Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997). Unfortunately, there is ample evidence that FL education is structured in ways so as to reproduce the pervasive societal belief that second languages are a resource available for mainstream monolingual speakers only. Different expectations for majority and minority language students perpetuate "a view of 'foreign language study' for majority language students as an elite endeavor" (Tedick & Walker, 1995, p. 302). Bluntly put, monolingual native speakers of English are encouraged to study a foreign language during adolescence but are not expected to develop proficiency in it for actual use, whereas minority students are compelled to develop native-like academic proficiency in the majority language in very limited periods of time and often at the expense of their first language development (Dicker, 1996). Thus, the liberal rhetoric of language-as-resource for the 21st century perpetuates the entrenched myth of foreign language learning as an elite endeavor: mastery of a second language is presented as desirable cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1982) to equip majority English speakers for the challenges of a competitive job market, while the bilingualism of minority speakers is treated as a hindrance to academic and socioeconomic success, or as an unnecessary and unrealistic effort in a casteregulated distribution of jobs in the corporate economy (Ogbu, 1988). In addition to the problem of different standards for majority and minority language students, few minority language students choose foreign language teaching as a career (Lange, 1991; Valdes, 1992, 1995; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). The reasons for the alarming under-representation of minority teachers in FL departments can be traced back to hegemonic notions of nativeness and standardness which perpetuate gatekeeping practices against minority students. The teaching force in most university FL departments comprises majority non-native speakers who attained near native-like competence through extended formal instruction and study abroad experiences on the one hand, and native speakers who acquired the target language in the course of primary socialization and are hired as international teaching assistants on the other. Both groups present the alleged advantage of having high proficiency in a standard variety of the L2 and a mastery of literature and grammar (Valdes, 1995), and both types of teachers embody the ideal target of the "monolingual speaker" even though they are, strictly speaking, bilingual. The extent of this gatekeeping problem cannot be neglected, since it reinforces the cycle of exclusion and elitism: as has been amply documented, mainstream teachers are inadequately prepared to provide academic support for minority students (e.g., Davis & Golden, 1994; Nieto, 1992; Valdes, 1995) and minority teachers are crucial in providing role models for minority student populations (e.g., Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1991). Although the need for role models in minority education has been recognized in the teacher education literature (Chinn & Wong, 1992; Dilworth, 1990; Irvine, 1992; King, 1993), very little is done at an institutional or practical level to remedy the situation in the realm of FL education (Wilberschied Dassier, 1995). SOURCES OF HEGEMONIC BELIEFS IN FL EDUCATION In the preceding discussion I have argued that there is an elitist double standard prevalent in FL education: bilingualism in a foreign language is encouraged for monolingual English speakers and is presented as a resource for developing economic prowess, while the bilingualism of immigrants and indigenous groups is perceived and confronted as a problem. These beliefs and attitudes remain unproblematized because of the misguided conviction that FL teaching is apolitical, and they effectively serve to stigmatize language minority students in many FL classrooms, or to keep them away from pursuing advanced study in a foreign language. Such gatekeeping mechanisms need to be understood in the context of structural constraints of the FL profession, since the specifics of the different institutional settings in which prospective teachers are socialized and where languages are taught and learned profoundly affect the realities of the FL profession. Consequently, the remainder of the chapter will discuss how power struggles and professional legitimization efforts within academia and in the wider society have strongly influenced the FL professional and epistemological agendas chosen since the mid eighties. I will build the argument around four areas: teacher credentialism, the language proficiency movement, the paralyzing focus on methods, and the myth of the "native speaker." These four pillars of FL professional and scholarly cultures constitute a legacy that, in many ways, has kept broader sociopolitical considerations outside the realm of FL education, with the consequence that minority language students' concerns have been neglected. As a result, the FL profession has failed to provide minority language students as well as Englishspeaking majority students with optimal opportunities for academic achievement. STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS IN FL INSTITUTIONS Some scholars have argued that "second language contexts share more similarities than differences and that the time is ripe for language teachers as well as language educators in these fields to join efforts" (Tedick & Walker, 1994, p. 303). However, the historical, ideological, and structural differences that permeate the second language (SL) professions and the respective communities of teachers and scholars cannot be underestimated (Ortega, in press). It may well be a disservice to the goals of a politically responsible language education to ignore the specificity of different institutional settings in which languages are taught and learned. University language departments, in which foreign language teachers are typically forged, focus almost exclusively on the teaching of literature and on literary criticism. Within these departments, a tension has always existed between literature (and sometimes theoretical linguistics) scholarship as a legitimate form of academic knowledge on the one hand, and language teaching and applied linguistic research on the other. These latter areas of scholarship are viewed as 'non-tenurable specialt[ies]' (Di Pietro, Lantolf, & Labarca, 1983; also Teschner, 1987). This tension has had a negative impact on egalitarian language education in at least three respects. First, the tension perpetuates the historical view of the study of foreign languages as ancillary to the reading of the 'classics' (Rivers, 1983) and heavily contributes to a traditional conception of learning that is Eurocentric and bookish and is sustained by a lecture-based pedagogy (see Shor, 1986). This philosophy of language teaching and learning not only engenders elitist attitudes towards language minority students, but it is also particularly ill-suited to prepare FL teachers for serving those language minority students in FL classrooms. Second, this structural tension plays a major role in the failure of FL departments to develop language competent students and teachers (e.g., Di Pietro, Lantolf, & Labarca, 1983; Lafayette, 1993; Valette, 1991). This failure was denounced in the educational reform literature and has been since then bitterly addressed by the FL profession (e.g., see discussion in Schrier, 1993), with a tendency for solutions that capitalize on excellence and professionalism to the exclusion of language equality concerns. The resolution of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in 1995 to set national standards for the FL profession was directed towards long-term solutions to the problem of underachievement in functional FL competence (Lafayette, 1996). Third and finally, conflicts of professional legitimization and status attainment within FL university departments have promoted an inward approach to the problems of the FL profession, preventing FL teachers and scholars from establishing the basis for dialogue within broader educational and political perspectives and keeping FL teacher preparation programs entrenched into language "camps" (Tedick & Walker, 1995). Because FL scholars have always needed to vindicate their professional status within language departments and to legitimate language teaching as a discipline in the wider university system, they have sought to associate themselves with legitimate sources within academic research traditions, namely psychology and linguistics. Thus, the tendency has been to ignore the sociopolitical dimensions of learning and the sociocultural context of education, which are the center of academic inquiry in colleges and departments of education. Individuals, associations, and institutions in FL education seem for the most part to have ignored structural and political constraints that make it impossible to gain professional monopoly and autonomy over FL teaching education in the country on the sole basis of teacher education improvement and a push for professionalization (see Labaree, 1995; and Murray, 1992, for analyses of the fundamental problems of basing professionalization and status attainment struggles on the models of high status professions such as medicine and law). In spite of increasing efforts for professionalism in second and foreign language education (Crookes, 1997), it is still difficult to convince both the general public and the university hierarchy in more traditional disciplines (e.g., linguistics and literature departments) that language teaching is a form of exclusive professional expertise. Two examples of conventional wisdom need to be dispelled: that native or near-native proficiency is sufficient qualification to teach a language, and that the most efficient way of learning a second language as an adult is by immersion in the target-language community. The former belief questions the need for a language teacher career, while the latter questions the necessity and benefits of FL formal instruction. In light of these professional struggles, changes in language education initiated in the early 1980s responded to two professional issues of great importance at that time: the need to ensure near-native language competence among second language teachers and students, and the need to establish a knowledge base for the teaching and learning of second languages that sets the basis for effective L2 classroom techniques. The solutions offered, however, amply failed to contemplate considerations of language equality and the impact of the new professional agenda on minority students. Indeed, it is a fair assessment to contend that the nature of the solutions for enhanced quality of FL instruction and legitimized professional status have often been sought without a consideration of broader negative sociopolitical consequences, such as the reinforcement of gatekeeping mechanisms that have to date left minority groups out of the FL teaching profession. Indeed, the linguistic and cultural resources of minority language students have been untapped in most FL professional initiatives. TEACHER CREDENTIALISM The concern to ensure high degrees of linguistic and cultural competence among FL teachers has led to the implementation of standardized proficiency tests as part of teacher credentialing mechanisms in many states. Some FL teacher educators have gone as far as to suggest that, if feasible, mandatory study abroad experiences should be included in standard teacher preparation programs (Lafayette, 1993). These professional initiatives, .however, overlook research that shows how the use of teacher entry and competency exams disproportionately affects minority students (Dilworth, 1990; King, 1993), and how study abroad and traveling are beyond the reasonable scope of prospective FL minority students and teachers, since abroad exchanges are often seen as a prohibitive investment of time and money (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). Only recently has community-based learning begun to be considered a worthy alternative in providing FL learners with first-hand exposure to language input (D. R. Long, 1997; Overfield, 1997). On the other hand, there has been a sense of marginalization of FL professional associations from the federal and state government processes of accreditation of FL programs and certification of teachers. Namely, FL teacher associations acknowledge the fact that their professional initiatives, though influential, have no authority over federal and state decision-making policies for teacher accreditation and certification (Lafayette, 1993). For instance, Rhodes and Oxford (1988) report that most FL teachers in the elementary school (FLES) programs lacked certification to teach FLs, and Schrier (1993) notes that a double standard in the provision of certification by state departments of education allows emergency licensing to native speakers, who are accredited to teach some languages in some states with no language-teaching preparation. This is particularly the case with the so-called 'truly foreign languages' (Jorden & Walton, 1989) or less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). THE PROFICIENCY MOVEMENT Under the same thrust for teaching excellence and professionalism stands the development of the "proficiency movement" in the world of SL education (Bachman & Savignon, 1986). Although many in the FL profession posited positive washback effects of the proficiency-based tests on teacher competency, curriculum design, and methods (e.g., Higgs, 1982; Omaggio, 1983; Schulz, 1988), the proficiency movement has also reinforced pervasive attitudes of linguistic elitism and minimal awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language teaching. For one, the proficiency literature has persistently ignored the criticisms of scholars who pointed out the inadequacy of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines to measure the language ability of circumstantial bilinguals (Valdes, 1989; see also Valdes & Figueroa, 1994), the biased notions of standardness and nativeness underlying the Guidelines (e.g., Marisi, 1994) and the fact that an overemphasis on language proficiency and communicative competence often diverts due attention from the real language needs of minority students and hinders the recognition of their potential as resources in FL education. More subtly, practices in FL classrooms that connect the attainment of language proficiency and communicative competence with making a rule of the use of the target-language only