# RKS- Myth of the Model Minority

By Kev, Kevin, Lily and Rajeev

## 1AC

### Performance

#### {insert your performance}

#### **The model minority myth operates under the structural triangulation of the White, Asian, and Black. Racial categories are embodied onto different identities through racialization and enforced by modern schooling practices. Even though Asian are upheld as the Model Minority, they are simultaneously racialized as foreign and unassimilated foreigners. The duality of Forever Foreigner syndrome and Model Minority Myth simultaneously posits Asian as a threat to America and undermine solidarity between non-black groups.**

Lee et al. 16 (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Eujin Park, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison & Jia-Hui Stefanie Wong, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Trinity College; 2016/12/14; “Racialization, Schooling, and Becoming American: Asian American Experiences” http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360)

Schools as civic institutions play a crucial role in shaping racial categories and redistributing resources and opportunities based on race. Far from being racially neutral institutions, schools “daily teach young people the naturalized status of race” (Leonardo, 2011, p. 680). Schools are racialized as White spaces that work to protect White supremacy through racialized tracking practices (Oakes, 2005; Tyson, 2011); the “hidden curriculum of Whiteness” (Leonardo, 2004, p. 144); and the privileging of White cultural capital (S. J. Lee, 2005; Lewis, 2003). Drawing on Mills’ Racial Contract, Leonardo (2013) argues that Whites have entered into an epistemological contract that places Whites as knowers and people of color as subknowers. In schools, then, youth of color are “targets of epistemological imposition within the industrial complex of knowledge” (Leonardo, 2013, p. 607). Antiblackness in schools further reinforces “the ideological and material ‘infrastructure’ of educational inequity—the misrecognition of students and communities of color, and the (racialized) maldistribution of educational resources” (Dumas & ross, 2016, p. 432). When schools enact anti-Black policies, practices, and discourses, they become a “site of suffering” (Dumas, 2014, p. 2) for Black children and families. Similarly, many scholars have demonstrated how schools have positioned other youth of color as deviant, dangerous, and inferior (López, 2003; Ngo, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999). Thus, schools are important sites where racialization processes play out in the everyday lives of young people. Although it is abundantly clear that dominant U.S. racial ideology positions Whites as superior to people of color, and African Americans as inferior, dangerous, and unworthy of civil protections and equal opportunity, the racial position of Asian Americans has always been less clear cut. At times, Asian Americans have been rendered invisible in the largely Black and White discourses surrounding race, and at other moments, invisibility can transform into a state of hypervisibility (Coloma, 2006; Zia, 2000). When made visible, Asian Americans have served as a “phantasmatic site, on which the nation projects a series of condensed, complicated anxieties regarding external and internal threats to the mutable coherence of the national body” (Lowe, 1996, p. 18). Significantly, Asian ethnic groups have always been categorized together since they began arriving in the United States, and this ethnic lumping has been central to their racialization. Categorized as yellow or Oriental, early Asian immigrants resisted racial lumping, especially because they understood that these labels framed them as foreign threats and undesirable. It was not until the postwar years, when the growth of second- and third-generation US-born Asians and decreased residential and economic barriers led to more contact between ethnic groups, that the panethnic concept of Asian American was embraced by Asian immigrants themselves (Espiritu, 1992). Espiritu (1992) explains that “when manifested in racial violence, racial lumping necessarily leads to protective panethnicity” (p. 7). Thus, although the racial categorization as Asian has been externally imposed, Asian Americans have also taken up this identity to seek political and economic resources—to mixed results and consequences, as we later explain. A relational conceptualization of racialization is particularly useful when examining the racialization of Asian Americans, who are always positioned in comparison to other groups as more hardworking than, less American than, more successful than, less loyal than. However, even hierarchical understandings of racialization are, by nature, relational, and scholars recognize that racialized groups can move up and down the hierarchy depending on the context (Bonilla-Silva, EDUCATIONAL STUDIES 5 2009; Omi & Winant, 2015). In this article, we draw on scholars who conceptualize racialization as relational, as well as those who see it as hierarchical. Thus, we refer to racialization generally to encompass both hierarchical and relational racialization processes, in recognition of the fact that these processes are fluid and contextual. Kim (1999) describes Asian American racialization as racial triangulation in relation to Whites and African Americans. Racial triangulation occurs through the simultaneous processes of relative valorization and civic ostracism, which alternately valorize Asians relative to African Americans but also figure them as foreign and unassimilable, excluding them from civic membership. Bow (2010) conceptualizes this racial position as the “racially interstitial” (p. 4) between Black and White. Examination of this interstitiality is crucial to our understanding of racialization, she argues, because it is this space that “forces established perspectives and definitions into disorientation … [it] can represent the physical manifestation of the law’s instability, its epistemological limit, the point of interpellations’ excess” (Bow, 2010, p. 4). Taken together, these theorists argue that Asian Americans occupy an ambiguous, amorphous, and contradictory space in the field of racial positions. Throughout US history, Asian Americans have been framed alternately as perpetual (and dangerous) foreigners and/or as model minorities. Although seemingly oppositional discourses, Asian American scholars have discussed how these images are two sides of the same coin, both working to uphold White supremacy and undermine interracial solidarity (L. S. H. Park, 2008; Wu, 2002). The model minority discourse positions Asian Americans as hard-working, submissive, and entrepreneurial immigrants who place admirable importance on family and education. By dint of their diligence, as the story goes, Asian immigrants have achieved economic and academic success in US society and schools, thus proving that social mobility and the American dream can be achieved by anyone who puts in enough effort. Although such images of Asian Americans are seemingly positive, the model minority discourse renders invisible the struggles experienced by Asian Americans, ignores structural and historical factors that stand in the way of social mobility for communities of color, and instead blames those very communities for their problems (Bascara, 2006; S. J. Lee, 2009; Wu, 2002). In doing so, this narrative upholds the myth that the United States is a meritocratic society, where issues of racial inequality are no longer a barrier for people of color. Rhee (2013) further contends that the model minority discourse acts as a disciplinary technology of racialized neoliberalism, through which Asian American neoliberal subjects are (self)-governed. Thus, this ideology confers a secondary citizenship that is contingent on “model” behavior and acceptance of the rules, which also limits the possibilities for progressive social change in Asian American communities (L. S. H. Park, 2008). However positive it may seem at first glance, inherent to the model minority is the potential threat of the perpetual foreigner. As L. S. H. Park (2008) argues, when Asian Americans fail to perform as the model minority, they may be cast as foreigners who do not fit into White American ideals. Scholars further note that foreigner also often denotes enemy, particularly in times of wartime conflict and economic distress (Lowe, 1996; N. T. Saito, 2001; Wu, 2002). During World War II, Japanese American citizens were forced into internment camps because they were positioned as foreign threats to US national security; today, Arab Americans are similarly framed as directly opposed to American interests and identity (Abu El-Haj, 2007, 2010; Fine & Sirin, 2008). Denied full, unqualified Americanness, Asian Americans continue to be racialized as model minorities and perpetual foreigners.

#### **The myth of the model minority compares the successful Asian American to the Black/brown body---this places the blame on these black and brown students instead of the structures that create such conditions**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

I have shown that administrators, teachers, and other staff institutionalized the high degree of racial stratification at the school through formal and informal sorting mechanisms and through instructional practices that marginalized Black and Latino youth. Further, the stratification between Asian American and Black/Latino students was hierarchal. Although there was tremendous diversity of academic, social, and ethnic positions among Asian American students, as a group, they were privileged over Black and Latino students in teacher and staff representations of them, expectations for them, and interactions with them. The racialization of minority youth was highly differentiated, with the tropes of the Asian American model minority and oppositional and unengaged Black/Brown youth, as meaning-making anchors. The creation of racial categories was mutually co-constitutive; one was defined in relation to the other and these relationships were in turn related to the ideology of color-blindness. Students’ academic status and social competence were defined in differentiated racial terms. Staff tended to draw from a model minority trope to value Asian American students’ school efforts and interactions positively, often beyond individuals’ actual depth of learning or achievement on standardized tests. They tended to value Black and Latino students’ behavior and performance negatively, often below their demonstrated competence. Black youth were routinely labeled “resistant” and Latino youth were characterized as “invisible.” This process was often self-fulfilling, as many Black and Latino students became discouraged by the “achievement gap”between Asian American Americans and other racial minorities. Black and Latino students consequently expressed a lower sense of belonging to and ownership of the school relative to Asian American Americans, who had better access to school resources and were disproportionately represented in leadership activities. Buoyed by perceptions of themselves as “smart” and “engaged,” Asian Americans often internalized this identity and saw themselves on upward trajectories, even when in practical terms, many struggled with the content of higher level curricula. Asian Americans who defied model minority expectations sometimes faced academic and social exclusions similar to those experienced by Black and Latino students, though they were not disciplined at the same high levels. Very often, “Asian American” was understood by teachers and staff as a stand-in for White. Asian-ness and Blackness often served as racial foils, complicating the Black-White binary and the binary relationship of White supremacy/oppression of the racialized ‘Other.’ In this case, racial privilege was constrained. For example, the purchase on power that Asian Americans had as a privileged group at this school was conditional upon certain demands for normalized behavior and came at the extraordinary expense of educational equity. Seeing these constraints enables a greater view of intertwined contexts (of economic inequality, concentrated poverty, and societal disregard for “ghetto schools”) that shaped CHS as one institution among many. Moreover, the ability of the school to highlight Asian American students’ relative success created a distraction from the fundamentally low standards for teaching and learning that characterized this and other urban schools. The reproduction of the model minority myth in an urban school setting essentially functioned as a smokescreen for the profoundly constrained educational opportunity that was offered to poor students in a struggling school, in a marginalized community.

#### **This forces Asian Americans to conform to whiteness in order to access to schooling and education, this push toward whiteness is an attempt to distance themselves from blackness**

**Lee et al. 16** (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Eujin Park, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison & Jia-Hui Stefanie Wong, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Trinity College; 2016/12/14; “Racialization, Schooling, and Becoming American: Asian American Experiences” http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360)

The educational scholarship on pre-1965 Asian American immigrants suggests that early Chinese and Japanese Americans actively worked to resist their racialization through performing ideal American identities that signaled an early expression of the model minority image. Like other non-Whites, Asian Americans were subjected to segregation and even exclusion from schools. Chinese-only schools operated in San Francisco from 1859 to 1879, after which time Chinese children were excluded from all San Francisco public schools until the 1885 case of Tape v. Hurley. In discussing the segregation of Chinese American students during this period, Coloma (2006) argues that the exclusionary policies were based on a White-Black binary and revealed the fact that “the policies of Jim Crow extended beyond the US South and contributed to anti- Asian prejudice in the racially charged climate of California” (p. 4). In Mississippi, Chinese were officially barred from White schools until the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, but some Chinese families had managed to negotiate access to White public schools for their children in some Mississippi Delta towns by the late 1930s, and most districts accepted Chinese children in White schools by the late 1940s (Jung, 2008; Lim de Sánchez, 2003; Loewen, 1988). To gain access to White schools during Jim Crow, Chinese immigrants living in the Mississippi Delta had to [convincing] Whites that the Chinese were closer to Whites than Blacks. In particular, Chinese immigrants had to develop social ties with prominent Whites in their towns, which many did by joining local churches and, simultaneously, distancing themselves socially from Blacks (S. J. Lee, in press; Loewen, 1988). In short, Chinese immigrants gained access to White schools in the Mississippi Delta during Jim Crow by following the rules of White supremacy and performing an early expression of model minority behavior. The stories of how Chinese immigrants gained access to White schools in the Mississippi Delta during the Jim Crow era reveal the relational nature of Asian American racialization and demonstrate that Chinese immigrants were active agents in challenging their racial positioning (S. J. Lee, in press). In contrast to earlier Asian immigrants, post-1965 Asian immigrants entered the nation at a time when the model minority image of Asian Americans was being established in the national imagination. Although the prominence of the model minority image may appear to suggest that Asian Americans have gained status, the review of the research suggests that Asian Americans may embrace the model minority image and behaviors associated with the stereotype in response to racism. Louie’s (2004) Chinese American participants were aware of the “clear racial hierarchy” (p. 56) in the United States. They also understood that perpetual foreigner and model minority discourses shaped how dominant society viewed them. In response, Chinese families turned to education as a “credentialing mechanism to safeguard against potential discrimination” (Louie, 2004, p. 56). Parents believed that because of racism their children would face, they would have to try even harder in school to lessen its impacts. Thus, even middle-class Chinese parents, who presumably would not have the same financial concerns as working-class parents, stressed higher education in technical and licensed professions and discouraged children from pursuing majors in social sciences or liberal arts. They reasoned that their children would face less racial discrimination in professions that were more technical and skill-based. Similarly, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) discovered that Chinese immigrant parents and Vietnamese refugee parents pushed a success frame, which centered around getting a good education that would lead to a good job, for their second-generation children. Furthermore, their strategies, including steering their children away from creative fields, were framed by the recognition that as Asian Americans their children would face racial bias. Thus, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) found that “Asian immigrant parents directed their children into elite colleges, specific majors, and particular occupations so that they would be better protected from subjective evaluations” (p. 58). In other words, the immigrant parents in Louie’s (2004) study and those in J. Lee and Zhou’s (2015) study encouraged a model minority performance as a strategy to cope with racism, but their actions have simply been read as evidence that they are model minorities. Lew(2006) also found that both middle-class and working-class Korean Americans recognized that the strictly racialized hierarchy in the United States would prevent them from achieving authentic, unhyphenated Americanness. However, middle-class participants’ class position made it possible for them to aspire to a class-based understanding of Americanness. They were able to pursue this definition of American through the high-quality education and social capital that their middle-class positions afforded them. Concerns about protecting and advancing the model minority image have also been found to influence relationships among Asian Americans (S. J. Lee, 2009). In writing about South Asian educational migrants in the post-1965 era, Thomas (2015) found that South Asians embraced the model minority as a way to understand and perform their racial and class positions. Thomas (2015) argues that highly educated South Asian immigrants were invested in reinforcing a model minority narrative, which they feared was being challenged by subsequent waves of working class South Asians who were unable to live up to model minority standards. Scholarship suggests that many Asian immigrant and second-generation youth are invested in performing model minority behavior (Cheng, 2013; Chhuon & Hudley, 2011; J. Lee & Zhou, 2015; S. J. Lee, 2009; G. C. Park, 2011). For example, in his research on working class Korean immigrant high school youth, G. C. Park (2011) found that participants believed they would never be accepted as authentic Americans because of their race and ethnicity. Thus, students performed a model minority identity as a coping strategy, which they believed got them closer to Whiteness. Furthermore, G. C. Park found that the students sought “to achieve social distance from other Koreans who could not or did not conform to the stereotype via social rewards and punishments” (p. 123). Not only do some Asian Americans perform the model minority, they may actively discipline those who do not or cannot perform.

#### **The myth of the model minority perpetuates anti-blackness; it is a tool of white supremacy to wedge people of color leading to the psychological violence of Asian Americans**

Kuo 15 (Rachel Kuo is a MA student @ NYU studying racial justice in digital media and a contributing writer for Everyday Feminism, *6 Reasons Why We Need to Dismantle The Model Minority Myth of Those Hardworking Asians*, <http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/04/dismantle-model-minority-myth/>

*“We are threatened, unlike most whites, by efforts to use our race against us.” –Frank Wu* Asians are good at math and science. They’re successful economically and academically. They are hard working and high achieving. While these tropes may seem outdated, they’re still [well known and recognizable](http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/02/dont-ask-asian-people-this/). For example, the other day, just to see what Google searches were most popular, I searched: “Why are…” and the first thing that came up was: “Why are Asians so smart?” *Who are these ‘Asians’ that people* keep talking about? While these sorts of comments might seem like compliments or affirmations, they are actually overly simplistic generalizations that reveal the devious and exploitative nature of race and racism in the United States. And they all fall under the [model minority myth](http://everydayfeminism.com/2014/11/lies-asian-american-men/) – a stereotype that generalizes Asian Americans by depicting them as the perfect example of an if-they-can-do-it-so-can-you success story. This myth is also a political strategy that highlights the success of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Indian immigrants with a specific professional and educational background. It is a historical and presently used tool designed to protect institutionalize\d white supremacy and validate anti-black racism. For a long time, Asian American activists have worked to debunk the model minority myth by discussing its negative consequences and impacts. By positioning of some Asian American groups as a model of success in the United States, we also need to ask: “A model for whom?” Standing up against the myth has been a long-time call to action that has recently been re-incited by non-indictment verdicts for the murders of Eric Garner and Mike Brown, as well as the murders of many others in the Black community. This sentiment is currently amplified by social media movements like [#ModelMinorityMutiny](http://www.racefiles.com/2014/10/13/model-minority-mutiny/)and [#StartTheConversation](http://theaerogram.com/south-asians-ferguson-showing-solidarity/), which push for Asian Americans to stand in solidarity alongside other communities of color and to debunk the model minority myth in everyday conversations about racism. Here are some ways to unpack why the model minority myth is used as a tool of oppression, especially one that perpetuates anti-black racism. 1. The myth fosters internalized racism within certain Asian American communities against other communities of color. In order to begin undoing the myth, [we must also begin to tackle the ways we’ve internalized anti-blackness.](http://wocinsolidarity.tumblr.com/post/103692353715/hey-non-black-folks) Often, our communities use racist rhetoric that’s disguised as casual observation or advice: *They*just need to work harder, don’t date *them,* or don’t go to *their* neighborhood. The myth can be a protective buffer against the stigma of being seen as “outsiders.” Being cast as ‘perpetual foreigners’ fueled a desire for some Asian immigrants to survive by seeking ways to fit in and belong, to have access to the same resources and privileges as those with the most economic and political power – wealthy, white Americans. As a result, we sometimes [subconsciously and consciously act protective and proud](http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/02/on-internalized-racism/) of that “model” status. *If we’re the model of success, then surely we’ll be free from the persecution of those who don’t, won’t, and can’t adhere to the standard? Right?* But it is through this very orchestrated messaging that we’ve been conditioned to forget that America is stolen land. It is occupied land. It is a country built on slave labor and the colonization of its indigenous people. Yet, America, to some Asian Americans, is viewed as a “promised land,” and many of us came to the United States with a belief that there were opportunities to live free from oppression. Moving forward, we need to re-examine who gives those promises, recognize the villainy behind why they were offered, acknowledge whom we are truly taking them from, and heal from the way they have hurt our diverse communities. We need to [stand up against the model minority myth and demand resistance against white supremacy](http://www.hyphenmagazine.com/blog/archive/2014/12/apology-black-folks) and that means letting go of the idea of the “American Dream.” 2. The model minority myth divides people of color and specifically serves as a tool of anti-black racism. Racial myths and stereotypes are often used as a “wedge” to divide groups, whether it’s creating unfair racial hierarchies or emphasizing elements of cultural and racial superiority and/or inferiority. In this specific case, [the model minority myth is successful because it constructs Black people as a “problem” minority](http://groupthink.jezebel.com/kill-the-asian-american-model-minority-1570030025). It teaches some Asian Americans to compare where we are and what we’ve accomplished with where Black Americans are and what they’ve accomplished. It turns us into juxtapositions and situates us as racial binaries. Asian Americans have different histories of oppression than other communities, and it’s unfair to compare existing struggles. This is rarely talked about outside of activist communities, but some Asian immigrants were intentionally selected to be model minorities, which we’ll discuss more below. Rooted in the ‘pull yourself up by the bootstraps’ ideology, the term ‘model minority’ was popularized during the 1960’s Civil Rights Movement – this stereotype is racist to both Asian Americans and Black Americans. By creating a narrative that hard work equates success, it negates past and present structural barriers that interrupt success for different marginalized groups. The “success” of certain groups of Asian Americans was contrasted with the “failure” of African Americans. The myth comes hand in hand with other statements like, “If Asians can be successful by working hard, why can’t Black people?” [It serves as a functional stereotype that uplifted the narrative of meritocracy and the American Dream](http://diverseeducation.com/article/52979/). In witnessing family friends and relatives talk about their life experiences, themes of hard work and sacrifice are the most salient. My own parents believe that they have worked hard to get to where they are. At some point since they immigrated here, they have learned to believe in the narrative that anyone can find success if they just work hard enough. However, to accept any positive stereotype about the model minority myth is to also comply with a racist system that favors and privileges whiteness – and that is something that not only harms other people of color, it hurts members in our own communities. 3. The myth also serves to create “good” immigrants and “bad” immigrants. The myth creates the idea that some people deserve to be in the U.S. and some people don’t. Some immigrants are lazy. Some snuck in to take away jobs from hard-working “Americans.” Immigration policies purposefully included and excluded certain groups. For example, the 1965 Immigration Act allowed Asians, specifically East Asians, of a certain educational and class background into the United States. However, the model minority myth [equates voluntary immigrant experiences with the experiences of those who have descended from slavery](http://www.racefiles.com/2014/10/13/model-minority-mutiny/) and those who arrived involuntarily and/or by force, such as a result of war or U.S. colonization and expansion projects abroad. My parents immigrated to the U.S. seeking political freedom and better economic and educational opportunities. Yet, these freedoms and opportunities are actually limited. They are offered as placations that[obscure violent histories and institutions of slavery, colonialism, war, and genocide.](http://www.hyphenmagazine.com/blog/archive/2014/12/apology-black-folks) These opportunities selectively include and exclude different communities’ ability to participate. 4. The myth flattens and erases Asian American identity. [Asian American identities that don’t abide by the model minority rulebook](http://www.racefiles.com/2014/08/20/why-ferguson-matters-to-asian-americans/) are deemed invalid. Our validity and value is determined by our utility in preserving the racial hierarchy. Not only is it eugenic to ascribe character traits, like quiet, polite, and obedient, to an entire racial group, the myth prevents coalition building within our diverse Asian American communities. There are radically different histories, experiences, and oppressions across the Asian American diaspora, yet often, we are lumped together as one ambiguous other. Whenever people think about ‘Asian’ identities, they think specifically of East Asian identities, such as Chinese, Japanese, or Korean. [Other groups](http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/01/myths-about-native-hawaiians/) in the Asian and Pacific Islander diaspora are erased, and their lived realities and challenges are diminished. Assuming all Asians are the same, the myth also creates a mono-dimensional Asian American[without regard to intersections](http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/01/why-our-feminism-must-be-intersectional/). It does not take into account class, citizenship, language, gender, sexuality, ability, religion or other social identities. 5. The model minority myth is used to deny racial justice. In invoking this myth, policymakers also fail to recognize existing inequities and create access for Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) subgroups and other racial groups. [The myth makes the economic and educational struggles](http://college.usatoday.com/2014/10/15/students-reject-the-model-minority-myth/) of low-income AAPI families, Pacific Islanders, Southeast Asian refugees, undocumented immigrants, and other groups invisible – its [unambiguity and inaccuracy](http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0123-wu-chua-model-minority-chinese-20140123-story.html) makes it a convenient narrative that prevents solutions to racial and socioeconomic inequity. For example, [only 12-13%](http://colorlines.com/archives/2012/06/pew_asian_american_study.html) of Hmong, Cambodian, and Laotian Americans have a college degree and [less than 10%](http://colorlines.com/archives/2012/06/pew_asian_american_study.html) of Samoan-Americans do. [2.3 million Asian Americans](http://colorlines.com/archives/2012/06/pew_asian_american_study.html) are uninsured. AAPI groups suffer from physical and mental health disorders due to [lack of culturally competent care](http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/01/mental-health-professional-cultural-competency/). They’re left out of leadership roles at the top of organizations. Many AAPI groups also live in poverty, face labor exploitation, and are disenfranchised from the education system. Focusing on those that are doing well makes the issues of those who aren’t far less visible. We also need to begin to understand different [histories and state policies](http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/12/08/black-bodies-broken-worlds/) in order to tackle the construction of one model minority against a problem minority. Historically, the myth was created to diminish the Black community’s demands for equal rights during the Civil Rights era. By creating a racial hierarchy, the myth also started to prevent solidarity movements between the two communities. 6. The model minority myth erases shared histories of oppression and of solidarity. There is a long legacy of solidarity and shared oppression between Asian immigrants and enslaved Black folks. Most versions of history disconnect the study of slavery from the study of Asian and Latinx immigration, leaving out stories of transracial struggle. Asian immigrants, such as the Chinese, have historically and strategically been thought of as both bridges and wedges between white folks and Black folks. For example, throughout the 19th century, [Chinese “coolie” laborers](http://www.npr.org/blogs/codeswitch/2013/11/25/247166284/a-history-of-indentured-labor-gives-coolie-its-sting), lived in an intermediary position between slavery and free labor. After the 1850’s, labor became explicitly racialized when Britain brought Chinese laborers to the Caribbean as a solution to suppress Black slave rebellion. The Chinese were given the social potential to form a “middle class family” in order to create a racial hierarchy with White people at the top, Black people at the bottom, and Chinese people somewhere in between. Black activists like [Frederick Douglass link Black slavery and Chinese “coolie” labor together](http://cis.org/BlackAmericansOnImmigration) in system that strategically separated and these two racial identities and then exploited these divisions. Some examples of earlier solidarity movements that are erased from history books include: In the 1920s, the black Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Workers [issued a statement of solidarity with Filipino workers](http://www.socialjusticejournal.org/archive/73_25_3/73_01_Kim.pdf) that were used to break a strike. During the 1930s, in Seattle, [coalitions across Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino American communities](http://depts.washington.edu/civilr/aa_intro.htm) emerged to fight against bills that would have made interracial marriage illegal. In the Mississippi Delta, Chinese workers were recruited to work cotton fields during the Reconstruction era. When contracts expired, some stayed to open grocery stories – [these stores mostly sold to Black clientele and also offered an alternative to commissaries run by former plantation owners](http://www.hyphenmagazine.com/magazine/issue-23-bittersweet/mississippi-bok-choy#sthash.M2vaqnP8.dpuf). Civil Rights movements helped [end racist immigration laws against South Asians](http://blackdesisecrethistory.org/post/109836295943/1965). In the late 1960s, Asian Americans [were part of the Third World Liberation Strikes](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/1735) in Berkeley that launched the Black Power movement and inspired the Yellow Power movement. Asian American activists like Grace Lee Boggs and Yuri Kochiyama worked hard to build interracial solidarity and worked closely with leaders like Malcolm X. As a way to destabilize the model minority myth and construct an alternate history, historian Vivek Bald examined the relationship between Bengali migrants and the African American community in Harlem and [showed how racial lines between “Asian-ness” and “Black-ness” blurred](http://www.aaww.org/the-skin-vivek-bald/). Bengali migrants experienced anti-black racism and witnessed black anti-racist organizing. This history of cross-racial solidarity allows possibilities of a connected, holistic, radical movement towards racial justice. We can begin to resist oppression by unlearning Euro-centric narratives of U.S. history. \*\*\* Although the myth has created incentives for silent complicity in a racial system with “winners” and “losers,” [this complicity costs us real solidarity and justice.](http://18millionrising.org/blog/2014/may/7/deeper-words-donald-sterling/) How can we begin to act upon a commitment to social justice and build solidarity with those that we have also oppressed in our own struggles? Drawing from the title of the critical transformative justice anthology, by Jai Dulani, Ching-in Chen, and Leah Lahshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha: [The revolution starts at home.](https://inciteblog.wordpress.com/2010/05/22/815/) This begins with reflecting on our own privilege, power, and identity. It means owning and admitting complicity in a racist system that we may feel guilty or defensive about. It means having vulnerable and sometimes difficult conversations with families, friends, and others that we love, respect, and trust. In beginning to have conversations with others like my parents, I also have realized that not engaging in the conversation is an underestimation of them. Assuming that they won’t understand or won’t care is an [unfair and exclusionary characterization](http://everydayfeminism.com/2014/12/social-justice-at-home/) that they don’t have a place in racial justice movements. Asian American communities are not just bridges or wedges for other groups of color. Uniting under the term people of color [allows for building solidarity between movements that also allows for different racial histories](http://www.blackgirldangerous.org/2013/03/2013321whats-wrong-with-the-term-person-of-color/). In order to resist white supremacy in a meaningful way, we need to build coalitions across communities of color in order to share and redistribute power and combat racism rooted in anti-blackness and colonialism. Power can come from communities coming together to demand justice. This solidarity can help us [more equitably redistribute resources and labor, take care of ourselves and each other, and center the needs of those most impacted by violence](http://www.blackgirldangerous.org/2015/01/side-queer-trans-people-color-acting-solidarity-queer-trans-black-lives/). By confronting the mutual enemy of systemic racism, these coalitions can disrupt history and cycles of oppression. Partnerships that are fluid, critical, holistic, intersectional, and inclusive offer solutions that include and address multiple perspectives and issues. We need to acknowledge past and present complicity and complacency in perpetuating anti-black racism and moving past guilt and desire for forgiveness. We need to truly want change. We can begin doing transformative, accountable work by knowing when to start speaking up without usurping another voice. We can have diverse, horizontal leadership across communities where all forms of contributions are valued. We can participate and show up the way others ask us to. We can begin to self-reflect on different forms of privilege and power. For me, in standing up against the model minority myth, I am also refusing further complicity in reinforcing anti-black racism.

#### **The Model Minority Myth mystifies the plight of the Southeast Asian by upholding an image of universal success—the invisible hand of White supremacy locks Southeast Asian the cycle of poverty, underachievement, and senseless violence. Their culture is portrayed “savage and primitive” in comparison to the white ideal of the Model Minority image. This pits Asian communities against each other by portraying students who internalize the Myth as “good students” and those who dare to resist the system as “problematic students”. The Myth is only a tool to sustain White Supremacy.**

Lee 17 et al. (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin- Madison. Choua Xiong, a graduate student pursing a joint degree in Cultural Anthropology and Educational Policy Studies. Linda Marie Pheng, an associated Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin- Madison. Mai Neng Vang

, a third-year graduate student in the Educational Policy Studies program; “The Model Minority Maze: Hmong Americans Working Within and Around Racial Discourses”; 2017/6/10; <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/jsaaea/vol12/iss2/1/>; p2-5)

Since the Civil Rights era, Asian Americans have been positioned as “model minorities” who have achieved economic and academic success through hard work, grit, and adherence to traditional cultural values. From the moment the stereotype emerged on the scene Asian American communities have been embroiled in debates over how to respond. Critical Asian American scholars have repeatedly argued that the model minority stereotype is a hegemonic tool that sustains the myth of meritocracy, silences charges of racial injustice, disciplines Black and Brown communities and masks the struggles faced by Asian American communities (Hartlep, 2013; Lee, 2009; Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Leonardo, 2009; Osajima, 1988; Poon et al., 2015). Fifty years after the model minority stereotype first came to national prominence it continues to be used as a tool of White supremacy to justify the racial positioning and subjugation of Asian American, African American and Latinx (Armus, 2015) students and their communities. One strategy that scholars have used to challenge the validity of the model minority stereotype is to call for ethnically disaggregated data that uncovers the differences across various Asian American subgroups. Scholars have, for example, highlighted the high rates of poverty and academic underachievement within Southeast Asian American communities in an attempt to prove that the model minority stereotype is a myth (Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Walker-Moffat, 1995). A significant, but unintended, consequence of this line of scholarship is that Southeast Asian Americans have come to represent an exception to the model minority or a “failed” Asian American. As Poon and her colleagues argue, the focus on ethnically disaggregated data and the educational problems faced by some Southeast Asian American communities has contributed to the reproduction of deficit thinking and the reification of the model minority stereotype (Poon et al., 2015). Despite years of critique from Asian American scholars, the model minority stereotype continues to frame dominant understandings of who Asian Americans are and how they are doing relative to other racial groups. Whether framed as a model minority or used as evidence that the model minority is a myth, all Asian Americans are constrained by the model minority stereotype. As a disciplinary tool, the model minority stereotype controls Asian American experiences and identities. Furthermore, the stereotype contributes to how Asian Americans respond to and understand race and racialization. This paper explores the complex and diverse ways that Hmong American youth and Hmong American community leaders in a community in Wisconsin are making sense of and responding to the model minority stereotype and the racial positioning of the Hmong American community. The article will illustrate the persistent power of the model minority stereotype to frame Asian American experiences, identities, and actions. The Hmong people, often referred to as Miao or Meo in Asia, are an ethnic group that originated from China and Southeast Asia. During the Second Indochina War (Vietnam War) and the Secret War in Laos, Hmong people in Laos were recruited as guerilla fighters to support American troops against the Communist-backed North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and Pathet Lao forces (Cha, 2010; Quincy, 2012; Vang, 2008). After the United States pulled out of Vietnam in 1975, Hmong people became targets for ethnic and political persecution (Vang, 2008). As a result of their involvement with the U.S. military, Hmong people were forced to flee from Laos to Thailand, the United States, and other European countries as refugees. After initial resettlement across the United States, many Hmong people engaged in secondary migration to California and several Midwestern states in order to maintain kinship ties and co-ethnic networks, build social and cultural capital, increase economic opportunities, and gain access to different and better educational opportunities (Chan, 1991; Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1984; Vang, 2008). Hmong Americans have experienced economic and academic challenges since their resettlement in the United States in the mid-1970s. Race has been a central organizing principle in the United States since the formation of the nation, and research on immigrants and refugees reveals that the process of racialization is central to becoming American (Abu El-Haj, 2015; Lee, 2005; Olsen, 1997). The dominant discourse on race centers on the White and Black dichotomy that associates Whites with desirable and positive characteristics and Blacks with undesirable and negative characteristics (Feagin, 2000). Scholarship on Asian Americans has shown that the two dominant racial discourses surrounding Asian Americans are the image of Asians as “perpetual foreigners” and the image of Asian Americans as “model minorities” (Fong, 2008; Lee, 2014; Okihiro, 1994). According to the “perpetual foreigner” stereotype, Asian Americans are continuously positioned as outsiders based on binaries of profound cultural differences: Eastern versus Western, preliterate versus modern. As noted previously, the model minority stereotype suggests that Asian Americans have achieved widespread academic and economic success through hard work and adherence to traditional Asian cultural norms. While there has been a lot of attention to the academic and economic achievements associated with the model minority image, it is important to point out that the stereotype also includes significant behavioral characteristics—hard work, self-sufficiency, obedience, respect, compliance, etc. (Petersen, 1966). Like other Asian Americans, Hmong Americans are rejected for their “foreignness” through the discourse of cultural differences, yet they are accepted as “honorary Whites” when they perform model minority achievements and behavior (Tuan, 1998). These racial discourses shape (mis)understandings of Hmong Americans in educational spaces. The educational experiences, particularly the causes of educational inequity among Hmong Americans, are often understood to be the result of cultural clashes or cultural differences between Hmong culture and mainstream U.S. culture (Donnelly, 1994; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988; Sherman, 1988). Within the cultural clash discourse, Hmong culture is depicted as homogenous, fixed, savage and primitive in comparison to modern Western culture (DePouw, 2012; Ngo, 2008). Hones (2002), for example, argues that due to cultural differences and limited English proficiency, parents “don’t know what to expect from American schools, how to be involved, or what questions to ask regarding the schooling their children are receiving” (p. 46). Similarly, Lee and Green (2008) attribute Hmong American students’ poor academic achievement to parents not being educated and not keeping track of their children’s whereabouts. Xiong and Huang (2011) argue that students’ low motivation level for education accounts for delinquent behaviors. As these examples demonstrate, the cultural clash discourse defaults to an individualist argument that blames parents and individuals for poor academic achievements and high truancy rates (Lee, 2015; Xiong et al., 2008). In other words, an exclusive focus on cultural differences overlooks systematic inequities (Lee, 2001). Binary assumptions regarding Asian versus mainstream American culture and deficit perspectives on languages other than English have been identified with English as a Second Language (ESL) programs that promote English monolingualism (Xiong & Xiong, 2011). While ESL programs do provide resources for newcomers and English learners, Xiong and Zhou’s (2006) study point out that Hmong Americans are tracked into ESL based on the assumption that Hmong Americans need ESL programming simply because Hmong is spoken in the home. Importantly, research demonstrates that placement in ESL classes tracks students into lower academic classes that limit academic success (Callahan, 2005; Xiong & Zhou, 2006). As Asian Americans, the Hmong American community is also judged against the standards of the model minority stereotype. The scholarship on Hmong Americans and U.S. Census data on Hmong Americans reveal that Hmong students often struggle to achieve the levels of economic and academic achievement associated with the model minority stereotype (Ngo, 2006; Ngo & Lee, 2007). Given the Black and White discourse of race in the United States, the academic and economic struggles experienced by Hmong Americans and other Southeast Asians lead to the ideologically blackening of these communities (DePouw, 2012; Lee, 2005; Ong, 1999). Lee’s (2005) study of Hmong Americans at University Heights School (UHS) reveals the ways that race and racism frame the educational experiences of Hmong Americans. In particular, Lee discovered that Hmong Americans at UHS who aspired to high academic achievement and reflected “traditional” Hmong values were viewed positively by their teachers. In contrast to the “traditional” students, many of the self-identified “Americanized” students questioned the value of education and adopted hip-hop styles of clothing and language associated with African American youth culture. As a result of the way the “Americanized” students performed their identities they were viewed negatively by their teachers. Most significantly, these “Americanized” students were compared to African American students or ideologically blackened within the school and thus excluded from opportunities. Adding to Lee (2005), DePouw (2012) argues that colonialism and racism are embedded in the process of Hmong racialization based on the Black/White binary. Beyond statistical performances of the model minority and being ideologically blackened, DePouw’s (2006, 2012) discussion of Black/White binary suggests that the process of Hmong racialization is also tied to behavioral performances. Despite Hmong Americans' academic and economic struggles, Hmong Americans are still expected to behaviorally perform a non-complaining citizenship. When Hmong American students help institutions recruit “diversity,” promote cultural events, and graduate from their programs despite academic struggles, Hmong Americans successfully performed the behavioral aspects of the model minority. On the contrary, Hmong Americans are blackened when they engage in student activism, demand curriculum inclusivity in schools, and request for meaningful inclusion in campus decision-making process. In the performance of the model minority, Hmong Americans achieve honorary whiteness. When they engage in resistance, Hmong Americans become blackened. This process of racialization systematically silences and polices Hmong Americans to perform the model minority.