in the L2 classroom abound, banning connections between first and second language development in FL instruction. Missing these connections amounts to indifference towards the maintenance of the Ll in an English-dominant society, to linguicism (Nieto, 1992) in the FL classroom against FL minority students who are speakers of a non-standard variety of the target language or of English, and to inadequacy in dealing with heterogeneous language proficiencies and functional literacies (in the Ll and/or in English) in the FL classroom. Similarly, the communicative goal of exposing students to 'authentic' discourse is overwhelmingly understood as promoting the use of authentic materials produced by native speakers for native speakers of the language in the target culture, always portrayed as an existing standard in a foreign country outside the States. In spite of the fact that there are numerous speech communities of the so-called foreign language within the States, to which minority students in the FL classroom may belong, these are ignored in materials, syllabi, and classroom discussions. These nested pedagogical practices and attitudes inspired by the goal of proficiency and communicative language competence have reinforced and exacerbated the situation of insularity of the FL classroom and its orientation towards the ideal of the monolingual speaker in a far foreign country. As Tedick et al. (1993, p. 57) put it, "the study of second languages is largely decontextualized, unrelated to students' real life within their school, community, family, and peer groups." THE CHOICE OF A KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR THE PROFESSION: ABOUT METHODS Decontextualizing second language education from the larger sociocultural and political realities in which it is embedded has a long tradition (see Crookes, 1997) and has led to the proliferation of formulas for theory, inquiry, and praxis that are supposedly valid for all teachers, with all students, in all settings, and for all second languages taught irrespective of societal language status and power conflicts with English, the majority language (see Barnhardt, 1994, for a similar criticism). The overwhelming focus on language-specific, 'one-size-fits-all' (Kubota, 1998) methods, at least for some sectors of the FL profession, seems to respond to the perceived need of teachers to operate with usable, practical knowledge that is readily applicable to teaching (Labaree, 1992). It also reflects in part the professional will to proclaim a content knowledge base which is specific to and exclusive of second language teaching (e.g., Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Jarvis, 1983; Lafayette, 1993; Lange, 1983; Wing, 1993). Extensive research on culturally responsive pedagogies attests to the structural, institutional, and sociocultural incongruencies that result from methods-based, decontextualized approaches to teaching and teacher education (e.g., Barnhardt, 1994; Cazden, 1988; Davis, 1995; Delpit, 1988; Holliday, 1994; Kubota, 1998; Kuo, 1995; McDermott, 1982; Weinstein, 1984; Willet, 1995). Critical voices in the wider field of education have repeatedly claimed that a myopic focus on methodology often diverts attention away from examining the sociohistorical and political dimensions of education and mask the process of unconscious reproduction of unequal societal power relationships in the classroom (Bartolome, 1994; Bredo, Henry, & McDermott, 1990; Britzman, 1986). Although a few FL scholars have directly addressed the problem of what has been called "the paralyzing focus on methodology" in the FL education profession (McKay & Wong, 1988; Tedick & Walker, 1994; Tedick et al., 1993), there is a conspicuous silence in the literature regarding the implications of such an overwhelming focus in questions of political responsibility of individual language teachers and of the profession as a whole (however, in the ESL profession there are critical appraisals of this problem; see Auerbach, 1986; Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; and see Faltis, 1990; and Graman, 1988; in the realm of FL). There has been a gradually increasing recognition of the pitfalls of equating a single 'methods' course with foreign language teaching education for over a decade now (e.g., Bernhardt and Hammadou, 1987) and the tendency in recent years has been one of acknowledging the need for language teacher educators to address teacher development rather than 'teacher training' or 'teacher preparation,' and to talk about pedagogical content knowledge rather than 'methodology courses' as the core components of FL teacher education (e.g., most contributions in Alatis, Stern, & Strevens, 1983; Lange, 1990; Richards & Nunan, 1990). The change of terminology, however, constitutes little more than an example of lip service to more general trends in the teacher education literature, and most of these proposals persist with the paralyzing emphasis on pedagogical methods. THE MYTH OF "THE NATIVE SPEAKER" AND LINGUICISM IN FL PROFESSIONAL CULTURES In the mainstream FL professional culture of teachers, as well as in society at large, primary socialization (child L1 acquisition in a monolingual setting) and immersion in the target culture as an adult (adult L2 acquisition in the monolingual setting of the target society) seem to be the privileged paths to attainment of near-native competence (see Ferguson & Huebner, 1991; Valdes, 1995; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). Furthermore, the FL traditional definition of multiculturalism seems to encompass only cultures outside of the United States. As a result, FL teachers give students the ambivalent message that certain kinds of naturalistic learning are superior not only to formal instruction (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995), but also to naturalistic acquisition in community contexts within the States. For instance, all FL programs in higher education place a great emphasis on study abroad experiences (e.g., De Keyser, 1990; Freed, 1995; Nash, 1976; Pyle, 1981), and FL textbooks overwhelmingly concern themselves with the portrayal of mainstream cultural values of the countries where the target-language is spoken, with no reference to US speech communities (see Moore, 1991; cited in Tedick et al., 1993; Ramirez & Hall, 1990). Due to the traditional focus on English monolingual students, FL research and FL pedagogy have naturally failed to link language and literacy development of the second language to that of the first language (Tedick & Walker, 1995), since this is not an issue for majority monolingual speakers. As a consequence, FL teachers typically remain unaware of or uninterested in L1 maintenance. Yet, understanding relationships between first and second language literacy and proficiency development would be essential when addressing the needs of circumstantial bilinguals (see Cummins, 1991, 1992; Valdes, 1992), and ignorance of such issues often leads to linguicism, or the prejudice against non-standard varieties of the target-language (Nieto, 1992) commonly displayed in FL classrooms. Namely, because of lack of knowledge of sociolinguistics and second dialect and second language learning, FL teachers often insist upon "standardness" of either the L1 or the L2 of the minority student and may even label the non-mainstream student as an 'inadequate' language learner (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). In many cases, FL teachers may take certain non-standard language forms used by bilingual students in the class as non-native-like, rather than belonging to the non-standard native variety of the students. On such occasions, it is not unusual for FL teachers not to be able to recognize certain forms as systematic features of a particular variety of the language, and to conclude, mistakenly, that a student has 'fossilized' altogether. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS This chapter examined the main areas of conflict between the mainstream ethos of the FL profession and the goals of multilingualism and language equality for minority language students. It was argued that the entrenched belief that foreign language education can be apolitical and neutral has prevented FL teachers from critically examining their responsibility in the advancement of multilingualism in educational settings and in the society at large. There is an elitist double standard prevalent in FL education: bilingualism in a foreign language is encouraged among monolingual English speakers and is presented as an economic resource, while the bilingualism of immigrants and indigenous groups is perceived and confronted as a problem. This elitism is not questioned because of the belief that the language education of minority students need not be the concern of the foreign language profession. In actuality, such attitudes and beliefs serve as gatekeepers for language minority students in many FL classrooms and harm the FL profession in the long term by precluding a recognition of the potential resources that bilingual students bring into the classroom. Language minority students can not only provide Englishspeaking majority students with optimal opportunities for language interaction that are believed to facilitate L2 development (M. H. Long, 1996; Swain, 1995), but they also bring into the FL classroom cultural and linguistic bridges to communities in the States. These bridges are likely to constitute a force for integrative and instrumental motivation, making foreign language learning more relevant and immediate for English-speaking students and increasing chances of high levels of FL achievement (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). In sum, realizing the potential of minority students' contribution to a notion of foreign languages as a resource for all can lead to the improvement of FL instruction and greater involvement in foreign language study among English-speaking as well as minority language-speaking students in the US (e.g., Sung & Padilla, 1998). Power struggles and professional legitimization efforts within academia and in the wider society have strongly influenced the FL professional and epistemological agendas since the mid eighties. Teacher credentialism, a focus on language proficiency, the search for a defined knowledge base for FL teaching and learning, and the myth of a "native speaker" as the ideal target of FL education constitute the most pervasive legacy of the last two decades. This legacy has had negative sociopolitical consequences for the increasing minority student populations in schools and universities. In the search for professional legitimization, FL teaching education has often become a matter of method-based, context-free solutions, while the profession as a whole has failed to enter into an examination of the complex interconnections between language, literacy, and cultural development of students in their first and second language, and how methods interact with the social context of learning and the political and educational goals of individuals and institutions. What can be done to aid FL teachers and educators in their increasing efforts to respond to the needs and goals of circumstantial bilinguals in L2 classrooms? Some proposals in the FL profession envision a future perspective of a "common corps of second language professionals" joined in the process of reconceptualizing the FL profession and changing language teaching practices to encourage bilingualism and multiculturalism in the citizenry (Lange, 1987; McKay & Wong, 1988; Tedick & Walker, 1995). Other perhaps more realistic frameworks concentrate on the specialization among language teaching professional bodies in distinct areas of expertise. Thus, Valdes (1992) suggests that the FL profession be tracked into a FL teaching division, devoted to the teaching of second languages to majority students who are monolingual speakers of English, and a language maintenance division that concerns itself with the needs of minority students who are circumstantial bilinguals and enter SL education with a wide range of proficiency in their first language. In serving the needs of minority language students in FL classrooms, Valdes argues for the need to develop a specific body of research in pedagogy for and assessment of circumstantial bilingualism (see Valdes, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1995). Whether changes come from specialization of FL professionals into tracks or from an overall and pervasive sensitization toward the political responsibilities of language education, the FL profession as a whole will need to avail itself of appropriate tools to face the unprecedented challenges that language classrooms in most parts of the world pose today (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997). The description of FL professional realities entails several layers at the macro-level: the differing degrees of power and status that a particular second language has with respect to the societal or majority language (ideological and sociopolitical aspects); the specificity of different institutional settings in which languages are taught and learned (institutional and structural aspects); and the cultural and linguistic membership of teachers and students within a class (cultural identity aspects). FL teacher education programs and FL scholarly discussions will need to address these three dimensions of professional engagement if future communities of FL teachers are to be prepared to serve the needs of minority students and to fulfill the commitment to language equality in education. Since the system of beliefs and values of individuals is extremely resistant to substantive change, top down approaches to changes in curriculum are likely to leave teachers' cultures untouched (see Davis, 1995). Models of collaboration among various second language communities of teachers and students within different educational settings seem to be successful in creating conditions that may lead to radical changes among the individuals and institutions involved. In these models, university FL or less commonly taught language departments work in conjunction with high schools to bring together minority and majority language students in projects that focus on language-as-resource and on improved second language instruction (e.g., Huebner, Bartolome, Avelar-Lasalle, & Azevedo, 1989; the Partnership Project in this volume). The strength of these efforts resides in the uniqueness of capitalizing on the neglected language resources of minority students while promoting interaction between educational settings that remain otherwise isolated from each other.

### Link – Schools

#### The school model enforces Eurocentric knowledge production and facilitates the marginalization of minority students

**Ochoa ‘8** (Gilda L.; Professor of sociology and Chicana/o-Latina/o studies at Pomona College. She is the author of Becoming Neighbors in a Mexican American Community and Learning from Latino Teachers and coeditor of Latino Los Angeles.Deconstructing Power, Privilege, and Silence in the Classroom, “Teaching against Traditional Schooling,” https://www.academia.edu/6804193/Deconstructing\_Power\_Privilege\_and\_Silence\_in\_the\_Classroom)

The structure of traditional classrooms reinforces the status quo, limiting critical thinking and self-reflection. Traditional classrooms are based on the “banking model of education” in which the instructor is positioned as the conveyor of knowledge and students are expected to passively receive information. Students are rewarded for being silent, obedient, and agreeable or for participating only when called on. Since the professor is conceived as the expert, little space is provided for students to enter into dialogue, share their personal experiences, reflect on how they are affected by the course, or critically assess the course curriculum and classroom pedagogy. Typically, dissension and conflict are discouraged. When students are treated as empty receptacles into which knowledge is deposited, what they know and experience is often devalued and disregarded. Personal experiences may be trivialized as anecdotes or as irrelevant to the course material, while academic theories and “facts” are perceived as more rigorous and important Knowledge is presented as something to be acquired; it is static, distant material that remains disembodied from members of the class. By the time students begin college in the United States, they have undergone years of socialization not only about their expected roles but also about proper modes of comportment in the traditional classroom. These preferred modes of decorum are raced, classed, and gendered as particular ways of communicating are valued. “Standard English” is the privileged language, and students receive various messages that loudness, anger, laughter, interruptions, disagreements, and speaking with emotions or with their hands are unacceptable and disruptive. Instructors interested in challenging the status quo and preventing the boredom and passivity of students advocate for the creation of empowering or liberatory classrooms. These classrooms are student-centered, cooperative, participatory, reflective, and negotiated between the instructor and students. They provide opportunities to “relate personal growth to public life” and devise strategies for personal and societal transformation. Even when we aim to create student-centered and democratic classrooms, all students and teachers do not experience these classrooms in the same manner. Students who have encountered an educational system in which school officials and course curricula reflect and affirm their social locations and perspectives are more likely to exhibit higher levels of entitlement, ownership, and confidence in the class- room compared with students whose schooling has been less positive. For example, studies indicate that when class participation is encouraged, White males tend to speak more frequently and for longer periods of time. Students of Color may have experiences of being treated as “native informants” who are asked to “educate” the class on the histories, experiences, or opinions of an entire group of people. In particular, compared to their peers, Latinas are less likely to feel psychologically safe in school environments. From an early age, Latinas report fears of speaking up in the classroom. In a student-centered classroom aiming to challenge more traditional forms of education, these patterns can result in the continued centering of white- ness, middleclassness, and masculinity and the marginalization of groups of color, the working class, and women. Fortunately, for those of us looking for strategies to deconstruct dominant ideologies and classroom practices, there are progressive tenets and critical theories within and outside academia that can be used across disciplinary contexts. We have found that some of the most exciting work on teaching and learning comes from inter- and multidisciplinary approaches. Our training and experiences in the classroom lead us to draw from sociology and Chicana/o studies. In sociology, C. W. Mills’s sociological imagination helps students and us to uncover taken-for-granted practices and create student-centered classrooms. Mills’s sociological-imagination perspective is crucial for strengthening students’ critical thinking skills. It encourages students to deindividualize problems and instead see the relationships between “public issues of social structure” and “personal troubles of mileu.” Likewise, neo-Marxist, racial-formation, feminist, and other conflict theories allow for analyses of the persisting inequalities of power and resources as they are structured in society and differentially influence lives by race and ethnicity, class, and gender. Similar to some of the perspectives advanced by conflict theorists, the origins of Chicana/o studies make it a discipline that challenges dominant perspectives, focuses on the societal factors influencing Chicanos/as and Latinos/as, emphasizes social change research and scholarship, and valorizes knowledge from personal experiences and family histories. By using frameworks and readings from multiple disciplines that center on the analysis of race, class, and gender, instructors and students are provided with new ways to think about classroom dynamics and to understand the significance of social location for life chances, experiences, and perspectives.

### Link – STEM

#### Western science has no basis in reality – its focus on objective detachment estranges western science from actual interpretation – other cultural sciences are critical – making the decision to embrace openness is paramount to resolving the destruction of the natural world

Cajete 2006 (Gregory.; PhD, a Tewa from Santa Clara Pueblo, is the Director of the University of New Mexico Native American Studies Program and also an Associate Professor in the Department of Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies in the UNM College of Education. “Unlearning the language of conquest: scholars expose anti-indianism in America”, pg. 255-259)

The ~~blindness~~ of modern perception with regard to nature prevails throughout postmodern technocratic society. Western science and society continue to deny the spirit and intelligence of nature. Enclosed in a technologically mediated world, people rarely encounter nature in any signifi cant or creative way. Nature may be the topic of the latest *National Geographic* special or the focus of the newest Walt Disney theme park, but direct experiences with nonhuman nature, if they happen at all, are limited to pets, zoos, parks, and farms. What most people know about animals and nature comes from television. While moderns may have technical knowledge of nature, few have knowledge of the nonhuman world gained directly from personal experience. Native science is an echo of a premodern affi nity for participation with the nonhuman world. As a way of knowing the world, it exists at the margins of modern society as an unconscious memory, a myth, a dream, a longing, and as the lived experience of the few Indigenous societies that have not yet been totally displaced by the modern technologically mediated world. Creative participation in nature provides a glimpse of the human nature that has grounded our sensual experience. Before we developed modern perceptual habits and linguistic prejudices, this experience was common. The perceptual process upon which Native science rests remains a mystery for most moderns**.** It is certainly not the “real world” of jobs, school, the mall, and television. Yet, if we learn once again to feel, see, hear, smell, and taste the world as our ancestors did, we may remember something truly wonderful about nature in humans. This does not mean that we should or even can return to the premodern, hunter-gatherer existence of our ancestors, but only that we must carry their perceptual wisdom and way of participation into the twentyfi rst century, where the environmental challenges we face will require a totally different way of living in nature. The French phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty makes the following observation: “We begin by reawakening the basic experience of the world, of which science is the second-order expression . . . To return to things themselves is the return to that world which precedes knowledge, of which knowledge always speaks, and in relation to which every scientifi c schematization is an abstract and derivative sign language.”6 Native science embodies the central premises of phenomenology **(the philosophical study of phenomena)** by rooting the entire tree of knowledge in the soil of direct physical and perceptual experience of the earth. In other words, to know yourself you must fi rst know the earth. This process of intersubjectivity is based on the notion that there is a primal affi nity between the human body and the other bodies of the natural world. According to Edmund Husserl, the conceptual father of phenomenology, there is a kind of “associative empathy” between humans and other living things, which is grounded in the physical nature of bodies.7 Husserl believed that lived experience, or the “life-world,” was the ultimate source of human knowledge and meaning. The life-world evolves through our experience before we rationalize it into categories of facts and apply scientifi c principles. Our life-world evolves through our experience from birth to death and forms the basis for our explanation of reality. In other words, it is subjective experience that forms the basis for the objective explanation of the world. The Western science view and method for exploring the world starts with a detached “objective” view to create a factual blueprint, a map of the world. Yet, that blueprint is not the world. In its very design and methodology, Western science estranges direct human experience in favor of a detached view**. It should be no surprise that** the knowledge it produces requires extensive recontextualizing within the lived experience in modern society. This methodological estrangement, while producing amazing technology, also threatens the very modern life-world that supports it.The life-world that Husserl describes is culturally relative. It is diverse and different for each culture and each person because it is based on the experienced world of distinct peoples who evolved in distinct places and described themselves and their surroundings in distinct languages. Yet, there is a unity in such diversity, derived from the fact that humans share a species-specifi c experience and knowledge of nature. Humans also share an experience of nature with all other living things, although our perceptions are different from those of other species due to our unique physical biology. This is the basis of the life-world, a vast ocean of direct human experience that lies below all cultural mediation. This consciousness of the life-world forms another foundation of Native science. Current cultural concepts of time, space, relationships, and linguistic forms are rooted in this precultural biological awareness. From a phenomenological viewpoint, all sciences are Earth-based. Western science must acknowledge this common foundation, this rootedness in the same physical world as Native science, and for its continued evolution, it must integrate and apply the collective lived experience of human participation with nature. In David Abram’s words, “Every theoretical and scientifi c practice grows out of and remains supported by the forgotten ground of our directly felt and lived experience, and has value and meaning only in reference to this primordial and open realm.”8 Of course, the physical body is an essential aspect of lived experience. The body, as the source of thinking, sensing, acting, and being, and as the basis of relationship, is a central consideration of Native science. This is why the metaphor of the body is used so often by tribes to describe themselves, as well as their communities, social organization, and important relationships in the world. Tribal use of the metaphor describes not just the physical body, but the mind-body that experiences and participates in the world. Indeed, humans and the natural world interpenetrate one another at many levels, including the air we breathe, the carbon dioxide we contribute to the food we transform, and the chemical energy we transmute at every moment of our lives from birth to death. Phenomenology parallels the approach of Native science in that it provides a viewpoint based on our innate human experience within nature. Native science strives to understand and apply the knowledge gained from participation in the here and now, and emphasizes our role as one of nature’s members rather than striving to be in control of it. “Ultimately, to acknowledge the life of the body, and affi rm our solidarity with this physical form, is to acknowledge our existence as one of earth’s animals, and so to remember and rejuvenate the organic basis of our thoughts and our intelligence.”9 The creative body and all that comprises it—mind, body, and spirit— are the creative, moving center of Native science. **Although this may seem commonsense,** modern thinking abstracts the mind from the human body and the body of the world. This modern orientation, in turn, frequently disconnects Western science from the lived and experienced world of nature**.** The disassociation becomes most pronounced at the level of perception, because our perceptions orient us in the most elemental way to our surroundings. Ultimately, our innate receptivity to our surroundings, combined with our individual creativity and mediated by our cultural conditioning, characterizes our perception**.** In reality, orientation, receptivity, creativity, perception, and imagination are integrated through participation with nature. This is why participation is a key strategy of Native science; it can take many forms and can be individual as well as collective. In Native contexts, creative participation may result in a story, song, dance, new technology, or even a vision, ritual, or ceremony. We cannot help but participate with the world. Whether we acknowledge and are creatively open to the perceptions that will result, or remain oblivious to its infl uence and creative possibilities toward deeper understanding, is our decision. This is the perpetual trap of Western science and the perpetual dilemma of Western society: all humans are in constant interaction with the physical reality. Western science and society perpetuate the illusion of “objective” detachment and psychological disassociation. Anti-“Indian” hegemony maintains this illusion, an illusion the world cannot afford to serve any longer.