#### **Debate is complicit in a larger system of oppression that render us voiceless in a foreign culture. The forced assimilation into normative, English-centered debate make the activity incompatible with the democratic deliberation and policy education of international debaters. Without the acceptance of diversity in debate community, white supremacy will continuous codified most vulnerable minorities as disposable “second-class citizens” to maintain America’s global dominance.**

Darder 16 (Antonia Darder is a scholar, artist, poet, activist, and public intellectual, and the Leavey Presidential Endowed Chair in Ethics and Moral Leadership in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University. “CULTURAL HEGEMONY, LANGUAGE, AND THE POLITICS OF FORGETTING: Interrogating Restrictive Language Policies”; 2016-4-23; <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31666629/Darder_Cultural_Hegemony__Language_Rights___Politics_of_Forgetting-1.pdf>?)

In light of a colonial history of language imposition, it is important to understand the cultural hegemonic implications of language erosion beyond individual choice or the practical inducement of English for academic and labor gains. Views of language as “purely mechanical devices” (Nieto 2007) or solely as signifiers of national allegiance must be decentered, as educators engage with the powerful reality that language, political power, and economics are all inextricably tied to the ideological formations of the nation-state and, as such, language functions as a fundamental human resource for the construction of meaning and the establishment of relationships within both the private and public sphere. “In fact, the human being cannot exist without communicating; eliminating the possibility of communication from the human spirit entails removing its humanity” (Nieto 2007). This is precisely the experience of many children from linguistically racialized populations, when they enter a classroom where the supremacy of English functions not only against their academic well-being, but their democratic participation as well. Upon entering the Engliz vsh-only classroom, language minority students are rendered voiceless in a foreign sound system and cultural milieu that does not afford them a place for self-expression or self-determination. And often, even when these students learn English, stereotypical perceptions of deficiency persist, denying them meaningful opportunities to participate in ways that English proficient students readily enjoy in the process of their academic formation. Without these opportunities, the ability of English-language learners to succeed in school is overwhelmingly compromised, as they struggle not only to learn the grade-level content, but also grapple with traversing limited language comprehension, in a context that affords them little, if any, language support As suggested earlier, it is no wonder that language constitutes such a deeply contested terrain of struggle. Instructional language is implicated in significant ways, when considering the future possibilities and limitations students will experience not only in the classroom, but also out in the world. Similarly, community conditions that infuse life, meaning, and belonging into individual and collective life are also important factors in their academic achievement, given that linguistic rights, education, and democratic participation are absolutely central to language minority community empowerment. Hence, when important human conditions shaped by a long-standing history of oppression and marginalization are ignored, disregarded, or maligned within schools, the political empowerment and well-being of language minority students and their families are also negatively affected. This process can, unfortunately, leave linguistically racialized communities at the mercy of a deeply engrained hegemonic process that prevents them from naming their world and, hence, from participating in significant educational language-policy debates and decisions that will impact the destiny of their children. As a consequence, language minority students who enter the classroom with a primary language other than English are also often (mis)assessed too quickly as intellectually deficient or developmentally delayed, as a consequence of assessment measures that do not take into account the cultural and linguistic dissonance experienced by otherwise intellectually capable children entering into an unfamiliar language environment. Unfortunately, the linguistic forms of racialization at work in the schooling of English-language learners, or what Angela Valenzuela (1999) terms “subtractive schooling,” disrupts the ability of both educators and policy makers to see beyond their shrouded projections of inferiority—a phenomenon that stifles the ability to recognize, assess, and employ the strengths and capacities these language minority students already possess. Unexamined racialized perceptions of language minority populations often render teachers blind to those cognitive resources that would normally provide the logical foundation for new linguistic experiences related to learning English. Accordingly, the inability of mainstream teachers to engage the knowledge and skills that these students bring to the classroom is a key barrier to academic success; as is the absence of the primary language as the medium of instruction. The institutionalized ideology of exclusion at work here discourages not only the use of minority languages in the United States, but also disrupts the successful academic formation of linguistically racialized students, while it renders them vulnerable to cultural hegemony. 13 In many ways, we can understand the task at hand to be one that requires us to decolonize our minds from debilitating ideologies that persistently racialize students of color who do not speak English, judging them in need of remediation, yet unworthy of the expenditure of additional resources. In the logic of Race to the Top (RTT) and its predecessor, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the goal of education is to create the global competitive edge that can ensure domination of the world’s political economy—at the expense of children from the most vulnerable populations. As such, expenditures of educational resources are liberally being directed toward science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM)—including in the early years—in the government’s frenzy to meet its overarching goal. In the world of highstakes accountability, STEM initiatives are pronounced the panacea for global supremacy, while questions of culturally democratic life have been eclipsed by preoccupations with the (hidden) curriculum of class formation and the citizen as unbridled consumer. In accordance, linguistic racialization is implicated as part of a larger and more complex system of economic and political subordination that positions language minority students and their families as disposable, second-class citizens (Darder and Torres 2004). This encompasses an ideology that often distorts the ability to see working-class language minority communities in the United States as worthy of full educational rights. The consequence is the perpetuation of a culture of failure and educational neglect that relegates these communities to a position of invisibility—aided by the politics of the labor market, ill-representations in media, and the increasing incarceration of poor working-class men and women of color (Gilmore 2006).

#### **Asian rhetoric functions as a disruption of the dominant discourse surrounding the Asian American identities. This counter-memory empowers Asian people who have had scripts placed onto them. Although different Asian groups have had different experiences, situating shared tropes creates a locus for Asian people to galvanize around, and creates the foundation for Asian spaces of resistance.**

Franchini 13 (Jennifer Lee Sano-Franchini, Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Writing. Michigan State University, Professor in the Department of English, Virginia Tech, XCaliber Award for Exceptional Contributions to Technology-Enriched Teaching and Learning, 2015, THE RHETORICAL MAKING OF THE ASIAN/ASIAN AMERICAN FACE: READING AND WRITING ASIAN EYELIDS, 2013, Doctoral Dissertation - Michigan State University)

This is an Asian American rhetoric project. Asian American rhetoric has long been concerned with the temporality of shifting identities. By “temporality of shifting identities,” I refer to how identities move and change across time and space, particularly as they meet, engage, and conflict with other identities, and the implications of how we articulate and measure these shifts. Through such notions as “process of becoming,” and through a focus on concepts like memory and historiography, the temporalities of cultural and racial identity have been central to the making of an Asian/Asian American rhetoric (Hoang, 2008; Mao, 2006; Monberg, 2008; Wang, 2010; Wu, 2002). This work has been particularly pertinent as Asians and Asian Americans have been and continue to be pigeonholed into a number of stock stereotypes. For instance, as LuMing Mao (2006) explained, Chinese American rhetoric “can never be unique, not only because there is no internal coherence to speak of, but also because it is always in a state of adjusting and becoming, both in relation to its ‘native’ (Chinese) identity and in relation to its ‘adopted’ (American) residency. And the process of adjusting and becoming is forever infused with its own tensions, struggles, and vulnerabilities, within the context of each and every borderland speech event [my emphasis]” (p. 17). Mao went on to say that: Chinese American rhetoric [...] becomes viable and transformative not by securing a logical or unified order, but by participating in a process of becoming where meanings are situated and where significations are contingent upon each and every particular experience. Further, in this process of becoming, Chinese American rhetoric is not to be had either by abstraction or by us searching for fixed features of harmony or seamless 12 blending. Rather, the making of Chinese American rhetoric lies in the process of contestation, interrogation, and reflection--or in what I call ‘heterogeneous resonance. (p. 5) This quote has methodological importance for doing Asian American rhetoric in that it highlights a research practice of examining meanings as situated and contingent on experience, and of focusing on “[processes] of contestation, interrogation, and reflection” (Mao, 2006, p. 5). A second example of the focus on temporalities of shifting identities in Asian American rhetoric is Haivan Hoang’s (2008) work on rhetorical memory, which she described as “a process of participation in a wider cultural production” (p. 80). Describing memory as “central to Asian American rhetoric, a rejoinder to the persistent forgetfulness that displaces Asian Americans from commonplace understandings of what is American” (p. 63), Hoang focused on the processes by which dominant cultural narratives are constructed, particularly as they have implications for Asian American subjectivities. In other words, to do Asian American rhetoric is to interrogate how stories about Asians and Asian Americans are constructed, disseminated, and circulated over time, and the political implications that follow. These political implications go on to influence how individuals make sense of their personal experiences, and so on. In terms of methodology, Hoang identified, “Asian American rhetorical memory, then, has most often articulated countermemories that destabilize and then reconstitute the American subject” (p. 63). Moreover, Asian American rhetoric is constitutive of “not shifts to different memorial objects, but, more so, the epistemological shifts that guide the practice of how to remember” (p. 64). In relation to the “wider cultural production” of memory, Terese Guinsatao Monberg (2008) has also been attentive to the temporalities of shifting memory as she worked toward a 13 “culturally contingent model of feminist historiography, [arguing that] certain methods of listening--because they are attentive to interdependencies among rhetorical space, memory, and history--are central to the makings of an Asian Pacific American ‘feminist’ rhetoric” (p. 86). Identifying the ways in which we tend to privilege seeing over hearing in the Academy and in our research practices, Monberg explored how this results in particular narratives and particular bodies being left out of the grand narratives we tell ourselves about who we are. In so doing, Monberg showed how some kinds of cultural memory are simply not accessible through traditional, alphabetic textual modes of analysis. That said, this is an Asian American project, not because it aims to categorize rhetorical practices that are ostensibly Asian American, but because 1) it is, itself, an Asian American practice, interpreted through an Asian American lens (read: me); 2) it examines meaning as it is “situated” and contingent on experience; 3) it contributes to “wider cultural production” by deconstructing dominant, U.S.-based cultural narratives, particularly about Asian bodies as it examines and articulates “countermemories that destabilize and then reconstitute the American subject. In so doing, this dissertation explores the “temporality of shifting identities” by focusing specifically on the ways in which the temporal logics that ground the way we make arguments about Asian bodies shape subjectivity. My goal here is furthermore to create a discursive “space for Asian Americans where [we] can resist social and economic injustice and reassert [our] discursive agency and authority in the dominant culture” (Mao and Young, 2008, p. 3).

### Critical

#### **The model minority myth operates under the structural triangulation of the White, Asian, and Black. Racial categories are embodied onto different identities through racialization and enforced by modern schooling practices. Even though Asian are upheld as the Model Minority, they are simultaneously racialized as foreign and unassimilated foreigners. The duality of Forever Foreigner syndrome and Model Minority Myth simultaneously posits Asian as a threat to America and undermine solidarity between non-black groups.**

Lee et al. 16 (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Eujin Park, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison & Jia-Hui Stefanie Wong, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Trinity College; 2016/12/14; “Racialization, Schooling, and Becoming American: Asian American Experiences” http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360)

Schools as civic institutions play a crucial role in shaping racial categories and redistributing resources and opportunities based on race. Far from being racially neutral institutions, schools “daily teach young people the naturalized status of race” (Leonardo, 2011, p. 680). Schools are racialized as White spaces that work to protect White supremacy through racialized tracking practices (Oakes, 2005; Tyson, 2011); the “hidden curriculum of Whiteness” (Leonardo, 2004, p. 144); and the privileging of White cultural capital (S. J. Lee, 2005; Lewis, 2003). Drawing on Mills’ Racial Contract, Leonardo (2013) argues that Whites have entered into an epistemological contract that places Whites as knowers and people of color as subknowers. In schools, then, youth of color are “targets of epistemological imposition within the industrial complex of knowledge” (Leonardo, 2013, p. 607). Antiblackness in schools further reinforces “the ideological and material ‘infrastructure’ of educational inequity—the misrecognition of students and communities of color, and the (racialized) maldistribution of educational resources” (Dumas & ross, 2016, p. 432). When schools enact anti-Black policies, practices, and discourses, they become a “site of suffering” (Dumas, 2014, p. 2) for Black children and families. Similarly, many scholars have demonstrated how schools have positioned other youth of color as deviant, dangerous, and inferior (López, 2003; Ngo, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999). Thus, schools are important sites where racialization processes play out in the everyday lives of young people. Although it is abundantly clear that dominant U.S. racial ideology positions Whites as superior to people of color, and African Americans as inferior, dangerous, and unworthy of civil protections and equal opportunity, the racial position of Asian Americans has always been less clear cut. At times, Asian Americans have been rendered invisible in the largely Black and White discourses surrounding race, and at other moments, invisibility can transform into a state of hypervisibility (Coloma, 2006; Zia, 2000). When made visible, Asian Americans have served as a “phantasmatic site, on which the nation projects a series of condensed, complicated anxieties regarding external and internal threats to the mutable coherence of the national body” (Lowe, 1996, p. 18). Significantly, Asian ethnic groups have always been categorized together since they began arriving in the United States, and this ethnic lumping has been central to their racialization. Categorized as yellow or Oriental, early Asian immigrants resisted racial lumping, especially because they understood that these labels framed them as foreign threats and undesirable. It was not until the postwar years, when the growth of second- and third-generation US-born Asians and decreased residential and economic barriers led to more contact between ethnic groups, that the panethnic concept of Asian American was embraced by Asian immigrants themselves (Espiritu, 1992). Espiritu (1992) explains that “when manifested in racial violence, racial lumping necessarily leads to protective panethnicity” (p. 7). Thus, although the racial categorization as Asian has been externally imposed, Asian Americans have also taken up this identity to seek political and economic resources—to mixed results and consequences, as we later explain. A relational conceptualization of racialization is particularly useful when examining the racialization of Asian Americans, who are always positioned in comparison to other groups as more hardworking than, less American than, more successful than, less loyal than. However, even hierarchical understandings of racialization are, by nature, relational, and scholars recognize that racialized groups can move up and down the hierarchy depending on the context (Bonilla-Silva, EDUCATIONAL STUDIES 5 2009; Omi & Winant, 2015). In this article, we draw on scholars who conceptualize racialization as relational, as well as those who see it as hierarchical. Thus, we refer to racialization generally to encompass both hierarchical and relational racialization processes, in recognition of the fact that these processes are fluid and contextual. Kim (1999) describes Asian American racialization as racial triangulation in relation to Whites and African Americans. Racial triangulation occurs through the simultaneous processes of relative valorization and civic ostracism, which alternately valorize Asians relative to African Americans but also figure them as foreign and unassimilable, excluding them from civic membership. Bow (2010) conceptualizes this racial position as the “racially interstitial” (p. 4) between Black and White. Examination of this interstitiality is crucial to our understanding of racialization, she argues, because it is this space that “forces established perspectives and definitions into disorientation … [it] can represent the physical manifestation of the law’s instability, its epistemological limit, the point of interpellations’ excess” (Bow, 2010, p. 4). Taken together, these theorists argue that Asian Americans occupy an ambiguous, amorphous, and contradictory space in the field of racial positions. Throughout US history, Asian Americans have been framed alternately as perpetual (and dangerous) foreigners and/or as model minorities. Although seemingly oppositional discourses, Asian American scholars have discussed how these images are two sides of the same coin, both working to uphold White supremacy and undermine interracial solidarity (L. S. H. Park, 2008; Wu, 2002). The model minority discourse positions Asian Americans as hard-working, submissive, and entrepreneurial immigrants who place admirable importance on family and education. By dint of their diligence, as the story goes, Asian immigrants have achieved economic and academic success in US society and schools, thus proving that social mobility and the American dream can be achieved by anyone who puts in enough effort. Although such images of Asian Americans are seemingly positive, the model minority discourse renders invisible the struggles experienced by Asian Americans, ignores structural and historical factors that stand in the way of social mobility for communities of color, and instead blames those very communities for their problems (Bascara, 2006; S. J. Lee, 2009; Wu, 2002). In doing so, this narrative upholds the myth that the United States is a meritocratic society, where issues of racial inequality are no longer a barrier for people of color. Rhee (2013) further contends that the model minority discourse acts as a disciplinary technology of racialized neoliberalism, through which Asian American neoliberal subjects are (self)-governed. Thus, this ideology confers a secondary citizenship that is contingent on “model” behavior and acceptance of the rules, which also limits the possibilities for progressive social change in Asian American communities (L. S. H. Park, 2008). However positive it may seem at first glance, inherent to the model minority is the potential threat of the perpetual foreigner. As L. S. H. Park (2008) argues, when Asian Americans fail to perform as the model minority, they may be cast as foreigners who do not fit into White American ideals. Scholars further note that foreigner also often denotes enemy, particularly in times of wartime conflict and economic distress (Lowe, 1996; N. T. Saito, 2001; Wu, 2002). During World War II, Japanese American citizens were forced into internment camps because they were positioned as foreign threats to US national security; today, Arab Americans are similarly framed as directly opposed to American interests and identity (Abu El-Haj, 2007, 2010; Fine & Sirin, 2008). Denied full, unqualified Americanness, Asian Americans continue to be racialized as model minorities and perpetual foreigners.

#### **The myth of the model minority compares the successful Asian American to the Black/brown body---this places the blame on these black and brown students instead of the structures that create such conditions**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

I have shown that administrators, teachers, and other staff institutionalized the high degree of racial stratification at the school through formal and informal sorting mechanisms and through instructional practices that marginalized Black and Latino youth. Further, the stratification between Asian American and Black/Latino students was hierarchal. Although there was tremendous diversity of academic, social, and ethnic positions among Asian American students, as a group, they were privileged over Black and Latino students in teacher and staff representations of them, expectations for them, and interactions with them. The racialization of minority youth was highly differentiated, with the tropes of the Asian American model minority and oppositional and unengaged Black/Brown youth, as meaning-making anchors. The creation of racial categories was mutually co-constitutive; one was defined in relation to the other and these relationships were in turn related to the ideology of color-blindness. Students’ academic status and social competence were defined in differentiated racial terms. Staff tended to draw from a model minority trope to value Asian American students’ school efforts and interactions positively, often beyond individuals’ actual depth of learning or achievement on standardized tests. They tended to value Black and Latino students’ behavior and performance negatively, often below their demonstrated competence. Black youth were routinely labeled “resistant” and Latino youth were characterized as “invisible.” This process was often self-fulfilling, as many Black and Latino students became discouraged by the “achievement gap”between Asian American Americans and other racial minorities. Black and Latino students consequently expressed a lower sense of belonging to and ownership of the school relative to Asian American Americans, who had better access to school resources and were disproportionately represented in leadership activities. Buoyed by perceptions of themselves as “smart” and “engaged,” Asian Americans often internalized this identity and saw themselves on upward trajectories, even when in practical terms, many struggled with the content of higher level curricula. Asian Americans who defied model minority expectations sometimes faced academic and social exclusions similar to those experienced by Black and Latino students, though they were not disciplined at the same high levels. Very often, “Asian American” was understood by teachers and staff as a stand-in for White. Asian-ness and Blackness often served as racial foils, complicating the Black-White binary and the binary relationship of White supremacy/oppression of the racialized ‘Other.’ In this case, racial privilege was constrained. For example, the purchase on power that Asian Americans had as a privileged group at this school was conditional upon certain demands for normalized behavior and came at the extraordinary expense of educational equity. Seeing these constraints enables a greater view of intertwined contexts (of economic inequality, concentrated poverty, and societal disregard for “ghetto schools”) that shaped CHS as one institution among many. Moreover, the ability of the school to highlight Asian American students’ relative success created a distraction from the fundamentally low standards for teaching and learning that characterized this and other urban schools. The reproduction of the model minority myth in an urban school setting essentially functioned as a smokescreen for the profoundly constrained educational opportunity that was offered to poor students in a struggling school, in a marginalized community.

#### **This forces Asian Americans to conform to whiteness in order to access to schooling and education, this push toward whiteness is an attempt to distance themselves from blackness**

**Lee et al. 16** (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Eujin Park, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison & Jia-Hui Stefanie Wong, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Trinity College; 2016/12/14; “Racialization, Schooling, and Becoming American: Asian American Experiences” http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360)

The educational scholarship on pre-1965 Asian American immigrants suggests that early Chinese and Japanese Americans actively worked to resist their racialization through performing ideal American identities that signaled an early expression of the model minority image. Like other non-Whites, Asian Americans were subjected to segregation and even exclusion from schools. Chinese-only schools operated in San Francisco from 1859 to 1879, after which time Chinese children were excluded from all San Francisco public schools until the 1885 case of Tape v. Hurley. In discussing the segregation of Chinese American students during this period, Coloma (2006) argues that the exclusionary policies were based on a White-Black binary and revealed the fact that “the policies of Jim Crow extended beyond the US South and contributed to anti- Asian prejudice in the racially charged climate of California” (p. 4). In Mississippi, Chinese were officially barred from White schools until the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, but some Chinese families had managed to negotiate access to White public schools for their children in some Mississippi Delta towns by the late 1930s, and most districts accepted Chinese children in White schools by the late 1940s (Jung, 2008; Lim de Sánchez, 2003; Loewen, 1988). To gain access to White schools during Jim Crow, Chinese immigrants living in the Mississippi Delta had to [convincing] Whites that the Chinese were closer to Whites than Blacks. In particular, Chinese immigrants had to develop social ties with prominent Whites in their towns, which many did by joining local churches and, simultaneously, distancing themselves socially from Blacks (S. J. Lee, in press; Loewen, 1988). In short, Chinese immigrants gained access to White schools in the Mississippi Delta during Jim Crow by following the rules of White supremacy and performing an early expression of model minority behavior. The stories of how Chinese immigrants gained access to White schools in the Mississippi Delta during the Jim Crow era reveal the relational nature of Asian American racialization and demonstrate that Chinese immigrants were active agents in challenging their racial positioning (S. J. Lee, in press). In contrast to earlier Asian immigrants, post-1965 Asian immigrants entered the nation at a time when the model minority image of Asian Americans was being established in the national imagination. Although the prominence of the model minority image may appear to suggest that Asian Americans have gained status, the review of the research suggests that Asian Americans may embrace the model minority image and behaviors associated with the stereotype in response to racism. Louie’s (2004) Chinese American participants were aware of the “clear racial hierarchy” (p. 56) in the United States. They also understood that perpetual foreigner and model minority discourses shaped how dominant society viewed them. In response, Chinese families turned to education as a “credentialing mechanism to safeguard against potential discrimination” (Louie, 2004, p. 56). Parents believed that because of racism their children would face, they would have to try even harder in school to lessen its impacts. Thus, even middle-class Chinese parents, who presumably would not have the same financial concerns as working-class parents, stressed higher education in technical and licensed professions and discouraged children from pursuing majors in social sciences or liberal arts. They reasoned that their children would face less racial discrimination in professions that were more technical and skill-based. Similarly, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) discovered that Chinese immigrant parents and Vietnamese refugee parents pushed a success frame, which centered around getting a good education that would lead to a good job, for their second-generation children. Furthermore, their strategies, including steering their children away from creative fields, were framed by the recognition that as Asian Americans their children would face racial bias. Thus, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) found that “Asian immigrant parents directed their children into elite colleges, specific majors, and particular occupations so that they would be better protected from subjective evaluations” (p. 58). In other words, the immigrant parents in Louie’s (2004) study and those in J. Lee and Zhou’s (2015) study encouraged a model minority performance as a strategy to cope with racism, but their actions have simply been read as evidence that they are model minorities. Lew(2006) also found that both middle-class and working-class Korean Americans recognized that the strictly racialized hierarchy in the United States would prevent them from achieving authentic, unhyphenated Americanness. However, middle-class participants’ class position made it possible for them to aspire to a class-based understanding of Americanness. They were able to pursue this definition of American through the high-quality education and social capital that their middle-class positions afforded them. Concerns about protecting and advancing the model minority image have also been found to influence relationships among Asian Americans (S. J. Lee, 2009). In writing about South Asian educational migrants in the post-1965 era, Thomas (2015) found that South Asians embraced the model minority as a way to understand and perform their racial and class positions. Thomas (2015) argues that highly educated South Asian immigrants were invested in reinforcing a model minority narrative, which they feared was being challenged by subsequent waves of working class South Asians who were unable to live up to model minority standards. Scholarship suggests that many Asian immigrant and second-generation youth are invested in performing model minority behavior (Cheng, 2013; Chhuon & Hudley, 2011; J. Lee & Zhou, 2015; S. J. Lee, 2009; G. C. Park, 2011). For example, in his research on working class Korean immigrant high school youth, G. C. Park (2011) found that participants believed they would never be accepted as authentic Americans because of their race and ethnicity. Thus, students performed a model minority identity as a coping strategy, which they believed got them closer to Whiteness. Furthermore, G. C. Park found that the students sought “to achieve social distance from other Koreans who could not or did not conform to the stereotype via social rewards and punishments” (p. 123). Not only do some Asian Americans perform the model minority, they may actively discipline those who do not or cannot perform.

#### **The Myth is anti-black at its core—it posts Asian as the “model minority” and criminalize blacks as “the problematic minority”. Assimilation into Model Minority behavior only strengthens the tool White Supremacy used to maintain the system of antiblackness.**

Lee 17 et al. (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin- Madison. Choua Xiong, a graduate student pursing a joint degree in Cultural Anthropology and Educational Policy Studies. Linda Marie Pheng, an associated Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin- Madison. Mai Neng Vang

, a third-year graduate student in the Educational Policy Studies program; “The Model Minority Maze: Hmong Americans Working Within and Around Racial Discourses”; 2017/6/10; <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/jsaaea/vol12/iss2/1/>; p11-13)

Like our middle-class Hmong American participants, our low-income Hmong American participants and those who work closely with these communities, are deeply concerned with the invisibility of Hmong Americans in Dane County. Mee, a youth coordinator for an advocacy group that works with Southeast Asian and Black communities in Dane County (SHOUT), expressed her frustration regarding the way the model minority stereotype masks the concerns of Hmong people: I still think that a lot of people don’t know who Hmong folks are. I think that a lot of people still think that we are East Asian, Chinese folks right? And that we fit into the model minority myth. Yeah, I think… that if they do think about Hmong people they think, I think they think about the model minority folks right. Really trying to put us into that box. Mee goes on to assert that Hmong Americans are not model minorities: But I think we look at those statistics right, and we take out SEA folks from that, when we look at it, we see that SEA folks are the complete opposite of the model minority myth. That we are not doing well at all. We are actually really poor, we are not graduating high school and college. All of that right. Interestingly, Mee suggests that Hmong American middle-class professionals may unintentionally confirm the model minority stereotype in the eyes of the dominant society through their advocacy work. In the following quote she argued that middle-class Hmong leaders are not the only leaders in the community: Hmong leadership does not only come from young people who are professionals, right. And that it’s um, that Hmong leaders comes in all shapes and forms. And that in reality at SHOUT, a lot of the Hmong leaders, a lot of folks that we think are Hmong leaders are elderly Hmong women. They are the ones that we go to, um for like, they are the one that we go to because they know whose family has not eaten, whose family does not have clothes, and whose families needs help right. And yeah, I think a lot of people look at elderly Hmong women and think that they are stupid and they don’t have anything to contribute and they don’t know anything. Right, and that actually, they think that they are a burden to the city and the state right. But in reality they have the most wisdom and they know the most about what the community needs. Mee and our other low-income Hmong American participants are overtly critical of the model minority stereotype, and they also recognize that the model minority stereotype implicitly compares Asian Americans to other groups of color. Specifically, Mee argues that as Asian Americans, Hmong Americans experience relative racial privilege compared to Black people. In support of her position, she points to the disciplinary practices at schools that target Black students for behaviors that go unpunished when performed by Asian and White students. Meng, a youth leader at SHOUT, also expressed a recognition that Whites view Hmong Americans more positively than they view Black people: They (Whites) see us differently from black people, I think. They always say, “oh we have good food, you know. We behave well, we behave better than black folks. We have good grades or I don’t know that we’re healthy.” Mee and other members of SHOUT argue that efforts to perform a model minority image represent a consent to hegemonic racial discourses that damage both the Hmong American community and the Black community (Lee, 2009). In the following quote, Mee asserted that Hmong people should not strive to become model minorities: It (the model minority stereotype) is just feeding into the system of White supremacy, not only that, but the model minority myth is very anti-Black. Everything about the model minority myth is being white, becoming White and being the furthest thing from black. We should not try to be the model minority at all. It’s like we are trying to fit into the system, and the system is just using the model minority as a tool to keep us down. So that it can keep on working its magic. Mee’s critique of the model minority stereotype highlights the anti-Blackness implicit in the discourse. She recognizes that the model minority discourse is implicitly comparative in nature, and that there cannot be a model minority without a concomitant problematic minority (Lee, 2009; Poon et al., 2015). Mee and other Southeast Asian members of SHOUT have developed close relationships with low-income Black people through their work in SHOUT. Through their experiences working with SHOUT, Mee has seen firsthand the ways that race and class intersect with other identities in the lives of low-income communities, and she has come to recognize that low-income Black and Southeast Asians face shared forms of marginalization. Mee and other members of SHOUT argue for an intersectional approach to challenging the multiple forms of oppression faced by members of the low-income Black and Southeast Asian American communities in Dane County. Thus, Mee's critique of the model minority stereotype is based on her commitment to building cross-racial coalitions with other low-income communities of color.

#### **The Model Minority Myth mystifies the plight of the Southeast Asian by upholding an image of universal success—the invisible hand of White supremacy locks Southeast Asian the cycle of poverty, underachievement, and senseless violence. Their culture is portrayed “savage and primitive” in comparison the white ideal of the Model Minority image. This pits Asian communities against each other by portraying students who internalize the Myth as “good students” and those who dare to resist the system as “problematic students”. The Myth is only a tool to sustain White Supremacy.**

Lee 17 et al. (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin- Madison. Choua Xiong, a graduate student pursing a joint degree in Cultural Anthropology and Educational Policy Studies. Linda Marie Pheng, an associated Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin- Madison. Mai Neng Vang

, a third-year graduate student in the Educational Policy Studies program; “The Model Minority Maze: Hmong Americans Working Within and Around Racial Discourses”; 2017/6/10; <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/jsaaea/vol12/iss2/1/>; p2-5)

Since the Civil Rights era, Asian Americans have been positioned as “model minorities” who have achieved economic and academic success through hard work, grit, and adherence to traditional cultural values. From the moment the stereotype emerged on the scene Asian American communities have been embroiled in debates over how to respond. Critical Asian American scholars have repeatedly argued that the model minority stereotype is a hegemonic tool that sustains the myth of meritocracy, silences charges of racial injustice, disciplines Black and Brown communities and masks the struggles faced by Asian American communities (Hartlep, 2013; Lee, 2009; Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Leonardo, 2009; Osajima, 1988; Poon et al., 2015). Fifty years after the model minority stereotype first came to national prominence it continues to be used as a tool of White supremacy to justify the racial positioning and subjugation of Asian American, African American and Latinx (Armus, 2015) students and their communities. One strategy that scholars have used to challenge the validity of the model minority stereotype is to call for ethnically disaggregated data that uncovers the differences across various Asian American subgroups. Scholars have, for example, highlighted the high rates of poverty and academic underachievement within Southeast Asian American communities in an attempt to prove that the model minority stereotype is a myth (Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Walker-Moffat, 1995). A significant, but unintended, consequence of this line of scholarship is that Southeast Asian Americans have come to represent an exception to the model minority or a “failed” Asian American. As Poon and her colleagues argue, the focus on ethnically disaggregated data and the educational problems faced by some Southeast Asian American communities has contributed to the reproduction of deficit thinking and the reification of the model minority stereotype (Poon et al., 2015). Despite years of critique from Asian American scholars, the model minority stereotype continues to frame dominant understandings of who Asian Americans are and how they are doing relative to other racial groups. Whether framed as a model minority or used as evidence that the model minority is a myth, all Asian Americans are constrained by the model minority stereotype. As a disciplinary tool, the model minority stereotype controls Asian American experiences and identities. Furthermore, the stereotype contributes to how Asian Americans respond to and understand race and racialization. This paper explores the complex and diverse ways that Hmong American youth and Hmong American community leaders in a community in Wisconsin are making sense of and responding to the model minority stereotype and the racial positioning of the Hmong American community. The article will illustrate the persistent power of the model minority stereotype to frame Asian American experiences, identities, and actions. The Hmong people, often referred to as Miao or Meo in Asia, are an ethnic group that originated from China and Southeast Asia. During the Second Indochina War (Vietnam War) and the Secret War in Laos, Hmong people in Laos were recruited as guerilla fighters to support American troops against the Communist-backed North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and Pathet Lao forces (Cha, 2010; Quincy, 2012; Vang, 2008). After the United States pulled out of Vietnam in 1975, Hmong people became targets for ethnic and political persecution (Vang, 2008). As a result of their involvement with the U.S. military, Hmong people were forced to flee from Laos to Thailand, the United States, and other European countries as refugees. After initial resettlement across the United States, many Hmong people engaged in secondary migration to California and several Midwestern states in order to maintain kinship ties and co-ethnic networks, build social and cultural capital, increase economic opportunities, and gain access to different and better educational opportunities (Chan, 1991; Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1984; Vang, 2008). Hmong Americans have experienced economic and academic challenges since their resettlement in the United States in the mid-1970s. Race has been a central organizing principle in the United States since the formation of the nation, and research on immigrants and refugees reveals that the process of racialization is central to becoming American (Abu El-Haj, 2015; Lee, 2005; Olsen, 1997). The dominant discourse on race centers on the White and Black dichotomy that associates Whites with desirable and positive characteristics and Blacks with undesirable and negative characteristics (Feagin, 2000). Scholarship on Asian Americans has shown that the two dominant racial discourses surrounding Asian Americans are the image of Asians as “perpetual foreigners” and the image of Asian Americans as “model minorities” (Fong, 2008; Lee, 2014; Okihiro, 1994). According to the “perpetual foreigner” stereotype, Asian Americans are continuously positioned as outsiders based on binaries of profound cultural differences: Eastern versus Western, preliterate versus modern. As noted previously, the model minority stereotype suggests that Asian Americans have achieved widespread academic and economic success through hard work and adherence to traditional Asian cultural norms. While there has been a lot of attention to the academic and economic achievements associated with the model minority image, it is important to point out that the stereotype also includes significant behavioral characteristics—hard work, self-sufficiency, obedience, respect, compliance, etc. (Petersen, 1966). Like other Asian Americans, Hmong Americans are rejected for their “foreignness” through the discourse of cultural differences, yet they are accepted as “honorary Whites” when they perform model minority achievements and behavior (Tuan, 1998). These racial discourses shape (mis)understandings of Hmong Americans in educational spaces. The educational experiences, particularly the causes of educational inequity among Hmong Americans, are often understood to be the result of cultural clashes or cultural differences between Hmong culture and mainstream U.S. culture (Donnelly, 1994; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988; Sherman, 1988). Within the cultural clash discourse, Hmong culture is depicted as homogenous, fixed, savage and primitive in comparison to modern Western culture (DePouw, 2012; Ngo, 2008). Hones (2002), for example, argues that due to cultural differences and limited English proficiency, parents “don’t know what to expect from American schools, how to be involved, or what questions to ask regarding the schooling their children are receiving” (p. 46). Similarly, Lee and Green (2008) attribute Hmong American students’ poor academic achievement to parents not being educated and not keeping track of their children’s whereabouts. Xiong and Huang (2011) argue that students’ low motivation level for education accounts for delinquent behaviors. As these examples demonstrate, the cultural clash discourse defaults to an individualist argument that blames parents and individuals for poor academic achievements and high truancy rates (Lee, 2015; Xiong et al., 2008). In other words, an exclusive focus on cultural differences overlooks systematic inequities (Lee, 2001). Binary assumptions regarding Asian versus mainstream American culture and deficit perspectives on languages other than English have been identified with English as a Second Language (ESL) programs that promote English monolingualism (Xiong & Xiong, 2011). While ESL programs do provide resources for newcomers and English learners, Xiong and Zhou’s (2006) study point out that Hmong Americans are tracked into ESL based on the assumption that Hmong Americans need ESL programming simply because Hmong is spoken in the home. Importantly, research demonstrates that placement in ESL classes tracks students into lower academic classes that limit academic success (Callahan, 2005; Xiong & Zhou, 2006). As Asian Americans, the Hmong American community is also judged against the standards of the model minority stereotype. The scholarship on Hmong Americans and U.S. Census data on Hmong Americans reveal that Hmong students often struggle to achieve the levels of economic and academic achievement associated with the model minority stereotype (Ngo, 2006; Ngo & Lee, 2007). Given the Black and White discourse of race in the United States, the academic and economic struggles experienced by Hmong Americans and other Southeast Asians lead to the ideologically blackening of these communities (DePouw, 2012; Lee, 2005; Ong, 1999). Lee’s (2005) study of Hmong Americans at University Heights School (UHS) reveals the ways that race and racism frame the educational experiences of Hmong Americans. In particular, Lee discovered that Hmong Americans at UHS who aspired to high academic achievement and reflected “traditional” Hmong values were viewed positively by their teachers. In contrast to the “traditional” students, many of the self-identified “Americanized” students questioned the value of education and adopted hip-hop styles of clothing and language associated with African American youth culture. As a result of the way the “Americanized” students performed their identities they were viewed negatively by their teachers. Most significantly, these “Americanized” students were compared to African American students or ideologically blackened within the school and thus excluded from opportunities. Adding to Lee (2005), DePouw (2012) argues that colonialism and racism are embedded in the process of Hmong racialization based on the Black/White binary. Beyond statistical performances of the model minority and being ideologically blackened, DePouw’s (2006, 2012) discussion of Black/White binary suggests that the process of Hmong racialization is also tied to behavioral performances. Despite Hmong Americans' academic and economic struggles, Hmong Americans are still expected to behaviorally perform a non-complaining citizenship. When Hmong American students help institutions recruit “diversity,” promote cultural events, and graduate from their programs despite academic struggles, Hmong Americans successfully performed the behavioral aspects of the model minority. On the contrary, Hmong Americans are blackened when they engage in student activism, demand curriculum inclusivity in schools, and request for meaningful inclusion in campus decision-making process. In the performance of the model minority, Hmong Americans achieve honorary whiteness. When they engage in resistance, Hmong Americans become blackened. This process of racialization systematically silences and polices Hmong Americans to perform the model minority.