## 2NC Block

### 2NC – Framework

#### The Role of the Ballot is to affirm the best form of subjectivity – the aff results in the assimilation of the subaltern into Western modes of thinking making discrimination and consumption inevitable

**Rebughini ’14** (Paola.; Professor of Sociology at the State University of Milan. She has a PhD in sociology from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (Paris). She works on social theory, intercultural relations and social movements. Her recent publications include: Children of Immigrants in a Globalized World: A Generational Experience (with E Colombo; Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). [email: paola.rebughini@unimi.it], “Subject, subjectivity, Subjectivation,” http://www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/2nd%20Coll%20Subject,subjectivity.pdf)

The theme of cultural difference, of the construction of subjectivity beyond the influence of western culture, the question of colour line and racialization, have also been fundamental in shaping the debate on the subject in recent decades. A generation of intellectuals born or working outside the western world has developed reflections and empirical studies showing that western conceptualization of the subject can no longer consider itself the unique or authentic model. Starting with the pioneer studies of Said (1979), then Spivak (1988), Bhabha (1994), Dussel (1995), Chakrabarty (2000), Mbembe (2013) and many others, intellectuals coming from the previously colonized world have revealed the historicity and the cultural relativism of the western model of subjectivity as well as its associations with the colonial past. Prior to postcolonial and de-colonial studies, the works of Frantz Fanon and those of the African-American WEB Du Bois had already raised the question of the ‘authentic’ subjectivity of the non-white individual and the impossibility of the ‘coloured’ subject to be really free and emancipated. This focus on the embodied and political ‘difference’ of subalterns has been used as a critical standpoint against the ontology of the western, white subject, and it has been enhanced, again, by the influence of poststructuralism, psychoanalysis, deconstructivism, as well as by the heterodox Marxism of Gramsci (Young, 2001). The aim has been not only that of criticizing the abstract subject but also that of investigating the pluralism of subjectivities of all subalterns, such as colonized and racialized people. However, in spite of the heterogeneity of these theoretical sources and the determination to define the subject in a new way, a certain attitude of ‘negative dialectics’ is a common characteristic of these studies as in Adorno’s perspective: the accent is put on what is lacking, on what is not, on what was against the law or mainstream signifiers, even though the task is to find an autonomous and nonEurocentric way to describe and express subjectivity. This attitude of negative dialectics has been contested especially by Latin American de-colonial studies (Dussel, 1995; Mignolo, 2002; Quijano, 2000) which have insisted on the necessity of decolonizing knowledge, avoiding a passive assimilation of western analytical tools, and finding an interpretation of subjectivity and emancipation in the hybrid culture of subaltern strata of non-western countries, such as those of indigenous people. A partially alternative path towards this goal has been taken by authors who have faced the topic of postcolonial and post-racialized subjectivities from the reconstruction of the historical background. Scholars like Chatterjee (2011) and Bhambra (2007) have tried to show how a reconsideration of historical events of colonization can be reconciled with the original cultural hybridity of the very western idea of subjectivity. The western cultural legacy has been constantly contaminated and ‘translated’ by other cultural influences and by the combination of these elements in empirical and contingent historical situations. Hence, we cannot say that there is a truly western and non-western idea of the subject, because even the Kantian or the Hegelian ideas of subjectivity are related to the historical events of their time such as colonization (Buck-Morss, 2000). The culturelessness aspect of the western idea of subjectivity has also been criticized by cultural studies, by their empirical research on migrations and popular culture and their relations with racialization and discrimination processes (Gilroy, 2004; Hall, 1997). Also from a more explicitly political stance – such as that of the New Left Review edited by Stuart Hall – the aim was to carry out a re-examination of the resistant subjectivities – not necessarily those of the white working class – against the hegemony of cultural and economic elites. Here the focus was less on an ontological idea of the subject to be dismantled, than on the construction of subjectivities by means of emancipation. Everyday experience, cultural consumption, rituals, subcultures, social movements are the fields where ‘alternative’ and hybrid subjectivities are performed.

#### Western standards impose only one way knowing casing historical and societal biases resulting in serial policy failure because policy makers impose these views on populations

Kanth ‘9 (Rajani Kannepalli.; Visiting Fellow at Harvard University, USA. Though born in India, he is a US citizen and has resided overseas for most of his life. His major research interests lie in the fields of Economics, Social Theory and Policy, and Women's Issues.The Challenge of Eurocentrism Global Perspectives, Policy, and Prospects, “Economic Development and the Fabrication of the Middle East as a Eurocentric Project,” http://www.palgrave.com/de/book/9780230612273)

We define Eurocentrism as the presumption that Western European (and North American) social standards and values (which are assumed to be unique to Europe) are the only accepted means for evaluating the performance of other societies simply by virtue of being more “modern,” “enlightened,” “civilized,” and “superior.” Eurocentrism is a special case of Ethnocentrism, but of all the ethnocentric habits of thought Eurocentrism has been by far the most dominant one since the eighteenth century. This mode of thinking has permeated cultures across the world, the various academic disciplines in the social sciences, and inevitably legal and political institutions. Being Eurocentric does not necessarily mean that one is from the West , in fact the gravest form of Eurocentrism is the one adopted by the modern states and their elites in the so-called East or Orient. Indigenous Eurocentrism in the Orient, we argue, is the ultimate success of the Eurocentric project and was mostly achieved through coercive intrusion by colonial powers (and by domestic elites), and was later transferred to the deeply Eurocentric postcolonial authorities that continued the modernist agenda either with a capitalist or socialist flavor. In fact, one of the most cited justifications for colonialism has been to bring civilization, modernity, and progress to the colonized world. As a result, more than half a century after the end of colonialism the Eurocentric habits of thought continue to be entrenched in the conventional wisdom: We have been taught . . . that there exists an entity called the West and that one can think of this West as a society and civilization independent of and in opposition to other societies and civilizations [i.e., the East]. Many of us even grew up believing that this West has [an autonomous] genealogy according to which ancient Greek begat Rome, Rome begat Christian Europe, Christian Europe begat the Renaissance, the Renaissance the Enlightenment, the Enlightenment political democracy and the industrial revolution. Industry, crossed with democracy, in turn yielded the United States embodying the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . [That is] misleading, first, because it turns history into a moral success story, a race in time in which each [Western] runner of the race passes on the torch of liberty to the next relay. History is thus converted into a tale about the furtherance of virtue, about how the virtuous [i.e., the West] win out over the bad guys [the East]. (Wolf 1982, cited in Hobson 2004, p. 1) Thus, Eurocentrism denies the contribution of non-Western societies to the collective achievements of human kind by teaching that “ the history of Europe covers the essential history of civilization ” (Du Bois 1946, p. 148). As pointed out by Frank (1998, p. 9), the myth of European exceptionalism encompasses a number of basic arguments: “(i) social development is caused by characteristics which are internal to society, (ii) the historical development of society is either an evolutionary process or a gradual decline. These arguments allow Orientalists to establish their dichotomous ideal types of Western society whose inner essence unfolds in a dynamic process towards democratic industrialism” (Turner 1986, p. 81). Accordingly, as argued by Max Weber, the Occident is characterized by a unique combination of rationality and activism (Hodgson 1993, p. 86). Wallerstein (1996) identifies five ways in which social sciences express their Eurocentric bias: (i) a historiography that claims European scientific superiority over other cultures; (ii) the parochialism of its universalism claiming that made-in-Europe science has discovered the “laws of motion” of both nature and society, and that such laws are valid across time and space; (iii) its assumptions that the “West” is uniquely and especially “civilized”; (iv) its Orientalism (as defined in the works of Anouar Abdel-Malek and of Eurocentric ideology. Accordingly, the Left often neglects “to reflect on exactly how much of Marxism is infected with similar notions” (Kanth 1997, p. 90). The best known example is probably Marx with his Eurocentric imagination of the “ Orient where civilization was too low and the territorial extent too vast to call into life voluntary association ” (Marx 1853). In contrast, the Occident was characterized by voluntary association that led to the development of private enterprise. The period between 1700 and 1850 clearly dates the rise of Eurocentrism as a fundamental construct of the “West” as a superior society blessed with all possible virtues and moral values that the “East” lacked. Needless to say that the geographic references to “East” and “West” in their modernist meanings are precisely the construct of the same Eurocentric imaginary. The MENA region itself is a Eurocentric fabrication aimed at essentializing the region and its people. As Halliday explains: We should long ago have resisted the temptation to see the region as a single, integrated political or socio-economic whole [. . .]. One of the besetting distortions of the region, replicated by Western stereotyping and local ideology alike, is that the region’s politics and history can be explained by timeless cultural features, a Middle Eastern “essence” or an “Islamic mindset.” (Halliday 1999, p. 4) For our analysis, therefore, first we need to clarify what the MENA region is, and its usefulness as a unit of analysis. Like most of the developing world, the MENA region was more of a product of strategic factors from the European point of view than anything else. As Lewis and Wigen (1997, p. 37) exposed, geographically speaking seeing Europe and Asia as parts of a single continent would have been a more accurate classification but would fall short of granting Europe the superiority that “Western Europeans” believed it deserved. By fabricating a seemingly scientific continental division between Europe and Asia, Western scholars managed to strengthen the notion of a cultural dichotomy between these two regions. Moreover, starting from the beginning the Middle East was not a region defined by cultural, historical, or geographical units but by strategic military needs. In fact, the term itself was the brainchild of the military theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan in 1902 to refer to the region neighboring the Persian Gulf (Lewis and Wigen 1997, p. 65). Furthermore, if the Middle East is in the middle from the perspective of Western Europe (and North America) then which region and countries lie in the Near East? The most visible sign of a lack of structural basis for the fabrication of such a unit of analysis is the continuing confusion regarding the borders of this region. A quick look at the current social sciences literature reveals a lack of consensus on which countries to include in this region. The list ranges from all North Africa, some Central Asia (such as Afghanistan), Persian Gulf (i.e., Iran, Bahrain, UAE, Qatar), Asia Minor (Turkey), Mediterranean island(s) (Malta but not Cyprus for some unknown Edward Said); and (v) its attempts to impose the theory of progress (Wallerstein 1996, p. 1). As a result, proponents of both capitalism and socialism, which Kanth (1997) described as “the twin faces of Janus,” often fell into the traps reason), and Eastern Mediterranean (Israel, Lebanon, Palestine, Syria). It is common practice to exclude Cyprus and Malta from the classification although (according to the geographical and historical justifications used for other countries) they are part of the region. The same problem applies to the exclusion of Armenia and Azerbaijan from the list. Another visible sign of the absurdity of using MENA as a unit of analysis and the apparent difficulty of using it for comparative research is the presence of multiple classifications. To give an example, it is common to classify the countries in the region based on: oil rich/oil poor; labor rich—oil rich (Iran, Iraq)/labor poor—oil rich (Kuwait, Qatar, UAE, Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Libya, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia); labor rich–oil poor (Egypt, Turkey); oil poor–limited natural resource (Israel, Tunisia, West Bank and Gaza, Jordan, Lebanon); natural resource poor states (Sudan, Yemen); NICs (Turkey, Egypt, Tunisia); industrialized (Israel) countries (i.e., Richards and Waterbury 1996). Despite this multiplicity, still no one questions the usefulness of classifying all these countries in one group despite different economic, historical, cultural and geographical mappings. The fabricated mapping of the region has long been internalized by the region itself. In addition to the imagined existence of the region as a unit of analysis, the region also took for granted the basic tenets of modernity as defined in Europe. As discussed by Kanth (1997) and Hobson (2004), equating Westernization with modernity presupposes geographical and cultural uniqueness and superiority of Western Europe over the rest of the world. Despite the presence of a growing body of research documenting and challenging the claim that democracy, individualism, secularism, market society and in general modernity started in Europe and is an end product of European culture, the intellectuals, academicians, the military and policy makers continue to impose an imagined version of modernity on their populations.