#### **The Model Minority Myth is complicit in ALL vectors of oppression. It helps to perpetuate a laundry list of oppressions through the brainwashing of Asians themselves.**

Yang-Stevens & Pham 16 [Kat Yang-Stevens is a queer gender femme and first generation Chinese Am, they are a writer, educator, organizer and and cultural creator who creates and facilitates original teaching materials and workshops; Alex-Quan Pham is a Vietnamese queer, gender non-conforming femme warrior; “Akai Gurley the "Thug," Peter Liang the "Rookie Cop" and the Model Minority Myth”; February 26, 2016; https://katyangstevens.squarespace.com/complicatingourcomplicity]

A popular image of Asians, particularly East Asians, in the US is the model minority myth, which is very successfully used as a tool to help maintain white supremacy in the US. The model minority myth grew in popularity in the 1950s and 60s in a strategic manner which countered growing public unrest regarding “racial disparities” in the US. The model minority myth flattens vastly different Asian ethnicities, painting Asians as a monolithic group of “good” non-whites able to rise above unfair and strenuous conditions to be held up as an exemplary group of minorities in the US. The basic idea is that if Asians can succeed in spite of the hardships stacked against them, why can’t other non-whites? Despite being completely false and doing more harm for Asian communities than good, these so-called “positive stereotypes” promoted through the model minority myth imply that other racialized groups who have “not done as well for themselves” – especially Black people, but also Indigenous and Latinx peoples – are strictly to blame for their own hardships and “disenfranchised” position in US society. This framework strategically obscures structural disparities created through anti-Black white supremacist violence, such as the lasting impacts and legacy of African chattel slavery. The model minority myth crafts a stifling, inaccurate, and violently homogenizing representation of “Asian-Americans.” This carefully constructed identity is employed by white supremacy as a wedge tool to maintain the existing US social orders that relegate Black people to “the bottom.” Meanwhile, we are strategically taught to believe that Indigenous peoples are “extinct” and therefore their lands are considered “empty” and available for our and others’ settlement. Newly arriving Asians, as well as those of us born here in the United States, are active participants in the settler colonial nation state. Our presence here on these lands – however complicated by our own histories of European colonialism and dispossession, and the violence we experience due to white supremacy and other oppressive power structures– works to ensure the continued occupation of these lands, the ongoing invisibilization and genocide of Indigenous peoples, and the unrelenting attacks on their lifeways.The model minority myth is a highly valued staple in the world of white conservative media. Bill O'Reilly, the infamously bigoted right-wing pundit for Fox News, used it in a long-winded rant entitled “The Truth About White Privilege,” in which he tried to argue that white people are not structurally advantaged in comparison to non-white groups of people. He laughably argued that while white privilege doesn’t exist, “Asian privilege” does recycling false and decontextualized “statistics” and rhetoric about “Asian success” to blame Black americans for their own oppression and justify his anti-Black ramblings. Immediately following the killing of Akai Gurley, both the mainstream and conservative right wing media, as well as independent bloggers (read: racists on the internet) hurried to pull up Gurley’s records, building a “case” to justify his death and excuse Liang’s lethal actions that night. Articles can be found repeatedly referring to Gurley as a “thug” and a “career criminal.” The word “thug” itself has its roots in the Hindi and Urdu word thag – which has meanings related to swindler, thief, and the verb “deceive” – and only entered the English language after the British colonial occupation of India in the 1800s, during which Indian “thugs” were targeted for extermination. Over time, the word in Standard american English has transformed into a racially coded epithet applied especially to Black people, and sometimes other people of color, to imply that they have a violent and untrustworthy nature. The way that the term “thug” is used in media shows a clear indication that if a Black person is deemed a “thug,” their mistreatment or murder at the hands of the police can be excused, or even celebrated as a “good riddance.” For years Black people have spoken out about the way the term “thug” is morphing into a socially acceptable way to call Black people the N-word without actually using the N-word.Less than 24 hours after Akai Gurley was killed, New York’s CBS local had already published a story which ended with the unnecessary, unsubstantiated, and sensationalizing claim that “Gurley has 24 prior arrests on his record.” Regardless of the truth of that claim, it should go without saying that Gurley’s past had nothing to do with the cause of his death, and in no way justifies the extrajudicial taking of his life. Arrests by the police are racially motivated; the record of arrests may be a more accurate reflection of institutional racism and anti-Blackness rather than representation of Gurley’s character. In June 2015, the New York Post went as far as to outright declare Peter Liang’s innocence by deeming the shooting “accidental” in their article headlined “Cop who accidentally shot man in stairwell to face manslaughter charge.” We have been taught the racist and anti-Black notion that Black people somehow deserve the violences inflicted upon them by white people and white power structures like the institution of the police. This common train of thought ignores that Black peoples’ existence in this country has always been constructed as criminal, especially following the end of African chattel slavery. Legislation such as the Black Codes, the Pig Laws, and other statutes enforced during the Jim Crow Era, legally placed heavy restrictions and harsh punishments on Black people. These statues were not applied to whites, and were often not enforced, or were unevenly enforced against, other non-Black people. These types of legislation are aimed at denying Black people civic equality and preventing them from accessing critical infrastructural resources. Using the "model minority myth" again as a wedge, news outlets as well as supporters of Liang have been able to paint clear and oppositional images of Gurley and Liang. Gurley has repeatedly been presented to us as a "career criminal" and a "thug" with a long history of arrests. We can observe a recurring implication that his "violent lifestyle" would have brought him to a similar fate anyways, or that he "had it coming to him" for engaging in "criminal" activity inthe past. Portrayal of Gurley in this decontextualized, inaccurate, and dehumanizing way strategically and conveniently leaves out crucial historical and present day context of the specific violences enacted against Black people. These histories and contexts manifest themselves today through the degradation of Black people's quality of life, such as through unsafe public housing like NYCHA buildings filled with predominantly Black residents living in homes with hallways without working lights, where police officers wander the stairwells in the dark with loaded guns pointed forward. In contrast, Liang is portrayed very differently; he is always pictured in the media with his mouth closed, not speaking, and wearing a suit. He is spoken of as “inexperienced” and a “rookie.” He is described as being born to an immigrant family, and a hard worker. Most importantly he is (was) a member of the NYPD, an organization dedicated to serving and upholding the white supremacist, colonial nation state. The term “rookie cop” consistently precedes or follows Liang’s name in media. The descriptor automatically and often unconsciously registers in people’s minds as a marker of innocence, since it has connotations of inexperience and is often used to indicate that someone is foolish, amateur, and doesn’t know any better. The term is obviously infantilizing, and it is no surprise that it has been repeated over and over again since infantilization has a long and well documented history of being projected onto the bodies and characters of Asian americans. Infantilize Asian women and you’ll find the well-known stereotype of the eroticized, childlike and submissive Asian woman. Infantilize Asian men and you’ll arrive at your equally well-known trope of the clumsy, unassertive and apologetic “emasculated”\* Asian man: a slit-eyed, buck-toothed figure with hands clasped, a bowing and obsequious buffoon with limited agency. Insistence on constructing Liang as an unlucky “rookie cop” in the wrong place at the wrong time who didn’t know what he was doing is simply another more coded and less direct way of applying this passive and infantilized Asian stereotype onto Liang. “Emasculated” appears in quotes to draw attention to the ways that this term relies on the sexist and transphobic construct of gender essentialism, and its use as a pejorative assumes that non-masculine is inferior to masculine. The inherently dehumanizing racist stereotype described above is used to invoke and identify a particular type of East Asian character which is associated with certain unfavorable and inferior traits in mainstream US consciousness; this trope provides us with a lens to see how Liang is received and viewed. Liang has not spoken to media, but he need not speak to summon a series of feelings and thoughts in the general public about who he is – feelings which ultimately draw sympathy, and portray him in a light of innocence. Like Liang, Gurley also doesn’t have to speak; but for Gurley, the silent image of a Black man invokes not sympathy and a presumption of innocence, but rather an arsenal of anti-Black narratives and tropes which are projected onto his defenseless and now lifeless body – may he rest and rise in peace, power, and love.Due to internalized racism – a process which impacts the ways that racialized peoples see ourselves and what words and characteristics we identify with – it is of no surprise that many Asians have taken to finding a sense of pride – and certain levels of safety and protection – in identifying with the model minority myth. This racist myth was created by and is consistently weaponized by whites; however, it is also employed by Asian people against other racialized groups. The model minority myth has become so pervasive, invasive, and insidious that it is even employed by Asian people against other Asian people in both direct and indirect ways. Through the media as well as the academic and non-profit industrial complex, homogeneously “authentic” “representatives” of our heterogenous communities are determined, constructed and empowered. This unique class of “educated” and “legitimate” Asians is then able to inform and considerably contribute to the determination of the terms of engagement in “social justice” organizing, and even dictate which Asian people are seen as valid, legitimate, and worthy of being heard, included, or protected.The model minority myth can and often does function completely undetected in mainstream consciousness, and there is no doubt it is functioning in this case. Whether Liang and his supporters are conscious of it or not, they are all relying on racist stereotypes, both of Asian and Black people, to insist on Liang’s innocence. The insistence to find Liang not culpable of ending Gurley’s life and to perceive Gurley as somehow deserving of his own death invokes the lies of the model minority myth. Ideas espoused by many of Liang’s supporters play right into the time- honored tradition of white power in the US benefiting from non-white groups of people enacting violence and aggression towards one another: explicitly serving, protecting and upholding anti-Blackness while ultimately fortifying white power.

#### **Debate is complicit in a larger system of oppression that render us voiceless in a foreign culture. The forced assimilation into normative, English-centered debate make the activity incompatible with the democratic deliberation and policy education of international debaters. Without the acceptance of diversity in debate community, white supremacy will continuous codified most vulnerable minorities as disposable “second-class citizens” to maintain America’s global dominance.**

Darder 16 (Antonia Darder is a scholar, artist, poet, activist, and public intellectual, and the Leavey Presidential Endowed Chair in Ethics and Moral Leadership in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University. “CULTURAL HEGEMONY, LANGUAGE, AND THE POLITICS OF FORGETTING: Interrogating Restrictive Language Policies”; 2016-4-23; <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31666629/Darder_Cultural_Hegemony__Language_Rights___Politics_of_Forgetting-1.pdf>?)

In light of a colonial history of language imposition, it is important to understand the cultural hegemonic implications of language erosion beyond individual choice or the practical inducement of English for academic and labor gains. Views of language as “purely mechanical devices” (Nieto 2007) or solely as signifiers of national allegiance must be decentered, as educators engage with the powerful reality that language, political power, and economics are all inextricably tied to the ideological formations of the nation-state and, as such, language functions as a fundamental human resource for the construction of meaning and the establishment of relationships within both the private and public sphere. “In fact, the human being cannot exist without communicating; eliminating the possibility of communication from the human spirit entails removing its humanity” (Nieto 2007). This is precisely the experience of many children from linguistically racialized populations, when they enter a classroom where the supremacy of English functions not only against their academic well-being, but their democratic participation as well. Upon entering the Engliz vsh-only classroom, language minority students are rendered voiceless in a foreign sound system and cultural milieu that does not afford them a place for self-expression or self-determination. And often, even when these students learn English, stereotypical perceptions of deficiency persist, denying them meaningful opportunities to participate in ways that English proficient students readily enjoy in the process of their academic formation. Without these opportunities, the ability of English-language learners to succeed in school is overwhelmingly compromised, as they struggle not only to learn the grade-level content, but also grapple with traversing limited language comprehension, in a context that affords them little, if any, language support As suggested earlier, it is no wonder that language constitutes such a deeply contested terrain of struggle. Instructional language is implicated in significant ways, when considering the future possibilities and limitations students will experience not only in the classroom, but also out in the world. Similarly, community conditions that infuse life, meaning, and belonging into individual and collective life are also important factors in their academic achievement, given that linguistic rights, education, and democratic participation are absolutely central to language minority community empowerment. Hence, when important human conditions shaped by a long-standing history of oppression and marginalization are ignored, disregarded, or maligned within schools, the political empowerment and well-being of language minority students and their families are also negatively affected. This process can, unfortunately, leave linguistically racialized communities at the mercy of a deeply engrained hegemonic process that prevents them from naming their world and, hence, from participating in significant educational language-policy debates and decisions that will impact the destiny of their children. As a consequence, language minority students who enter the classroom with a primary language other than English are also often (mis)assessed too quickly as intellectually deficient or developmentally delayed, as a consequence of assessment measures that do not take into account the cultural and linguistic dissonance experienced by otherwise intellectually capable children entering into an unfamiliar language environment. Unfortunately, the linguistic forms of racialization at work in the schooling of English-language learners, or what Angela Valenzuela (1999) terms “subtractive schooling,” disrupts the ability of both educators and policy makers to see beyond their shrouded projections of inferiority—a phenomenon that stifles the ability to recognize, assess, and employ the strengths and capacities these language minority students already possess. Unexamined racialized perceptions of language minority populations often render teachers blind to those cognitive resources that would normally provide the logical foundation for new linguistic experiences related to learning English. Accordingly, the inability of mainstream teachers to engage the knowledge and skills that these students bring to the classroom is a key barrier to academic success; as is the absence of the primary language as the medium of instruction. The institutionalized ideology of exclusion at work here discourages not only the use of minority languages in the United States, but also disrupts the successful academic formation of linguistically racialized students, while it renders them vulnerable to cultural hegemony. 13 In many ways, we can understand the task at hand to be one that requires us to decolonize our minds from debilitating ideologies that persistently racialize students of color who do not speak English, judging them in need of remediation, yet unworthy of the expenditure of additional resources. In the logic of Race to the Top (RTT) and its predecessor, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the goal of education is to create the global competitive edge that can ensure domination of the world’s political economy—at the expense of children from the most vulnerable populations. As such, expenditures of educational resources are liberally being directed toward science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM)—including in the early years—in the government’s frenzy to meet its overarching goal. In the world of highstakes accountability, STEM initiatives are pronounced the panacea for global supremacy, while questions of culturally democratic life have been eclipsed by preoccupations with the (hidden) curriculum of class formation and the citizen as unbridled consumer. In accordance, linguistic racialization is implicated as part of a larger and more complex system of economic and political subordination that positions language minority students and their families as disposable, second-class citizens (Darder and Torres 2004). This encompasses an ideology that often distorts the ability to see working-class language minority communities in the United States as worthy of full educational rights. The consequence is the perpetuation of a culture of failure and educational neglect that relegates these communities to a position of invisibility—aided by the politics of the labor market, ill-representations in media, and the increasing incarceration of poor working-class men and women of color (Gilmore 2006).

#### **We refuse to distance ourselves from the pathology of blackness. Our disavowal of the Model Minority Myth is claiming our proximity to blackness, which is an orientation to destroy the world.**

Phạm 16 (Xoài Phạm is is a Vietnamese queer, gender non-conforming femme warrior “Ending Anti-Blackness Needs to Be a Top Priority for Asian Americans – Here’s Why”; 2016/2/26; <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/02/ending-anti-blackness-asian>)

What space can Black Asians find in Asian communities when Blackness is unwanted and mistreated yet simultaneously stolen and parodied? How can Black Asians, and Black folks as a whole, feel safe with non-Black Asians when the perpetrator of the Charleston massacre wrote on his website that East Asians “are by nature very racist and could be great allies of the White race?” Dear non-Black Asians, it has long been time to shift our priorities. When the Black Lives Matter movement was beginning to be derailed by those who were using #AsianLivesMatter, it was clear that these non-Black Asians didn’t realize that Black Asians exist too and that if they actually gave a fuck about Asian people at all, they would support Black Asians and Black Lives Matter. But aside from that self-serving reason, the derailing of Black Lives Matter also hurts non-Black Asians because white supremacy relies on anti-Blackness to survive. A white supremacist world is not sustainable without anti-Blackness fueling it. And because white supremacy, and oppressive systems in general, rely on erasure, non-Black Asians forget that before Europeans started the Atlantic slave trade, there was the Arab slave trade of East Africans. Grappling with our anti-Blackness as Asian Americans has to take place both within and outside of a white supremacist context, because non-Black people committing anti-Blackness predates European anti-Blackness. This is not to say that non-Black Asians are more responsible than Europeans for anti-Blackness; rather, I am pointing out the fact that non-Black Asians certainly did not need white people to instruct them on how to be anti-Black. Claiming that anti-Blackness is a result of white conditioning is shirking responsibility. White supremacist politics of erasure makes us forget that the crux of white supremacy is anti-Blackness. When we forget this, and proceed to be anti-Black, we only support the white supremacist structure that we long to destroy. My call to action for my fellow non-Black Asians is to re-envision our place in racial justice. Rather than simply claiming allyship to Black justice movements we need to understand that Black liberation is crucial to any foreseeable future for racial justice, which means it is our duty to contribute to Black liberation too. White supremacy will never end if non-Black people of color continue, whether consciously or not, to uphold white supremacy by hurting Black folks. It’s time to stop believing that we’ll be safe by accessing some white privileges. We need to be vigilant and understand that the settler state called America, founded on stolen Indigenous territories, will never be here to benefit us. Remember when the government decided that they would be more blatant with their racism and rounded up tens of thousands of Japanese American families to incarcerate them? The United States could do the exact same thing again to South Asian and Arab Americans as Islamophobia grows, and it’ll again be for “national security.” The Southeast Asian refugees who thought they could find safety in America are being deported once again. As we speak, the imperialist American military is wreaking havoc all across Asia, resulting in the deaths of marginalized people like our trans sister Jennifer Laude, a Filipina trans woman killed at 26 by a US Marine. Reaping the benefits of white supremacy may be appealing, but it is ultimately poisonous. Fighting anti-Blackness gets everyone closer to real justice. Many of the structures that harm Asian Americans, like law enforcement, the prison system, and the military industry, harm Black folks the most, and that includes Black Asians. The efforts of Black Lives Matter, in resisting structures that harm us, will benefit all people of color, whether that’s intended or not. Among Asian communities, Black Lives Matter will benefit both Black Asians and non-Black Asians. But we can’t expect Black folks to do all of the work for non-Black people. We can’t let justice be achieved off the backs of Black people. To ask Black activists and organizers to do all of the work is in itself anti-Black. Beyond supporting Black Lives Matter because of how the movement helps us, let’s support Black Lives Matter simply because Black Lives Matter and the whole damn world needs to know. We need to reframe our discussions around racial justice and recognize that ending anti-Blackness should be a top priority. Whether we’re committed to Black liberation, the end of anti-Asian oppression, the abolition of white supremacy, or the possibility of a better world at all, we need to prioritize ending anti-Blackness. Now what does that mean? It means centering Black people in our racial justice struggles. It means unconditionally demanding justice for Akai Gurley, who was murdered by Peter Liang of the NYPD. It means centering Black Asians in any and all discussions about Asian identity, since Black Asians would largely be the most victimized of all Asians. And it means redistributing financial, political, and emotional resources to Black folks, especially Black femmes. Ultimately, it can mean the abolition of anti-Black structures like police and prisons, and the decolonization of land owned by anti-Black settler colonial governments. I know that these are some hefty goals, maybe goals that you haven’t dreamed of yet. But I believe that we will win. And sooner than you think.

#### **Asian rhetoric functions as a disruption of the dominant discourse surrounding the Asian American identities. This counter-memory empowers Asian people who have had scripts placed onto them. Although different Asian groups have had different experiences, situating shared tropes creates a locus for Asian people to galvanize around, and creates the foundation for Asian spaces of resistance.**

Franchini 13 (Jennifer Lee Sano-Franchini, Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Writing. Michigan State University, Professor in the Department of English, Virginia Tech, XCaliber Award for Exceptional Contributions to Technology-Enriched Teaching and Learning, 2015, THE RHETORICAL MAKING OF THE ASIAN/ASIAN AMERICAN FACE: READING AND WRITING ASIAN EYELIDS, 2013, Doctoral Dissertation - Michigan State University)

This is an Asian American rhetoric project. Asian American rhetoric has long been concerned with the temporality of shifting identities. By “temporality of shifting identities,” I refer to how identities move and change across time and space, particularly as they meet, engage, and conflict with other identities, and the implications of how we articulate and measure these shifts. Through such notions as “process of becoming,” and through a focus on concepts like memory and historiography, the temporalities of cultural and racial identity have been central to the making of an Asian/Asian American rhetoric (Hoang, 2008; Mao, 2006; Monberg, 2008; Wang, 2010; Wu, 2002). This work has been particularly pertinent as Asians and Asian Americans have been and continue to be pigeonholed into a number of stock stereotypes. For instance, as LuMing Mao (2006) explained, Chinese American rhetoric “can never be unique, not only because there is no internal coherence to speak of, but also because it is always in a state of adjusting and becoming, both in relation to its ‘native’ (Chinese) identity and in relation to its ‘adopted’ (American) residency. And the process of adjusting and becoming is forever infused with its own tensions, struggles, and vulnerabilities, within the context of each and every borderland speech event [my emphasis]” (p. 17). Mao went on to say that: Chinese American rhetoric [...] becomes viable and transformative not by securing a logical or unified order, but by participating in a process of becoming where meanings are situated and where significations are contingent upon each and every particular experience. Further, in this process of becoming, Chinese American rhetoric is not to be had either by abstraction or by us searching for fixed features of harmony or seamless 12 blending. Rather, the making of Chinese American rhetoric lies in the process of contestation, interrogation, and reflection--or in what I call ‘heterogeneous resonance. (p. 5) This quote has methodological importance for doing Asian American rhetoric in that it highlights a research practice of examining meanings as situated and contingent on experience, and of focusing on “[processes] of contestation, interrogation, and reflection” (Mao, 2006, p. 5). A second example of the focus on temporalities of shifting identities in Asian American rhetoric is Haivan Hoang’s (2008) work on rhetorical memory, which she described as “a process of participation in a wider cultural production” (p. 80). Describing memory as “central to Asian American rhetoric, a rejoinder to the persistent forgetfulness that displaces Asian Americans from commonplace understandings of what is American” (p. 63), Hoang focused on the processes by which dominant cultural narratives are constructed, particularly as they have implications for Asian American subjectivities. In other words, to do Asian American rhetoric is to interrogate how stories about Asians and Asian Americans are constructed, disseminated, and circulated over time, and the political implications that follow. These political implications go on to influence how individuals make sense of their personal experiences, and so on. In terms of methodology, Hoang identified, “Asian American rhetorical memory, then, has most often articulated countermemories that destabilize and then reconstitute the American subject” (p. 63). Moreover, Asian American rhetoric is constitutive of “not shifts to different memorial objects, but, more so, the epistemological shifts that guide the practice of how to remember” (p. 64). In relation to the “wider cultural production” of memory, Terese Guinsatao Monberg (2008) has also been attentive to the temporalities of shifting memory as she worked toward a 13 “culturally contingent model of feminist historiography, [arguing that] certain methods of listening--because they are attentive to interdependencies among rhetorical space, memory, and history--are central to the makings of an Asian Pacific American ‘feminist’ rhetoric” (p. 86). Identifying the ways in which we tend to privilege seeing over hearing in the Academy and in our research practices, Monberg explored how this results in particular narratives and particular bodies being left out of the grand narratives we tell ourselves about who we are. In so doing, Monberg showed how some kinds of cultural memory are simply not accessible through traditional, alphabetic textual modes of analysis. That said, this is an Asian American project, not because it aims to categorize rhetorical practices that are ostensibly Asian American, but because 1) it is, itself, an Asian American practice, interpreted through an Asian American lens (read: me); 2) it examines meaning as it is “situated” and contingent on experience; 3) it contributes to “wider cultural production” by deconstructing dominant, U.S.-based cultural narratives, particularly about Asian bodies as it examines and articulates “countermemories that destabilize and then reconstitute the American subject. In so doing, this dissertation explores the “temporality of shifting identities” by focusing specifically on the ways in which the temporal logics that ground the way we make arguments about Asian bodies shape subjectivity. My goal here is furthermore to create a discursive “space for Asian Americans where [we] can resist social and economic injustice and reassert [our] discursive agency and authority in the dominant culture” (Mao and Young, 2008, p. 3).

## 2AC

### 2AC v. Afropessimism

#### **Our is method is conscientization – a process of constant clarification that allows us to name the world and perceive how we exist in it – through this dynamic process we have already begun and will continue to create real change**

Osajima ‘7 [2007, Keith Osajima is a professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands. REPLENISHING THE RANKS: Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans; JOURNAL OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES (JAAS), February, Volume 10, No. 1; p. 64]

Conscientization for these respondents meant being able to “name their world.” That is, a meaningful education had helped them to recognize and understand the impact that societal conditions and forces of oppression have on their lives and the lives of others. As Friere writes, the process of conscientization, or education for critical consciousness, “involves a constant clarification of what remains hidden within us while we move about in the world,” and it provokes “recognition of the world, not as a ‘given’ world, but as a world dynamically ‘in the making.” Such recognition often inspires people to work against that oppression, thus beginning their active efforts to transform the world. Naming the world was an important step toward actively changing it.

#### Permutation do the affirmative – the kritik is severing the myth out of this debate. In order to be a pessimist, we need to first understand the complexity of civil society.

#### **Permutation: Our disavowal of the Model Minority Myth is our attempt to reclaim our proximity to Blackness. Afro-Asian Solidarity is our orientation to destroy our white-washed world.**

Liu 17 (Wen Liu, a graduate student in Philosophy at The City University of New York “Cruising Borders, Unsettling Identities: Toward A Queer Diasporic Asian America”; 2017/6/2; <http://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3040&context=gc_etds>; p113-116)

The Asian American body politic is in no way a singular construction. As I have articulated previously, the pro-police Chinese American mobilization emerged precisely out of the crisis of representation of Asian Americanness, in which the model minority promise of success is threatened and pan-ethnic solidarity is crumbling. Whereas the pro-police Chinese Americans seized the moment to insert a post-racial agenda, other Asian American community organizers aimed to repopularize a nostalgic sense of Asian-Black solidarity and pan-ethnic Asian Americanness to counter the ethnic nationalism of the Chinese American mobilization and support the broader racial justice demands of Black Lives Matter. Soon after Peter Liang was indicted, a coalition of Asian American community-based organizations, led by Organizing Asian Communities (CAAAV), mobilized a vigil for Gurley’s family in front of the Police Plaza in NYC on March 15, 2015. The number of the participants at the vigil was small compared to the pro-Liang mobilization that would occur the year after, approximately 40 people on a chilly, rainy spring afternoon, but the crowd was in all definitions a diverse group of individuals: members of Korean, Filipino, South Asian, and other Asian American nonprofit organizations; Gurley’s family including his aunt, daughter, and partner; and other members of BLM, socialist, and anti-war leftist organizations also participated in the event. It was undoubtedly a multiracial and multiethnic gathering that demonstrated an image of cross-identity solidarity at the time of tragedy. This image of cross-racial and cross-ethnic alliance was intentionally delivered. It was present in a speech from the organizer from CAAAV, which called attention to the importance of standing in solidarity with the broader racial justice demands of BLM, to counter the numerous deaths and unnamable violence with the persistence of devaluing lives, particularly Black lives. Cathy Dang, the director from CAAAV, drew from the organization’s experiences of working alongside Black and Brown communities in the past 20 years to demand justice from the police and judicial system. Specifically, she referenced the case of an immigrant Chinese boy who was killed by NYPD in the 1990s, and how the incident has bridged activists across racial lines: This year marks the 20th year anniversary of the death of Yong Xin Huang. In the mid 90s, the media started to finally cover police brutality cases when Anthony Baez, Hilton Vega, and Nicholas Heyward were killed. Then there was Yong Xin Huang, 16-year old Chinese immigrant boy from Bushwick, Brooklyn who was killed by the NYPD. The Huang family and CAAAV organized alongside with the other families to demand justice from the NYPD and the judicial system. Black and Brown communities were the first ones there for the Huang family and as our member said—I believe that the Chinese community should stand on the side of justice. Our hope is that the Chinese community, Asian communities, and all communities come together for justice. This cross-racial representation is not just crucial but necessary to the Asian American body politic—to signify that Asian Americans, too, have had a history of violence inflicted by the state. It argues against the persistent image of model minority success and proximity to Whiteness. It relies on the temporary shift back to the time of violent state exclusion to reinstate an Asian American racial position that is closer to Blackness. Figure 5. Flowers with Chinese sign that says #BlackLivesMatter. Photo by author. Anachronism. The #Asians4BlackLives contingency that emerged out of the Peter Liang controversy organized a platform on Tumblr 3 specifically to counter the conservative representations of Asian Americanness dominated by the Chinese American pro-Liang mobilization. They call out the anachronistic reference of MLK’s speech as being ignorant to Black history and the broader implications of the Civil Rights movement in the US. The #Asians4BlackLives on Tumblr. Afro-Asian solidarity images of Asian American activists protesting alongside Black Power activists against police violence spread across different #Asian4BlackLives blogs such as the #Asians4BlackLives and #APIS4BlackLives to stress the interdependent histories of the communities. MLK’s and Malcom X’s speeches against the Vietnam War and calls for Third World solidarity were repeatedly cited on these platforms to highlight the important intersection of domestic racial violence and imperialist wars abroad.4 To historicize Afro-Asian solidarity is not only important to show that the perspective of Asians for Black Lives is indeed temporally legitimate and morally justifiable, but it is also the only way to bring a sense of urgency to rescuing pan–Asian Americanism from prior to the neoliberal disfranchisement of the category of Asian American itself. The widened class and ethnic division within Asian American communities in recent years have reduced the political power and racial legitimacy of the category as a whole. Only through claiming its proximity to Blackness can Asian Americanness move outside of the awkward position of neither white nor black, and continue to exist as a relevant and legible racial community.

#### **Resisting and drawing out the myth of the model minority myth opens possibilities for advancing racial education for not only Asian but black students.**

Osajima ‘7 [2007, Keith Osajima is a professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands. REPLENISHING THE RANKS: Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans; JOURNAL OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

In exploring contexts, public discourses, and policies in higher education, some publications identified the historicity of race and racism in higher education and its effects on the modern university regarding AANAPISI and affirmative action policies (Buenavista et al., 2009; CARE, 2008; Chang, 2000; Engberg & Hurtado, 2011; Jung, 2012; S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; S. S. Lee, 2006; Park, 2013). For example, S. S. Lee (2006) argued that the MMM “serves as a particularly powerful rhetorical strategy for **diverting resources away from race-conscious programs for African Americans and other minorities**, and from de-legitimizing policies such as affirmative action” (p. 4). By examining higher education through a critical lens, S. J. Lee and Kumashiro (2005) highlighted the political implications of the MMM to counteract the civil rights advocacy, noting that “the stereotype has been used as a political weapon against other marginalized groups of color . . . in order to silence charges of racial inequality” (p. xii). Furthering this body of literature, Park and Teranishi (2008) argued that the establishment of AANAPISI countered the MMM through a community-based racial repositioning of AAPIs. This contrasted with other AANAPISI scholarship reviewed that did not use a critical definition. By resisting the opportunity to counter the MMM as a simplistic success narrative by presenting evidence of AAPI educational deficits, they argued that the creation of AANAPISI **opens possibilities for advancing racial justice and solidarity** by explicitly aligning AAPI interests with other communities of color in minority serving institution legislation.

Chung Allred’s (2007) exploration of the racialization and positioning of Asian Americans, as a racial mascot, in relation to other racial groups exhibited two key components in presenting a critical definition of MMM. It was one of the only texts in the college admissions literature to critically depict the destructive duality of the MMM on Asian Americans and the polarizing effect it has on degrading other minority groups, specifically African Americans. At the same time, Chung Allred (2007) contended that some disadvantaged AAPI populations, especially Pacific Islanders and Southeast Asian Americans, could benefit from affirmative action, and other more privileged Asian Americans could benefit in “distinct and discrete ways” (p. 58) from the end of affirmative action in admission practices. The author, therefore, cited a framework of educational deficits among Pacific Islanders and Southeast Asian Americans to argue against perceptions of universal high achievement among AAPIs and how some can benefit from affirmative action policies. Even though Chung Allred (2007) presented a critical definition of the MMM, the Poon et al. 488 text simultaneously drew from a deficit lens to argue for the inclusion of some AAPIs in affirmative action programs. Therefore, scholarship using critical frameworks did not always avoid deficit thinking.

#### **Discussing and critically reflecting about racial issues, more specifically issues about Asian Americans is vital for changing dominant structures**

Osajima ‘7 [2007, Keith Osajima is a professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands. REPLENISHING THE RANKS: Raising Critical Consciousness Among Asian Americans; JOURNAL OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

Pearl Cruz had begun to change when a friend invited her to attend a meeting to organize a campus protest. **Watching and listening** to powerful and articulate women of color speak out about racism and sexism had inspired Pearl: I went home that summer and devoured every piece of feminist literature I could get my hands on. So I’m just sitting there reading like a maniac all summer long, just digesting what had happened that year. . . . It was really something, it hit me all at once.22 Ryan Suzuki’s interest in issues of oppression had first been piqued in diversity training workshops he took as a resident advisor. Later, in graduate school, a key mentor, Ricardo Munoz, had helped Ryan to develop his conceptual and analytic understanding. Munoz had pushed Ryan to do more **reading about the systematic nature of oppression in the United States.** Ryan describes Munoz’s influence as follows: He really put a much more intellectual analysis to things. . . . It was more about the systematic things that were going on, about changing structures, about resources, those kinds of things, rather than just that a person needs to be sensitized.23 In these cases, we begin to see more precisely what it means to have a “relevant” and “meaningful” education. For Joe, Ryan, and David, conscientization meant being able to see themselves in larger social structural contexts, not simply as individuals but as people whose lives intersect with and are shaped by race and racism.

For Brian, information about the history of Asian Americans had prompted critical reflections on two levels. First, because he had never known about the history of Asian Americans, the class had given him new information that had helped him to understand his family history. Second, it had led him to **critically reflect upon his previous education**. He questioned why he **hadn’t learned any of this before**? Why was his experience absent from U.S. history courses? This process had led him to think more critically about the racism embedded in his educational experiences. Margaret had experienced a similar reaction. She had realized that her education had only taught her about **European American history**, prompting her to ask, “how many students were out there who never would take this class. . . and would never really know more than one version of history?” Her Asian American courses had provided the analytic tools and language needed to see the reason and logic of racism, sexism, and heterosexism. Conscientization for these respondents meant being able to “name their world.” That is, a meaningful education had helped them to recognize and understand the **impact that societal conditions and forces of oppression have on their lives** and the lives of others. As Freire writes, the process of conscientization, or education for critical consciousness, “involves a constant clarification of what remains hidden within us while we move about in the world,” and it provokes “recognition of the world, not as a ‘given’ world, but as a world dynamically ‘in the making.”24 Such recognition often inspires people to work against that oppression, thus beginning their active efforts to transform the world.25 Naming the world was an **important step toward actively changing it**

#### **The constant reminder to become like Asians cases psychological violence against blacks. Disavowing the Model Minority Myth takes away one of the tools white supremacy use to justify it’s violence against blackness.**

Wu 02 “The Model Minority: Asian American 'Success' as a Race Relations Failure” Frank H. Wu holds the title of Distinguished Professor, the highest rank accorded faculty at UC Hastings. He was renewed early and unanimously for a second term of service as Chancellor & Dean, after being voted the most “influential” dean in legal education in a poll by National Jurist magazine.

Even if the praise of the model minority myth were genuine and not feigned in a particular instance, it cannot help but send a message about African Americans. African Americans know full well what the model minority myth is all about. In Spike Lee's movie Do The Rig/a,Thing, a chorus of elderly African American men sitting in lawn chairs both respect and envy the Asian American shopkeeper across the street. The corner men, Sweet Dick Willie, Coconut Sid, and ML, "have no steady employment, nothing they can speak of" except that "they do, however, have the gift of gab" and with the aid of a bottle "they get philosophical."Watching the Asian American toil in his business, ML frets, "Either dem Koreans are geniuses or we Blacks are dumb."(,~

Were we to accept the usefulness of assessing racial groups against each other and forgo qualms about the morality of such an exercise, the model minority myth evaluation of Asian Americans vis-a.-vis African Americans has been executed so poorly as to be worthless. Asian Americans and African Americans should not be compared in racial terms, but the model minority myth forces the task.