#### Eurocentrism supports economic rationality justifying violence to the margins and lead to serial policy failure in state interactions

Kanth ‘9 (Rajani Kannepalli.; Visiting Fellow at Harvard University, USA. Though born in India, he is a US citizen and has resided overseas for most of his life. His major research interests lie in the fields of Economics, Social Theory and Policy, and Women's Issues.The Challenge of Eurocentrism Global Perspectives, Policy, and Prospects, “Economic Development and the Fabrication of the Middle East as a Eurocentric Project,” http://www.palgrave.com/de/book/9780230612273)

Economists deserve a fair share of the blame for their contribution to Eurocentrism. Joseph Schumpeter’s classic History of Economic Analysis (1954) taught generations of economists that there was a “Great Gap” in the development of economic thought between ancient Greece and the European Renaissance. During the “Dark Ages,” he argued, there was nothing of significant intellectual contribution worth studying. Schumpeter and his followers have completely ignored the contributions made to economics by Al-Ghazali, Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Taimiyah, Ibn Qayyim, Abu Yousuf, and Ibn Sina, among many others. Several decades later, the so-called Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region is still struggling with the socioeconomic consequences of Eurocentrism. Mainstream economics (i.e., neoclassical) focuses on uncovering the universal laws of economic behavior that apply regardless of time and space. Such laws, however, happen to be impregnated with Eurocentric notions of “economic rationality” and modernity. As such, neoclassical economics asserts that people everywhere are essentially the same, and therefore all that needs to be done is to help them (willingly or unwillingly) discover the rational way of organizing their economies. The Orientalist paradigm, however, takes the position that MENA’s culture and people are special and different. Accordingly, the Middle Eastern culture including the dominant religion (i.e., Islam) creates major impediments not only to economic development, and the rise of capitalism and free enterprise, but also to the spread of democracy, and civil society. It is these two approaches to MENA that have dominated the economic analysis of the region and have driven the policy agenda for decades. The recent revival of writings on MENA coincides with the rise of a new wave of wars from within and outside the region. The strategic importance of the region combined with the old attitudes of anti-Islamism and Orientalism led to a series of publications in Economics, as in other fields, to explain the apparent backwardness and underdevelopment of the region. However, the old Orientalist habits of thought and Eurocentric methods engulfed most of the findings of those studies and did very little to further our understanding of development and underdevelopment in the region. The list of the so-called factors of underdevelopment is long but can be summarized as: (a) lack of Western style institutions such as the legal code, and cultural barriers influenced by Islam; (b) state-oriented inward looking economic policies; (c) lack of “integration” with the world economy; (d) chilling investment climate and political instability; and (e) capital market imperfections, low levels of human capital, high population growth, and low productivity. In this paper, we review the growth and development experience of the MENA countries with a special attention to the institutional and historical roots of underdevelopment in the region. We argue that there is a general lack of historical analysis of the current problems in the region not the least any study of the effect of Eurocentric modes of institution building. This, we believe, not only creates the wrong impression that the existing barriers to development are ahistorical, but also shadows any analysis of the intra- and interregional interactions, including the colonial and the most recent postcolonial periods. The paper concludes with an alternative agenda to undo the stronghold of Eurocentrism in the region.

#### Eurocentrism sanitizes the educational system and ensures ethnocide and dominance via neoliberal subjectivity

**Mazrui ‘9** (Ali A.; Professor and Director of Global Cultural Studies at State University of New York, Binghamton, Senior Scholar in Africana Studies at Cornell University and Chancellor of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology in Kenya. He is a leading expert on comparative civilization and has published over thirty books. He has also done television documentaries for the BBC, London, and PBS, Washington, DC. His books are on Global Cultural Studies, African Studies, political Islam, and North-South relations, “Between Hegemony and Homogeny”)

This brings us to the twin-concepts of homogenization and hegemonization— however ugly the words may be! One of the consequences of globalization is that we are getting to be more and more alike across the world every decade. Homogenization is increasing similarity. The second accompanying characteristic of globalization is hegemonization — the paradoxical concentration of power in a particular country or in a particular civilization. While “homogenization” is the process of expanding homogeneity, “hegemonization” is the emergence and consolidation of the hegemonic center. With globalization there have been increasing similarities between and among the societies of the world. But this trend has been accompanied by disproportionate global power among a few countries. Culturally the world first got Europeanized; and then it slowly became Americanized. By the twenty-first century people dress more alike all over the world than they did at the end of the nineteenth century ( Homogenization ). But the dress code that is getting globalized is overwhelmingly the Western dress code ( Hegemonization ). Indeed, the man’s suit (European) has become almost universalized in all parts of the world. And the jeans’ revolution (American) has captured the youth dress culture of half the globe. 10 By the twenty-first century the human race is closer to having world languages than it was in the nineteenth century, if by a world language we mean one which has at least 300 million speakers, has been adopted by at least ten countries as a national language, has spread to at least two continents as a major language, and is widely used in four continents for special purposes ( Homogenization ). However, when we examine the languages which have been globalized, they are disproportionately European—especially English and French, and to lesser extent, Spanish ( Hegemonization ). 11 The British Empire was the first to spread the English language. The American imperium later took over the dissemination of English. Arabic is putting forward a strong claim as a world language, but partly because of the globalization of Islam and the role of Arabic as a language of Islamic ritual. By the twenty-first century we are closer to a world economy than we have ever been before in human history. A sneeze in Hong Kong, and certainly a cough in Tokyo can send shock waves around the globe ( Homogenization ). And yet the powers that control this world economy are disproportionately Western. They are the G-7: The United States, Japan, Germany, Britain, France, Canada, and Italy in that order of economic muscle ( Hegemonization ). The United States led the way as a producer and consumer, and as a source of capital and technology. By the twenty-first century the Internet has given us instant access to both information and mutual communication across large distances ( Homogenization ). However, the nerve center of the global Internet system is still located in the United States and has residual links in the United States Federal Government ( Hegemonization ). 12 The educational systems in the twenty-first century are getting more and more similar across the world—with comparable term-units and semesters, and increasing professorial similarities, and similarity in course content ( Homogenization ). But the role-models behind this dramatic academic convergence have been the educational models first of Europe and later of the United States, which have attracted both emulators and imitators ( Hegemonization ). The ideological systems of the world in the twenty-first century are also converging as market economies seem to emerge triumphant. Liberalization is being widely embraced, either spontaneously or under duress. Anwar Sadat in Egypt opened the gates of infitah , and even the People’s Republic of China has adopted a kind of market Marxism. India is in danger of traversing the distance from Mahatma Gandhi to Mahatma Keynes ( Homogenization ). The economic supremacy of the United States and the European Union was at last genuinely challenged. However, the people who are orchestrating and sometimes enforcing marketization, liberalization and privatization are still Western economic gurus —reinforced by the power of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United States, and the European Union. Indeed, Europe is the mother of all modern ideologies, good and evil— liberalism, capitalism, socialism, Marxism, fascism, Nazism and others. The most triumphant by the end of the twentieth century has been Euro-liberal capitalism (market ideologies) (Hegemonic Homogenization ). The most influential champion of market ideologies was now the United States.

### 2NC – AT: Perm

#### Perm fails – Use of Eurocentric Knowledge to challenge the struggles of the marginalized contradicts indigenous perspectives and privileges western education systems reifying Eurocentric dominance

**Battiste and Henderson ‘9** (Marie.; Mi'kmaw educator from Potlotek (pronounced Boht-loh-deck) First Nations, Nova Scotia and full professor in the Department of Educational Foundations at the University of Saskatchewan, James.; an international human rights lawyer, advocate, and educator. He was born in Oklahoma to the Bear Clan of the Chickasaw Nation and also has heritage from the Cheyenne Nation. Currently, he works in Canada as the Research Director of the Native Law Center and as a professor of Aboriginal law at the University of Saskatchewan College of Law, “Naturalizing Indigenous Knowledge in Eurocentric Education”)