Acknowledging that African Americans in general have endured worse discrimination does not diminish the serious racial discrimination that Asian Americans as a group have f::tced. The adulation of Asian Americans considers only Asian Americans. Asian Americans are not as inspiring if the unique history and distinctive present circumstances of African Americans are fairly weighed-without supposing that African Americans have been so traumatized that they are damaged beyond redemption.~s

### 2AC v. Black Feminism

#### Black women run the risk of being painted by the myth of the model minority due to apparent progress in American society.

#### **Kaba 8** (Amadu Jacky Kaba, 29 April 2008 “Race, Gender and Progress: Are Black American Women the New Model Minority”, Springer Science and Business Media, <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs12111-008-9043-8.pdf>)

This now brings us to Black American females. An increasing number of evidence tend to indicate that although Black American females still continue to feel the negative effects of the legacy of slavery in the USA, they appear to be making substantial progress in many different ways by the beginning of the twenty-first century. If the central argument of the model minority concept in the USA pertains to groups that once experienced severe economic, social and political isolation and managed to rise up despite those difficulties, then one could expand the model minority concept to include Black American females. No subgroup has suffered severe economic, political and social isolation more than Black American females. During slavery, they suffered as black people and then after the abolition of slavery they were again discriminated against as women, when their male counterparts were allowed to vote and serve in the US Congress and state legislatures, they and white and women from other racial groups were not allowed to serve. Also, gender discrimination in education and the work place and the glass ceiling prevented them from attaining any significant success in their own country of birth. By the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century in the USA, however, although one can still compile numerous evidence showing Black American females still lagging behind many other subgroups, including their male counterparts and women in other groups, one can now also point to increasing evidence showing them rising in many important sectors of society. In addition, unlike Asian Americans, a significant proportion of whom are not native-born US citizens, the overwhelming majority of Black American females are native-born US citizens. Also, the Black American female population already in the tens of millions is several millions more than the total Asian American population. By the first half of 2008, for example, the evidence show that while a Black American woman has served as a National Security Adviser and Secretary of State of the USA, no Asian American has yet to serve in those two crucial positions. This shows that a clear argument could be made that Black American women are rising and becoming America’s model minority in the most original way. This paper is divided into three parts or sections. The first part presents many examples showing that almost 400 years after they were brought to the USA as slaves and over 140 years after the emancipation of slaves in the country, Black American females still continue to be negatively impacted by the legacy of that peculiar institution. This first part of the paper will provide economic and social indicators showing that Black American females still lag behind other groups and subgroups including their black male counterparts. The second part of this paper argues that although there are numerous examples showing that Black American women continue to lag behind other groups in many economic and social indicators, there appears to be increasing evidence showing gains or progress being made by them, including in education, politics, and the economy. Many examples will be given to support this claim. It is these gains that caused the author to ask whether Black American women are becoming the new model minority. Finally, the third part of this paper attempts to explain the factors that are contributing to the author’s claim that Black American women are becoming America’s new model minority. Among the interrelated factors are religion, avoidance of drugs, avoidance of crime, work ethic, and discipline and diligence, and a gradual transfer of wealth and knowledge from older and wealthy Americans of any race or gender. To get a better understanding of the issues that are examined in this paper, it is important to first present the racial and gender breakdowns of the USA as of 2005.

#### Permutation: The method of the 1AC breaks down the normative communication model of debate exhibited by framework. The Darder evidence outlines the ways in which the mainstream policies steer minority students towards a homogenous identity and erase their primary culture and community. The 1AC’s regulation of the common standards of debate can be liberatory for black women from the constricting norms of debate. Our discussion and reflection on racial issues is vital in the struggle against changing dominant structures. Through the process of conscientization we can perceive how we exist in the world and create real change. This method can function as a liberatory practice by provoking what Osajijma calls “recognition of the world not as a given world, but as a world dynamically in the making. The methods of the 1AC can work to liberate black women and Asian-Americans from the myth of their progress in American society as telling of their social location and freedom from racial oppression.

#### And the myth of the model minority plays a role in the erasure of sexual violence amongst women.

**Kuo 17** (Rachel Kuo, Contributor, 5-27-2017, “How Rape Culture and Racism Combine to Hurt Asian Women,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/how-rape-culture-and-racism-combine-to-hurt-asian-women\_us\_592a15ade4b0a7b7b469cb22)

In addition to erasing inequities in material access, the [model minority myth](http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/04/dismantle-model-minority-myth/) is a narrative that prevents racial justice. As the model minority myth also links with other stereotypes of Asian Americans mashes together different ethnicities, nations, cultures, languages ― mashing together people – to produce the idea that “all Asians are the same.” That we are interchangeable. This erasure of individualism, in a society that prioritizes individualism as fundamental to humanity, is a [form of dehumanization](http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/06/racism-against-asian-americans/). The model minority myth can be tied to tropes about Asian women being “obedient“ and “passive” – that we should be “quiet” and “silent.” The myth also plays a large role in the erasure of sexual violence in Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. 41–61 percent of Asian American women experience physical and/or sexual violence, but these incidents of assault [go largely unreported](https://thinkprogress.org/the-damaging-effects-of-the-model-minority-myth-5de48554c2d9#.ywbt24npu). In addition to erasing inequities in material access, the model minority myth is a narrative that prevents racial justice. If we are supposed to be “models” of racial exceptionalism, how could we possibly face any problems such as violence? How dare we have feelings of pain and grief? Legacies of white sexual imperialism continue to be taken up by white men as well as men of color ― and we must grapple with the ways gendered, racialized, and sexualized violence work in our communities.Though they may seem like a harmless infatuation with Asian women and our bodies, fetishes of Asian women link to experiences of racist, sexual violence and have negative impacts on our physical safety and mental and emotional health.If we are cute, fragile, delicate, then we must be[in need of manly protection](https://thebodyisnotanapology.com/magazine/10-ways-depictions-of-asian-culture-uphold-body-terrorism/). Or if we are cold, heartless, compassionless dragon ladies, then we need to be “tamed.” Either way, we end up being denied agency over our own bodies, consent, and safety. These fetishes and stereotypes have had further serious and violent implications as they contribute to rape culture.

#### **Critical race theory about Asian Americans allows people to understand race in relation to other experiences such as gender, citizenship and class.**

Liou 14 “Asian American Education and Income Attainment in the Era of Post-Racial America” LIOU is an assistant professor at Mary Lou Fulton Teachers

College at Arizona State University. His current research focuses on equity- minded school reform and how students experience their school leaders’.

expectations in the classroom.

To better understand the complexity of Asian Americans as a population, we posit three theoretical frameworks to effectively examine their experiencesin the K–Ph.D. pipeline. These frameworks were chosen fromtwo vantage points. First, we situate critical race theory within the field ofeducation to examine this population’s educational attainment as an aggregated group and seek to understand the status of their social and economic mobility in the United States. We then use Lowe’s (1996) conceptual frameworks of heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity to look within this population for dissimilarities in educational attainment by social class, gender, and citizenship. Finally, Bonilla-Silva’s (2006) concept of abstract liberalism helps to bring these concepts together to understand how the larger narratives of race and colorblindness coexist to politically position Asian Americans in wedge issues such as affirmative action. Looking from these lenses allows us to capture a more complex understanding of the coherence of race and colorblindness**,** and how they work simultaneously to put Asian Americans in a politically vulnerable place to be neglected in policy discussions about race**,** opportunity gaps, and affirmative action. Critical race theory in education provides an analysis of race throughthe following principles: (1) the centrality of race and racism and their relationships with other forms of subordination in education, (2) the challenge to dominant ideology that renders stereotypes and deficit thinking about low-income people of color obsolete, (3) the commitment to social justice in education and beyond, (4) the centrality of experiential knowledge, and (5) a transdisciplinary perspective (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solorzano, 1997, 1998; Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Ornelas, 2002, 2004; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). This framework allows us to begin with a set of questions concerning the model minority and perpetual foreigner stereotypes and their connections with postracial discourse. We then focus on Asian Americans as the point of the analysis and critically examine the ways dominant racial ideologies are operative within education for this population. The framework of critical race theory provides us with the analytic lens to recognize the permanence of the model minority thesis as central to the problems associated with interpretations about the academic achievements of Asian Americans. With this framework as the foundation for our research, we look to extend our theoretical understanding of the ways in which race is not only salient in the educational pipeline for Asian Americans, but also a reality even for those who may have obtained a high level of success. Critical race theory gives us the interpretive lens through which we understand how race has meanings for Asian Americans. It also helps us to best understand race in **relation to other institutional experiences** across gender, citizenship, and class, which have an intersectional influence on the educational attainment and earning power of Asian Americans (McCall, 2005).

#### **Permutation do both: The myth of the model minority and sexist discourse work hand in hand to strengthen patriarchy.**

Mah 14 (Joy Goh-Mah is a feminist writer based in London. She blogs on issues related to feminism and race at [Crates and Ribbons](http://www.cratesandribbons.com/), and is a part of [Media Diversified](http://mediadiversified.org/). Follow [@CratesNRibbons](https://twitter.com/CratesNRibbons). “The ‘Model Minority’, like the ‘Virgin/Whore’ dichotomy, is man-made -”; 2014/5/7; http://www.feministtimes.com/model-minority-virgin-whore-man-made/#sthash.M9iYIhhy.dpuf)

Sadly, this campaign proved extremely effective and many in the Asian community actually believed in it, leading to the growth of offensive, anti-black sentiments, as in the infamous book The Triple Package by Amy Chua, where she argues that inherent characteristics determine the success of different races, while ignoring structural inequalities. Being a woman of colour, this tactic of ‘divide and rule’ to uphold oppression is strikingly familiar to me, and is a perfect example of white supremacy taking lessons from the patriarchy. The concept of ‘good minorities’ and ‘bad minorities’ echoes the ‘virgin/whore’ dichotomy, where ‘good girls’ are distinguished from ‘bad girls’, and taught to fear and despise them. - See more at: http://www.feministtimes.com/model-minority-virgin-whore-man-made/#sthash.M9iYIhhy.dpuf Needless to say, the concepts of the ‘good girl’ and the ‘strong, independent woman’ are just as flawed as the construct of the model minority. You may be wildly successful in your career, even become the highest paid woman in your field, but what you earn will still be a mere fraction of what your male counterpart does. Similarly, the most certain predictor of rape or male violence occurring lies with the attitudes and decisions of the perpetrator, and is not determined by what the victim is wearing, or how she is behaving. These lies are an insidious tactic wielded by the white supremacist patriarchy, in an attempt to focus our attention away from structural inequality and towards individual responsibility. It strives to tear asunder the unity of the oppressed classes, encouraging us to blame one another for our own oppression. It fosters antagonism 1between people of colour, dangles the promise of white acceptance over the heads of East Asians in exchange for their complicity in maintaining anti-black oppression, teaches girls to view their sisters with contempt, and tells successful women that women who do not rise to their level are simply not good enough. And while our attention and blame is focused within, the white supremacist patriarchy continues to thrive without. The parallels between these tactics are stark and for me show why we cannot compartmentalise sexism and racism, fighting one and then the other as if they were separate and distinct issues. White supremacy and patriarchy are embroiled in a nefarious alliance, feeding off and nourishing each other to uphold oppression. They are unified and, if we wish to combat racial and gender oppression, our efforts and solutions must be too.

#### Link turn: The myth functions as a method of white supremacy to strengthen itself, pitting minority groups against each other by labeling one as the good minority and the other that bad. The Pham evidence in the 1AC indicates the importance of the analysis of the way anti-blackness and the myth build off of one another in order to dismantle greater structures. Through the intersectional analysis of the 1AC, we gain a deeper understanding of the power relations the myth develops which allows us to dismantle the myth that pits communities of color against each other and functions as a way to marginalize Black and Latino communities.

### 2AC v. Framework

#### **First, we meet—we are a regulation on education— our performance of Asian rhetoric creates defiance and within the liminal space of debate. The refusal of the myth is regulation in and of itself by disrupting the norms of the classroom.** Interpersonal communication is superior to standard government curriculum, as it’s the only way to form a PERSONAL CONNECTION and ADDRESS PERSONAL EXPERIENCE which is the only way to break down stereotypes like the model minority myth

#### Resolved includes debaters as agents

**OED, 1989**

“Of persons: determined”

#### Should means criticism, not a mandate.

**Oxford, ‘5** [Aug 16, 2005; http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/should?]

Definition of should in English should Pronunciation: /ʃʊd/ verb (3rd sing. should) 1 used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness, typically when criticizing someone’s actions: he should have been careful I think we should trust our people more you shouldn’t have gone indicating a desirable or expected state: by now pupils should be able to read with a large degree of independence used to give or ask advice or suggestions: you should go back to bed what should I wear? (I should) used to give advice: I should hold out if I were you

#### **Counter-interpretation—we affirm a multi-dimensional debate—this claims OUR PERFORMANCE OF ASIAN RHETORIC as a RUPTURE which allows debaters to contest the dominant NORMS IN THE DEBATE SPACE. Debate should facilitate personal choices rather than exclude them through an arbitrarily education model imposed on us.**

#### **This interpretation functions as a permutation—they can debate in their way and we can do it our way. This captures all their offense. They need to prove why this debate is key.**

#### **Our interpretation is preferable for 3 reasons**

#### **Resolution engagement— our interpretation allows for quality method vs. method, clash, and policy debates. K debate isn’t going anywhere; it’s only a question of whether or not it’s bound to the controversy point of education. We don’t under limit or avoid a concrete discussion of education policy, it simply allows the aff to discuss education from non-governmental mindsets.**

#### **Their interpretation is a double turn—forcing assimilation into traditional debate norms preclude access to all their claims about democratic deliberation and policy education.**

Darder 16 (Antonia Darder is a scholar, artist, poet, activist, and public intellectual, and the Leavey Presidential Endowed Chair in Ethics and Moral Leadership in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University. “CULTURAL HEGEMONY, LANGUAGE, AND THE POLITICS OF FORGETTING: Interrogating Restrictive Language Policies”; 2016-4-23; <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31666629/Darder_Cultural_Hegemony__Language_Rights___Politics_of_Forgetting-1.pdf>?)

Assimilative mainstream policies and practices steer language minority students toward reproducing individualistic identities as consumer-citizens, both dependent and in service to the political economy of the nation-state. Nowhere in this formulation is there the intention of transforming conditions of inequality experienced by language minority populations beyond aspiration to individual material success, as the most important measure of personal value. Accordingly, victim blaming notions persist, pushing language minority students, overtly or covertly, to lose the voice of their primary culture, language, and community, in exchange for a domesticated and homogenized voice, reproduced in the image of the dominant culture/class. As would be expected, bilingual students can begin to internalize negative projections and, thus, strive to disassociate from their primary language and culture. As a consequence, many experience shame toward their cultural identity and language community. In some instances, children may even begin to refuse to speak their primary language in the family, insisting on answering and speaking to their parents in English—what they already begin to perceive in their young minds as the legitimate language of power. So powerful is the hegemony of English in the United States and abroad that it is not unusual to hear the laments of Latino, Hawaiian, Native American, or immigrant parents who fear their cultural relationships with their children are eroding, as they are primed by subtractive schooling practices (Valenzuela 1999) to pursue English-only dreams. Hence, restrictive language policies in schools and society have effectively functioned in the service of language racialization and linguistic genocide (Skatnubb-Kangas, 2000). Moreover, these policies have not only been convenient pedagogical vehicles for control over language as a communicative process but, more importantly, as mechanisms of political socialization and cultural hegemony (Gramsci 1971). The language of instruction, labor, and popular culture, then, must be recognized as a powerful terrain of struggle for language minority populations around the globe—for central to their history of colonization and slavery has been the use of restrictive language policies to guarantee the economic exploitation, domination, and political exclusion from full democratic participation within the body politic of the nation-state.

#### **Sequencing DA – Interrogate history of model minority myth as a site of layered temporalities and experiences is a necessary prerequisite to true engagement. Their definition is an arbitrary assignment of power that prevent us from critically thinking about how we debate and evaluate our arguments—ie we question results of policies rather than the paradigms that authorized them in the first place.**

Trofanenko ‘5 [2005, Brenda Trofanenko is a research chair in education, culture, and community at Acadia University. “On Defense of the Nation,” The Social Studies, 96.5, 193+; http://go.galegroup.com.proxy.binghamton.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA139957613&v=2.1&u=bingul&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w[

Knowing how history is a site of political struggle, how we engage with social studies education means emphasizing how power, processes, and practices bear tangible effects on forging a national (and common) history by reproducing and vindicating inclusions and exclusions. Such a critique requires questioning how a singular, fixed, and static history celebrates the U.S. nation and its place in the world as that "common base of factual information about the American historical and contemporary experience" (27) argues for in the Fordham report. Our world history courses are central to defining, understanding, and knowing not only other nations but also the position of each nation in relation to the United States. The centrality that the west holds (notably the United States as an imperial power) is ingrained and willful in framing specific representations of the west that normalize the imperial practices that established this nation. The role that the United States holds on the world stage frequently remains unquestioned in social studies classrooms. Certainly, we engage with various images and tropes to continue to advance how the colonialist past continues to remain present in our historical sensibilities. Moreover, the increasing number and choices of archival sources function as a complement to further understanding the nation. If students are left to rely on the variety of historical resources rather than question the use of such resources, then the most likely outcome of their learning will be the reflection on the past with nostalgia that continues to celebrate myths and colonial sensibility. To evaluate the history narrative now is to reconsider what it means and to develop a historical consciousness in our students that goes beyond archival and nostalgic impulses associated with the formation of the nation and U.S. nation building. We need to insist that the nation, and the past that has contributed to its present day understanding, is simultaneously material and symbolic. The nation as advanced in our histories cannot be taken as the foundational grounds. The means by which the nation is fashioned calls for examining the history through which nations are made and unmade. To admit the participatory nature of knowledge and to invite an active and critical engagement with the world so that students can come to question the authority of historical texts will, I hope, result in students' realizing that the classroom is not solely a place to learn about the nation and being a national, but rather a place to develop a common understanding of how a nation is often formed through sameness. We need to continue to question how a particular national history is necessary as an educational function, but especially how that element has been, and remains, useful at specific times. My hope is to extend the current critique of history within social studies, to move toward understanding why history and nation still needs a place in social studies education. In understanding how the historicity of nation serves as "the ideological alibi of the territorial state" (Appadurai 1996, 159) offers us a starting point. The challenge facing social studies educators is how we can succeed in questioning nation, not by displacing it from center stage but by considering how it is central. That means understanding how powerfully engrained the history of a nation is within education and how a significant amount of learning is centered around the nation and its history. History is a forum for assessing and understanding the study of change over timeiyZupancic, which shapes the possibilities of knowledge itself. We need to reconsider the mechanisms used in our own teaching, which need to be more than considering history as a nostalgic reminiscence of the time when the nation was formed. We need to be questioning the contexts for learning that can no longer be normalized through history's constituted purpose. The changing political and social contexts of public history have brought new opportunities for educators to work through the tensions facing social studies education and its educational value to teachers and students. Increasing concerns with issues of racism, equality, and the plurality of identities and histories mean that there is no unified knowledge as the result of history, only contested subjects whose multilayered and often contradictory voices and experiences intermingle with partial histories that are presented as unified. This does not represent a problem, but rather an opportunity for genuine productive study, discussion, and learning.

#### **Monoculture DA—Debate either recognizes the pluralistic nature of its community or debate becomes extinct itself.**

Valdivia-Sutherland 98 [November 22nd 1998, Butte Community College Cynthia; “Celebrating Differences: Successfully Diversifying Forensics Programs” National Communication Association’s 84th Annual meeting; <http://www.phirhopi.org/spts/spkrpts05.2/sutherland.htm>]

Although the foundation of forensics events may have been grounded in the ancient rhetoric of Greece and Rome, the globalization of American culture calls for a more diverse rhetorical competency. One of the ways such competency can be developed is by reviewing different multicultural communicative styles. To accomplish this we will briefly examine some features of Asian culture as an exemplar of multicultural differences affecting forensic participation. Although this perusal is limited, it should offer insight into potential multicultural impacts. Perhaps the single most important feature affecting communicative styles within some Asian cultures centers around Confucianism, a philosophy encouraging both reciprocity and group harmony -- empathetic understanding of the other, and self-sacrifice for the good of the community. Consequently, cultures upholding Confucianism as their dominant paradigm place high value on group conformity and relational ethics, resulting in communication patterns designed to "initiate, develop, and maintain social relationships" (Yum, 1988, p. 384) Subsequently, such cultures are more interested in the process by which communication occurs rather than its outcome, most often utilizing indirect communication as a primary tool of the communication event. The impact of Confucianism on the communicative styles of its proponents is profound. First, communication is designed to induce cooperation among group members, and second, to promote relationships rather than individual goal attainments. In the world of forensic competitions, such commitment to the group disallows satisfaction in individualized success, while at the same time creating an environment fraught with face-losing potential. Imagine the shame evident in the one team member who does not advance to awards, or that debate team who drops in the final round. Such face-losing occurrences are common in current forensic practices, and may account for the small number of known debate societies within collectivist societies. Equally relevant to this examination of multicultural differences is nonverbal communication. Culturally bound, nonverbal communication is an area in which misunderstanding between cultures has the potential to flourish. For example, Japanese display rules prohibit negative facial expressions; consequently, it is common for the Japanese to smile even when angry (Argyle, 1982, p. 63). Consider the confusion during an interpretation of literature in which an angry or distraught character smiles in what is perceived an inappropriate moment. The same would hold true if this competitor was attempting to persuade the audience concerning some grave or life-threatening matter. Given Western cultural nonverbal norms, forensic critics would assess the smiling competitor negatively, and the competitor would suffer the impact on the ballot. It is not unlikely such negative attribution would result in the competitor not advancing into the final round, and thus, the competitor would not have opportunity to contribute to the overall success of the team through acquisition of sweepstakes points. Again, such an outcome would constitute loss of face for the competitor, a serious offense in many Asian cultures. Beyond facial expression, noted cultural differences in nonverbal communication range from amount and frequency of eye contact to arrangements of time and space, as well as appropriateness of gestures. Any of these holds the potential for negative impact within a forensics tournament, either in a round of competition, or during social interaction between rounds. The consequences of such misunderstandings may be that multicultural students, feeling uncomfortable in the Westernized cultural realm of forensics, will leave the activity in order to maintain their own cultural perspectives. From this brief overview of some of the inherent differences within multicultural approaches to communicative style, it is evident that the current underlying philosophy of forensic competitions needs to expand if accommodation of cultural dissimilarities is to take place. The question remains: How? Toward Pluralism in Forensics It has been argued that forensics is (or should be) primarily an educational enterprise, rooted in pedagogy, rhetoric, and research. If this is so, then in advancing into the 21st century, an era in which societies will increasingly become multicultural, it makes sense to adopt Albert and Triandis' (1985) objective of effectuating intercultural education within a multicultural society. The aim of this objective is "to prepare individuals to function effectively in both their culture of origin and in their new culture" (p. 391). Implementing this objective in forensics will not be easy. Change never is. However, while human beings do not automatically embrace the unknown, inability to move beyond a state of stasis equates to stagnation in human development. Within the world of forensics, coaches, critics, and competitors must continually adapt, evolving in their interactions with an ever-changing environment, or risk extinction. The possibility for forensic multicultural evolution can be strengthened in several ways. First, those of us involved in the activity must hone our self-diagnostic skills; in other words, we must consistently and honestly examine what we are doing, why, and with what effect. Are we "doing the greatest good for the greatest number?" If not, why not? Second, we must recognize the potential for educational gain when we expose ourselves and our students to multicultural awareness, knowledge, and acceptance**.** Not only will our learning experience be enriched, but we may also be led to explore identities and to question cultural domination, thereby increasing acceptance of differences. Finally, we must begin to begin. We cannot advance beyond our current state until we initiate action. This can be accomplished in many different ways. Here are a few: a. Recruitment of forensics competitors through on campus multicultural clubs and organizations. b. Development of non-traditional forensics programs. For example: a one-unit non-traveling team that exposes students to and educates them about forensics and/or the use of intramural competitions. c. Adopticn of debate tcpics centered on global rather than national concerns. d. Expository speeches geared to inform about other cultures. e. Interpretive programs adopted from another culture's canons of literature. f. Creation of new events or a return to old ones (such as oratorical speeches which harmonize with African speaking styles). g. Experiential activities designed to expose individuals in forensics to other cultural views. h. Research assessing current forensic multiculturalism. Summary Returning to the question, "Is it possible for pluralism, 'a process by which both minority and majority cultural members adopt some norms of the other group' to thrive within the context of the competitive speech and debate arena?," the answer is yes, but a qualified yes. The reason for this response comes from the understanding of what a process is: a state of evolution, a passage from one place to another. From this understanding, it is easy to see that process implies ongoingness, a continuous going forth from one point to the next. Consequently, in investigating its status quo, questioning its pedagogies, and attempting to initiate change, forensic professionals concerned with multiculturalism are already involved in such a process. Ultimately, as gaps in cultural knowledge decrease, norms will shift. At such a time, we will begin to co-opt certain cultural elements from outside our own -- in turn, sharing what has been exclusively ours with others. Arguably, this is not pluralism in its purest form, but it is a move toward pluralism that constitutes participation in the process of pluralism. As such, it is a move toward multiculturalism in what has traditionally been the monocultural world of forensics. So you still want to increase diversity within your forensics program? Good for you, and for us. Now, let the celebration of differences begin!

#### **6. The Aff is a pre-requisite to their terminal impact of portable skills—the Myth overdetermines Asian Identity as apolitical, which makes Asians voiceless in the political economy.**

Tang 17 et al. (Julia Tang, a professor of psychology at Mount Saint Mary’s University. Laura Wray, an associated professor from the department of social welfare at the UCLA. Christine Victorino, a professor of educational policies at UC Riverside. “Are They Political? Examining Asian American College Students’ Civic Engagement”; 2017/6/3; <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Laura_Wray-Lake/publication/311523981_Are_they_political_Examining_asian_american_college_students%27_civic_engagement/links/584edb8a08ae4bc899397c57/Are-they-political-Examining-asian-american-college-students-civic-engagement.pdf>; p 4-5)

Asian Americans often face stereotypes of being high achieving, hard-working, smart, and successful; given the generally positive nature of these stereotypes, Asian Americans are often referred to as the model minority (Junn, 2007; Lee, 2009). Asian Americans have also long been stereotyped as uninformed, uninterested, and uninvolved in politics (Hing, 1993). The model minority stereotype helps perpetuate the view of Asian Americans as apolitical in at least three ways. First, the assumption that Asian Americans prioritize hard work, achievement, and success may lead to views that Asian Americans do not value or have interest in civic participation. Colleges and universities often perpetuate stereotypes of Asian Americans by overemphasizing achievement and underrepresenting civil rights achievements and collective actions (Chang et al., 2007). Second, the assumption that Asian Americans are conformists leads to expectations that Asian Americans will be passive observers rather than active political participants (Lien et al., 2004; Park et al., 2008). Finally, Asian Americans are thought to experience greater social and economic integration and less stigmatization than other ethnic minority groups (Sánchez-Jankowski, 2002). This idea may lead to erroneous assumptions that there are no shared causes or injustices that bind Asian Americans together (Wong et al., 2011). In reality, Asian Americans are often racialized and have a long history of racial exclusion and discrimination (Wong, 2006). They are seen as perpetual foreigners (Junn & Masuoka, 2008) and remain challenged by popular perceptions that they are un-American, even if they are American born (Park et al., 2008). There is an urgent need to move beyond the model minority stereotype in civic research with Asian Americans. This stereotype is problematic because it fails to recognize barriers to civic engagement for Asian Americans (e.g., citizenship, voter registration, discrimination, language barriers; Lien, 2004; Wong et al., 2005) and ignores examples of Asian Americans who are highly civically engaged (Kwon, 2008; Wong et al., 2011).

#### **TVA doesn’t solve—two reasons**

#### **The topical version of the Aff is a double bind, either their topical version is only different from the 1AC through use of the USFG and therefore the lit base is predictable and they get neg ground to engage the Aff or the topical version is unpredictable because of the lit base then TVA doesn’t solve for the Aff and links back to their offense.**

#### **TVA is the manifestation of the Model Minority that forces Asians to assimilate into traditional white debate, which sustains white domination.**

McGinnis 15 (Theresa McGinnis is an Associate Professor in the Teaching, Literacy and Leadership Department. “A Good Citizen is What You’ll Be”: Educating Khmer Youth for Citizenship in a United States Migrant Education Program”; 2015/3/17; <http://jsse.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/index.php/jsse/article/viewFile/1399/1515>; p2-3)

Increasingly regimented curricula in US schools exert a dominant discourse that has a narrowing, constraining, and homogenizing influence on cultural diversity and related educational practices, including ideas of citizenship education. At the same time modern immigration patterns have broadened the cultural diversity of student populations in US schools and influenced the need for global awareness. (Levitt & Waters, 2002: Suaraz-Orozco & Qin-Hillard, 2004).These intricacies of a global world challenge young immigrants’ identity construction and the relationships between, citizenship, identity and power. Several researchers argue that simple notions of citizenship as a nation bound legal status with expectations for a national identity need to be reconsidered (i.e. Abu El-Haj, 2009; Banks, 2008; Fischman & Haas, 2012; Ong 2003). Instead they argue that citizenship or the “guarantor of rights” needs to be disentangled from the “expectations for assimilation to a particular national identity” (Abu El-Haj, 2009, p. 279). Overall, these researchers maintain that citizenship education for full participation in a globalized world must be transformed so that all students learn to reflect upon and challenge both local and global structures that limit equality (Abu el-Haj, 2009; Banks, 2008; Levinson, 2005). 3 Citizenship education and the US educational context Historically, within the US there has been a link between democracy, schooling and citizenship (Borman, Danzig & Garcia, 2012; Perry & Fraser, 1993; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960’s pushed the boundaries of democracy to include more inclusive education policies for non-White citizens (Banks, 2008; Perry & Fraser, 1993). Multicultural education programs were developed to provide curriculum that addressed the voices and identities of the ethnically and linguistically diverse student populations of the US public schools. Though no formal policy exists, school districts are encouraged to adopt policies that support all students “for full citizenship in a multiracial/multicultural democracy” (Perry & Fraser, 1993 p. 16), and to adopt policies that provide education for equitable outcomes and therefore informed, democratic citizens (Borman, Danzig & Garcia, 2012). However, while the hope was that multicultural education would support struggles against cultural hegemony, US schools continue to function as White mainstream institutions (Banks, 2008; Duffy, 2007; Perry & Fraser, 1993). Hence, citizenship education within US public schools continues to focus on narrow conceptions of citizenship. Students are asked to develop commitments to the nation-state and to US mainstream culture (Banks, 2008). For example, Duffy (2007) describes how the rhetoric of the public schools in Minnesota offered Hmong refugee students curricula and materials that encouraged them to “think American” and identify with the values taught in US schools. He explains how the literacy practices of the public schools involved teaching Hmong refugees “the ways of thinking, speaking, writing and acting practiced by members of the majority culture…diminishing Hmong-language practices of the home and supplanting these with the ‘ways with words’ privileged in schools” (p. 138). Duffy (2007) viewed these practices as ideologically narrow, assimilationist and “builders of national identity” (p. 138). Embedded in the ideology of the narrow focused citizenship education of US educational institutions is a wider notion about poor immigrants or refugees whose supposedly primitive cultures are socially determined to be undesirable (Ong, 2003, p. xviii). Cambodians, one of the largest and the poorest refugee groups living in the United States, are part of a larger panethnic Asian American label, and hence positioned in relation to other more successful Asian Americans who have been perceived within the US as “model minorities” (Lee, 1996). The “model minority” myth portrays Asian Americans as smart and successful, quiet and obedient, and thus “good” citizens (Reyes, 2007; Tuan, 1998). In contrast, a pervasive discourse exists within the US categorizing Cambodians as “less successful exemplars of the Asian “race,” less model-minority material, and more underclass in orientation” (Ong, 2003, p. 85). This type of discourse has followed the children of refugees into the institutional spaces of schools where the terms, “Other Asian” (Um, 2003) and “Bad Asian” (Lei, 2003) emerged as descriptors of Khmer youth – terms that infer the youth are lacking in potential, gangster, and are generally “at-risk.” Chhuon (2013) points out that these beliefs transmitted to Khmer youth in schools can shape the way youth learn about belonging in school and in US society. He argues that US educational institutions promote a national identity based on hegemonic mainstream white ideals, which further perpetuate the idea that there is one “correct” white middle class identity for citizens. For many marginalized youth these hegemonic practices exert exclusionary feelings and challenge their sense of belonging to an “American“ identity, including citizenship (Abu El-Haj, 2008)

#### **We are impact turning limits.**

#### **Community Policing DA—the Model Minority both corrupts and is an exacerbated outcome of the NEG interpretation—this flips all their participation warrants and is an independent link to our Racism impacts**

Eng & Han 08 (David L. Eng, Ph.D., Columbia University; Asian American Studies Program, Shinhee Han, C.S.W. Counseling & Psychological Services of Columbia University, A Dialogue on Racial Melancholia, Published online: 01 Jul 2008, http://www.uib.no/sites/w3.uib.no/files/attachments/9.\_enghan-a\_dialogue\_on\_racial\_melancholia\_0.pdf)AsianFury

As we know, the formation of the U.S. nation quite literally entailed—and continues to entail—a history of institutionalized exclusions, from Japanese American internment to immigration exclusion acts legislated by Congress, brokered by the Executive, and upheld by the Judiciary against every Asian immigrant group.5 For example, from 1882 to 1943, Chinese Americans experienced one of the longest juridical histories of immigration exclusion as well as bars to naturalization and citizenship. Yet, few people realize that the first exclusion laws passed against a particular ethnic group were passed against the Chinese. These laws were followed by a series of further exclusion acts culminating in the 1924 National Origins Act and the Tyding-McDuffie Act of 1934, which effectively halted all Asian immigration and naturalization. At the same time, other laws were instituted against miscegenation and ownership of private property.

Discourses of American exceptionalism and democratic myths of liberty, individualism, and inclusion force a misremembering of these exclusions, an enforced psychic amnesia that can only return as a type of repetitive national haunting—a type of negative or absent presence (see Cheng, 1997, pp. 51–52). The popular model minority stereotype that clings to Asian Americans is both a product of—and productive of—this negative or absent presence.6 In its compulsive restaging, the model minority stereotype homogenizes widely disparate Asian and Asian American racial and ethnic groups by generalizing them all as economically or academically successful, with no personal or familial problems to speak of. In this manner, the stereotype works not only to deny the heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity of various Asian American groups that do not fit its ideals of model citizenry.7 Moreover, it also functions as a national tool that erases and manages the history of these institutionalized exclusions. The pervasiveness of the model minority stereotype in our contemporary vocabulary works, then, as a melancholic mechanism facilitating the erasure and loss of repressed Asian American histories and identities. These histories and identities can return only as a type of ghostly presence. In this sense, the Asian American model minority subject also endures in the United States as a melancholic national object—as a haunting specter to democratic ideals of inclusion that cannot quite “get over” the histories of these legislated proscriptions of loss.

1. We are an impact turn to fairness.
2. Calls for fairness begs the question fairness for whom—fairness in debate is non-unique—traditional debate marginalizes those with economic disparities because they don’t have databases, coaches, or the time to be updating policy files; the neg’s reinforcement of policy-centric frameworks only exacerbates this by attempting to exclude these groups from the activity.
3. Definition of Fairness is arbitrary—how fairness is determined in debate shifts depending on community norms.

### 2AC v. Semiocap

1. The genealogical analysis of Asian identity has been interpreted through the attempt to gain access to schools and education. The myth of the model minority is used to further perpetuate capitalism. Lee et al. 16 (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Eujin Park, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison & Jia-Hui Stefanie Wong, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Trinity College; 2016/12/14; “Racialization, Schooling, and Becoming American: Asian American Experiences” http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360)

The educational scholarship on pre-1965 Asian American immigrants suggests that early Chinese and Japanese Americans actively worked to resist their racialization through performing ideal American identities that signaled an early expression of the model minority image. Like other non-Whites, Asian Americans were subjected to segregation and even exclusion from schools. Chinese-only schools operated in San Francisco from 1859 to 1879, after which time Chinese children were excluded from all San Francisco public schools until the 1885 case of Tape v. Hurley. In discussing the segregation of Chinese American students during this period, Coloma (2006) argues that the exclusionary policies were based on a White-Black binary and revealed the fact that “the policies of Jim Crow extended beyond the US South and contributed to anti- Asian prejudice in the racially charged climate of California” (p. 4). In Mississippi, Chinese were officially barred from White schools until the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, but some Chinese families had managed to negotiate access to White public schools for their children in some Mississippi Delta towns by the late 1930s, and most districts accepted Chinese children in White schools by the late 1940s (Jung, 2008; Lim de Sánchez, 2003; Loewen, 1988). To gain access to White schools during Jim Crow, Chinese immigrants living in the Mississippi Delta had to [convincing] Whites that the Chinese were closer to Whites than Blacks. In particular, Chinese immigrants had to develop social ties with prominent Whites in their towns, which many did by joining local churches and, simultaneously, distancing themselves socially from Blacks (S. J. Lee, in press; Loewen, 1988). In short, Chinese immigrants gained access to White schools in the Mississippi Delta during Jim Crow by following the rules of White supremacy and performing an early expression of model minority behavior. The stories of how Chinese immigrants gained access to White schools in the Mississippi Delta during the Jim Crow era reveal the relational nature of Asian American racialization and demonstrate that Chinese immigrants were active agents in challenging their racial positioning (S. J. Lee, in press). In contrast to earlier Asian immigrants, post-1965 Asian immigrants entered the nation at a time when the model minority image of Asian Americans was being established in the national imagination. Although the prominence of the model minority image may appear to suggest that Asian Americans have gained status, the review of the research suggests that Asian Americans may embrace the model minority image and behaviors associated with the stereotype in response to racism. Louie’s (2004) Chinese American participants were aware of the “clear racial hierarchy” (p. 56) in the United States. They also understood that perpetual foreigner and model minority discourses shaped how dominant society viewed them. In response, Chinese families turned to education as a “credentialing mechanism to safeguard against potential discrimination” (Louie, 2004, p. 56). Parents believed that because of racism their children would face, they would have to try even harder in school to lessen its impacts. Thus, even middle-class Chinese parents, who presumably would not have the same financial concerns as working-class parents, stressed higher education in technical and licensed professions and discouraged children from pursuing majors in social sciences or liberal arts. They reasoned that their children would face less racial discrimination in professions that were more technical and skill-based. Similarly, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) discovered that Chinese immigrant parents and Vietnamese refugee parents pushed a success frame, which centered around getting a good education that would lead to a good job, for their second-generation children. Furthermore, their strategies, including steering their children away from creative fields, were framed by the recognition that as Asian Americans their children would face racial bias. Thus, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) found that “Asian immigrant parents directed their children into elite colleges, specific majors, and particular occupations so that they would be better protected from subjective evaluations” (p. 58). In other words, the immigrant parents in Louie’s (2004) study and those in J. Lee and Zhou’s (2015) study encouraged a model minority performance as a strategy to cope with racism, but their actions have simply been read as evidence that they are model minorities. Lew(2006) also found that both middle-class and working-class Korean Americans recognized that the strictly racialized hierarchy in the United States would prevent them from achieving authentic, unhyphenated Americanness. However, middle-class participants’ class position made it possible for them to aspire to a class-based understanding of Americanness. They were able to pursue this definition of American through the high-quality education and social capital that their middle-class positions afforded them. Concerns about protecting and advancing the model minority image have also been found to influence relationships among Asian Americans (S. J. Lee, 2009). In writing about South Asian educational migrants in the post-1965 era, Thomas (2015) found that South Asians embraced the model minority as a way to understand and perform their racial and class positions. Thomas (2015) argues that highly educated South Asian immigrants were invested in reinforcing a model minority narrative, which they feared was being challenged by subsequent waves of working class South Asians who were unable to live up to model minority standards. Scholarship suggests that many Asian immigrant and second-generation youth are invested in performing model minority behavior (Cheng, 2013; Chhuon & Hudley, 2011; J. Lee & Zhou, 2015; S. J. Lee, 2009; G. C. Park, 2011). For example, in his research on working class Korean immigrant high school youth, G. C. Park (2011) found that participants believed they would never be accepted as authentic Americans because of their race and ethnicity. Thus, students performed a model minority identity as a coping strategy, which they believed got them closer to Whiteness. Furthermore, G. C. Park found that the students sought “to achieve social distance from other Koreans who could not or did not conform to the stereotype via social rewards and punishments” (p. 123). Not only do some Asian Americans perform the model minority, they may actively discipline those who do not or cannot perform.

1. The Model Minority Myth universalizes Asian academic success, and further perpetuate capitalism by installing this model on Asians. Lee 16 et al. (Stacey J. Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Eujin Park, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison & Jia-Hui Stefanie Wong, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Trinity College; 2016/12/14; “Racialization, Schooling, and Becoming American: Asian American Experiences” http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360)

Although research reveals that Asian Americans advance a model minority identity to protect themselves from racism, it also shows that schools position Asian Americans as model minorities. Scholars have found that teachers describe Asian American students in model minority terms and express a preference for Asian American students over other students of color (Cheng, 2013; J. Lee & Zhou, 2015; S. J. Lee, 2009; Rosenbloom & Way, 2004). Asian Americans are positioned by schools as model minorities to dismiss the concerns of other groups of color and/or to justify the existing racial system (Cheng, 2013; S. J. Lee, 2009; Rosenbloom &Way, 2004;Wing, 2007; Yu, 2006). In her ethnography of a highly competitive and academically elite high school in the Northeast, S. J. Lee (2009) found that the racially diverse student population was resegregated by a rigid system of academic tracking. When presented with evidence of racial inequality at the school, teachers and administrators maintained that the differences in outcomes were rooted in students’ effort, talent, culture, and/or interests. Invoking the model minority stereotype, teachers and administrators argued that the academic success of many Asian American students proved that the school’s policies and practices were color-blind. In their qualitative study of racial discrimination at an urban high school, Rosenbloom and Way (2004) discovered that teachers “implicitly or explicitly believed in the model minority myth regarding Asian students and, thus, had contentious relationships with Latinos and African Americans” (p. 444). In both of these studies, the model minority stereotype was used to discipline and silence the concerns of non- Asian students of color in ways that fueled tension between Asian American and other students of color. Wendy Cheng’s (2013) recent work on predominantly Asian American and Latino suburbs reveals the way that shifting demographics are shaping the racialization of Asian Americans. As her participants explained the achievement gap between Asian American and Latino students, the model minority stereotype of Asian Americans once again emerged. Specifically, she found that students and teachers alike called upon a cultural explanation in which the “Asian culture was valorized—at least in the context of pursuing academic success—while what was construed as Mexican or Latina/o culture (often used interchangeably) was stigmatized” (Cheng, 2013, p. 77). Cheng (2013) argues that as model minorities, the Asian American students at the school experience a racialized privilege that is not about the “privilege to be considered normal but a privilege to be considered exceptional (in comparison to other non-white minority groups)” (p. 75). Cheng’s work adds to the evidence that schools continue to employ the model minority as a way to disparage other groups of color and blame them for their educational struggles. Similarly, based on their research on second-generation Chinese and Vietnamese Americans, J. Lee and Zhou (2015) argue that being racialized as Asian leads to a positive stereotyping that is translated into “a form of symbolic capital that gives Asian Americans access to invaluable institutional resources that are not equally available to all students” (p. 135). Asian Americans are also positioned as model minorities in the context of affirmative action debates in higher education. The success of Asian Americans in higher education has been used to legitimate the claim that admissions processes are meritocratic and should not be race-based. Through the model minority stereotype, Asian American students are painted as victims (Omi & Takagi, 1996; Teranishi, 2010) and become “racial mascots” of those who oppose affirmative action (Allred, 2007, p. 69). The affirmative action debates thus continue to pit Asian Americans against Blacks and other students of color. Furthermore, the racialization of Asian Americans as model minorities works in conjunction with the image of the yellow peril, which results in the de-minoritization of Asian Americans, who come to be seen as taking over higher education institutions and not in need of the same support as other communities of color (S. S. Lee, 2006). Omi and Takagi (1996) argue that it is not only opponents of affirmative action, but also supporters, who fail to consider the specific racialization and racial positions of Asian Americans. They argue that advocates of affirmative action often fold the interests of Asian Americans into those of a larger group of communities of color, without considering how their differing pattern of racialization shapes experiences of racism. More recently, Teranishi (2010) has argued that, with the exception of debates surrounding selective college admissions and affirmative action, Asian American and Pacific Islanders are largely absent from discussions in higher education. Thus, in the affirmative action debates, Asian American interests are rendered invisible and excluded from conversations about the realities of race and racism in higher education and society at large.

#### Talking about the myth of the model minority in debate is uniquely key. The claim that we get consumed by capitalism is non-unique; that is the status quo for minority bodies. Asian American women are always consumed by the public because of their constant hyper-sexualization. Similarly, black people are always already consumed by the public. There is no avoiding consumption. Their argument just proves the status quo and doesn’t happen because of the 1AC.

#### The myth of the model minority is a form of communicative capitalism. Asians are sold the idea of whiteness as valuable but can never fully achieve whiteness and are stuck in between trying to be white but simultaneously non-white.

#### Permutation do both: Through our deconstruction of the myth of the model minority we are unlearning anti-black practices as a form of deschooling. If we win that the myth is a manifestation of communicative capitalism then the aff is already a performance of the alternative.

#### Division DA: If capitalism is as evil as we agree it is then multiple strategies with multiple actors is good and creates greatest chance of fighting capitalism. It is neoliberal to divide strategies to fight capitalism which replicates the impacts of neoliberalism. We are a resistance to communicative capitalism and aren’t mutually exclusive with the alt. Its not a question of either/or but a question of AND. We need to reject communicative capitalism in all instances.

### 2AC v. Settler Colonialism

#### The aff is a pre-requisite – only interrogating Asian privilege in a settler colonial context can lead to productive decolonial movements

Fujikane 12 (Candace, Professor of Cultural Studies and English, Published by Routledge Publishing, Published on April 1st 2012, “Asian American critique and Moana Nui 2011: securing a future beyond empires, militarized capitalism and APEC”, pg. 5-6) RR Jr

We can first trace Asian American critiques of US empire to the 1968–1969 Third World Strike at what was then San Francisco State College. The Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) brought together African American, Asian American, Latino/a, and American Indian campus groups demanding an autonomous ethnic studies program and community control over curricula and hiring, and the TWLF drew critical connections between domestic civil rights struggles in the United States and international human rights struggles in imperial wars being fought in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. As an historical event linking racism in the United States with US imperialism, the Third World Strike reminds us that ethnic studies was founded on conceptions of shared struggles on a global scale. There is another dimension to the Third World Strike that Asian American critical inquiry must consider. At the same time that the Third World Strike was taking place, American Indians were engaged in the second occupation of Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay. Asserting American Indian title to the federal facility by right of discovery, American Indian activists at Alcatraz initiated the Alcatraz-Red Power movement (ARPM) which led to 70 property takeovers in the following nine years (Johnson et al. 1997). Similarly, in 1976, Kanaka ‘ Oiwi were engaged in struggles to reclaim Kaho‘olawe, an island that had been used since the Second World War as a site for bombing target practice by the US military. These struggles illustrate that although American Indians and Kanaka ‘ Oiwi were allied with people of color on civil rights issues and against US imperialism, their primary struggle was to reclaim their ancestral lands from the United States. Although Asian Americans, particularly Japanese Americans who were critical of the US political system after their internment during World War II, supported American Indians at Alcatraz and Hawaiians at Kaho‘olawe in important ways, they used a framework of race and class struggle that did not account for the uniqueness of indigenous land dispossession or their own positions in a settler colonial context (Johnson 1996: 118; Gidra 1970; Tanioka and Yamaguchi 1970; Kudaka 1970; Kotani 1985: 168–169).4 As I have argued elsewhere, Asian American studies as a discipline has also historically had a stake in claiming America in ways that are ideologically at odds with indigenous critiques of US settler colonialism(Fujikane 2005). Asian American studies has generally focused on Asian American civil rights and immigrant rights, histories of racial, ethnic, heteropatriarchal and class oppression and literary, cultural and political forms of resistance to those interlocking axes of oppression, interracial and interethnic conflicts and alliances, movements of people to and from the United States in terms of immigration, diaspora, transnational mobility and the international divisions of labor, and multiple forms of imperialisms in Asia. In a multicultural ethnic studies framework, claiming America often inadvertently ends up reproducing the settler colonial claims to Native lands made in white settler historiography. Kanaka ‘ Oiwi leader and scholar Haunani-Kay Trask first identified Asian Americans in Hawai‘i as settlers who benefit from the dispossession of Hawaiians. Trask writes, Our Native people and territories have been overrun by non-Natives, including Asians. Calling themselves ‘local’, the children of Asian settlers greatly outnumber us. They claim Hawai‘i as their own, denying indigenous history, their long collaboration in our continued dispossession, and the benefits therefrom. Part of this denial is the substitution of the term ‘local’ for ‘immigrant’, which is, itself, a particularly celebrated American gloss for ‘settler’. As on the continent, so in our island home. Settlers and their children recast the American tale of nationhood: Hawai‘i, like the continent, is naturalized as but another telling illustration of the uniqueness of America’s ‘nation of immigrants’. (Trask 2008: 46)5 Kanaka Oiwi are genealogically connected to Hawai‘i, their kulaiwi or ancestral lands, through Papahanaumoku, ‘She who births land’ (ho‘omanawanui 2008: 125; Kamahele 2008: 79; Trask 2008: 45). Under the US occupation of Hawai‘i, Asian Americans are settlers who do not have this genealogical relationship to land in Hawai‘i. As Trask points out, the failure to identify immigrants in settler states as settlers makes possible the teleological fantasy of settler states evolving into ‘multicultural’ nations (Trask 2008: 47). The effects of Asian American settler colonialism become even more visible when we examine indices that register political power in Hawai‘i, such as the ethnic breakdown of the 2009 Hawai‘i State Legislature (see Table 1). According to these figures, Japanese constitute only 21.9% of the population of Hawai‘i, but they are 40% of the Senate and 38% of the House of Representatives (Okinawans are included in statistics for ‘Japanese’, but separately they are about 4% of the population, 12% of the Senate and 6% of the House). Whites constitute 21.1% of the population, 16% of the Senate, and 20% of the House. By contrast, Hawaiians constitute 22.1% of the population compared with 16% of the Senate and 14% of the House. Overall, Asian Americans make up about 44% of the population, 64% of the Senate and 72% of the House. The conditions of Asian American settler colonialism are only made possible by the US settler state and its occupation of Hawai‘i. The United States has acknowledged that its military unlawfully invaded Hawai‘i and backed the overthrow of the Hawaiian government by a white American oligarchy on January 17, 1893. In 1993, President Bill Clinton signed US Public Law 103-150, apologizing for the United States’ role in the military invasion and overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. In the Apology Resolution, the United States acknowledges that Kanaka ‘ Oiwi have never relinquished their sovereignty: ‘The indigenous Hawaiian people never directly relinquished their inherent sovereignty as a people or over their national lands to the United States, either through their monarchy or through a plebiscite or referendum’. The document also acknowledges the illegal seizure of Hawaiian national lands: ‘The Republic of Hawaii also ceded 1,800,000 acres of crown, government and public lands of the Kingdom of Hawaii without the consent of or compensation to the Native Hawaiian people of Hawaii or their sovereign government’. The Apology Resolution has been cited to argue that the sovereign state of Hawai‘i continues to exist, and Kanaka ‘ Oiwi can assert their claim to 1.8 million acres of crown and government lands called the ‘ceded’ lands, half of all land in Hawai‘i seized at the time of the overthrow and now administered by the State of Hawai‘i.6

#### Their totalizing binary of settler vs indigenous results in the erasure of the Alien positionality – our analysis of Asian experience through forced migration has more explanatory power for various positionalities in correspondence to land relations

Day 16 (Ikyo, Associate Professor of English Chair, Critical Social Thought, Mount Holyoke, Specialization Asian American literature and visual culture, Critical Ethnic Studies, Marxism, Settler Colonial Studies, Queer of Color Critique, American Studies, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*, p29-32)

While Asians have not held any prominence in popular media projections of settler national culture, which often erases or figuratively disguises Asians as infiltrating replicants or alien invaders, the opposite has been true for Indigenous identities. As Scott Lauria Morgensen explains, the settler colonial imaginary is continually underwritten by Indigenous tropes that convey settler “conquest and incorporation of primitivity.” Much like the way the 2011 feature film Cowboys and Aliens aligns cowboys and Indians with each other against an invading, technologically superior alien population—read Asian—settler identity is heavily invested in appropriating Indigeneity. This is a mode of white settler identification that Shari Huhndorf calls “going Native,”77 which functions to cover over colonial invasion and reimagine a natural affiliation to the land. The erasure of the alien and the romantic identification with the Native are two sides of the settler colonial coin. By mapping out the triangulation of Native, alien, and settler positions, this book moves beyond a binary theory of settler colonialism, which is predominantly structured around an opposition between Indigenous peoples and settlers. While scholarship on the settler-Indigenous dialectic has been tremendously valuable, it often falls short of clarifying the role that nonwhite migration plays within such a framework or how it intersects with other aspects of white supremacy. Reflecting on what she calls the “indigenous-settler binary,” Andrea Smith similarly cautions that this “binary certainly exists, [but] our analysis of it is insufficient if not intersected with other logics of white supremacy.”78 In particular, key questions over the status or role that racialized migrants play within white settler colonialism often remain unasked or avoided. In a binary framework of settler colonialism— where one is either a settler or an Indigenous person—slaves, indentured laborers, or refugees are “settlers,” despite the involuntary context of their migration to North America? If we observe Jared Sexton’s claim that “no amount of tortured logic could permit the analogy to be drawn between a former slave population and an immigrant population, no matter how low-flung the latter group,”79 do descendants of slaves exceed the conceptualization of migrants more generally? These questions highlight some of the uncertainty that surrounds the nonwhite “alien” and the role of race within settler colonialism. As the cases below signal, slavery and the abject condition of blackness complicate a straightforward approach to settler colonialism organized around a central opposition between settlers and Indigenous peoples. More directly, the “settler” classification collapses important racial distinctions between various contexts of voluntary and forced migration into one homogeneous group of “occupiers.” Recent studies of settler colonialism that have given attention to Asian or other nonwhite, non-Indigenous cultures have often distinguished settler identity by the degree to which migration is intentional. Writing about Canadian settler imperialism, for example, Adam Barker notes the changing provenance of settlers: “[They are] often people of European descent, but in the contemporary sense Settler increasingly includes peoples from around the globe who intentionally come to live in occupied Indigenous territories to seek enhanced privileges.”80 In essence, settler identity—regardless of race—is predicated on the intentionality of migration. For those who may not have intended to migrate, however, Barker is more circumspect: “Attempts to integrate discussions of hybrid identities (such as the descendants of African peoples brought to the Americas against their will, many refugees, or Settler Muslims who are increasingly targeted by the state and other racist Settlers) with Settler and Indigenous identities are complicated and beyond the scope of this inquiry.”81 Complicating Barker’s view of voluntarism, Jodi Byrd’s theorization of settler colonialism accounts for the involuntary conditions of migration. She offers the term arrivant “to signify those people forced into the Americas through the violence of European and Anglo-American colonialism and imperialism around the globe.”82 For Byrd, structures of coerced migration distinguish the arrivant from the settler. Alternatively, Patrick Wolfe forcefully opposes voluntaristic approaches that attempt to differentiate the settler from coerced migrant populations such as slaves. He maintains that “the opposition between Native and settler is a structural relationship rather than an effect of the will. . . . Neither I nor other settlers can will our way out of it, whether we want to or not.”83 In particular, he draws on the Australian context in which unfree white convict labor was imported from Britain in order to pose the rhetorical question, “Does this mean that their descendants are not settlers?”84 Given that Wolfe concedes that white convicts in Australia did not pass on the condition of their criminality to their offspring, this example fails as a comparative equivalent to a US history of African slavery. The very content of black racialization has been based on the exclusive and transferable condition of racial slavery. Moreover, in claiming that settler identity applies even to “enslaved people [who] immigrated against their will,” Wolfe implicitly preserves the voluntarism that he otherwise rejects in his construction of the slave as an “immigrant.” Such references to immigration project a set of voluntaristic assumptions onto widely divergent conditions of voluntary and forced migration that are central features of the United States’ specific configuration as a settler colony. In the contemporary context, the racialized vulnerability to deportation of undocumented, guest-worker, or other provisional migrant populations similarly exceed the conceptual boundaries that attend “the immigrant.” Our awareness of these distinctions does not absolve any of these groups from being willing or unwitting participants in a settler colonial structure that is driven to eliminate Indigenous people. However, folding them into a generalized settler position through voluntaristic assumptions constrains our ability to understand how their racialized vulnerability and disposability supports a settler colonial project. The most unequivocal work to define Asian migrants as “settlers of color” is the edited volume Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i. Referring specifically to Asian Americans in Hawai‘i, editor Candace Fujikane states clearly that “all Asians, including those who don’t have political power, are identified in this book as settlers who participate in US settler colonialism.”85 Acknowledging the historical exploitation of Asian plantation labor in Hawai‘i, she argues that it is equally important to acknowledge the “ways that they [Asian migrants and their descendants] are beneficiaries of US settler colonialism” and how “early Asian settlers were both active agents in the making of their own histories and unwitting recruits swept into the service of empire.”86 In this formulation it is not necessary for migrants of color to migrate “intentionally” to become settlers; rather, settler status is a mixture of both self-determination and structural contingency. As Fujikane puts it succinctly, “Colonial intent [does not] define the status of Asians as settlers but rather the historical context of US colonialism for which they unknowingly became a part.”87 Furthermore, she also dispels the notion that Asians represent a “third space” outside the Indigenous-settler dialectic. She admits her previous subscription to this idea, but explains her change of thinking as follows: I was attempting to create a “third space” for Asians as another category of the oppressed in Hawai‘i. The attempt to ally [Asian] “locals” with “Natives,” however, created the illusion of a “shared” struggle without acknowledging that Asians have come to constitute the very political system that has taken away from Natives their rights as indigenous peoples. In this view, given the political power that Asian Americans currently enjoy in Hawai‘i, they cannot be said to represent a stable third space that is exempted from the settler-Indigenous dialectic or positioned “with” Indigenous peoples and “against” settlers.

#### The model minority myth operates under the structural triangulation of the Native, Alien and Settler. Contradictions on how settlerism is embodied onto different identities show that racialization is the basis of how power relations operate. Even though Asians were settlers, they are simultaneously racialized as the alien which is emblematic of the Forever Foreigner syndrome. This creates psychological violence against Asians.

Day 16 (Ikyo, Associate Professor of English Chair, Critical Social Thought, Mount Holyoke, Specialization Asian American literature and visual culture, Critical Ethnic Studies, Marxism, Settler Colonial Studies, Queer of Color Critique, American Studies, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*, p34-36)

\This book presents a theory of settler colonialism in North America that operates as a triangulation of symbolic positions that include the Native, the alien, and the settler. The distinctions between alien and settler are by no means stable or fixed but are meant to emphasize the role of territorial entitlement that distinguish them. What initially distinguishes the settler from the alien migrant, as Lorenzo Veracini offers, is that “not all migrations are settler migrations.”22 This is both poignantly true and, for African slaves, a profound understatement. As Frank Wilderson describes transatlantic slavery, “From the very beginning, we were meant to be accumulated and die.”2^ Alternatively, on the other end of the spectrum, the alien may not only be complicit with the settler colonial regime but may eventually inherit its sense of sovereign territorial right, such as Asian settlers in Hawaii.22 Acknowledging these inconsistencies, what I demonstrate in this book is that for slaves and racialized migrants, the degree of forced or voluntary migration or level of complicity with the settler state is ultimately secondary to their subordination under a setter colonial mode of production driven by the proprietorial logics of whiteness. In this light, highly differentiated populations of African slaves and Asian migrants historically represented alien rather than settler migrations. This shared status in no way implies an equivalence in the heterogeneous racial experience of African slaves and Asian migrants. Instead, it clarifies their historical relationship to North American land, which was as exclusive and excludable alien labor forces. Their unsovereign alien status was a precondition of their exploitation and intersects with the multiple economic logics that require and reproduce alien-ness in settler colonies. While African slaves represented a system of forced migration, unfree alien labor, and property—a form of biopolitical life that was “market alienable”122—the later recruitment of indentured and “free” Chinese labor incorporated provisionally, excludability, and deportability into the notion of alien-ness. The heterogeneously racialized alien is a unique innovation of settler colonialism. Race is thus an organizing principle of settler colonialism in North America, a principle that we neglect at the risk of relegating African slaves “to the position of the unthought”— and obscuring the persistence and evolution of Marx’s notion of primitive accumulation, where “conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, in short, force, play the greatest part.”— The governing logic of white supremacy embedded in a settler colonial mode of production relies on and reproduces the exploitability, disposability, and symbolic extraterritoriality of a surplus alien labor force. Therefore, complicating an Indigenous-settler binary, this book’s focus on the settler colonial alien follows Byrd’s method of “disrupting] the dialectics of settler/native, master/slave, colonizer/colonized.”122 As I attempt to clarify below, what remains fundamental to this triangulated articulation of settler colonialism is how land and labor are constitutive features of heterogeneous processes of settler colonial racialization.

#### Immigration DA – their analysis of settler vs indigenous papers over bodies that don’t fit into either category i.e. black slaves who were forcefully shipped over the Atlantic Ocean and forced to work in an alienated environment that is stolen land. They aren’t settlers by choice but the 1NC’s theorization of identity would lump them in with white settlers, that’s an external antiblackness impact to the alt

#### Our analysis of Asian American colonization as an example of settler colonialism allows us to craft self-reflexive political strategies from our own subject position – that’s a pre-requisite to taking down regimes of settler colonialism

Chen 10 (Kuan-Hsing Chen, professor in the Graduate Institute for Social Research and Cultural Studies, and also the coordinator of the Center for Asia-Pacific/ Cultural Studies, National Chiao Tung University, “Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization”, <http://reader.dukeupress.edu/asia-as-method/122?ajax>, 2010) RR Jr

Knowledge production is one of the major sites in which imperialism operates and exercises its power. The analyses in the preceding chapters suggest that the underdevelopment of deimperialization movements is a significant contributing factor in local, regional, and global conflicts throughout the contemporary world. This underdevelopment, I submit, has to do with the current conditions of knowledge production, which have serious structural limitations. To break through the impasse, critical intellectual work on deimperialization first and foremost has to transform these problematic conditions, transcend the structural limitations, and uncover alternative possibilities. To confront the long-lasting impact of leaving Asia for America" (tudyii ramie) since the Second World War in East Asia in general, and Tai-wan in particular, this chapter puts forward "Asia as method" as a criti-cal proposition to transform the existing knowledge structure and at the same time to transform ourselves. The potential of Asia as method is this: using the idea of Asia as an imaginary anchoring point, societies in Asia can become each other's points of reference, so that the understanding of the self may be transformed, and subjectivity rebuilt. On this basis, the diverse historical experiences and rich social practices of Asia may be mobilized to provide alternative horizons and perspectives. This method of engagement, I believe, has the potential to advance a different under-standing of world history. At the same time, the formulation of Asia as method is also an at-tempt to move forward on the tripartite problematic of decolonization, deimperialization, and de-cold war. To briefly recap the analysis devel-oped over the previous four chapters: the historical processes of imperi-alization, colonization, and the cold war have become mutually entangled structures, which have shaped and conditioned both intellectual and popular knowledge production. Through the use of Asia as method, a society in Asia may be inspired by how other Asian societies deal with problems similar to its own, and thus overcome unproductive anxieties and develop new paths of engagement. In proposing a means for self-transformation through shifting our points of reference toward Asia and the third world, Asia as method is grounded in the critical discourses of an earlier generation of thinkers, with whom we now imagine new possi-bilities. For those of us living in Asia, Asia as method is not a self-explanatory proposition. Until the last decade, most intellectuals in Asia had mul-tiple direct links to North America or Europe, but we had few contacts among ourselves. If we met at all, it was in New York, London, or Paris. At its most basic, Asia as method means expanding the number of these meeting points to include sites in Asia such as Seoul, Kyoto, Singapore, Bangalore, Shanghai, and Taipei. As a theoretical proposition, Asia as method is a result of practices growing out of the Inter-Asia Cultural Studies: Movements journal project, which has been operating since the late 19905. In this context, Asia as method can be considered a self-reflexive movement to examine prob-lems and issues emerging out of our experiences organizing interventions in various local spaces.' Those of us who have been involved come from very diverse intellectual and academic backgrounds, not to mention re-gions with immensely varied local histories. Yet we all feel that something important and worthwhile is emerging out of the intense dialogues we are undertaking among ourselves and with others. Asia as method is my own attempt to think through some of these intellectual concerns, priorities, and processes. The Inter-Asia project is not new An earlier generation of intellectuals paved the way, and having learned of their struggles, we are now finding out for ourselves how difficult it is to initiate dialogues and links among critical circles in Asia? The most obvious difficulty is the imbalance be-tween big countries and small ones, evident in the relationships between India and the rest of South Asia, Indonesia and the rest of Southeast Asia, and China and the rest of Northeast Asia. What we now call inter-national relations existed in each subregion of Asia before the forma-tion of the modem nation-state, and the earlier imbalances were exacer-bated by twentieth-century colonialism and nationalism. Each of these factors — size, colonial experiences, and nationalism—is evident in the major historical conflicts in the region: Japan's aggression in East and Southeast Asia, Indonesia's 1963 massacre of communists and reluctance to grant East Timor its independence, the division of Korea, the conflict between the CCP and the KMT, the partition of Pakistan from India, the separation of Singapore from Malaysia, and the unequal distribution of wealth between first- and third-world Asian countries. Dealing with these large-scale conflicts is made more difficult by recurring practical prob-lems. For example, English is often seen as a colonial language in non-English-speaking parts of Asia, and those countries that have adopted it are viewed by others as much too colonized. As we interact, problems such as this surface repeatedly, and we have not yet found effective ways to handle them.

#### Permutation do both – we can incorporate discussions of decolonization while centering it around the intricacies of the Model Minority Myth

#### The permutation solves – starting from the unique position of the Model Minority Myth is key to spurring discussions on the Forever Foreigner narrative. That’s the best strategy for resisting dominant narratives of settlerism

Yang-Stevens & Pham 16 [Kat Yang-Stevens is a queer gender femme and first generation Chinese Am, they are a writer, educator, organizer and and cultural creator who creates and facilitates original teaching materials and workshops; Alex-Quan Pham is a Vietnamese queer, gender non-conforming femme warrior; “Akai Gurley the "Thug," Peter Liang the "Rookie Cop" and the Model Minority Myth”; February 26, 2016; https://katyangstevens.squarespace.com/complicatingourcomplicity]

Though our Asian identities are both shaped by our relationships to anti-Blackness and settler colonialism, the focus of much attention has been only on our relationships to Black identities and has continued to overlook and obscure our participation in and relationship to settler colonialism. This has resulted in an absence of helpful language and terminology to frame the conversation, as well as examples of other work in this particular vein to build off of. I want to recognize the limitations and boundaries of how much can be unpacked in this piece, and make clear that while I have attempted to explore relationships between Asian and Black identities while situating them within a framework which recognizes settler colonial power, this piece does not and cannot efficiently explore the ways that Asian settler colonialism informs the construction of Asian identities or the specific relationships that exist between Asian and Indigenous peoples. Provocations such as these will live on only in the margins and fringes of what is referred to as “Asian-america” if the dominant corporatized and careerist academic- and NGO-friendly narratives are not challenged by analyses that work to explore and create understanding of settler colonialism as an ongoing structure in the US: one that Asians have been part of creating and continue to maintain

#### Link turn – the myth of the model minority juxtaposed with Yellow Peril narratives helps perfect modern day settler colonialism by encouraging silence among Asian-Americans

Kim 14 (Timothy, citing Kat Yang-Stevens, queer gender femme and first generation Chinese Am, they are a writer, educator, organizer and cultural creator who creates and facilitates original teaching materials and workshops, Published by Skidmore Osdp, Published on December 8th 2014, “Event Highlight: Understanding Settler Colonialism with Kat Yang-Stevens”, <http://skidmorecollegeosdp.blogspot.com/2014/12/event-highlight-understanding-settler.html>) RR Jr

Another main aspect that Kat Yang-Stevens discussed extensively was how the concept of Orientalism is used as a strategy of settler colonialism. The Orient has been referred to as the "non-west" and includes mainly the Middle East and Asia. It is perceived as "exotic" and "different," which creates the notion of Orientalism that the West is a superior culture compared to "othered" nations while such countries pose potential threats. Kat Yang-Stevens argued that Orientalism is also embedded in the society of the United States, and Latinxs, Arab Americans and Asian Americans are the target of such a concept. Kat Yang-Stevens explained that Latinxs, Arabs, and Asians are constructed as a constant threat to the country and not actually citizens of this country. The construction of a threat allows the US to claim a constant state of war and danger, which justifies increased militarization of borders, erosion of civil liberties and social services, and overseas interventions (including killing civilians). As an Asian in this country, it is both easy and comfortable to be trapped in the "model minority myth," which literally suggests Asians as a "model" minority that does not cause trouble or disruption and strives for the "American dream." The model minority myth, which is another tactic of settler colonialism, created the idea of Asians can obtain a "decent" status in the United States with the condition of remaining silent. As a result, there has been a culture formed of not speaking up and not acting upon injustices, and, ultimately, not siding with our other friends of color, who have been subject of extreme "white violence." (There have been Asian social justice movements and great Asian American social justice leaders, but there has been a lack of support from the wider Asian community.) I am not suggesting that Asians have not been victims of white supremacy or white oppression. We have suffered from great deal of racial profiling, xenophobia, hostility, exclusion, ignorance, and cultural appropriation. The list goes on and on. Nevertheless, many of us have chosen to remain comfortable where we are situated in this society. I believe that Asians here in this country should stop not talking, educating, and acting on social injustices that are so deeply rooted in this country just because it doesn't "directly" affect us.

#### We don’t preclude an analysis of settler colonial power relations – our interrogation is a recognition of the cultural reproduction of Asian Americans as being complicit within systems of colonial domination which means any risk the 1AC strayed away the myth is a reason to vote aff

Maira and Shihade 6 (Sunaina, Professor of Asian American Studies and is affiliated with the Middle East/South Asia Studies program and with the Cultural Studies Graduate Group, Professor at Abu-Lughod Institute for International Studies at Birzeit University, Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press, Published in June 2006, “Meeting Asian/Arab American Studies”, https://goo.gl/dLUVcG) RR Jr

This is one of the most resonant but also complicated issues at the heart of the connection between Asian American and Arab American studies, and at the core of the analysis of U.S. empire. Mamdani suggests that the paradigm that we need to consider to understand American support for Israel is that of settler-colonialism, which has triumphed in the formation of the United States. He argues that the American reluctance to confront its original sin of genocide against the native population underlies the American and Israeli “commitment to a shared civilizing mission, with civilization understood as a settler product that must be brought to natives.”36 In deconstructing the shared settler nationalism that binds the U.S. and Israel, Mamdani offers insights from the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, another settler state, that are relevant to Asian American studies and also to Pacific Islander studies.37 Mamdani’s argument helps to frame the experiences of Asian immigrants in relation to native peoples in the U.S., and provides a political critique that goes to the heart of core debates in Asian American studies about citizenship and social movements, including Asian American movements. One response to settler-colonialism in South Africa, in his view, was the conservative nationalist approach, in which “every immigrant was a settler.” The other was “radical nationalism,” which distinguished between settlers whose privileges were legally guaranteed by the settler state, and immigrants who had varying degrees of racialized privilege. Mamdani suggests that, ultimately, the problem is not really the settler, but “the settler state, the legal setup that guaranteed settler privilege. . . . The enemy from this point of view was everyone who defended the power of the settler state.”38 This is useful for those in Asian American studies who see the connections between the colonization of indigenous peoples in the U.S. and native peoples overseas, including in Israel. Thinking about settler-colonialism as part of U.S. imperial culture deepens the critique of multiculturalism within Asian American studies and challenges not just the construction of the “model minority” but the very notion of inclusion within, rather than opposition to, a settler state built on genocide and slavery. Mamdani’s analysis of settler-colonialism also connects these debates to discussions of the U.S. role in supporting apartheid and settler-colonialism overseas.

### 2AC ROJ

#### there’s no ROB that isn’t objective because even policy solutions discount K options; ROJ as anti-oppressive educator isn’t necessarily bad either; what is debate supposed to do for you to grow as an educator? When you tell me my knowledge is bad, they’re telling me to be quiet; judge should step in and use ballot to encourage pedagogical spaces.

Osajima ND (KEITH OSAJIMA, Professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands, “Internalized Oppression and the Culture of Silence: Rethinking the Stereotype of the Quiet Asian-American Student”, <http://nypolisci.org/files/PDF%20FILES/Chapter%20IV_%209_%20internalized%20oppression%20and%20the%20culture%20of%20silence%20FEC2.pdf>, DOA: 7/7/17)//AK

**As teachers of Asian students, how can understanding the nature of internalized oppression help us in practice?** I think **the value of the perspective is that it locates an important impetus of individual behavior in the oppressive structures and practices in society**. It is not the unchanging nature or static culture of Asian American students that accounts for their quiet behavior. Rather, it is **the internalizing of student and racial oppression that makes Asian students feel that the best way to get through is to be quiet or makes them believe that they can be nothing other than the quiet student.** The key implication here is that Asian students should not be blamed nor chastised if they exhibit this behavior. **It is not their fault that societal structures and oppression conveyed messages that this is the way to behave.**

**As teachers, the notion of internalized oppression should help us to see how the pressures of being an Asian-American student can often be limiting and constraining. Our job is to create a learning environment that contradicts those pressures and constraints; that encourages and makes it safe for Asian students to take some risks and to critically examine their lives in relation to societal oppressions.**

I tried to structure these contradictions into the class I just completed. 1) To move away from the banking system, I tried to limit the amount of time I lectured. In a 2-hour meeting, I never talked for more than half the period. I also tried to lecture in a way that elicited as much interactive thinking as possible. 2) To encourage each student to take some risks and think about issues, I had them regularly do “dyads” where I would have students pair off and each take a few minutes to think, for themselves, about a question or issue that was being presented. These dyads usually preceded the general discussion, and helped students to prepare and organize their thoughts before presenting them in the larger group. 3) I made it clear that each student’s contribution would be listened to respectfully, and that each student would get a chance to participate. To accomplish this, I made sure that no one, including myself, could “trash,” ridicule, or harshly criticize another student’s viewpoint. I also did not allow any one or two students to dominate discussions. I made it clear to them that I wanted to give other people a chance to talk before they got another chance.