The recognition and intellectual activation of IK today is a growing, purposeful, and political act of empowerment by Indigenous peoples. The task for Indigenous scholars and educators has been to affirm and activate holistic paradigms of Indigenous knowledge to reveal the wealth and richness of Indigenous languages, world views, teachings, and experiences, all of which have been systematically excluded from history, from contemporary educational institutions, and from Eurocentric knowledge (EK) systems. Through this act of intellectual self-determination, Indigenous academics are developing new syntheses and methodologies to decolonize themselves, their communities, and their institutions, as well as to bring about a blended trans-systemic synthesis in an educational context that respects and builds on both IK and EK (Blaut, 1993). IK is a growing field of inquiry both nationally and internationally, particularly for those interested in educational innovation and problem-solving. It includes Indigenous science, arts, humanities, and legal traditions. Each manifestation reflects an ecologically centered way of life or expresses a sustainable humanity. Each is integral to the renewal and revitalization of IK. Together they are embodied in relationships, songs, ceremonies, performances, symbols, dramatic representation, and works of art that animate the transmission of 1K and authority from generation to generation. Their purpose is to maintain the integrity of the people and place and the cosmology. EK has been constructed as the opposite of IK. Through its applications and teachings, it has long ignored, neglected, or rejected IK as primitive, barbaric, and inferior, centering and privileging European methodologies and perspectives. EK has long held the belief that only European consciousness counts as progress and that Indigenous peoples' consciousness was frozen in time. Consequently, IK and its internal perspectives have not been captured, understood, or stored systematically by EK traditions and conventional educational systems. Indeed, in most situations, reflected in the persistent and aggressive assimilation plans directed to-ward Indigenous peoples, EK has made concerted efforts in colonial powers forcefully to eliminate Aboriginal languages and heritages, which are the core foundations of IK. Since the early 1970s, Indigenous scholars educated in Eurocentric postsecondary tertiary institutions have led an international and national decolonizing movement toward reversing this forced assimilation process in reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision (Battiste, 2000a, 200b). Their movement comes as a direct consequence of their extended experience with, and learning in, condescending Eurocentric educational systems. In attempting to restore Indigenous communities, Indigenous scholars dis-covered that when they tried to use EK to unravel the challenges faced by their people, they met with contradiction and failure. This led to their questioning and contesting the supremacy and utility of Eurocentric thought. In a quest to heal their nations and communities, Indigenous scholars and professionals have turned to IK and Elders to restore control over Indigenous development and capacity enhancement using Indigenous forms of their research and methodologies. More significantly in the last two decades, Indigenous scholars, educators, professionals, and activists in Canada have been validating the importance, usefulness, and significance of IK, marked by an emerging query of 1K among governments, international organizations, universities, scholars, and policymakers. This has generated an explosive growth in the number of publications on the relevance of IK in a variety of policy sectors and academic disciplines. Of significance was the report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples in Canada (Government of Canada, 1996) that unequivocally embraced the importance of IK in the reconciliation and renewal of relations with Aboriginal peoples. The new theoretical and methodological paradigms that have been created to understand IK have illustrated its role in creating shared capacities that can alleviate poverty and create sustainable development. Today the literature animates the fundamental theory and methods of IK as a means to accord its protection and to raise its social value and its status as a system of knowledge, while Indigenous scholars generate the necessary intellectual space from EK to create a conceptual and analytical framework for its development. From Indigenous communities and Elders, the new revelations of IK and its pedagogies have generated a decolonizing and rethinking of education for Indigenous peoples. IK is far more than the binary opposite of EK. As a concept, IK benchmarks the limitations of Eurocentric theory and methodologies, evidence, interpretation, and conclusions. It fills the ethical and knowledge gaps in Eurocentric education, research, and scholarship. By animating the voices and experiences of the cognitive other and integrating them into the educational process, it creates a new, balanced center and a fresh vantage point from which to enhance Indigenous communities' capacities. IK reconceptualizes the resilience and self-reliance of Indigenous peoples and under-scores the importance of their own philosophies, heritages, and educational processes. This same generational alliance has created a dynamic Indigenous diplomacy network that has protected IK and its categories in an impressive number of international laws and conventions and national constitutions (Henderson, 2008). Although most of these documents are written from Eurocentric perspectives, they establish international standards for respecting IK, representing inclusive processes that assert that Indigenous peoples voices and visions have been heard. The Convention on Biological Diversity (United Nations [UN], 1992), the World Conference on Science for the Twenty-First Century: A New Commitment (UNESCO, 1999), and the Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples (Weissner & Battiste, 2000) formulated principles and practices for respect-ing IK, Indigenous science, and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). These international documents that affirm the heritage of Indigenous people include "all kinds of scientific, agricultural, technical and ecological knowledge, including cultigens, medicines and the rational use of flora and fauna" (Daes, 1993, Section 12). They seek to protect IK from re-searchers, predators, and biopiracy. The paradigm shift toward Indigenous humanities from Eurocentric humanities was generated in the UN system. Often these processes of Indigenous humanities of IK are understood as culture development or cultural diversity. In the Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Co-operation, UNESCO (1966) declared, "Each culture has a dignity and value which must be respected and preserved" and "Every people has the right and duty to develop its culture." The Stockholm Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development (1998) confirmed how important it is to bring Indigenous and other cultures "in from the mar-gins" and to the heart of policymaking for sustainable development. This transformation required cultural policies about IK to be broadened, rethought, and revitalized. The driving question is not whether governments should adopt IK and humanities, but how they should do so more effectively. The global consensus affirming IK is represented by the UN (2007) Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Declaration united humanity, ending the divisive separation of Indigenous peoples from other peoples in international human rights law. It crystallized the rights of Indigenous peoples in international law, which have moved from absence to a normative status, to a "hardened norm," and finally to an established international legal regime. It affirmed that Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment as a collective or as individuals of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in international human rights law (Article 1). We are now seen to be free and equal to all other peoples and individuals and have the right to be free from any kind of discrimination in the exercise of our rights, in particular, that based on our Indigenous origin or identity (Article 2). We have the right to self-determination, to pursue freely our social and cultural development (Article 3). We have the right to maintain and strengthen our distinct social and cultural institutions while retaining our right to participate fully if we so choose in the social and cultural life of the State (Article 5). We have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of our culture (Article 8). The Declaration (UN, 2007) affirmed that Indigenous peoples have the right to IK. We have the international human right to establish and control our institutions, educational systems, and provide education in our own languages in a manner appropriate to our cultural methods of teaching and learning (Article 14). We have a right to revitalize, use, develop, and transmit to future generations our "histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literature" (Article 13.1). We have "the right to maintain, control, protect, and develop our cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestation of our science, technologies and cultures" (Article 31). States cannot discriminate against Indigenous peoples' cultures, traditions, histories, and aspirations in education (Articles 14.2 and 15), and in conjunction with Indigenous peoples, are required to take effective measures to provide education to Indigenous students in our own culture and language (Article 14.3). These rights constitute the "minimum standards for the survival, dignity, and well-being of the indigenous peoples of the world" (Article 13). They are the standards of a decent society, but below the standards of a just society. Indigenous perspectives are the internal perspectives of IK developed from Indigenous languages that help generate a new global consciousness linking Indigenous peoples, social justice, and sustainable development. The notion of "blessed unrest" (Hawken, 2007) is about relationships with the land and peoples and their ability to build a consciousness that will be an integral source for a turning point or a tipping point of human consciousness about the earth: the ecological or green revolution. Neither IK nor the Indigenous perspectives is invoking a return to the past; rather they are a challenge to sustain knowledges, renew our understanding of our relationship with the natural world, reconnect to the spiritual dimension of being, and reshape the institutions and processes that shape our lives with our renewed understandings (Berry, 1999). These understandings are part of IK teaching about the ability to live well within the biological constraints of the surrounding life and its various processes. The teaching reveals the implicit underlying and interconnected order of a vulnerable biosphere. It has implicitly generated the largest cognitive transformation of humanity that states that every place matters and that the stewards of those lands, the Indigenous peoples, have values that will help sustain those spaces if they are allowed to thrive and flourish. It has nurtured a cascading global uprising, a movement of ideas, to reclaim basic human rights in relation to the earth. The vast movement attached to this uprising has overrun ideologies of EK, arising from personal insights but informing a collective knowledge. It has inspired a decolonization of knowledge and people searching for change in a postcolonial civilization and being dedicated to change. It has assisted human consciousness to restore, renew, and revitalize our connections to the place and peoples. In multiple sites IK allows peoples to confront despair, resignation, in-tolerance, racism, injustice, and power with momentum, conflict, spirit, and heart.

### 2NC – AT: Eurocentrism Inevitable

#### Eurocentrism not inevitable and questioning its dominance is pedagogically valuable

AFE ‘9 (Asia for Educators.; An initiative of the Weatherhead East Asian Institute of Colombia, Rethinking the rise of the West: The Great Divergence Debate, The "Great Divergence" and Comparative World History, http://afe.easia.columbia.edu/neh/course6/activity3.html)

This segment looks at the debates that have arisen in the last twenty-five years about the rise of the West. It begins with the opposing views of two eminent scholars, David Landes (author of The Wealth and Poverty of Nations) and Andre Gunder Frank (author of Re-Orient). Landes argues that European global dominance resulted from inherent cultural characteristics within European society, such as a distinctive work ethic. Frank, on the other hand, argues that European global dominance only became obvious after 1800, and that until then China held the dominant role in the world economy. The segment then moves to very recent comparative histories that place the rise of the West in an increasingly global context. These works emphasize three factors to contextualize the rise of the West. First, they argue that European dominance could only occur because Europeans were able to take advantage of slave labor and silver mines in the Americas. Europeans could then put the profits to use in global trade networks. Second, they argue that Europeans-especially the British-were able to industrialize early, primarily because they were fortunate enough to have a ready supply of coal deposits near large populations. Finally, the historians argue that the combination of early industrialization with the development of the nation-state and nationalism in Europe produced a particularly powerful expansionary response. Overall, the point of these studies is that European global dominance was not inevitable, and that issues of when, why, and how the West rose are still matters worthy of debate.

# Aff

### Alt Fails - Political

#### Alt Fails absent political action

**Rizvi ’17** (Uzma Z.; Associate Professor of Anthropology and Urban Studies at The Pratt Institute of Art and Design, Brooklyn, NY. She is also a Visiting Scholar in the Department of International Studies, American University of Sharjah., “Decolonization is political action, not an act of historical circumstance,” https://savageminds.org/2017/06/30/decolonization-is-political-action-not-an-act-of-historical-circumstance/)