All of these techniques seemed to work well. **Students participated in discussions, and began to grapple with questions that they had rarely been asked before. The experience provided me with hope that the educational process can do more than reproduce a compliant work force, but can be a vehicle for liberation.** *I invite you to join the struggle.*

## Compilation of Aff Cards

### Asian Overachievement/Homogenizing

#### **Asian Americans were painted as the “successful students” of the society compared to the Black/Brown urban ghetto. This was used as a tool to justify how the failure from people of color was brought upon themselves.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

I found that teachers and staff generally contrasted ‘engaged’ Asian American students with ‘resistant’ Black and ‘invisible’ and educationally deficient Latino youth, despite two important educational realities. The first was the remarkable diversity of students’ academic aspirations and performance. It is important to note that Asian American students outpaced their Black and Latino peers in formal indices of academic achievement, yet they were well represented on every point of the school’s academic and social status spectrums. Moreover, even those Asian American students who were considered successful students according to the local cultural context of expectations regarding academic achievement did not, in objective terms, consistently demonstrate academic strength and intellectual depth of learning. The second notable reality of the educational setting was its environment of taken-forgranted inequality and school failure. Despite their academic heterogeneity and educational difficulties, Asian American youth were encountered and assessed through a re-inscription of the model minority myth that positioned Asian Americans as an exemplar group in what was popularly imagined as a Black/Brown urban ghetto, a site of failure (Leonardo & Hunter, 2007). Resigned acceptance of both urban inequality and low expectations shaped adult and youth’s common-sense understandings of race at both the individual and organizational level. Ultimately, this exacerbated the severely compromised learning experience of all students. I will show that the model minority representation of Asian American success was a distortion of students’ actual learning experiences that diverted attention from school-level and societal-scale problems, whose symptoms included inequality among minority groups and shallow learning and limited achievement across groups. 27 In what follows, I situate my study of an urban school’s racialization of Asian American youth in relation to the discourse of color-blindness, before demonstrating how administrators, teachers and staff, as part of a race-making institution, engaged in mechanisms and practices that stratified Asian American and non-Asian students and constructed racial categories about them using interdependent and mutually influencing terms. These normative constructions were related, in different ways, to Whiteness.9 I close by arguing that they worked in conjunction to divert attention from structural limitations within and beyond the school that made both teaching and learning there a struggle.

#### **The widespread application of the model minority myth ignores the different cultures, ethnicities of Asians that differ from the “model” of an Asian.**

Wong 15 “A blessing with a curse: model minority ethnic students and the construction of educational success” Billy Wong Lecturer at University of Roehampton, MA (Hons), MRes, PhD, FHEA, Researches in education and career aspirations for young people, Social identity and sociality of education. ' Enterprising Science' (2012-2013) - Researcher and coordinator of the 'students and families' strand, 'ASPIRES' project (2009-2013) - Researcher on this 5-year ESRC (RES-179-25-0008) funded project.

The discourse of model minority is popularly used to acknowledge the educational and career success of minority ethnic groups. Lee (2009, p. 165) described it as ‘a racist discourse, which categorises, evaluates, ranks and differentiates between groups’. In the USA, these groups are typically associated with Asian Americans (Suzuki, 1977, 1989), particularly those with ancestral backgrounds from China, Korea and Japan. First mentioned by Peterson (1966) to describe the educational success of Japanese Americans, the term model minority was soon applied to all Asian American students, who are stereotyped as intelligent, studious and compliant (Lee, 2009). In public discourse, Asian Americans were elevated as a self-sufficient group which has integrated and ‘succeeded’ in American society, even though the statistics used to support these claims have been disputed (Suzuki, 2002). Although the model minority stereotype can support a self-fulfilling prophecy for some high achieving students (Lee, 2009), a body of literature has also cautioned about the potential dangers. These concerns can broadly be grouped into three themes: (1) justification of the existing education system, (2) the heterogeneity within and between ethnic groups and (3) the hidden injuries of high attainment.

First, critics have argued that the model minority thesis, which emerged during the US Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, was a political construction to defend the existing education system (Lee, 2009; Suzuki, 2002). The apparent educational success of Asian American students provided evidence/confidence that the US schooling system did not discriminate against minority ethnic groups. In turn, the model minority stereotype infers a deficit model for those who, in comparison, ‘underachieve’ and counters arguments made by racially disadvantaged groups (e.g. African Americans) about educational discrimination (Yu, 2006).

Second, the widespread application of model minority onto Asian American students is problematic because the ethnic groups which make up this broad category include a range of cultures/ethnicities and attainment levels (Li, 2005; Pang, Han, & Pang, 2011). Suzuki (2002) estimated that Asian Americans comprise of over 30 distinctive ethnic groups or subgroups, such as Hmong and Cambodians, who tend to underachieve (Ngo & Lee, 2007). In other words, the model minority identity, A blessing with a curse 731 commonly attributed to Asian Americans, can mask attainment variations within pan-ethnic groups.

Third, the model minority identity can dismiss students as individuals and present them with expected educational behaviours and performances, which can generate a range of pressures and ‘hidden injuries’ (Wong & Halgin, 2006). There are concerns that the model minority label can cast a shadow over the needs and supports of these ‘high achieving’ students and ignore areas of inequality and deeprooted disadvantages (Lee, 2009). The apparent success of Asian Americans (and those attributed as model minority more generally) may receive little or no support in terms of finance/bursary or targeted educational support programmes, such as affirmative action (Suzuki, 2002; Wong & Halgin, 2006). Furthermore, subtle forms of racism and discrimination, such as verbal insults and requests for ‘ethnic performances’ (e.g. speak ‘home’ language) from teachers or peers, can be downplayed since these issues appear to have a limited effect on their educational outcomes (Archer & Francis, 2007; Mau, 2014; Osajima, 1993).

#### **The Common Core curriculum ascribe the achievement gap between Asian and Black students to individual effort. This essentialist understanding is a smoke screen to mask the constrained educational opportunity for people of color, especially black people.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

I have shown that administrators, teachers, and other staff institutionalized the high degree of racial stratification at the school through formal and informal sorting mechanisms and through instructional practices that marginalized Black and Latino youth. Further, the stratification between Asian American and Black/Latino students was hierarchal. Although there was tremendous diversity of academic, social, and ethnic positions among Asian American students, as a group, they were privileged over Black and Latino students in teacher and staff representations of them, expectations for them, and interactions with them. The racialization of minority youth was highly differentiated, with the tropes of the Asian American model minority and oppositional and unengaged Black/Brown youth, as meaning-making anchors. The creation of racial categories was mutually co-constitutive; one was defined in relation to the other and these relationships were in turn related to the ideology of color-blindness. Students’ academic status and social competence were defined in differentiated racial terms. Staff tended to draw from a model minority trope to value Asian American students’ school efforts and interactions positively, often beyond individuals’ actual depth of learning or achievement on standardized tests. They tended to value Black and Latino students’ behavior and performance negatively, often below their demonstrated competence. Black youth were routinely labeled “resistant” and Latino youth were characterized as “invisible.” This process was often self-fulfilling, as many Black and Latino students became discouraged by the “achievement gap”between Asian American Americans and other racial minorities. Black and Latino students consequently expressed a lower sense of belonging to and ownership of the school relative to Asian American Americans, who had better access to school resources and were disproportionately represented in leadership activities. Buoyed by perceptions of themselves as “smart” and “engaged,” Asian Americans often internalized this identity and saw themselves on upward trajectories, even when in practical terms, many struggled with the content of higher level curricula. Asian Americans who defied model minority expectations sometimes faced academic and social exclusions similar to those experienced by Black and Latino students, though they were not disciplined at the same high levels. Very often, “Asian American” was understood by teachers and staff as a stand-in for White. Asian-ness and Blackness often served as racial foils, complicating the Black-White binary and the binary relationship of White supremacy/oppression of the racialized ‘Other.’ In this case, racial privilege was constrained. For example, the purchase on power that Asian Americans had as a privileged group at this school was conditional upon certain demands for normalized behavior and came at the extraordinary expense of educational equity. Seeing these constraints enables a greater view of intertwined contexts (of economic inequality, concentrated poverty, and societal disregard for “ghetto schools”) that shaped CHS as one institution among many. Moreover, the ability of the school to highlight Asian American students’ relative success created a distraction from the fundamentally low standards for teaching and learning that characterized this and other urban schools. The reproduction of the model minority myth in an urban school setting essentially functioned as a smokescreen for the profoundly constrained educational opportunity that was offered to poor students in a struggling school, in a marginalized community.

### Homogenization

#### **As refugees escaping the aftermath of America’s imperialist wars in Southeast Asia, Southeast Asian students and communities sought to achieve the America Dream by “pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps”. Yet, the realities of poverty, alienation, and racial violence revealed the America Dream is only a dream. Schools were not a place of liberation but alienation. The Myth, however, posit Southeast Asian refugees as “problem free high achievers”, which erased the spike in academic underachievement, school dropouts, and even suicide.**

Lee 17 et al (David Lee, a Professor of Educational Policy Studies at San Diego State Univeristy. Luke Duesbery, an Associate Professor in the School of Teacher Education. Peggy Han, ‎a Senior Analyst at Axiom Resource Management. Tashi Thumpten, a Master of Arts at San Diego State University. Chia S. Her, a graduate of educational policies at San Diego State University. Valerie Ooka Pang, a professor in the College of Education. “Academic Needs and Family Factors in the Education of Southeast Asian American Students: Dismantling the Model Minority Myth”; 2017/6/10; <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1154&context=jsaaea>; p4-12)

Osajima (2008) described the racially charged milieu of the mid-1960s when the Civil Rights movement was in full swing, resulting in race riots and Black militancy. During this time, the myth of the “model minority” began germinating vis-á-vis the accomplishments of one million Japanese and Chinese Americans who became models of success and eventually came to include other Asian subgroups including Korean, Vietnamese, and Filipino Americans (Osajima, 2008). One of the main motivations behind creating the “model minority” stereotype may have derived from the political motivation to create a dichotomous relationship pitting African Africans who received support through federally funded welfare programs against Asian Americans who had pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps (Petersen, 1971). This dynamic placed the burden of blame squarely on the shoulders of African Americans as the reason why there was such disparity in their educational and socioeconomic attainment. People who work hard do well in society. Those who do not achieve are not persistent or hard working. The backbone of the “model minority” rests on the unspoken premise that American society was not racist or discriminatory but built on meritocracy and fairness regardless of race, religion, or national origin (Osajima, 2008). The “model minority” stereotype reveals the intricate complexities behind such generalized notions of race and achievement. As a result, individuals have the unfair burden of being compared to these pre-established stereotypes rather than having full agency to construct their personal identities based on their own capabilities and character. Additionally, Osajima (2008) found that AAPI parents put a tremendous amount of pressure on their children to achieve in school without allowing for other avenues of success which naturally created resentment and angst among the younger generation. The passage of the 1965 Immigration Act was originally designed to exclusively increase European numbers in the United.States. by allowing 20,000 immigrants per country per year. Unintentionally there also was an increase in Asian immigrants (Odo, 2002; Osajima, 2008). From 1970 to 1980, the Asian population in America grew at a rapid pace from 1.4 million to 3.5 million (Osajima, 2008). The influx of AAPIs from diverse countries still did not change the narrow view which homogenized all AAPI ethnicities within one stereotype. Over time, greater numbers of AAPI students began matriculating into schools especially at top tier universities and became more visible and identifiable as academically successful which only added to the myth (Osajima, 2008). Yet, this perceived success was a “double-edged” sword in which Asian Americans were pigeonholed as only able to thrive in the academic arena and emphasized their single-minded focus on achievement (Zakeri, 2015). The strategic location of Southeast Asia in the Vietnam War era brought U.S. military interests in this region. As a result of war, many diverse Southeast Asian groups particularly the Vietnamese, Laotians (Lao and Hmong), Cambodians, and ethnic Chinese came involuntarily to the United States as refugees through special programs even though they did not meet visa or quota requirements (Kitano & Daniels, 2001). The “first wave” of Southeast Asian refugees during 1975 was composed primarily of the professional and intellectual class, while the “second wave” consisted predominately of laborers who were forced to scatter throughout the Unite States. despite the vast majority eventually migrating to the Sunbelt states, especially in California (Kitano & Daniels, 2001; Lam, 2015; Odo, 2002). From 1970 to 1980, the Southeast Asian population had grown from 20,000 Vietnamese to 415,235 Indochinese; 78 percent were Vietnamese, 16 percent Cambodians, and 6 percent Laotian, with numbers that kept growing in subsequent decades (Kitano & Daniels, 2001). The fallout from war, asylum in refugee camps, and the sudden relocation to the United States produced an adaptation process that can be described as a clash of cultures. Cultural pressures calling for Hmong women to marry during their childhood has had the effect of producing early school dropouts and the highest welfare rate among any group in the United States. despite these young women having had high academic achievement while in school (Kitano & Daniels, 2001). A 1985 Los Angeles Times article described an unusual case of cultural maladjustment in California when an apparent suicide by a Hmong man occurred due to the shame and confusion following a mere traffic violation (King & Holley, 1985). A window into the Hmong culture reveals that they did not have a written language until the arrival of missionaries in the 1950s and distrusted modern medicine, which placed heavy tolls on the younger generation in the United States to take care of their elders who were even fearful of driving or being driven in cars (King & Holley, 1985). The seeds of conflict and relocation to a new land produced the emergence of Southeast Asian American youth gangs especially among the Vietnamese (Lam, 2015). According to Reyes (2007), the “model minority” stereotype fails to take into account the complex identities of Southeast Asian Americans, especially among the younger generation, who try to distance themselves from the foreigner or “model” Asian image. The image of the “model minority” in contemporary times has undergone slight changes while still retaining political overtures. Omi and Winant (2015) argue that a “rearticulation” of the Asian American successful image has occurred due to the infusion of key elements of conservative political ideology. Conservative scholars such as Thomas Sowell described Asian American families as “better” because they work harder than other groups (Osajima, 2008). Such descriptions and perceptions denote the underlying power dynamics in the United States where minority groups are judged by those in power and either praised or chided based on generalizations. The political message underlying these portrayals is that the key determinant of success comes down to individual effort instead of structural problems within schools which affect every racial group differently (Wing, 2007). Some people may mistake success stories embedded in the “model minority” myth as reality when in fact these stories are typically not the norm. There are incidents where the high expectations placed upon AAPI students by their parents, teachers, and peers have caused stress and alienation leading to academic decline, school dropouts and even suicide especially among females (Kumashiro, 2008; Pang, 1991; Sue & Morishima,1982; Sue & Zane, 1985). In response to the needs of AAPI students, the Asian Pacific American Education Advisory (APAEA) Committee of the California State University (CSU) system was established by the chancellor in 1989 in order to provide any means of help for all enrolled AAPIs (Suzuki, 2002). This committee’s major findings revealed that AAPI students for whom English was a second language (ESL) were delayed from graduating by one or more years due to their lack of proficiency on English writing tests (Suzuki, 2002). The CSU schools provide ESL support but did not realize that AAPI students felt intimidated, unwelcomed, and excluded by the staff who were indifferent to their problems and needs, a phenomenon not only endemic to CSU campuses but other campuses around the country (Suzuki, 2002). AAPI ESL students were marginalized because of the “model minority” stereotype whereby all AAPIs were thought to be successful in their educational pursuits. Other racial groups find empowerment and a greater sense of efficacy in seeking help instead of being met with stereotypes and discouragement. Pang (1990) and Suzuki (2002) believe that AAPIs in the United States do not receive the help and encouragement to pursue majors in fields which require well-developed verbal or linguistic skills since the “model minority” stereotype suggests that they are “problem-free” high achievers. These scholars also believe that leadership programs are critical in developing communication and public-speaking skills which are needed to assume managerial positions in the workplace (Pang, 1990). Instead, these students are compelled to major in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) related fields; this impacts their low visibility for leadership roles at universities and other professions (Suzuki, 2002). Todd Gitlin (1982), a well-known sociologist, aptly stated that hegemonic ideologies “stand still, in a sense, by moving.” This statement describes the perpetual nature of the “model minority” stereotype, which has remained etched on the American consciousness since the 1960s despite major changes in the socio-political landscape (Osajima, 2008). This stereotype has moved from the pages of news articles to television, movies, and popular culture, which transforms connotation into reality; a reality that describes AAPIs as one-dimensional people focused on educational success. Yet the research literature demonstrates that the “model minority” is a myth rather than fact, especially when describing all Asian Americans. Many scholars (Lew, 2004; Ngo, 2006; Pang, Han, & Pang, 2011; Park, 2011; Wing, 2007) contend that AAPIs are neither a homogenous group nor collectively experience educational success. In fact, this term has caused greater divisions among AAPI subgroups in which certain ethnicities such as the Hmong who struggle educationally and economically are labeled as “Americanized” and “bad” as opposed to the “traditional” and “good” AAPI (Lee, 2005; Lew, 2006; Park, 2011). This term is not only detrimental to AAPIs who may underachieve but also to those who are successful because they are relegated to inhabit and manifest a caricaturized version of a stereotype in other peoples’ eyes. Hartlep (2014) suggested that teachers and school administrators need to better discern the fact that there are various Asian ethnicities with their own unique cultures, histories, and complex identities. These differences play a critical factor in how certain Asian Americans shape their lives in relation to the “model minority” myth. For instance, Lam’s (2015) research into Southeast Asian American and particularly Vietnamese American migration history reveal that the greater structural forces, such as poverty and the context of these refugee groups, produced youth gang members as they grew up in America. Such an identity, which is seemingly contradictory with the “model minority” stereotype, illustrates the multidimensional character of the Asian American identity which is infused with family history, class, as well as other cultural influences. Intergenerational conflicts also occur in many Southeast Asian families (Chhuon, Hudley, Brenner & Macias, 2010; Choi, He, & Harachi, 2008; Shah, 2007). Choi and her colleagues (2008) explained that many Cambodian American and Vietnamese American young people clash with their parents because they adopt more mainstream values. Parents were concerned because they lost so much of their familial authority when they migrated to the United States. The increase in intergenerational conflict leads to less parent-child bonding of both Vietnamese American and Cambodian American parents and their children. Many parents, no matter how long they had lived in the United States, saw the erosion of cultural values as a threat to the family (Choi et. al., 2008). For example, Choi and her colleagues found that about 43 percent of their Vietnamese American sample and 65 percent of the Cambodian American teenagers reported that they were involved in fighting, shoplifting, teasing, and staying out late at night. Shah (2007) studied members of Laotian American families and also found intergenerational conflict. However, she discovered there was an emphasis on family that permeated the lives of many Laotian youth. Numerous adolescents also valued family time and enjoyed cooking together, sharing meals, and speaking in Lao or Mien. Cambodian American adolescents also may not have the same social capital of other AAPI groups such as Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans (Eng, 2012). Eng found that many Cambodian American families did not reside in the same area for an extended period of time and this led to the lack of developing extensive social networks that could be of assistance to their children. In addition, parents were less likely to be involved in schools, however they did provide time for their children to do their homework and encouraged them to get good grades. Many families were members of families living in poverty therefore the students did not have the same opportunities for afterschool activities as their mainstream peers. Research has found that many Cambodian American, Laotian American, and Vietnamese American high school students are often not ready to enter college (Her, 2014). Her found that in the Early Assessment Program which is a collaboration of the California Department of Education, the California State Board of Education, and the California State University system have instituted a system where the readiness of eleventh graders in math and English is assessed. They take placement assessments and if they do not show proficiency on the college level, the students must take remedial courses in their freshmen year. For example, 64 percent of the Cambodian American students who took the exam in English in 2013 were identified as not college ready. Seventy-three percent of Laotian American students and forty-three percent of Vietnamese American high school students that same year were also found not prepared to enter college in English. Conflation of Perception and Statistics: College Graduation Rates Suzuki (2002) believed that the higher college graduation rates among AAPIS, 38 percent versus 20 percent of the U.S. population based on 1993 U.S. Census Bureau data, helped to substantiate the “model minority” myth. Also, the socioeconomic status of AAPIs had risen since the 1970s along with the immigration levels from economically prosperous Asian countries such as Japan, China, and Korea which caused some in the public to draw a false causal relationship between these two phenomena (Stokes, 1987; Wallace, 1982). This simplistic level of analysis belies the truth. Recent studies suggest that since the late 1980s, White Americans consistently received a higher rate of return on the same level of education than AAPIs (Cabezas & Kawaguchi, 1988; Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Hune & Chan, 1997; Jiobu, 1988; Wong & Nagasawa, 1991; Woo, 2000). For AAPI, the high level of education they had acquired was relatively problematic compared to their female counterparts because of the “glass” or “bamboo” ceiling (Hyun, 2005; Woo, 2000) whereby they would consistently lose out to similarly qualified White men in the workplace especially in management positions (Pang, Han, & Pang, 2011; Woo, 2000). For instance, at institutions of higher education, AAPI full-time faculty totaled 31,259 or 5 percent in 1997, yet there were only 2,736 or 2 percent in executive, administrative, or managerial positions (Number of Full-Time Faculty Members by Sex, Rank, and Racial and Ethnic Group, 2000; Characteristics of College Presidents, 1995, 2000). When certain positions are based purely on credentials, AAPIs seem to have a competitive chance at obtaining a job, yet when the position involves more abstract qualifications such as perceptions of leadership, AAPIs, especially men, fall to the wayside. The three-year estimate from 2007 through 2009 for Whites is the highest at $23,640. This is in comparison to Cambodian Americans and Laotian Americans at $16,000, Vietnamese Americans at $21,000 and black Americans at $16,300. White Americans earn substantially more than the AAPIs and Black American individuals. Cambodian Americans and Laotian Americans have some of the lowest person incomes of AAPIs (National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education, 2008). U.S. Census data demonstrate that a limited number of Southeast Asian Americans 25 years and older have earned a bachelor’s degree or graduate degree; 18 percent of Cambodian Americans, and 28.4 percent of Vietnamese Americans have attained this level of education. Disaggregated 2007–2009 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimate (2011) data shows that the educational attainment of Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese Americans are similar to African Americans and Latinos. A more comprehensive view of educational attainment of AAPIs can be found in Table 1. This information demonstrates the wide range of diversity within the AAPI community in regard to educational attainment of those who are 25 years and older. In 2000, 53.3 percent of Cambodian Americans, 40.6 percent of Laotian Americans, and 38.1 percent of Vietnamese Americans never graduated from high school compared to 19.6 percent of all U.S. adults (National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education, 2008). Figure 3 also depicts this data. The previous sections have provided a context for this research. The “model minority” myth is a powerful stereotype that has influenced how educators and others perceive Southeast Asian American and other AAPI students. The historical and financial status described characterizes the diversity within the AAPI student population.

#### **The plight of Southeast Asian gets obscured by the glamour of the Model Minority Myth, which homogenize all Asian subgroups as well to do high achievers.**

Li 05 (Guofang Li, a professor of second language and literacy education at Michigan State University; “Other People’s Success: Impact of the “Model Minority” Myth on Underachieving Asian Students in North America.”; 2005/6/7; <https://msu.edu/~liguo/file/KEDI%20Journal-Guofang%20Li%202005%5B1%5D.pdf>; p72-74)

Since the term “model minority” was coined, many scholars have argued that the term “model minority” itself is invalid and inaccurate. Main arguments include: 1) The methods of statistics analysis that supports the stereotype are often flawed; 2) The myth fails to recognize the increased evidence of Asian underachievement, dropout, and socio-economic gap; and 3) it fails to address the vast inter- and intra- group differences. Early in 1973, in their historical analysis of the model minority stereotype for the Chinese and the Japanese in America, Sue & Kitano concluded that although there appeared to be some kernel of truth in the stereotype, it was politically charged and highly problematic. They pointed out that the reported success of Chinese and Japanese Americans was a matter of record keeping as the methodology in many studies on Asian stereotypes was flawed. For example, many early studies on Asian stereotypes failed to address particular group characteristics (i.e., Asians tend to have more persons per household) that may influence the interpretation of results. Similarly, several other researchers challenged the “model minority” claim and presented a very different interpretation of the available socio-economic data on Asian Americans. They demonstrated that when the data on Asian Americans were disaggregated and analyzed in more sophisticated methods, the results showed greater disparity between Asians and their white counterparts in terms of educational, economical, and occupational achievement (see Chun, 1980; Suzuki, 1977, 1989, 2002). Research also indicates that the “model minority” stereotype does not reflect the increased evidence of Asian underachievement, dropout, and socio-economic gap. National Center for Educational Statistics (NECS) (2004) reports that Asians have lower achievement levels in reading, writing, and mathematics than their white counterparts. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading report card (grade 8) for 1998-2003 indicates that in some states Asians did not necessarily have higher achievement levels than Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians. In states such as Hawaii and Minnesota, the percentage of Asian American/Pacific Islanders at or above basic level in reading can be as low as 45% to 55%. In terms of mathematics, in some states (e.g., Hawaii), the percentage of Asian Pacific Islander students who are below basic level can be as high as 46%. In terms of educational attainment, data revealed that in 1990, 9.8% of adults of Asian Pacific descent had never progressed beyond 8th grade, compared with 6.2% of whites. Among Asian subgroups, the disparity was even greater: 54.9% of Hmongs, 40.7% Cambodians, and 33.9% Laotians had not completed the 5th grade (AAPIP, 1997). These statistics suggest that the “model minority” stereotypes are false representation of Asians as it ignores these intra- and inter-group differences. The growing Asian dropout rates also do not fit the “model minority” stereotype. Asian dropout rates vary in different groups. Southeast Asians are reported to have higher dropout rates than East Asians. In the Seattle School District in 1986-87, for example, the high school drop out rate of Vietnamese was 11.8% and that of other Southeast Asians was 17.9% compared to Japanese (5.1%) and Chinese (5.3%) (Wan, 1996). In the San Diego City Schools in California, for example, the 2001-2002 dropout rate of Pacific Islander was 13.0%; Indochinese was 9.8%; Filipino was 6.3%; and other Asian groups (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) were 5.8% (CED, 2004). Because of the “model minority” stereotype, many schools are reported to have not monitored or recorded the dropout rates among Asian Americans. As a result, some school districts do not realize that they are losing many Asian students (Walker-Moffat, 1995). In addition to Asian underachievement and their growing dropout rates, the increasing socioeconomic gap between Asians and whites also made the model minority stereotype problematic. According to U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, in the early 1990s, the poverty rates among Asian Pacific American groups were Hmong (64%), Cambodian (43%), Laotian (35%), Vietnamese 26%, Chinese 14%, and Korean (14%). These rates are much higher than that of the whites (9%) and that of the national average (13%). In addition to these inter-group differences, statistics also show that there exist vast intragroup differences. Within the highly acclaimed Chinese community, for example, only 30% have achieved middle class status while the majority remain members of the working or lower class, referred to as “downtown Chinese” who are manual labors with little English proficiency and limited education (Siu, 1998). The “model minority” myth fails to reflect not only these intra- or inter-group differences, but also the individual differences. In her ethnographic study of four Chinese families in Canada, Li (2002) revealed that due to different family environments, parental educational backgrounds and occupational choices, social contexts of reception, and interactions with schools, the children and their families achieved different levels of success and failure. The “model minority” stereotype is therefore a myth that is “a fictitious, unproven or illusory thing that circulates in contemporary society, the false representation and erroneous beliefs” (Min, 2003, p. 192). Many researchers posit that when such a false representation is widely accepted, the consequences become divisive and destructive (Min, 2003; Suzuki, 2002; WalkerMoffat, 1995). Why then does the stereotype still exist? What purposes does it serve for Asian students who do not fit the model? In the following section, I discuss how the “model minority” myth can pose a threat to the advancement of many underachieving Asian American students in schools.

#### **The widespread application of the model minority myth ignores the different cultures, ethnicities of Asians that differ from the “model” of an Asian.**

Wong 15 “A blessing with a curse: model minority ethnic students and the construction of educational success” Billy Wong Lecturer at University of Roehampton, MA (Hons), MRes, PhD, FHEA, Researches in education and career aspirations for young people, Social identity and sociality of education. ' Enterprising Science' (2012-2013) - Researcher and coordinator of the 'students and families' strand, 'ASPIRES' project (2009-2013) - Researcher on this 5-year ESRC (RES-179-25-0008) funded project.

The discourse of model minority is popularly used to acknowledge the educational and career success of minority ethnic groups. Lee (2009, p. 165) described it as ‘a racist discourse, which categorises, evaluates, ranks and differentiates between groups’. In the USA, these groups are typically associated with Asian Americans (Suzuki, 1977, 1989), particularly those with ancestral backgrounds from China, Korea and Japan. First mentioned by Peterson (1966) to describe the educational success of Japanese Americans, the term model minority was soon applied to all Asian American students, who are stereotyped as intelligent, studious and compliant (Lee, 2009). In public discourse, Asian Americans were elevated as a self-sufficient group which has integrated and ‘succeeded’ in American society, even though the statistics used to support these claims have been disputed (Suzuki, 2002). Although the model minority stereotype can support a self-fulfilling prophecy for some high achieving students (Lee, 2009), a body of literature has also cautioned about the potential dangers. These concerns can broadly be grouped into three themes: (1) justification of the existing education system, (2) the heterogeneity within and between ethnic groups and (3) the hidden injuries of high attainment.

First, critics have argued that the model minority thesis, which emerged during the US Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, was a political construction to defend the existing education system (Lee, 2009; Suzuki, 2002). The apparent educational success of Asian American students provided evidence/confidence that the US schooling system did not discriminate against minority ethnic groups. In turn, the model minority stereotype infers a deficit model for those who, in comparison, ‘underachieve’ and counters arguments made by racially disadvantaged groups (e.g. African Americans) about educational discrimination (Yu, 2006).

Second, the widespread application of model minority onto Asian American students is problematic because the ethnic groups which make up this broad category include a range of cultures/ethnicities and attainment levels (Li, 2005; Pang, Han, & Pang, 2011). Suzuki (2002) estimated that Asian Americans comprise of over 30 distinctive ethnic groups or subgroups, such as Hmong and Cambodians, who tend to underachieve (Ngo & Lee, 2007). In other words, the model minority identity, A blessing with a curse 731 commonly attributed to Asian Americans, can mask attainment variations within pan-ethnic groups.

Third, the model minority identity can dismiss students as individuals and present them with expected educational behaviours and performances, which can generate a range of pressures and ‘hidden injuries’ (Wong & Halgin, 2006). There are concerns that the model minority label can cast a shadow over the needs and supports of these ‘high achieving’ students and ignore areas of inequality and deeprooted disadvantages (Lee, 2009). The apparent success of Asian Americans (and those attributed as model minority more generally) may receive little or no support in terms of finance/bursary or targeted educational support programmes, such as affirmative action (Suzuki, 2002; Wong & Halgin, 2006). Furthermore, subtle forms of racism and discrimination, such as verbal insults and requests for ‘ethnic performances’ (e.g. speak ‘home’ language) from teachers or peers, can be downplayed since these issues appear to have a limited effect on their educational outcomes (Archer & Francis, 2007; Mau, 2014; Osajima, 1993).

### Impacts

#### **There are three impacts to the Model Minority Myth.**

#### **1. The psychological violence of Asian Americans**

#### **2. The oppression of other minorities that white supremacy justifies through the myth**

#### **3. The resentment between minority groups**

장 ’93 [1993, 장 Robert S. is a Professor of Law and an Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, He also serves on the advisory board of Berkeley’s Asian American Law Journal. “Toward an Asian American Legal Scholarship: Critical Race Theory, Post-Structuralism, and Narrative Space”, 81 Cal. L. Rev. 1241]

B. The Model Minority Myth This history of discrimination and violence, as well as the contemporary problems of Asian Americans, are obscured by the portrayal of Asian Americans as a "model minority." Asian Americans are portrayed as "hardworking, intelligent, and successful." 7 1 This description represents a sharp break from past stereotypes of Asians as "sneaky, obsequious, or inscrutable."'74 But, the dominant culture's75 belief in the "model minority" allows it to justify ignoring the unique discrimination faced by Asian Americans. The portrayal of Asian Americans as successful permits the general public, government officials, and the judiciary to ignore or marginalize the contemporary needs of Asian Americans. An early articulation of the model minority theme76 appeared in U.S. News & World Report in 1966: At a time when Americans are awash in worry over the plight of racial minorities One such minority, the nation's 300,000 Chinese-Americans, is winning wealth and respect by dint of its own hard work. In any Chinatown from San Francisco to New York, you discover youngsters at grips with their studies.... Still being taught in Chinatown is the old idea that people should depend on their own efforts-not a welfare check-in order to reach America's "promised land." Visit "Chinatown U.S.A." and you find an important racial minority pulling itself up from hardship and discrimination to become a model of self-respect and achievement in today's America." This "model minority" theme has become a largely unquestioned assumption about current social reality.7 " At its surface, the label "model minority" seems like a compliment. However, once one moves beyond this complimentary fagade, one can see the label for what it is-a tool of oppression which works a dual harm by (1) denying the existence of present-day discrimination against Asian Americans and the present-day effects of past discrimination, and (2) legitimizing the oppression of other racial minorities and poor whites. That Asian Americans are a "model minority" is a myth. But the myth has gained a substantial following, both inside and outside the Asian American community.79 The successful inculcation of the model minority myth has created an audience unsympathetic to the problems of Asian Americans. Thus, when we try to make our problems known, our complaints of discrimination or calls for remedial action are seen as unwarranted and inappropriate. They can even spark resentment. For example, Professor Mitsuye Yamada tells a story about the reactions of her Ethnic American Literature class to an anthology compiled by some outspoken Asian American writers: [One student] ~~blurted~~ out that she was offended by its militant tone and that as a white person she was tired of always being blamed for the oppression of all the minorities. I noticed several of her classmates' eyes nodding in tacit agreement. A discussion of the "militant" voices in some of the other writings we had read in the course ensued. Surely, I pointed out, some of these other writings have been just as, if not more, militant as the words in this introduction? Had they been offended by those also but failed to express their feelings about them? To my surprise, they said they were not offended by any of the Black American, Chicano or Native American writings, but were hard-pressed to explain why when I asked for an explanation. A little further discussion revealed that they "understood" the anger expressed by the Blacks and Chicanos and they "empathized" with the frustrations and sorrow expressed by the Native American. But the Asian Americans?? [sic] Then finally, one student said it for all of them: "It made me angry. Their anger made me angry, because I didn't even know the Asian Americans felt oppressed. I didn't expect their anger." 80 This story illustrates the danger of the model minority myth: it renders the oppression of Asian Americans ~~invisible~~. This invisibility has harmful consequences, especially when those in positions of power cannot see: To be out of sight is also to be without social services. Thinking Asian Americans have succeeded, government officials have sometimes denied funding for social service programs designed to help Asian Americans learn English and find employment. Failing to realize that there are poor Asian families, college administrators have sometimes excluded Asian-American students from Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP), which are intended for all students from low-income families. 81 In this way, the model minority myth diverts much-needed attention from the problems of many segments of the Asian American community, particularly the Laotians, Hmong, Cambodians, and Vietnamese who have poverty rates of 67.2%, 65.5%, 46.9%, and 33.5%, respectively.82 These poverty rates compare with a national poverty rate of 9.6%.83 In addition to government officials, this distorted view of the current status of Asian Americans has infected at least one very influential member of the judiciary and legal academy. At a recent conference of the Association of American Law Schools, Judge Posner asked two rhetorical questions: "Are Asians an oppressed group in the United States today? Are they worse off for lacking sizable representation on the faculties of American law schools?"84 His questions are rhetorical because he already has answers, with figures to back them up: "In 1980, JapaneseAmericans had incomes more than 32% above the national average income, and Chinese-Americans had incomes more than 12% above the national average; Anglo-Saxons and Irish exceeded the average by 5% and 2%, respectively."" He also points out that "in 1980, 17.8% of the educational investment as do their white counterparts.94 A closer look, then, at Japanese Americans, Posner's strongest case, reveals flaws in his meritocratic thesis when individual income, geographic location, educational attainment, and hours worked are considered. In 1980, Japanese American men in California earned incomes comparable to those of white men, but "they did so only by acquiring more education (17.7 years compared to 16.8 years for white men twenty-five to forty-four years old) and by working more hours (2,160 hours compared to 2,120 hours for white men in the same age category)."95 The income disparities for men96 from other Asian American groups are more ~~glaring~~.9 7 Thus, the answer to Posner's first question98 is yes-Asian Americans are an oppressed group in America. To accept the myth of white population aged 25 and over had completed four or more years of college, compared to 32.9% of the Asian-American population. '8 6 The unspoken thesis in Judge Posner's comments, which has been stated by other proponents of meritocracy, is "that, when compared to Whites, there are equal payoffs for qualified and educated racial minorities; education and other social factors, but not race, determine earnings."87 If Posner is right, Asian Americans should make as much as their white counterparts, taking into account "education and other social factors, but not race." Yet when we look more carefully at the statistics, we find some interesting anomalies which belie the meritocratic thesis. First, Posner's reliance on median family income88 as evidence for lack of discriminatory effects in employment is misleading. It does not take into account the fact that Asian American families have more workers per household than do white families;89 in fact, "more Asian American women are compelled to work because the male members of their families earn such low wages." 90 Second, the use of national income averages is misleading because most Asian Americans live in geographical locations which have both higher incomes and higher costs of living.91 Wage disparities become apparent when geographic location is considered. 92 Third, the fact that Asian Americans have a higher percentage of college graduates does not mean that they have economic opportunities commensurate to their level of education. Returns on education rather than educational level provide a better indicator of the existence of discrimination.93 Many Asian Americans have discovered that they, like other racial minorities, do not get the same return for their the model minority is to participate in the oppression of Asian Americans. In addition to hurting Asian Americans, the model minority myth works a dual harm by hurting other racial minorities and poor whites who are blamed for not being successful like Asian Americans. "African-Americans and Latinos and poor whites are told, ~~'look~~ at those Asians-anyone can make it in this country if they really try.' "" This blame is justified by the meritocratic thesis supposedly proven by the example of Asian Americans." ° This blame is then used to campaign against government social services for these "undeserving" minorities and poor whites 01 and against affirmative action.10 2 To the extent that Asian Americans accept the model minority myth, we are complicitous in the oppression of other racial minorities and poor whites. This blame and its consequences create resentment against Asian Americans among African Americans, Latinos, and poor whites.103 This resentment, fueled by poor economic conditions, can flare into anger and violence. Asian Americans, the "model minority," serve as convenient scapegoats, as Korean Americans in Los Angeles discovered during the 1992 riots." 4 Many Korean Americans "now ~~view~~ themselves as 'human shields' in a complicated racial hierarchy," caught between "the racism of the white majority and the anger of the black minority."1'0 The model minority myth plays a key role in establishing a racial hierarchy which denies the oppression of Asian Americans while simultaneously legitimizing the oppression of other racial minorities and poor whites.

#### **Racism have shifted from the biological paradigm to incorporate cultural ideologies. This creates the paradoxical identity of the Model Minority, who is simultaneously the unassimilable other and yet the high unassimilable. This allows elites to choose a Asian group to sustain white domination by pitting oppressed groups against each other.**

Liu 17 (Wen Liu, a graduate student in Philosophy at The City University of New York “Cruising Borders, Unsettling Identities: Toward A Queer Diasporic Asian America”; 2017/6/2; <http://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3040&context=gc_etds>; p14-28)

The heightened anti-Chinese sentiment recently shocked the Asian American communities with hateful graffiti signs spray-painted in San Francisco neighborhood writing “No More Chinese” (Hamilton, 2015). The Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission also reported that hate crimes against Chinese Americans rose from only one case in 2014 to 11 cases in 2015 in the Los Angeles County, making Chinese Americans the group with the largest increase of hate crime incidents besides Muslim Americans (Wang, 2016). The xenophobic expressions, particularly against Chinese in the US, are certainly not new. During the peak of the financial crisis at 2008, White supremacist groups and right wing politicians framed Chinese immigrants and China the nation-state as the job stealers and the primary problem that contributed to the American economic downturn. Since 2015, Donald Trump’s presidential campaign, which was largely built on the image of China as an economic enemy and a foreign military threat alongside “ISIS” has triggered a spike in anti-Asian hate crimes overall (Yam, 2017). While Asian Americans, particular Chinese Americans, were constructed as the hateful and threatening Other, mainstream columnists such as Nicolas Kristof from the New York Times continue to fuel the model minority myth through highlighting the educational and middle-class successes of Asian Americans. The new discourses of model minority, highlighted in Kristof’s (Oct 10, 2015) article “The Asian Advantage,” no longer solely rely on the biological paradigm of the smart Asian brain or IQ test scores, since such arguments can be easily traced back to the biological racial hierarchies sanctioned by natural sciences that are deemed to be backwards and inappropriate. Instead, the newer discourses, incorporate cultural ideologies such as the hardworking Confucian values and even the sociological models of post-1965 immigrant policy to explain this highly selected population of “disproportionately doctors, research scientists and other highly educated professionals.” This “Asian advantage” is often supported by empirical psychological studies of cultural differences and perceptions (e.g., Nisbett, 2009) to explain how success to Asian Americans and White Americans is conceptually disparate, where Asian Americans are taught to always strive toward higher academic achievement through hard work and never feel content with themselves, as in Kristof’s own words, “Asian-American kids are allowed no excuse for getting B’s — or even an A-. The joke is that an A- is an ‘Asian F.’” These awfully familiar narratives in the contemporary discussion of Asian Americanness, though avoid attributing differences to biological race, genes, or intelligence, are culturally essentializing and serving the Orientalist function of contrasting Asianness with Americanness, marking Asianness as the ultimate cultural other yet at the same time highly assimilable. As historian Ellen Wu articulates, Asian Americanness has been marked as “definitely not-white” through institutional exclusion but also “definitely not-black” based on its highly assimilable capacity (2014, p. 2; emphasis original), bouncing off Whiteness and Blackness across different moments of history. We thus must understand the construction of Asian Americanness as is neither singular nor linear, but inscribed with “heterogeneity, hybridity, multiplicity” (Lowe, 1996, p. 60)To combat the model minority myth, progressive Asian American scholars and activists usually attempt to tackle the monolithic portrayal through the route of representation, emphasizing how Asian Americans are a diverse population (e.g., Aung and Chun, 2015; Kang, 2015), including the comparatively less economically and educationally advantageous ethnics subgroups of Cambodians, Laotians, Hmong, Burmese, and Vietnamese. Therefore, in their logic, the stereotypical portrayal of Asian Americans is a result of sampling error that requires a more accurate representation of the racial group. However, these arguments on representation often end up becoming tautological and theoretically weak, and thus contradict the liberal discourse of visibility and representation that sustains the category of Asian Americanness in the first place. One might argue that there are poorer Asian Americans so model minority myth is untrue, but another might say that there are successful Asian Americans and they deserve rights and citizenship. This paradoxical logic is particularly evident in the affirmative action debates, where Asian American academic achievement becomes a highly contested discourse, splitting between different conceptualizations of who can rightfully represent the population. On one hand, opponents of affirmative action often deploy colorblind rhetoric to argue that Asian Americans with high academic achievements should have the right to enter elite universities over other racial minorities who have lower academic achievements. On the other hand, proponents of affirmative action disagree with the simplistic portrayal of the population, and highlight how Asian American subgroups, particularly the Pacific Islanders who receive lower level of education, are entitled to the rights of admission based on the policy (Park and Liu, 2014). These contradictory and paradoxical discourses of the Asian American success are not purely external, but circulate within the Asian American communities, as polls of Asian Americans have consistently shown a 50/50 split in their view on affirmative action (Ong, 2003). The case of affirmative action illustrates how Asian Americanness is deployed as a moving target in US racial politics utilized by the elites to reinforce colorblind politics and White domination, picking and choosing the appropriate ethnic subgroup to represent the entire population whenever it is convenient. While the liberal discourse that addresses Asian Americanness as a racial and cultural representation has traditionally served to strengthen visibility and demand group-based rights, it also reveals the instability of the racial category itself. Furthermore, the culturally essentialist depictions of Asian values are not only perpetuated by white interests, but also Asian American elites, who have spent a fortune in reproducing the stereotypes and profiting from them. The popularity of Fresh Off the Boat, the ABC TV 2015 series based on Eddie Huang’ memoir, telling the typical story of an immigrant family and the American Dream, and Amy Chua’s (2011) Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother, emphasizing the Chinese values of success, shows the public’s obsession of Asian Americans as the model minority, as well as the communities’ own investment in cultivating these archaic yet partially advantageous representations. Therefore, the myth of model minority is not an inaccuracy of representation, but a challenge to the assumption that there is such a coherent racial population to be represented in the first place. The abiding myth about Asian Americans serves as a powerful metaphor in the virtue of American multiculturalism: its tolerance, inclusion of differences, and absence of racial conflicts. To move away from the construction of Asian Americanness as truthful population that can be scientifically measured and examined necessitates a rearticulation of Asian Americanness as a raced, gendered, classed, and sexualized biopolitic that produces physical and imaginary boundaries of nation, geography, and citizenship. Moreover, it demands an elevation of scale in Asian American inquiry from the domestic and national to the transnational and diasporic, as well as from the individual and demographic to the historical and structural. Particularly, in the current neoliberal landscape, multiculturalism has been successfully appropriated by the American nation-state to legitimatize its global capitalist leadership. How Asian Americanness is deployed not only to mediate US racial relations but also the geopolitical relations between the US and Asia Pacific thus becomes a central concern in this dissertation.

#### **The model minority myth not only makes it extremely difficult for Asian students who are struggling in the academic field, but also paint negative images of over achievement and excessive competition.**

Jo 12 “Asian American college students’ mathematics success and the model minority stereotype” Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Columbia University.

The model minority stereotype has persisted into the 21st century, without any signs of dissipating (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kuwai, 2005; Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Yu, 2006). Asian Americans are still heralded as motivated, self-sufficient achievers who support the achievement ideology and are evidence that success in today’s society is color-blind and non-discriminatory. How does this seemingly positive stereotype affect Asian American students?

A major misconception that the model minority stereotype suggests is that Asian Americans are a homogeneously successful group. However, the reality is that Asian Americans are a very diverse group in many aspects – ethnicity, culture, academic achievement, socioeconomic status, educational attainment, generational status, family values, and median household income (Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Because Asian Americans as a whole are assumed to be academically successful, the many Asian American students that do struggle are not able to get the help and support that they may need in school, whether it be because they feel that by asking for help, they are not living up to the expectations of the stereotype or because they feel that they will be bringing shame to their family (Lee, 1994; 2009). Additionally, though the stereotype appears to be a compliment to Asian Americans, it is often mixed with negative images of over achievement, excessive competition, and social awkwardness and isolation (Cheung, et al., 2005).

#### **Research proves that negative stereotypes negatively affects the performances of Asians**

Jo 12 “Asian American college students’ mathematics success and the model minority stereotype” Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Columbia University.

Research shows that negative stereotypes when made salient, negatively affect performance. What about positive stereotypes? Do positive stereotypes, such as the model minority stereotype, then affect performance in a positive manner? Are Asian American students, under the model minority stereotype, at risk of stereotype threat? In 1999, Shih, Pittinsky, and Ambady conducted an investigation of Asian American women. The sample of women were divided into three groups and asked to take a quantitative test. In one group, their female identity was made salient, in another, their Asian identity was made salient and in the control group, no identity was made salient. The researchers hypothesized that the group in which the female identity was made salient would underperform compared to the control group and the group in which the Asian identity was made salient would outperform the control group. The results were as predicted. The group of females in which their Asian identity was made salient achieved the highest performance score, then the control group, followed by the group in which a female identity was made salient. The negative stereotype associated with women and mathematics appeared to inhibit mathematics performance and the positive stereotype associated with Asians and mathematics reversed the effect. However, an investigation by Cheryan and Bodenhausen in 2000 found that the positive stereotypes that people commonly hold about Asians’ mathematical skills can inhibit performance and created the potential for “choking” under the pressure of high expectation (Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000). In an effort to live up to these inaccurate expectations, many Asian students are unable to be as academically successful as they could without the pressure. What factors account for these contradicting results? Cheryan & Bodenhausen refer to a study by Baumeister et al. (1985) to explain their results: Shih et al. (1999) chose to manipulate identity salience subtly and indirectly; the questions chosen made no reference to how the participant felt others viewed the group, therefore these questions were unlikely to create a sense of public expectations for performance (Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000). In the study by Cheryan & Bodenhausen, the questions chosen to manipulate identity salience were changed to make public, group related expectancies obvious. As a result, the group in which the Asian identity was made salient did not perform as well as the control group. The nature of this dissertation study reveal that the stereotype, “all Asians are good at math” is very much a public expectation of the group and is one that nearly all of the Asian American students in this study were aware of. As a result, one could expect the results of Cheryan & Bodenhausen to be more applicable to Asian American students today: public, group related expectations leading to inhibited mathematics performance.

### Antiblackness

#### **False stereotypes of Asian Americans were used as a weapon to marginalize other racial minority students**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

Asian American students attend increasingly diverse schools, yet scholarship on their experiences typically considers them in isolation, leading to a group-level emphasis rather than a focus on the relational processes that give ‘Asian’ meaning as a social and educational construction and social location. Building on theories of racialization, I study an urban context where multi-group ethnic and racial relations are negotiated. My dissertation examines how Asian American and Black students, as well as staff, engaged in discourses and practices that reproduced **patterns of inequality among groups of students of color** in a high-poverty school that was 99% non-White, but where Asian Americans comprised almost half the student body. This research clarifies how positive but conditional notions of Asian-ness were created through and against negative ideas of Blackness, in particular. Staff generally contrasted engaged Asian American students **with oppositional Black youth**, despite the diversity of students’ aspirations and performance. While some contested these constructions, many students acted in ways that reinforced them. These biased perceptions ultimately led to greater support for Asians American students, who expressed a stronger sense of belonging to and ownership of the school than non- Asians. My work examines formal and informal stratification among racial minority youth and elucidates the ideologies and mechanisms that normalized it. Despite their academic heterogeneity, urban Asian American students were **privileged** through a re-inscription of the **model minority myth that imputes a cultural basis** for Asian American educational success, while Black students were interpreted through negative stereotypes and expectations. This dissertation highlights the costs of Asian American students’ privilege in this context and draws attention to the continued marginalization of racial minority students. It argues that the model minority trope and the trope of the oppositional and deficient Black subject were bound together in the schooling of Asian American and Black students. It reveals the **power of the myth to shape** how all students are **positioned in a racial hierarchy**, thus giving insight into racialization itself.

#### **Asian Americans were painted as the “successful students” of the society compared to the Black/Brown urban ghetto. This was used as a tool to justify how the failure from people of color was brought upon themselves.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

I found that teachers and staff generally contrasted ‘engaged’ Asian American students with ‘resistant’ Black and ‘invisible’ and educationally deficient Latino youth, despite two important educational realities. The first was the remarkable diversity of students’ academic aspirations and performance. It is important to note that Asian American students outpaced their Black and Latino peers in formal indices of academic achievement, yet they were well represented on every point of the school’s academic and social status spectrums. Moreover, even those Asian American students who were considered successful students according to the local cultural context of expectations regarding academic achievement did not, in objective terms, consistently demonstrate academic strength and intellectual depth of learning.

The second notable reality of the educational setting was its **environment of taken-forgranted inequality** and school failure. Despite their academic heterogeneity and educational difficulties, **Asian American youth were encountered** and assessed **through a re-inscription of the model minority myth** that positioned Asian Americans as an **exemplar group** in what was **popularly imagined** as a Black/Brown urban ghetto, a site of failure (Leonardo & Hunter, 2007). Resigned acceptance of both urban inequality and low expectations shaped adult and youth’s common-sense understandings of race at both the individual and organizational level. Ultimately, this exacerbated the severely compromised learning experience of all students. I will show that the model minority representation of Asian American success was a distortion of students’ actual learning experiences that diverted attention from school-level and societal-scale problems, whose symptoms included inequality among minority groups and shallow learning and limited achievement across groups. 27

In what follows, I situate my study of an urban school’s racialization of Asian American youth in relation to the discourse of color-blindness, before demonstrating how administrators, teachers and staff, as part of a race-making institution, engaged in mechanisms and practices that stratified Asian American and non-Asian students and constructed racial categories about them using interdependent and mutually influencing terms. These normative constructions were related, in different ways, to Whiteness.9 I close by arguing that they worked in conjunction to divert attention from structural limitations within and beyond the school that made both teaching and learning there a struggle.

Current school curriculum and classroom interactions fails to account the uneven nature among different groups. School’s efforts for a “multicultural paradigm” only builds into white normativity because teachers are unwilling to engage themselves.

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

The color-blindness of this perspective does not equate with blindness to cultural differences, but accords with a superficial emphasis on ethnic culture and multicultural values. Diverse cultural norms provide a more obvious, and less institutionally critical, explanation for racial inequality across social domains than does the “broad social practices” alluded to by Lopez.

At Central High School (CHS), some educators **refused to recognize race altogether** while preferring to discuss culture (e.g. “Asian culture,” “Chinese culture,” or “Black culture”) in lieu of race. Teachers and staff tended to **distance themselves** from student outcomes that evinced **racial inequality** and instead championed the tenet of multiculturalism as an affirmation of the school’s valuing of cultural diversity. However, as Leonardo and Hunter (2007) note, “the very **presence of multiculturalism is evidence of a reaction to a White normativity** in school curricula, administrative structures and classroom interactions” (p. 263). In other words, a school’s effort to raise the profile of a multicultural paradigm is generated by the need to recognize what is excluded by White dominance and privilege in the first place.

Education and race scholars Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) maintain that the increasingly popular multicultural paradigm is limited in its celebration of difference, because it **fails to account for the intrinsically uneven nature** of difference among groups:

In the schooling of multiracial minority students at CHS, the ‘difference’ of Asian-ness (attributes socially constructed as Asian) translated into educational opportunities and experiences that were denied to Black and Latino students, whose racialized difference could not as readily be linked to Whiteness through the vehicle of the model minority ideal. I argue that Asian American students were “**racially made**” (i.e. socially constructed as Asian racial subjects) not in a vacuum, but through and **against the racialization of Black and Latino youth** (and vice versa). This “making” occurred through the daily practices of teachers and staff, as well as students.

#### **Asian and Blacks are only the flip side of the same coin.**

Nakagawa 13 [7/14/13, Scott Nakagawa community builder, Japanese American, and troublemaker, “I Ask You, What If Trayvon Martin Was Asian?,” <http://www.racefiles.com/2013/07/14/so-i-ask-you-what-if-trayvon-martin-was-asian/>]

In fact, imagining the victim of this tragedy as Asian American makes our society’s negative stereotyping of African Americans especially apparent. Why? Because Asian Americans are subject to a different kind of stereotype that was created as a foil to the racist, victim-blaming narrative of African Americans that continues to serve as a justification for attacking the welfare state. That stereotype casts Asian Americans as the model minority: a group of mathletic (though not athletic) super-achievers, overcoming prejudice and economic disadvantage, not by protest, but through hard work and uncritical patriotism. The model minority myth popped up in the media during the Civil Rights era in a 1966 New York Times Magazine article entitled, “Success Story: Japanese American Style.” Until then, Asian Americans were mostly labeled as evil outsiders in order to justify immigration limits and Japanese American internment during World War II. But in the midst of Black uprisings and protests, the article recast Japanese Americans as a group that had quietly and politely pulled itself up by its bootstraps in spite of terrible obstacles (like being put in a concentration camp because, well, you’re making white people nervous ‘cuz you’re Japanese American). The article made the claim that Japanese Americans have a strong culture that values work, family and education which prevents J.A.s from becoming a “problem minority.” Problem minority? W.T.F! But the idea caught on, and over time, the myth expanded to Asians in general. By the 1980s, Ronald Reagan twice publicly congratulated Asian Americans for their success, while smacking down African Americans for supposed dependency on welfare. And in a “some of my best friends are Black” move, Reagan used Black conservative Alan Keyes as a wing man in this strategy. Reagan’s crazy false logic says that if Asian Americans can succeed in spite of terrible obstacles, then persistent poverty among African Americans must be a product of a defect in Black culture or Black people. And while Reagan was praising Asian Americans, the architects of the Reagan revolution were confounding attempts on the part of Black people to achieve success by ginning up anti-Black racism in order to attack welfare. I’d call Reagan a genius, except, well, that would be a compliment, and I just can’t go there. Nowadays, the model minority myth is just accepted as truth, even by lots of Asians. In fact, many Asian Americans commit what they presume to be a victimless crime by taking cover behind the myth of the model minority. But there are victims, and they aren’t only non-Asians. The victims include 54% of Asian American kids who claim to be bullied at school, at least in part, as a result of stereotyping. And, it includes the members of Asian ethnic groups that haven’t been so successful, such as Bangladeshis, Laotians, Cambodians and the Hmong, all of whom have lower per capita incomes than African Americans. The model minority myth marginalizes, even makes invisible, their suffering. But the greatest danger of anti-Asian stereotyping, whether it is “positive” or not, is that it continues to hold Asian Americans separate from other people. And this makes us vulnerable to the flip side of the myth of Asian exceptionalism: the idea of Asian Americans as a threat to “American” jobs. It was this kind of stereotyping that led to the murder of Vincent Chin, a Chinese American man who was beaten to death by displaced auto workers in 1982 during the U.S. vs. Japan auto wars. And, BTW, neither assailant ever did any jail time. And today, as China’s rise as an economic superpower inspires anxiety, even hatred, of the Chinese, the specter of more Vincent Chin’s ought to get us wondering, is it ever a good thing to be used, no matter what the pay off? Today, in the wake of the innocent verdict in the George Zimmerman case, I feel compelled to add this: The stereotypes that afflict African Americans and Asian Americans may be very different, but they are really flip sides of one card; a race card if you will. And it that card is being played against us all the time. We would be wise to recognize this, and work together to destroy these stereotypes of the model and problem minority, or future Trayvon Martin’s may, indeed, be Asian.

#### **The institution the disproportionate placement of minorities as a natural outcome from the students instead of institutional decision-making thus, leading to low expectations from the teachers to the students and vice versa.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

At CHS, the tracking of students into Advanced Placement (AP), “regular,” and Special Education classes, into academies (which I will discuss shortly), and into school-supported leadership positions contributed to racial hierarchy, because these racially stratified tracks were differently valued. Asian American students vastly predominated in AP classes, Leadership class, and the science-oriented academy, while non-Asians were much more likely to be enrolled in “regular” classes, to be given Special Education designation, and to participate in the arts academy or in no academy at all. These school spaces had unequal statuses. Students in different tracks developed unequal levels of entitlement and institutional belonging and they demonstrated unequal academic outcomes**.**

Moreover**, the disproportionate placement of Black and Latino students** in poorl functioning classrooms resulted in the academic isolation of those students. While the racially disproportionate character of such classes was visibly apparent, administrators and teachers saw this as a **natural outcome of student-related**, rather than **institutional decision-making**. Poorly functioning classes were a reality in practically every department at the school. These were settings where students had more control of the classroom than did teachers and where academic rigor and deep learning characterized an exceptionally infrequent experience. Often, Asian American students were the minority in these types of classrooms, even though they comprised almost half of the school’s student body. Teachers and staff routinely expected little from students in these spaces, and alternately, students expected low quality instruction from their teachers. For example, a teacher I spoke with casually referred to his role in one of these classes as “baby-sitting.” Security guards joked about how predictably they were called to break up fights in such classrooms, and substitute teachers dreaded being assigned to them.

A consistent feature of academically marginal spaces was the frequent assertion by Black students in particular that they were recipients of racism and the corresponding attempt by teachers and staff to counter these claims with de-racialized interpretations of classroom interactions and student outcomes.i I observed a poorly functioning science class where assertions of racism and Black identity were countered by the teacher’s color-blind stance. The following excerpt from my field notes illustrates a commonplace scene in which teachers simultaneously expected and condemned poor behavior from students, whose failings were routinely highlighted. The class composition ranged by period, but was roughly 75% African American, 10% Asian American, and 15% Latino.

#### **The model minority myth marginalizes Black and Latino youth, functioning as a smoke screen to limit educational opportunities for the oppressed.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

I have shown that administrators, teachers, and other staff institutionalized the **high degree of racial stratification** at the school through formal and informal sorting mechanisms and through instructional practices that m**arginalized Black and Latino youth**. Further, the stratification between Asian American and Black/Latino students was hierarchal. Although there was tremendous diversity of academic, social, and ethnic positions among Asian American students, as a group, they were privileged over Black and Latino students in teacher and staff representations of them, expectations for them, and interactions with them. The racialization of minority youth was highly differentiated, with the tropes of the Asian American model minority and oppositional and unengaged Black/Brown youth, as meaning-making anchors. The creation of racial categories was mutually co-constitutive; one was defined in relation to the other and these relationships were in turn related to the ideology of color-blindness. Students’ academic status and social competence were defined in differentiated racial terms. Staff tended to draw from a model minority trope to value Asian American students’ school efforts and interactions positively, often beyond individuals’ actual depth of learning or achievement on standardized tests. They tended to value Black and Latino students’ behavior and performance negatively, often below their demonstrated competence. Black youth were routinely labeled “resistant” and Latino youth were characterized as “invisible.” This process was often self-fulfilling, as many Black and Latino students became **discouraged by the “achievement gap”** between Asian American Americans and other racial minorities.

Black and Latino students consequently expressed a lower sense of belonging to and ownership of the school relative to Asian American Americans, who had better access to school resources and were disproportionately represented in leadership activities. Buoyed by perceptions of themselves as “smart” and “engaged,” Asian Americans often internalized this identity and saw themselves on upward trajectories, even when in practical terms, many struggled with the content of higher level curricula. Asian Americans who defied model minority expectations sometimes faced academic and social exclusions similar to those experienced by Black and Latino students, though they were not disciplined at the same high levels. Very often, “Asian American” was understood by teachers and staff as a stand-in for White. Asian-ness and Blackness often served as racial foils, complicating the Black-White binary and the binary relationship of White supremacy/oppression of the racialized ‘Other.’ In this case, racial privilege was constrained. For example, the purchase on power that Asian Americans had as a privileged group at this school was conditional upon certain demands for normalized behavior and came at the extraordinary expense of educational equity.

Seeing these constraints enables a greater view of intertwined contexts (of economic inequality, concentrated poverty, and societal disregard for “ghetto schools”) that shaped CHS as one institution among many. Moreover, the ability of the school to highlight Asian American students’ relative success created a distraction from the fundamentally low standards for teaching and learning that characterized this and other urban schools. The reproduction of the **model minority myth** in an urban school setting essentially functioned as a **smokescreen for the profoundly constrained educational opportunity that was offered to poor students** in a struggling school, **in a marginalized community**.

#### **Asians living in America are constantly under tremendous pressure to “not mess up.”**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

Louie (2004) writes that Asian Americans, as a group, “arguably hold a special place in the American collective consciousness as one of the quintessential immigrant strivers, especially in education” (p. xiv). The social construction and personal reality of being seen, and seeing oneself, as Asian at CHS were framed by social-economic hardship and the American Dream of class mobility. Like their peers, Asian American students whom I interviewed talked about having too little money not only for discretionary purchases, but also for basic goods like lunch. They described family lives fraught with sacrifice, severe financial anxiety, and class resentment. Also like their non-Asian peers, they spoke of wanting to make their families proud by finding an answer to these dilemmas in education. Yet, they confessed to buckling under **tremendous pressure “not to mess up,”** that is, not to extinguish the limited educational opportunities within their reach. Unlike some Asian Americans who were tracked into higher level classes, many Asian American students on the regular track did not win life-changing academic opportunities in the form of college admissions and scholarships. Instead, they spoke of plans to attend community college and then transfer to four-year universities. They referred to the experience of siblings or relatives who began classes at community college but eventually gave up on post-secondary education altogether, confirming widely known research on the very low transfer rate of community college students to four-year universities (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Grubb, 1991). They hoped not to follow the same trajectory, but lacked a plan to avoid it.45 Other Asian American students had no plans for postsecondary education at all; their highest educational hope was to graduate from CHS or from an alternative high school (upon dropping out of CHS). The majority of Asian American students at CHS had no academy affiliation or participated in the Art Academy, AVID, or the newly developed Health Academy. They took classes whose mixed racial profiles reflected the school’s demographics. Some participated in free afterschool tutoring and mentorship programs, such as the one offered by AYO. Some were ushered through the college application process by external youth mentorship programs or internal ones, like AVID, but most were unsure of the path ahead. For these students, high school graduation was the moment their families looked forward to, when they would pour their pride and love into celebration. In this section, I discuss Sheila and Vang, whose experiences typified those of Asian Americans tracked onto the “regular track.”

#### **The myth negatively perpetuates the notion of an “Asian”, homogenizing and entire race of people.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in Education in University of California, Berkeley.

Some Asian American students felt like they were quietly falling off a cliff, with no safety net to meet them at the bottom. Their academic alienation and **sense of failure** cannot be parsed from the context of the alienation they felt as adolescents coming of age in a setting of geographically concentrated poverty, what Gilmore (2007) calls a “forgotten place” (p. 31) vulnerable to the “organized abandonment” of globalized forces of labor and capital (Harvey, 1989, p. 303, as cited in Gilmore, 2008). Often, their parents did not know how to help them find a foothold in school, though they themselves had hoped education would provide their children with the opportunity of socio-economic mobility. The model minority expectation was at once close by and far away: it informed how adults and peers saw them on a day-to-day basis, but it also presented the quandary of why their experiences were a contradiction to this myth. Understandably, among all the students at school, they had the most “ambivalent relation to the hegemonic concept of the ‘model minority’” (Ong, 2003, p. 256). The following narratives shed light on how Asian American students understood their academic struggles and failure. For Somi, a Cambodian American student, peer social group influenced academic effort and motivation. She was friendly with some members of the Leadership group, who she described as people who “have to get things done. They don’t procrastinate.” She and her friends had a different approach: “We’re like, I’m going to get this done, but not now.” When I asked what she thought contributed to this difference, she did not talk about contrasting mind-sets or attitudes towards schooling, but referred to the groups themselves: “I think it’s the cliques. It’s because Leadership people hang out with Leadership people, and they have to be on top of everything. I think that’s what they learn from each other.” Like other CHS students (Asian American and otherwise) who I interviewed, Somi had something of an all-or-nothing approach to her education (“if you’re not doing good, you’re failing”). Her aunts and uncles dropped out of high school. If successful, she said she and her cousin would be the first in their family to attend college. In fact, Somi was unsure that she would even be able to graduate from high school, and said she would enroll in community college, but did not understand the timeline or requirements for graduation or transferring:

#### **The discussion of the social position of Asian Americans is necessary in the picture to understand the relationship between blackness and whiteness.**

Ching 15 “Racialization in the Context of Urban Asian American Student & the Asian-Black Binary” Yenhoa Ching is a Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate Division of Education in University of California, Berkeley.

As was demonstrated in Ms. Rand’s comments, the subjective experience of the social fact of Blackness related not only to Whiteness, but also to the **Asian American model minority stereotype**. Stereotypes about Black students sharply contrasted with the popular stereotype of Asian American students as “smart,” “engaged,” and “quiet.” For Black students, the dominant expectation was to fit the mold of the trope of an oppositional and deficient racial subject. Shared notions of what it meant to be Black were not called forth in isolation. Individuals and groups (both Black and non-Black) suggested what Blackness was and gave it normative value, but these ideas were shaped by the anchoring relationship of the Asian American model minority to the Black and Brown deviant minority subject locations.

The racial formation of Blackness (the construction, negotiation, and reinforcement of Black as a socio-historically constructed normative category) emerged through and against complementary constructions of Asian-ness and, in a different way, of Latino or Brownness. Blackness was understood at CHS through locally specific understandings and productions of meaning; telling the **story of Asian American students** at CHS would be absolutely incomplete without an understanding of the construction of **Blackness** and the perspective of Black students. The corollary is also true. It is absolutely **necessary to understand** Asian American racial positioning vis-à-vis the model minority stereotype to tell the story of **Black racialization** at CHS. Neither can be understood without examining the racial field as a whole.

The tropes of the Asian American model minority and Black and Brown oppositional and deficient minority exist in many types of educational environments, not only urban ones (nor only urban ones with a preponderance of Asian American and Black students). They reflect a broader configuration of the racial and ethnic hierarchy within the nation’s racial imaginary. However, the instantiation of these tropes as discursive anchors in this school reveal the extent to which Blackness and Asian American-ness served as ideological foils in a unique context where the **Black-White binary was supplanted by an Asian-Black binary.** The demographics of the school, the political and immigration history of the city, and the political and demographic character of the region all helped account for the binary’s presence.

# Case Neg

## Case

### Essentialism Turn

The affirmative essentializes the model minority experience – that results in homogenization and recreation of a Eurocentric standpoint – turns case

Osajima 98 – a professor and Director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Redlands(Keith, “Pedagogical Considerations in Asian American Studies”, Oct, 1998, Journal of Asian American Studies Volume 1, Number 3, Project Muse, Daehyun)

Teaching Asian American Studies--Theoretical Reconsiderations Teaching courses on Asian Americans requires that we respond to the challenges brought forth by changing those demographic, political, and institutional contexts shaping the field. Recent theoretical discussions on the direction of Asian American studies provide some guidance in [End Page 273] fashioning a response. They broadly suggest that we rethink the "essentialist tendencies" that have strongly informed the development of the field and teaching of our classes. Essentialism refers to efforts that reduce the complex and diverse experiences of Asian Americans into a few governing themes, patterns, narratives, or unifying concepts. In Asian American literature, for example, Lisa Lowe argued that there has been a tendency to reduce the complexity of Asian experiences into essentialist patterns of generational conflict and filial relations. 14 Shirley Hune observes that the presentation of Asian American history is often dominated by a victimization paradigm, where the main narrative portrays Asians as victimized by the racial oppression of whites. 15 In the social sciences, the Asian American experience has often been reduced to simplistic push-pull migration models, or universal patterns of assimilation, or developmental models of identity. Those critics argue that essentialism oversimplifies and homogenizes the Asian American experience and fails to analyze adequately the complexity and diversity that has accompanied demographic change. Organizing our classes around such essentializing schemas limit our ability to deal with the nuance and complexity of the Asian American experience. The search for unifying themes problematically excludes issues and unwittingly reinforces traditional, Eurocentric, disciplinary approaches to inquiry. Elaine Kim describes the dilemma well in her candid assessment of her own approach to literary analysis: I looked for unifying thematic threads and tidy resolutions that might ease the pain of displacement and heal the exile, heedless of what might be missing from this homogenizing approach and oblivious to the parallels between what I was doing and the dominant culture attempts to reduce Asian American experiences to developmental narratives about a movement from "primitive," "Eastern," and foreign immigrant to "civilized," Western, and "Americanized" loyal citizen. 16 To counter the hold of reductionist, homogenizing paradigms, Asian Americanists identify a number of ways to expand and add complexity to how we think about Asian America. Peter Kwong, for example, revisits the call for more attention to class dynamics. 17 He argues that a focus [End Page 274] on class will help us to see and understand the conflicts between the "uptown" middle- and upper-class Asians and the "downtown" working-class Asians. 18 Patricia Limerick adds that attention to class would deepen our understanding of relations between racial groups. We would have to "reckon with the events of 1933, when Mexican agricultural workers went on strike against Japanese berry growers . . . who were themselves working hard against the unjust disadvantages of the California Alien Land Law." 19 Along similar lines, we see expansion of Asian American studies in the area of gender issues. The work on Asian American women is substantial and growing. Recently, this work has been augmented by a focus on issues of sexuality and queer studies. This is an important breakthrough, bringing into view topics that have been "regularly shrouded in particular forms of silence in the Asian American community." 20 Central to work in this area are feminist and postmodern theoretical insights that examine how our subjectivities and identities are socially constructed within contexts of powerful discourses that define and shape social reality. Rather than treat identity as a fixed, singular entity, Asian Americanists working here urge us to see how our identities are multiple and fluid, situated and heterogeneous. An expanded Asian American studies is also moving away from dichotomous categorizations which create problematic boundaries and limitations in our analyses. For example, Shirley Hune challenges us to adopt more complex views of racism to counter the dichotomous black/white model. She wrote: "A binary paradigm is inadequate in a multiracial context. What is needed is a framework that incorporates multiple racial groups and explores the complexity of current and future inter-group dynamics." 21 Michael Omi and Howard Winant's work on "racial formations" has been particularly influential in this area. 22 Their attention to the historical, political, and discursive processes by which meanings of race and racism are contested and constructed has helped to break from static conceptualizations. Sau-ling Wong's notion of "denationalization," breaks from a domestic/foreign dichotomy that sometimes separates and draws rigid lines between the experiences of Asians in the United States and their experiences and ties to Asia. 23 She [End Page 275] argues that we must locate the Asian American experience as part of a "global scattering of peoples of Asian origin"--what she refers to as a "diasporic perspective." 24 Underscoring many of the calls for an expanded and complex Asian American studies is a renewed emphasis on cross-disciplinary approaches to inquiry.