As an archaeologist who is invested in the project of decolonization, I admit to being wary of its overuse within anthropological discourse to such a degree that it is depoliticized. Decolonization must remain a political project. As Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang succinctly reminded us in the first issue of the journal Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, “Decolonization is not a metaphor.” (2012) Recently The National Archives (UK) Blog posted a piece entitled, “Decolonising Archaeology in Iraq?” by Dr. Juliette Desplat. Whereas I am a big fan of archival research, in particular Dr. Desplat’s ongoing work on making the archive more publicly accessible through her blog posts, I was a bit perturbed by the generous use of the word decolonizing. Decolonization must be protected as a political act. The use of the word as a descriptor is naively violent if used to illustrate the manner by which bureaucracies articulate themselves in the post-colony — those are not acts of decolonization, more often than not they are in their first instances replications of previous power structures. Decolonization must continue to be thought of and contextualized as a mode of political action that, alongside dismantling colonial structures of power, provides the space for the oppressed to occupy equitable power relations. It is about reparations, it is about social justice, it is about equity, and it is about claiming power socially, politically, and psychologically. My main concern with The National Archives (UK) post was that it was purely descriptive about the colonial archaeologists working in Iraq, their words/letters/notes, and their petulant reluctance to abide by the new rules. With the focus on description, there was a lack of criticality; for example, any mention of Iraqi archaeologists or inspectors reproduced the dismissive tone found ripe in the archive. This was perhaps unintentional, but still problematic and unacceptable. Replicating racialized sterotypes of the other is ethically problematic, and if it is uncritically presented, it continues to travel through citation embedded within other concerns, like that of excavation and artifact movement. This packaged sensibility will continue to be reproduced, for example in Paul Barford’s blog in which he re-presents Desplat’s work under the title “The beginning of the end of excavation archive partage in Iraq.” The reproduction of her work, once again without a critical lens, just continues the cycle of archival reproduction without any sense that such replication could have contemporary consequences if treated without a context or analysis. The National Archives (UK) post started with the citing of the 1924 Antiquities act which provided quite a bit of latitude for foreign archaeologists to take back materials to the metropole and museums (the Act was written up by Gertrude Bell in 1922 while she was Honorary Director of Antiquities for Iraq). Upon Iraq’s independence (1933) however, the rules changed and archaeologists were no longer permitted to take artifacts out of Iraq and Iraqi inspectors were required on teams. These new rules caused quite a bit of frenzy among archaeologists and their home institutions (like the Oriental Institute and the University of Pennsylvania among others, see FO 371/16923), with memorandums of concern being written to the Foreign Office, and even a veiled threat by Sir Leonard Woolley who “thought it was a strong statement from the Iraqi government, and one that could discourage foreign expeditions to return to the country.” (Desplat 2017) Unsurprisingly, the archival record posted on the blog makes archaeologists sound like bratty, over privileged school boys who are only interested in their research and antiquities over and beyond the sovereignty of a nation of people. The archival memorandums posted on the blog illustrate the ways colonial epistemic muscle expected itself to continue to work in the postcolony. The clarity of expectations is the most interesting part of the archival material. If the Iraqi’s were going to make all these demands on foreign expeditions then they themselves had to prove their own modernity in order to gain the respect of the colonists. “George Rendel, the Head of the Eastern Department at the Foreign Office, emphasized the ‘serious injury which [the law’s] adoption would obviously occasion to the cause of archaeology in general’. He also thought that ‘the attitude adopted by the Iraqis in this matter [would] be regarded by many as a test of whether Iraq is really a modern and progressive State’ (FO 371/16923).” (Desplat 2017) Why must Iraqi’s pass a test of modernity to claim their own heritage? This doomed-from-the-start set up if often how patronizing colonialisms find their way into epistemic foundations of archaeological teaching. How many times have I heard, Why should we repatriate these artifacts to [insert post-colony here] if they themselves cannot take care of them? This blog post is not read in a vacuum, as concerns related to museums and museum collections are not relegated only to archaeologists. On my screen, the tab next to The National Archive post is an interview of Nicholas Mirzoeff by Inês Beleza Barreiros on BUALA. Barreiros does a great job in bringing together some key insights as questions leading Mirzoeff to outline and clarify his visual activist agenda which he brings to three main points, “empty the museum, decolonize the curriculum and open theory.” I will not expound on all of what these three points entail, but I bring this up just to say that his idea around emptying the museum is literally just that – all expropriated cultural materials should be returned to their appropriate owners. For all those of us involved in repatriation issues and the politics around cultural property, we know it is not that simple nor as easy, even though it should be — and it is also not a new hot button issue or the theory fad of the decade. It is one that communities world wide have been fighting for since archaeologists started taking their things. Curiously however, although national shifts in excavation regulations in the postcolony are common, as was the case in Iraq, when it comes to indigenous rights and repatriation, there is a particular form of violence that emerges even within the postcolony. The nation state is most anxious and precarious when confronted with indigenous sovereignty; this is true in postcolonial settings, such as in India, as well as in settler colonies such as the United States. The State then, whether a postcolonial or a settler colony, responds with such violence toward indigenous interests that it permeates all forms of interaction, from military action to scientific research. I was reminded of the violence of science in a recent book by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh entitled, Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits, in a passage that brought tears to my eyes and profoundly disturbed me, “In his final days, the last Yana Indian begged that his body be respectfully buried. Instead, Ishi’s museum friends dissected him “for science,” shipping his brain to the Smithsonian’s National Museum of Natural History. It sat on a storage shelf for decades in a jar of formaldehyde.” (2017: 14) This is what makes decolonization imperative and necessarily political. It is not just about a blog post that should not have used the word decolonising in it’s title. It is about recognizing, acknowledging and witnessing the violence that decolonization is a response to. Decolonization is not historical circumstance, it is and must be understood and protected as a political act. NOTE: I would like to acknowledge and appreciate Morag Kersel for bringing Desplat’s blog post to my attention. I would also like to restate that I think Dr. Desplat’s archival blogging is fantastic, it just needs to be allowed to be more critical. I hope The National Archive (UK) blog can find in itself some allowance for criticality.

### Alt Fails - Privatization

#### Even if Eurocentrism in public education is bad – privatization which is the alternative is net worse

**Rinehart** **‘3** (James.; Professor Emeritus, department of sociology, University of Western Ontario and author of The Tyranny of Work: Alienation and the Labour Process and co-author of Just Another Car Factory? Lean Production and Its Discontents, “Making Bad Schooling Worse, Retooling the Mind Factory: Education in a Lean State,” https://www.cautbulletin.ca/en\_article.asp?ArticleID=1365)

At the core of this sweeping indictment of all levels of the Ontario school system, past and present, is a comparison of the liberal education of the post-World War II welfare state era and the reforms of the Harris government. The book examines some developments in colleges and universities, but most of it relates how elementary and secondary schools went from bad to worse. Alan Sears maintains the education system has always been racist and sexist in that knowledge is imparted from a European male heterosexual point of view. This emphasis fails to meet the needs or reflect the experiences of people with non-European ancestors, women, gays and lesbians. However, liberal education was susceptible to demands for inclusion. In the 1970s, official multiculturalism and pressure from minorities opened a bit of space for pedagogical alternatives to Eurocentrism and removed some of the more overt racism and sexism. Despite promoting the idea that some are more gifted and deserving than others, liberal education tried to accommodate even the slowest students and prepared them for paid and household labour. Sears claims, however, that its central and defining mission (in part via liberal arts and history courses) was to develop moral citizens with a Canadian identity. Citizenship training conveyed to students expectations for a secure future and gave them a sense of entitlement to stable jobs and welfare state programs. Driven by a profits squeeze and an ascendent neo-liberal ideology that "aims to push the market deeper into every aspect of our lives by eliminating or shrinking non-market alternatives," corporate and state restructuring began in the 1970s. This resulted in an economy characterized by a rapid increase in contingent jobs, privatization, deregulated markets, globalized production, and cutbacks in and stricter eligibility requirements for welfare and unemployment benefits, among others. This harsh economic environment, which Sears calls lean production, is at the root of the Harris reforms. He maintains the expectations and sense of entitlement imparted by liberal education were seen by the Tories as incompatible with the new lean economy and as barriers to preparing students for both good and bad jobs. To set the stage for reformist measures that would deal with the "disciplinary requirements" of a lean economy the Harris government manufactured a "crisis" in education. The reforms raised the number of mandatory courses, made passing standardized tests a requirement for graduation, focused on teaching job-relevant skills, instituted career planning starting in the early grades (students keep portfolios that relate learning to occupational goals), assigned lots of homework (play is equated with a lean production taboo — waste), strictly enforced stringent disciplinary codes and cut back liberal arts courses to make room for courses in math, science, computers and business. Sears contends these changes were aimed more at developing discipline, an entrepreneurial mind-set and pared-down expectations than at skills acquisition. The reforms created a more competitive educational environment, increased the number of failures and drop-outs, reinforced sexism and made an "important break" from multiculturalism. The author's defense of the latter two consequences is not entirely convincing, but the projected increase in failures has been confirmed by a recent report of Professor Alan King. One-quarter of the students who started grade 9 under the new curriculum are unlikely to graduate, compared with one in five under the previous system. The main hurdle is the difficulty of grades 9 and 10 math and science courses required for a diploma. In addition to social science theoretical literature drawn from several countries, Sears' critique is based on historical and contemporary policy statements, documents and reports of government, educational consultants and business organizations. For the most part he does not examine the extent to which these policies have been implemented. Consequently, the analysis is not anchored in the kind of hard evidence that will convince skeptics, a fact the author admits at the outset. Sears is an activist whose "bold generalizations" are intended to be provocative and "to inform the direction of analysis and activism." Although there is no discussion of the impact on education of the Tory penchant for tax and spending cuts, it makes sense to understand the reform measures as a response to the emergence of a lean economy and the market orentation of neo-liberal ideology. However, Sears' analysis of historical developments in education makes it clear these reforms do not represent, as he suggests, a sharp break from past emphases on preparing students pedagogically and attitudinally for wage and household labour. Nor does he make a strong case for the claim that post-1970 cultural and economic changes, in conjunction with the reforms, exacerbated the school system's racism and sexism. The final chapter discusses resistance to the Tory reforms and presents Sears' view of what education should be. He has no faith in reforms within the system. Exciting teachers, smaller classes and a progressive curriculum won't solve problems inherent in an institution that has always been rooted in and shaped by a capitalist system. His ideal, based on the work of Bertold Brecht, is an inclusive, egalitarian, give-and-take participatory relationship between teachers and students in a milieu which is enjoyable, engrossing and playful. Sounds nice, but as Sears acknowledges, it's a utopian goal.

### Epistemology Not 1st

#### Epistemic questioning doesn’t empower the marginalized

Jarvis 2k (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128-9)

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggle as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the émigrés of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that problem-solving theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, “So what?” To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics” be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate. Contrary to Ashley’s assertions, then, a poststructural approach fails to empower the marginalized and, in fact, abandons them. Rather than analyze the political economy of power, wealth, oppression, production, or international relations and render and intelligible understanding of these processes, Ashley succeeds in ostracizing those he portends to represent by delivering an obscure and highly convoluted discourse. If Ashley wishes to chastise structural realism for its abstractness and detachment, he must be prepared also to face similar criticism, especially when he so adamantly intends his work to address the real life plight of those who struggle at marginal places.

### Eurocentrism Inevitable

#### Eurocentrism inevitable

**Neumann ‘10** (Iver B.; Norwegian political scientist and social anthropologist. He is the current Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science, “Sustainability and Transformation in Diplomatic Culture: The Case of Eurocentrism,” https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057%2F9780230297159\_7)

With the 200-year long period of Western hegemony in world history coming to a close, one way to assess diplomacy’s sustainability con- cerns the degree to which diplomatic culture is Eurocentric. Drawing on cultural anthropologists Clifford Geertz’s and Marshall Sahlins’s work on myth and narrative sociabilities respectively, I will try to theorize diplomacy in terms of its historical preconditions for action and the way it operates as a social practice. I will then discuss diplomatic immu- nity, permanent representation and the institution of dean of the corps diplomatique in the present-day system and demonstrate that Christian myths do indeed colour these sociabilities. I take this to show that contemporary diplomacy is Eurocentric. However, I conclude by argu- ing that, since the Christian myths of European diplomacy have been transformed, since diplomacy’s sociabilities have been hybridized and since the practices of contemporary diplomacy are being negotiated on a continuous basis, we should not care too much about Eurocentrism on the level of diplomacy itself. Diplomacy remains a public good, whose Eurocentrism is in some degree inevitable. How it affects specific individuals and groups is another matter.

#### Capitalism makes Eurocentrism inevitable

**Mansell** **‘16** (Jon.; Recently completed his PhD with a project exploring the phenomenon of displacement in the making of the modern international system., “AGAINST EUROCENTRISM IN THE EMERGENCE AND THE TRANSCENDENCE OF GLOBAL CAPITALISM,” http://ppesydney.net/eurocentrism-emergence-transcendence-global-capitalism/)

These questions notwithstanding, the authors key point is extremely powerful – the stories we tell ourselves about the ascendency of the West at best marginalise and homogenise the non-West, at worst they ignore it altogether. The indigenous peoples of the Americas condemned to work the silver mines of Potosi or the Africans brutally enslaved on the plantations of the Caribbean are entirely absent from the Brennerian account, whereas in the World System narrative they are understood purely in terms of passive victims of European developments. For Anievas and Nisancioglu, the challenge of writing a post-Eurocentric history of European ascendency is the challenge of finding an alternative theoretical paradigm for understanding the development of capitalism, which will restore the constitutive agency of the non-West. The alternative paradigm the authors propose to achieve this is the approach known as Uneven and Combined Development – a Marxist model first developed by Leon Trotsky in order to explain the unique historical conjuncture surrounding the 1917 revolution in Russia. The great value of this approach is that in focusing on the uneveness of development, the authors are able to move beyond the homogenisation of the non-West, instantly the non-West becomes diverse and plural. And yet while development is understood as uneven, the element of combination allows the authors to avoid the dangers of methodological internalism, by emphasising how all societies are inter-connected within a holistic analysis of the local particular conjunctures of a unified global capitalism. As such the Uneven and Combined Development approach allows the authors to restore constitutive agency in the making of capitalism beyond Europe, through the infinitely complex social relations that are constructed around the capital relation. Through this approach the authors develop rich empirical analyses (which they readily acknowledge are only ever exploratory, requiring specialist further investigation) in which the non-West ceases to be a passive, homogenous “other” and becomes instead exterior, multiple, diverse and actively engaged in ways that are complex and contingent in the geopolitical construction of an uneven and combined global capitalist system of social relations. Again, we might raise certain questions – in particular there seems something of a tension between the authors empirical project of telling the story of the ascendency of Europe and their theoretical commitment to moving beyond Eurocentrism. Certainly the book offers powerful accounts of contextual processes and contestations from beyond the West, but by necessity these are always related back to telling the story of the ascendency of the West – as such Europe always remains at the centre of the story being told. Indeed, we might go further and ask if the authors very ontological categories are not themselves Eurocentric – for example the category of “class” might be imagined differently in non-western contexts where it intersects with experiences of tribe or caste. Perhaps, however, it is a contribution of the book that it encourages us to think about these questions: would it be possible, and if so what would it mean to tell the story of the birth of capitalism from within Bantu, Aymara or Buddhist cosmological categories?

### Perm

#### Perm do both – multiperspectivity breaks down Eurocentric views

**Van Nieuwenhuyse ‘17** (Karel.; PhD (\*1975), is since 2013 assistant professor in History Didactics, in the Faculty of Arts, University of Leuven, Belgium. His main research interests related to history education are the position of the present, the use of sources, students’ historical narratives and the connection with their identification, historical representations of the colonial past, and the teaching of intercultural contacts, “Using Multiperspectivity to Break through Eurocentrism,” https://public-history-weekly.degruyter.com/5-2017-9/using-multiperspectivity-to-break-through-eurocentrism/)

The question then raises what can be done to go beyond a Western European oriented Eurocentric approach. The inclusion of multiperspectivity in history education might constitute a fertile strategy. This can be done both on a content and on a didactical level. On a content level, multiperspectivity encourages to include other perspectives and histories than solely Western European ones. This can be accomplished by focusing for instance on intercultural contacts – as important motors of change in the past [7] –, or on migration flows. Both approaches per se include more than only Western European societies. At the same time, they avoid the pitfall of a “world history” approach without any center, risking to make history insignificant for students, as they do not discern much connections with their position in the present. On a didactical level, multiperspectivity encourages to view historical events from several perspectives.[8] This can be accomplished, for instance by looking at the same time at local, national, regional and global dimensions of any historical issue, and entangling those perspectives;[9] by including multiple actors, historical sources, narrative plots and types of historiography;[10] and by applying an interaction- and communication framework when addressing intercultural contacts.[11] This framework focuses on the reciprocal influences in an encounter, and examines sources of the Western European “self” and “the other”. The central question is how the “self” and “the other” changed each other as a result of the contacts. In this framework, both parties are attributed agency, and also reciprocal representations are examined. It hence breaks through a Western European oriented Eurocentric view. Furthermore, the framework considers “us” and “them” as dynamic and changeable issues, in so far that “us” and “them” may sometimes transform into a new “us”. It does not allow to make a clear-cut distinction between the “us” and “them” since both influence and change each other. Identity is considered as a dynamic, and not a homogeneous and fixed issue anymore. The abovementioned approaches hence show that multiperspectivity can at the same time lead to enriching young people’s understanding of the past, to fostering their understanding of history and their ability to think historically, and to contributing to a critical and open-minded identity-building process among young people.

### Science Good

#### Rejecting modernity kills scientific thought; they are intrinsically related

Harding 7 (Sandra.; Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California at Los Angeles. “Modernity, Science, and Democracy”, [http://www.zemargraphics.com/biopolitics\_web/NASSPWOR.pdf](http://www.zemargraphics.com/biopolitics_web/NASSPWOR.pdf%20Accessed%2011/14/13))

In light of such extensive recent discussions of modernity and its woes, one might wonder whether yet another engagement with the topic could be worthwhile. I think there are two reasons to do so. Most of these accounts do not have modern science and technology clearly in focus, nor do they seem to think that gender relations are relevant to either modernity’s crisis or its possible successor. First, the science and technology issue. When these authors are from the humanities or classical social theory and its successors in the West, and whether they are politically on the Right, Left, or Center, science and technology are usually to be found off at the periphery of such accounts. Modernity for them is about exclusion of the influence of religion and kinship in forms of government and citizenship, economy, and education, and about a shift from past to future in social orientation. Such exclusion makes possible the creation of autonomous, rational institutions, including those of value-free modern science and, consequently social progress. Since these scholars are largely unfamiliar with the critiques of exceptionalist and triumphalist science indicated above, they often treat modern sciences as if they played no role in whatever economic, social and political ills lead them to question modernity. Yet interrogating what is meant by the modernity of Western sciences, and what have been the consequences and will be the likely futures of commitments to modernity in scientific institutions, their cultures and practices, is a more important intellectual and political task than such accounts reveal or comprehend. Such a project poses frustrating questions which challenge familiar ethical and political assumptions, and even seem critical of the psychic framework which well-intentioned academics bring to such a project. Do we have the right to try to answer such questions? Can we, especially those of us who are U.S. citizens, contribute to creating the polycentric democratic political spaces, in Egyptian economist Samir Amin’s (1998) phrase, called for by so many critics of the West’s modernity who want to encourage the design and emergence of desirable successors to the West’s global hegemony? On the other hand, what are the consequences of our neglecting to engage such issues? A small handful of critics and defenders of modernity, its political realities and promises, have directly focused on the natural sciences and their technologies. In today's world, they ask, do Western sciences promote or retard the growth of the democratic social relations and social progress which have been taken to be distinctive marks of modernity? Some have argued that these sciences and their philosophies in some respects actually block important directions in the growth of scientific knowledge and toward social progress--though they have different visions of social progress. Here I look at the consideration of these issues by three such critics of modernity who focus on the sciences: the French ethnographer and philosopher of science Bruno Latour (Latour 1993), the German sociologist Ulrich Beck (Beck 1992, 1999), and the Indian science studies intellectual Ashis Nandy (1990).

#### Scientific thought-especially discussions at the micro level are critical to preventing biosphere collapse

Ehrlich and Ehrlich ‘13 (Paul.; Professor of Biology and President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology, Sydney, His research interests are in the ecology and evolution of natural populations of butterflies, reef fishes, birds and human beings. Anne, Senior Research Scientist in Biology at Stanford and focuses her research on policy issues related to the environment, “Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?,”<http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/cntent/280/1754/20122845.full>)

The scientific community has repeatedly warned humanity in the past of its peril [[90](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-90)–[102](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-102)], and the earlier warnings [[93](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-93),[103](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-103)–[107](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-107)] about the risks of population expansion and the ‘limits to growth’ have increasingly been shown to be on the right track [[108](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-108)–[111](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-111)] (but see Hayes [[17](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-17)]). The warnings continue [[109](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-109),[112](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-112)–[119](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-119)]. Yet many scientists still tend to treat population growth as an exogenous variable, when it should be considered an endogenous one—indeed, a central factor [[120](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-120)]. Too many studies asking ‘how can we possibly feed 9.6 billion people by 2050?’ should also be asking ‘how can we humanely lower birth rates far enough to reduce that number to 8.6?’ To our minds, the fundamental cure, reducing the scale of the human enterprise (including the size of the population) to keep its aggregate consumption within the carrying capacity of Earth [[121](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-121)], is obvious but too much neglected or denied. There are great social and psychological barriers in growthmanic cultures to even considering it. This is especially true because of the ‘endarkenment’—a rapidly growing movement towards religious orthodoxies that reject enlightenment values such as freedom of thought, democracy, separation of church and state, and basing beliefs and actions on empirical evidence. They are manifest in dangerous trends such as climate denial, failure to act on the loss of biodiversity and opposition to condoms (for AIDS control) as well as other forms of contraception [[122](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-122)]. If ever there was a time for evidence-based (as opposed to faith-based) risk reduction strategies [[123](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-123)], it is now. How can scientists do more to reduce the odds of a collapse? Both natural and social scientists should put more effort into finding the best ways of accomplishing the necessary re-modelling of energy and water infrastructure. They should develop better ways of evaluating and regulating the use of synthetic chemicals, a problem that might abate somewhat as availability of their fossil fuel sources fades (even though only about 5% of oil production flows into petrochemical production). The protection of Earth's remaining biodiversity (especially the crucial diversity ofpopulations [[124](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-124),[125](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-125)]) must take centre stage for both scientific specialists and, through appropriate education, the public [[126](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-126),[127](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-127)]. Scientists must continually call attention to the need to improve the human epidemiological environment, and for control and eventual elimination of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Above all, they should expand efforts to understand the mechanisms through which cooperation evolves [[128](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-128)], because avoiding collapse will require unusual levels of international cooperation. Is it too late for the global scientific community to collect itself and start to deal with the nexus of the two complex adaptive systems [[129](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-129)] and then help generate the necessary actions to move towards sustainability? There are certainly many small-scale science-based efforts, often local, that can provide hope if scaled up [[121](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-121)]. For example, environmental non-govenmental organizations and others are continually struggling to halt the destruction of elements of biodiversity (and thus, in some cases, of vital ecosystem services [[7](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-7)]), often with success. In the face of the building extinction crisis, they may be preserving nuclei from which Earth's biota and humanity's ecosystem services, might eventually be regenerated. And some positive efforts are scaling up. China now has some 25 per cent of its land in ecosystem function conservation areas [[130](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-130)] designed to protect both natural capital and human well-being. The Natural Capital Project [[131](http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/280/1754/20122845.full#ref-131)] is helping improve the management of these areas. This is good news, but in our view, many too few scientists are involved in the efforts needed, especially in re-orienting at least part of their research towards mitigating the predicament and then bringing their results to the policy front.