Essentialism causes racial and cultural rigidity – turns case

Hong 7 – Professor at the Nanyang Business School of Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. She received her Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1994 and had taught at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology from 1994 to 2002 before moving to University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where she taught for eight years. She received the Otto Klineberg Intercultural and International Relations Award in 2001, the Young Investigator Award (conferred by the International Society of Self and Identity) in 2004, and is a Fellow of the Association for Psychological Science. Her main research interests include culture and cognition, self, identity, and intergroup relations. She is currently the editor of Advances in Culture and Psychology, associate editor of Asian Journal of Social Psychology, and serving on the editorial board of Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. She has published over 100 journal articles and book chapters(Ying-Yi, “Essentializing Race”, 2007, <http://www.ntu.edu.sg/home/YYHong/papers/journal/14%20Essentializing%20race.pdf>, Daehyun)

GENERAL DISCUSSION In these two studies, we investigated the implications of Chinese Americans’ essentialist belief about race at two levels: cognitive responses in cultural frame switching (Study 1) and emotional reactivity when talking about bicultural experiences (Study 2). We found that the more strongly bicultural individuals endorsed an essentialist belief about race, the more likely they were to show cognitive difﬁculty when they had to switch rapidly between different cultural frames, and the more likely they were to show emotional reactivity when discussing matters that reminded them of their bicultural identity—that is, when its dual nature was under consideration. These results support our predictions that bicultural individuals’ racial beliefs set up a framework of meaning within which they relate to their ethnic and host cultures. That said, we are not advocating an assimilationist perspective that ethnic—minority individuals who consider racial boundaries as rigid are maladjusted in American society as a result of their failure to assimilate into the host culture. In fact, it has been suggested that essentialist discourse of race can have progressive implications for minority groups facing pressure to assimilate (Verkuyten. 2003). What we do posit, however, is that individuals’ essentialist beliefs about race can influence how they structure their experiences in a multicultural society, and that such beliefs influence psychological processes when individuals have to deal with two apparently discrete cultures. Although essentialism was the core of some of the pioneering theories in the field of intergroup relations (Allpori, 1954), this concept has not been given the attention it (leserves until re cently (e.g., Gelman, 2003: Ilaslam et al., 2004; Prentice & Miller. 2006; Yzerbyt et al., 1998). Adding to this literature, the present research demonstrates that essentializing race hinders bicultural individuals’ navigation between cultures. This new discovery is timely as many societies are undergoing rapid globalization and their people are being exposed to multiple cultural traditions. A critical examination of lay essentialist beliefs about social groups is crucial in understanding how such transitions can be most successfully accomplished.

### Macro-political Change

Focus on intraphysical violence fails to create normative or political prescriptions for the community – democratic proceduralism is essential to create intersubjective relations

Amanda Anderson 6, prof of English at Johns Hopkins The Way We Argue Now, 37-9

There remains yet another reason why the theory of communicative ethics cannot answer Butler’s theoretical investments. Despite Butler’s obvious political commitment, and her intermittent attention to race, internationalism, and institutions, her theories dwell overwhelmingly at the level of individual, intrapsychic drama. Nancy Fraser, who herself criticizes Butler’s intrasubjective focus, suggests that perhaps Butler’s recent appeals to radical democracy, though at this point only gestural, are the beginnings of a more sustained working out of normative commitments and collective practices. Perhaps. But I read these more as compensatory moments in a theory whose real focus often lies elsewhere. In Gender Trouble, because the field of politics remains fully focused on questions of identity, performative subversions necessarily emphasize the self ’s relation to the law, or the self ’s relation to the self (or to the normative identity the self inhabits). Given the exclusionary effects of any assumption of identity, one might assume that denaturalizing that process of assumption will have positive intersubjective consequences, but we are not told how this works.¶ The problem reemerges in Bodies That Matter, most pronouncedly in the essay “Phantasmatic Identification and the Assumption of Sex.” Here Butler makes an impassioned plea for the ethicopolitical efficacy of incoherent identity: since the assumption of coherent identity always comes at a cost, and harbors exclusions, we need to cultivate incoherent identity, or forms of identity that remain open to multiple, and what now appear as contradictory, identifications. Only then can we begin the ongoing process of overcoming a situation in which “the specificity of identity is purchased through the loss and degradation of connection” (BTM, 114). Not only does this account fail to elaborate any basis for its normative commitments, but there is an unexamined assumption that intrapsychic maneuvers translate directly into political realities, which seems to me to be a highly questionable claim. This comes out more sharply in the following gesture toward more positive psychic practices: “If [the] subject produces its coherence at the cost of its own complexity, the crossings of identifications of which it is itself composed, then that subject forecloses the kinds of contestatory connections that might democratize the field of its own operation” (BTM, 115; my emphasis). As was the case with performative subversion, the primary drama here is one of self-constitution. Democracy can be achieved internally, via the self ’s own internal operations. Intersubjective effects simply follow naturally from the form of identification undergone. At best, this constitutes an argument by analogy.¶ 39¶ This is one of those rare passages where Butler admits the possibility, indirectly and negatively to be sure, that we might actually foster antiexclusionary practices that would not require belatedness as a constitutive feature. Characteristically, Butler draws back somewhat from this utopian moment, stressing in subsequent paragraphs that processes of exclusion can never be eradicated. In the light of that sobering truth, she then offers a variant version of future possibility: by avowing our exclusionary identifications, we will glimpse an expanded community. In her words, we should “[trace] the ways in which identification is implicated in what it excludes, and [follow] the lines of that implication for the map of future community it might yield” (BTM, 119). In other words, to recognize that one is what one repudiates will help to effect a possible avowal of connection with those now constituted as irredeemably other. This passage more readily acknowledges the gap between intrapsychic and collective transformation, yet it still installs the former as the template for the latter.¶ Butler’s work is not devoid of all references to public and collective political practices. Indeed, she clearly aligns herself with specific activist communities—the feminist and gay and lesbian, most prominently—and seeks to articulate collective moments, most notably in “Gender Is Burning” and “Critically Queer,” two of the essays in Bodies That Matter. But there is a distinctly unmapped connection between her intrapsychic model and her collective model, an attempt to imagine that intrapsychic transformation will automatically yield social transformation, just as the assumption of identity has automatically produced all the exclusions that structure our social and political world. I think there is a real problem with this emphasis on intrapsychic identity, which will continue to disable Butler’s attempts to project positive political norms or to explain why she regards certain activist communities or moments as more “democratic” than others. Butler’s theory needs an account of how intersubjective and collective associations might be forged and nurtured beyond the moment of “contestatory connections.” This would necessarily require the risk of a greater normative clarity about democratic procedure (might not she at least risk a contingent proceduralism?).

Pragmatic and normative actions are necessary – their method shuts down material change

Tara McCormack 10, Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester, PhD in IR from the University of Westminster, “Critique, Security and Power: The Political Limits to Emancipatory Approaches,” p. 58, google books

Contemporary critical and emancipatory approaches reject the possibility of reaching an objective evaluation of the world or social reality because they reject the possibility of differentiating between facts and values. For the contemporary critical theorists, theory can only ever be for someone and for some purpose. As this is so then quite logically critical theorists elevate their own values to be the most important aspect of critical theory. As a result of the rejection of the fact/value distinction we see within the work of contemporary critical theorists a highly unreflective certainty about the power of their moral position. Critical theorists argue that all theory is normative, they offer in its place better norms: ones, as we have seen, that will lead to emancipation and will help the marginalised.¶ The claims made for the central role of the values of the theorist reveal the theoretical limits of critical and emancipatory theory today. Yet even good or critical theory has no agency, and only political action can lead to change. Theory does of course play an important role in political change. This must be the first step towards a critical engagement with contemporary power structures and discourses. In this sense, we can see that it is critical theory that really has the potential to solve problems, unlike problem-solving theory which seeks only to ensure the smooth functioning of the existing order. Through substantive analysis the critical theorist can transcend the narrow and conservative boundaries of problem-solving theory by explaining how the problematic arises. Unlike problem-solving theory, critical theory makes claims to be able to explain why and how the social world functions as it does, it can go beyond the ‘given framework for action’.¶ The critical theorist must therefore be able to differentiate between facts (or social reality) and values, this ability is what marks the critical theorist apart from the traditional or problem-solving theorists, who cannot, because of their values and commitment to the existing social world, go beyond the ‘given framework for action’. If we cannot differentiate between our desires or values or norms (or our perspective, to put it in Cox’s terms) and actually occurring social and political and historical processes and relationships, it is hard to see how we can have a critical perspective (Jahn, 1998: 614). Rather, through abolishing this division we can no longer draw the line between what we would like and everything else, and thereby contemporary critical theories are as much of a dogma as problem-solving theories. Contemporary critical theorists are like modern-day alchemists, believing that they can transform the base metal of the unjust international order into a golden realm of equality and justice through their own words. For contemporary critical theorists, all that seems that the crucial step towards progress to a better world order is for the theorist to state that their theory is for the purposes of emancipation and a just world order.

Conscious raising not enough—political change key

David, 13 – MA and PhD in Clinical Community Psychology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, assistant professor at the University of Alaska in the Joint PhD Program in Clinical Community Psychology that has a cultural and indigenous emphasis, where he also serves as the director of the Alaska Native Community Advancement in Psychology Program (E.J.R., Internalized Oppression: The Psychology of Marginalized Groups, Part III: Marginalized Racial and Ethnic Communities, “Future Research and Service Directions”, pp. 184-187, book)//SJF

Although many programs all point to critical action as a long-term objective of the consciousness-raising process, it is less clear what is needed to translate critical reflection into critical action. In other words, what are the conditions and best practices associated with helping individuals to resist oppression and take action against social inequities? Particularly, in light of the fact that participants presumably “complete” these consciousness-raising programs at some point and leave the support of their peers and facilitators, it would be vital to identify those practices that sustain Asian Americans’ commitment to social justice over the long term. As another sustainability strategy, it is important to assist Asian Americans in finding allies in other communities of color and recognize that coalitions may be an effective means of reaffirming support, broadening networks, and amplifying the political strength of a numerically small community.

David (2011) has observed that as critical reflection emerges, individuals develop an awareness of the shared experiences of oppression across different groups. Consequently, it would be vital for individuals to obtain a better understanding of the fundamentals of coalition building—from outreach to finding common agendas to power sharing. In order to realize the long-term and systemic changes to which these consciousness raising programs aspire, it will be critical to help participants find a way to sustain the passion and commitment to continue resisting oppression once they complete the program.

### **State Good**

The state isn’t categorically anti-Asian – litigation and federal rules act as a potential check

Seligman 11 (Brad – Lead Counsel, Dukes v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., The nationwide class action gender

discrimination case against Wal-Mart Stores and founder of the Impact Fund, which provides financial and technical assistance and representation for complex public interest litigation – Clearinghouse REVIEW Journal of Poverty Law and Policy, January/February 2011, <http://www.impactfund.org/downloads/Resources/UsingLawForChange-Seligman.pdf>)

Litigation as a tool for social change has a long and proud tradition in the United States. In the nineteenth century cases were brought to challenge discriminatory laws such as the Chinese Exclusion Act and to advance labor rights and the rights of women and people of color. In the twentieth century the epic battle to dismantle Jim Crow laws and the “separate but equal” doctrine culminated in the famous Brown v. Board of Education decision. In the 1960s federal rules were developed to make class action litigation more feasible, and courts approved massive institutional-change cases against industries and governmental units.1 In the 1970s environmental litigation, aided by the passage of federal laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act, became common. Starting in the 1980s, however, social justice litigation has become more challenging to pursue due to more conservative judges, tougher class certification and substantive law decisions, more demanding attorney-fee and cost-recovery requirements, the decline in federal enforcement of civil rights and environmental laws, and cutbacks and restrictions on legal services funding.2 Still, such litigation remains a potent weapon for change. In recent years the environmental justice and disability rights movements have shown that the path remains open for innovative litigation. Today we nevertheless must be more strategic and thoughtful about how we use litigation. Here I describe a holistic model of social justice litigation that includes adroit use of the media, coalitions, and working partnerships with community and grassroots organizations and other forms of advocacy. I explore the range of procedural devices in the social justice litigator’s tool box. And I remind readers to take pride in and enjoy their work.

### Narratives Bad

**Narratives commodifies one’s identity and has limited impact on the culture that one attempt’s to reform—the 1AC subverts its own most radical intentions by becoming an exemplar of the very culture under indictment—this turn case**

**Coughlin 95**—Anne M. Coughlin, Associate Professor of Law, Vanderbilt Law School [August, 1995, “Regulating the Self: Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship,” *Virginia Law Review*, 81 Va. L. Rev. 1229, Lexis]

Although Williams is quick to detect insensitivity and bigotry in remarks made by strangers, colleagues, and friends, her taste for irony fails her when it comes to reflection on her relationship with her readers and the material benefits that her autobiographical performances have earned for her. n196 Perhaps Williams should be more inclined to thank, rather than reprimand, her editors for behaving as readers of autobiography invariably do. When we examine this literary faux pas - the incongruity between Williams's condemnation of her editors and the professional benefits their publication secured her - we detect yet another contradiction between the outsiders' use of autobiography and their desire to transform culture radically. Lejeune's characterization of autobiography as a “contract” reminds us that **autobiography is a lucrative commodity**. In our culture, members of the reading public avidly consume personal stories, n197 which surely explains why first-rate law journals and academic presses have been **eager to market outsider narratives**. No matter how unruly the self that it records, an autobiographical performance transforms that self into a form of “property in a moneyed economy” n198 and into a valuable intel [\*1283] lectual asset in an academy that requires its members to publish. n199 Accordingly, we must be **skeptical** of the assertion that the outsiders' **splendid** publication **record is** itself sufficient **evidence of the success** of their endeavor. n200 Certainly, publication of a best seller may transform its author's life, with the resulting commercial success and academic renown. n201 As one critic of autobiography puts it, “failures do not get published.” n202 While writing a successful autobiography may be **momentous for the individual** author, this success has a **limited impact** on culture. Indeed, the transformation of outsider authors into “success stories” **subverts** outsiders' **radical intentions** by constituting them as exemplary participants within contemporary culture, willing to market even themselves to literary and academic consumers. n203 What good does this transformation do for outsiders who are less fortunate and less articulate than middle-class law professors? n204 Although they style themselves cultural critics, the [\*1284] storytellers generally do not reflect on the meaning of their own commercial success, nor ponder its entanglement with the cultural values they claim to resist. Rather, for the most part, they seem content simply to take advantage of the peculiarly American license, identified by Professor Sacvan Bercovitch, “**to have your dissent and make it too**.” n205

**Debate bad for narrative—it turns any response into an ad hominem attack. The fact we have to negate the aff makes their use of personal experience dangerous**

**Coughlin 95**—Anne M. Coughlin, Associate Professor of Law, Vanderbilt Law School [August, 1995, “Regulating the Self: Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship,” *Virginia Law Review*, 81 Va. L. Rev. 1229, Lexis]

The warning this episode conveys to readers signals more than a textual incoherence or the failure of Williams's own collaborative engagement. More fundamentally, it reveals the inherent inadequacy of autobiography as a tool of social criticism. The institutional spaces where the outsider stories have their existence, including the lecture tour podium and the pages of scholarly journals, are arenas that foster, indeed, depend on, **vigorous inquiry and dialectical exchange**. Before we agree to reorder society along lines a group of scholars may propose, scrupulous testing of their theories seems wholly appropriate. Yet, as Williams's bitter rebuke of her editors portends, personal stories tend to pre-empt responses other than sympathy or silence, precisely because any critical commentary or desire for clarification may be **dismissed as ad hominem** - and any criticism necessarily is ad hominem, since the material available for criticism or clarification is the scholar's personal experience. n193 Ironically, therefore, the power of the autobiographical exchange to inspire readers' sympathy turns out to be a **significant shortcoming** within the context of an academy whose participants, even when sympathetic to an idea, are **committed to** immediate, often face-to-face, critical inquiry and **debate**. n194 By rejecting any critical reaction as a treacherous failure of sympathy for the author's pain, if not as the product of prejudiced igno [\*1282] rance, and dismissing criticism as a personal attack on the author's character, autobiographical rhetoric is no less coercive of readers than the legal rhetoric that the outsiders desire to supersede. n195

### Ballot Bad

Their notion of resistance through the ballot masks state power – they’re just an illusion of change and empowerment – they make the problem worse and instill an adaptive politics of being and effaces the institutional constraints that reproduce structural violence

Brown 95 [1995, Wendy Brown is a professor at UC Berkeley, “States of Injury,” pp. 21-23]

For some, fueled by opprobrium toward regulatory norms or other mo- dalities of domination, the language of "resistance" has taken up the ground vacated by a more expansive practice of freedom. For others, it is the discourse of “empowerment” that carries the ghost of freedom's valence ¶ 22¶. Yet as many have noted, insofar as resistance is an effect of the regime it opposes on the one hand, and insofar as its practitioners often seek to void it of normativity to differentiate it from the (regulatory) nature of what it opposes on the other, it is at best politically rebellious; at worst, politically amorphous. Resistance stands against, not for; it is re-action to domination, rarely willing to admit to a desire for it, and it is neutral with regard to possible political direction. Resistance is in no way constrained to a radical or emancipatory aim. a fact that emerges clearly as soon as one analogizes Foucault's notion of resistance to its companion terms in Freud or Nietzsche. Yet in some ways this point is less a critique of Foucault, who especially in his later years made clear that his political commitments were not identical with his theoretical ones (and un- apologetically revised the latter), than a sign of his misappropriation. For Foucault, resistance marks the presence of power and expands our under- standing of its mechanics, but it is in this regard an analytical strategy rather than an expressly political one. "Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet. or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority to power. . . . (T]he strictly relational character of power relationships . . . depends upon a multiplicity of points of resis- tance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power relations.\*39 This appreciation of the extent to which resistance is by no means inherently subversive of power also reminds us that it is only by recourse to a very non-Foucaultian moral evaluation of power as bad or that which is to be overcome that it is possible to equate resistance with that which is good, progressive, or seeking an end to domination. ¶ If popular and academic notions of resistance attach, however weakly at times, to a tradition of protest, the other contemporary substitute for a discourse of freedom—“empowerment”—would seem to correspond more closely to a tradition of idealist reconciliation. The language of resistance implicitly acknowledges the extent to which protest always transpires inside the regime; “empowerment,” in contrast, registers the possibility of generating one’s capacities, one’s “self-esteem,” one’s life course, without capitulating to constraints by particular regimes of power. But in so doing, contemporary discourses of empowerment too often signal an oddly adaptive and harmonious relationship with domination insofar as they locate an individual’s sense of worth and capacity in the register of individual feelings, a register implicitly located on some- thing of an other worldly plane vis-a-vis social and political power. In this regard, despite its apparent locution of resistance to subjection, contem- porary discourses of empowerment partake strongly of liberal solipsism—the radical decontextualization of the subject characteristic of¶ 23¶ liberal discourse that is key to the fictional sovereign individualism of liberalism. Moreover, in its almost exclusive focus on subjects’ emotionalbearing and self-regard, empowerment is a formulation that converges with a regime’s own legitimacy needs in masking the power of the regime.¶ This is not to suggest that talk of empowerment is always only illusion or delusion. It is to argue, rather, that while the notion of empowerment articulates that feature of freedom concerned with action, with being more than the consumer subject figured in discourses of rights and eco- nomic democracy, contemporary deployments of that notion also draw so heavily on an undeconstructed subjectivity that they risk establishing a wide chasm between the (experience of) empowerment and an actual capacity to shape the terms of political, social, or economic life. Indeed, the possibility that one can “feel empowered” without being so forms an important element of legitimacy for the antidemocratic dimensions of liberalism.

### Cede the Political

The alt fails cedes power to the conservative right – political engagement key

Kreiss and Tufekci 13 - Professor in the School of Media and Journalism and Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of North Carolina AND Assistant Professor University of North Carolina (Daniel and Zeynep, “Occupying the Political: Occupy Wall Street, Collective Action, and the Rediscovery of Pragmatic Politics”, Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologie, 2013, Sage publications)

It is the turn from pragmatic politics and institutional engagement that distinguished Occupy from the Tea Party, the most recent manifestation of a five decade old populist conservative movement. Similar to other manifestations of conservative mobilization (McGirr, 2001; Teles, 2008) the Tea Party adopted a dual orientation toward both symbolic and institutional power. The most recent example is the Tea Party’s populist mobilization around the 2010 midterm elections, which reshaped the internal workings of the Republican Party and redoubled its institutional ability to block much of the president’s agenda—including what now passes as progressive reform. In conjunction with party elites and conservative media outlets, in 2010 the Tea Party movement drove turnout in the Republican primaries and the midterm elections (Williamson, Skocpol, & Coggin, 2011). After the elections, the Tea Party and its legislative allies created a 62-member caucus in the House and enlisted four members of the Senate to create a voting block that repeatedly eschewed legislative compromise. Even more, Tea Party activists not only drove turnout in the midterm elections, the presence of activists in districts helped hold members to account for the movement’s policy goals (Bailey, Mummolo, & Noel, 2011). In the process, the Tea Party caucus wielded all of the institutional tools at its disposal for the purposes of thwarting the president’s, and often the Republican House leadership’s, agenda. In this, the Tea Party resembles other movements that have taken advantage of political opportunities to open the space for new configurations of institutional politics (Amenta, 2008; McAdam & Tarrow, 2010). The contemporary conservative movement is, in large part, a story of the successful navigation of the twin faces of redemptive and pragmatic politics. Activists who participated in the redemptive mobilization around Barry Goldwater’s candidacy worked to reshape the Republican Party in the years after his defeat (Perlstein, 2001). All of which enabled movement conservatives to seize the political opportunity that Reagan’s candidacy offered. If Goldwater began to unravel the American consensus ideologically, it was Reagan who drew on the movement to wield the levers of institutional power that had effects that ran much deeper than cultural stylings. Reagan dismantled unions, cut taxes on the wealthy, and gutted social service programs. It was Reagan’s electoral victory that forged a radical reimagining of the American state and its obligations to its citizens, and created the institutional forms to hold it in place, from regulatory changes to the reshaping of the judiciary. Conclusion The Occupy movement may now be melting into a sedimentary network (Chadwick, 2007) of activists that will hang together through new media technologies and reconstitute itself around symbolic events in the coming years ― as it did in protest events at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions. This symbolic power will likely prove fleeting given the deinstitutionalized nature of redemptive politics. Deinstitutionalization can certainly be a strength in some contexts, such as the overthrowing of a dictator or the rapid creation and publicizing of a national political movement. But, in the routine workings of pragmatic politics, these organizational qualities are a distinct disadvantage, as secular liberals discovered in their recent defeat in the Egyptian elections. After the initial flare of the movement’s mediated publicity, the political context in the United States has changed to one that requires political organization able to engage and challenge institutional politics to advance an agenda forward. If Occupy is deeply divided about its engagement with pragmatic, institutional politics and fails to build meaningful ties to unions and civil society and advocacy organizations during the president’s second term it will be a wasted opportunity. Occupy’s redemptive energy, for instance, would be well directed towards the organization of a progressive, “Occupy Congress” voting block inside Congress that can hold Democrats to account for its aims. In effect, this strategy would call for using the master’s pragmatic tools to occupy the master’s institutional house. This strategy does not exclude the potential for transforming these institutional tools through a focus on process—neither does it disallow the regenerative politics which broader room for self-expression can facilitate. It does, however, call for rethinking the balance between process and durable goals, and between personal and institutional transformation—which in turn can transform the conditions through which individuals ultimately flourish. Nor is this a call for abandoning redemptive politics which can again be mobilized when the institutional levers of power become, as they will inevitably, calcified.

### Psy Violence=/=Falsafable

Psychological violence claims are methodologically inaccurate – it’s not an ontological condition

Hsiao, 10 (Hsin-Huang Michael – Director of and distinguished research fellow at the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, Taipei; member of the editorial board of the International Journal of Comparative Sociology – “Imperial citizens: Koreans and race from Seoul to LA,” (book review), Asian Ethnicity,11:1, 165-168, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14631360903506802?journalCode=caet20#.U1bFhvldX-4>)

In the LA context, the book’s remaining chapters continue to look into the struggles of ﬁrst and even second generation Korean immigrants and citizens to cope with the long-lasting US racialized system. The most obvious thesis this book aims to convey is that in racialized American society, racial barriers are still dominating many Asian Americans everyday lives, regardless of their class backgrounds. Race is assessed to go before class and class factors can not go beyond the race line. It sounds alarming. And such argument is used to explain why the LA racial riot occurred against Korean American businessmen. Again, selected interviews are used to illustrate and even to prove the existence of this profound social and racial discrimination. It is indeed a big theoretical issue and it requires much more vigorous methodological deliberation to verify the proposed assertion. The data presented in various sections in the chapters are certainly part of their true life experiences of being racially prejudiced or even discriminated against, but they are not convincing enough to verify the theoretical proposition that experiencing racial barriers has been an overwhelmingly everyday reality for Korean or Asian Americans. For example, it is argued that the second-generation Korean Americans are still ‘foreignized’ even though they have made it to higher class positions. At best, the author maintains that they are treated as a ‘foreign model minority’, still another subtle form of racial bias. On this bold observation, it can be counter argued by another set of life stories which could lead to diﬀerent conclusions. Everyday life experiences are complex for any speciﬁc ethnic group; being treated with respect and/or with prejudice may not necessarily be an ‘either/or’ matter, nor is it a ‘none-or-all’ phenomenon. How to make a fair though critical social observation does need more caution to scrutinize the data collected. Many of the citations on this matter used in the book can be easily criticized for being too short, too simplistic and they are taken without proper personal histories and social contexts. One better way is a through reading of a set of carefully selected life histories of both ﬁrst and second generation Korean immigrants and Korean Americans, tracing their respective life experiences in Seoul and LA. Therefore, despite the reservation on the methodological issue and data interpretation, this book can certainly be useful reading for scholars of international migration, transnationalism and racial justice.

## Afropessimism K

### Link—Culture

The notion that the aff is a universally accessible strategy assumes a subjectivity that the slave is shut out from – absent a starting point of blackness their multiculturalism just reifies anti-blackness – turns the case

Wilderson 10 (Frank B., Prof of African American studies and drama @ UC Irvine, Red White and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms)

The prescriptive register, on the other hand, might be called the Nat Turner syndrome. Blacks articulate and ruminate on these ensembles of questions, in hushed tones, in back rooms, quietly, alone, or sometimes only in our dreams. Save for a select few films like Up Tight!, The Lost Man, The Spook Who Sat by the Door, and Jamaa 189 Red, White, & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms Fanaka’s Soul Vengeance, this ensemble of questions rarely found its way into the narrative coherence of a screenplay. Even in Haile Gerima’s Bush Mama, one gets the sense that whereas Burnett’s cinematography and Gerima’s editing and acoustic innovation acknowledge the gratuitousness of violence that structures the chaos of Black life and simultaneously structures the relative calm of White life, the screenplay, on the other hand, insists on contingent and commonsense notions of police brutality and therefore is only willing or able to identify policing in the spectacle of police violence (e.g., Luann being raped) and not in the everyday banality of ordinary White existence. Still this is a shift, a breakthrough, and we have every reason to believe that this cinematic breakthrough finds its ethical correspondence not in the archive of film history but in actions such as those taken by the BLA and by random, angry, and motivated Black people who were emerging all across America at this time with just a brick and a bottle and certainly no more than a rifle and a scope. As sites of political struggle and loci of philosophical meditation, cultural capacity, civil society, and political agency give rise to maps and chronologies of loss and to dreams of restoration and redemption. The Marxist, postcolonial, ecological, and feminist narratives of loss followed by restoration and redemption are predicated on exploitation and alienation as the twin constitutive elements of an essential grammar of suffering. They are political narratives predicated on stories which they have the capacity to tell—and this is key—regarding the coherent ethics of their time and space dilemmas. The Slave needs freedom not from the wage relation, nor sexism, homophobia, and patriarchy, nor freedom in the form of land restoration. These are part and parcel of the diverse list of contingent freedoms of the “multitudes” (Hardt & Negri, Empire). Slave needs freedom from the Human race, freedom from the world. The Slave requires gratuitous freedom. Only gratuitous freedom can repair the object status of his/her flesh, which itself is the product of accumulation and fungibility’s gratuitous violence. But what does the Slave’s desire for gratuitous freedom mean for the Human’s desire for contingent freedom? This difference between contingent freedom and gratuitous freedom brings us to Bush Mama and the specter of the BLA, to the irreconcilable imbroglio between the Black as a social and political being and the Human as a social and political being—what Jalil Muntaquim termed, a bit too generously, “a major contradiction… between the Black underground and…Euro-American [revolutionary] forces” (109). The inability of the Human’s political discourses to think gratuitous freedom is less indicative of a “contradiction” than of how anti-Blackness subsidizes Human survival in all its diversity. Given this state of affairs, the only way the Black can be imagined as an agent of politics is when s/he is crowded out of politics. Politics, for the Black, has as its prerequisite some discursive move which replaces the Black void with a positive, Human, value. Thus, if the Black is to be politically within the world, rather than against the world, s/he only reflects upon politics as an ontologist, pontificates about politics as a pundit, or gestures politically as an activist or revolutionary, to the extent that s/he is willing to be structurally adjusted. Since exploitation and alienation’s grammar of suffering has crowded out the grammar of suffering of accumulation and fungibility— whipped a police action on it—the Black can only meditate, speak about, or act politically as a worker, as a postcolonial, or as a gay or female subject—but not as a Black object. One might perform an “anthropology of sentiment” on the Black and write “ontological” meditations, political discourse, or agitate politically, based on how often the Black feels like a man, feels like a women, feels like a gendered subject, feels like a worker, or feels like a postcolonial, and those feelings are important; but they are not essential at the level of ontology. They cannot address the gratuitous violence which structures that which is essential to Blackness and suffering, and they are imaginatively constrained in their will: they cannot imagine the kind of violence the Black must harness to break that structure. There is nothing in those Black sentiments powerful enough to alter the structure of the Black’s 700-year-long relation to the world, the relation between one accumulated and fungible thing and a diverse plethora of exploited and alienated human beings. In other words, there are no feelings powerful enough to alter the structural relation between the living and the dead, not if feelings are pressed into service of a project which seeks to bring the dead to life. But one can imagine feelings powerful enough to bring the living to death. Whenever Black people walk into a room, spines tingles with such imagination. Will they insist upon a politics predicated on their grammar of suffering or will they give us a break and talk about exploitation and alienation? Will they pretend to join the living or will they make us join the dead? The work of exploitation and alienation labors to make politics both possible and impossible. It is a two-pronged labor: it must animate the political capacity of the Human being while at the same time police the political capacity of the Black. In the 1960s and 1970s, cinema benefited from the specter of the Black Liberation Army’s power to wrench the question of political agency from the grasp of the Human being. Transposed by the ethical dilemmas of the Slave, the question of political agency 192 Red, White, & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms began to go something like this: what kind of imaginative labor is required to squash the political capacity of the human being so that we might catalyze the political capacity of the Black? If one were a Gramscian, the word “hegemony” would spring to mind, and from that word, the political ontologist would begin to meditate on and brainstorm around various ethical dilemmas implied in the phrase “hegemonic struggle.” This, of course, would be ontologically and ethically misguided, because struggles for hegemony put us back on the terrain of Human beings—the ground of exploited and alienated subjects— whereas we need to think this question through not on the terrain of the living exploited and alienated subject, but on that of the accumulated and fungible object. Again, a more appropriate word than hegemony is murder. If, when caught between the pincers of the imperative to meditate on Black dispossession and Black political agency, we do not dissemble, but instead allow our minds to reflect upon the murderous ontology of chattel slavery’s gratuitous violence— 700 years ago, 500 years ago, 200 years ago, last year, and today, then maybe, just maybe, we will be able to think Blackness and agency together in an ethical manner. This is not an Afro-Centric question. It is a question through which the dead ask themselves how to put the living out of the picture.

### Link—Asian Anti-Black

Talking about the Model Minority disavowal Antiblackness as the structure antagonism that created the Myth in the first place.

Ng 16 (Pamela Ng, a bachelor in Asian American Studies in Scripps College. “WTF is #Modelminoritymutiny?: Solidarity, Embodiment, and Practice in Subverting Ascribed Asian American Racial Positioning”; 2016/5/22; <http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1899&context=scripps_theses>; p14)

In talking about the model minority myth as a manifestation of a divisive tactic both internal and external to the Asian American and multiracial spaces, respectively, what needs to be a considered about identity politics is that, oftentimes, it leads to conversations that are more rooted in trying to prove Asian American oppression rather than moving towards unlearning the internalization of antiblack models of seeking liberation . While the latter placates a progressive stride towards better representation for Asian Americans, which can arguably have positive material results, this positivity comes with a glass ceiling that only mirrors the triangulation that has occurred throughout time.

The disavowal of the Model Minority Myth isn’t an attempt down white supremacy is mistakes the symptom of the disease for the disease itself—their solvency is a erasure of black Asian and posits their resistance as a disavowal of blackness.

Phạm 16 (Xoài Phạm is is a Vietnamese queer, gender non-conforming femme warrior “Ending Anti-Blackness Needs to Be a Top Priority for Asian Americans – Here’s Why”; 2016/2/26; http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/02/ending-anti-blackness-asian)

Anti-Blackness exists in every continent. It exists among all of our non-Black communities of color; it exists among the people in our families; and it exists among us, individually, too. Which means it’s our responsibility to continually fight to end anti-Blackness in every way we can. Among non-Black people of color, there is the widespread notion that racial justice means being united against white supremacy. Yet, non-Black people of color rarely address the question of how the abolition of white supremacy can never be realized if rampant anti-Blackness among non-Black people goes unchecked. Time and again, Asian American social justice warriors will readily fight white supremacy but in the same breath reinforce anti-Black tropes or appropriate Black American cultures. To live in the world that Black, Indigenous, and other people of color dream about requires a complete stop, utter end, total destruction of anti-Blackness. And I say this not as someone who has unlearned anti-Blackness but is unlearning, with the knowledge that the end of my oppression is bound up with Black liberation and with the knowledge that Black folks deserve unconditional freedom regardless. There is no quick-and-easy microwaveable version of unlearning anti-Blackness. It is a lifelong, necessary commitment. Here are some things I’ve noticed while unlearning. One of the ways that we Asian Americans attempt to show that we are valuable under the Euro-American gaze is by distancing ourselves from what we perceive to be Blackness – meaning we draw ourselves in stark contrast to the narrow stereotypes that non-Black people have already assigned to Black people. In the context of the beauty industry, this results in non-Black folks finding ways to bleach our skin, color our eyes and hair, and do our makeup in ways that not only reaches towards whiteness but also distances us from Blackness. For Asian Americans, the lighter the skin, the more beautiful you perceived to be. And across the Asian continent, lighter skin is a mark of beauty, while darkness is equated to ugliness. Girls, especially, have their bodies policed to make sure they conform to anti-Black ideas of beauty. As for income, Asian Americans often struggle to attain financial and political wealth in order to move out of poor, Black neighborhoods and prove to white people that we are not “like the Black folks.” As a result, we willfully buy into the “model minority myth,” which is the puke-inducing idea that Asian Americans are the good, hardworking example of what a minority should be. The term was coined by sociologist William Petersen in 1966 to describe the success of Japanese Americans in the face of anti-Japanese sentiment. Despite the fact that he was only describing a single ethnicity out of the many ethnicities in Asia – go read a map to remind yourself of how fucking big Asia is – people then began using the term to refer to Asian Americans as a whole. Yeah, people started using this model minority myth while talking about all immigrants from the entire continent of Asia – that shit was ridiculous to say the least. This myth only holds true if Asian Americans are willing to maintain that Black folks are a “bad minority.” The assigned value of non-Black Asian Americans is entirely dependent on the lack of value they assign to Blackness. But the truth is that in 2015, many communities of Asian Americans have begun to access the privileges that have been traditionally associated with white Americans. The danger is in saying that Asian Americans, as a whole, are a successful minority by capitalist standards, because there are many Southeast Asians, for example, disproportionately living in poverty and with mental illness. There are many undocumented Asians, too, who are not even taken into account in the rare cases that Asian Americans are even included in race-oriented surveys. There are also South and West Asians who are being victimized by the onslaught of Islamophobic hatred. The thing is that this model minority myth did not consider at all that Black Asians exist, and that Black Asians are facing the inconceivable violence of anti-Blackness, too. The colonial imposition of racial categories was not made to uphold the complexities of bodies and identities. Where do Black Asians fit in the context of anti-Blackness and a model minority? The most dangerous way that non-Black Asians distance ourselves from Blackness is by conceptualizing the Asian American as completely devoid of Blackness. When people hear “Asian,” the majority immediately think of a pale-skinned person with straight, black hair – someone who looks like Lucy Liu. The image that Asians and non-Asians have in their heads about who Asians are is not just woefully monolithic, but also removed from Blackness. When Asian identity – how Asians understand ourselves in relation to the world as racialized people – makes no room for Blackness, it results in the violent erasure of Black Asians from the face of the earth. If Black Asians aren’t known to exist, there is no consideration for the violence they face. There is no consideration to the multiplicities of Blackness that are reduced by non-Black folks. When Black Asians are erased, non-Black Asians have an easier time creating distance between ourselves and Blackness, gaining illusory value at the expense of Black people. One of the functions of white supremacy and anti-Blackness is to simplify the histories, ancestries, and identities of Black, Indigenous, and other people of color. This is why many people don’t know about Blackness in Asia and among the diaspora. It’s much more convenient to believe that Blackness has no place in Asian identity in order to more easily participate in the capitalist dynamics of whiteness. As a result, misinformed accusations of cultural appropriation, for example, ensue. South Asians have accused East Africans of appropriation for wearing headpieces, henna, and jewelry that are commonly associated with South Asians. Despite being separated only by the Indian Ocean, the ties that connect South Asians and East Africans are strained by non-Black Asians’ inclination to set the terms and conditions of how they want to use Blackness. All ties to Blackness are erased when non-Black Asians feel the need to monopolize our cultures, but there is no hesitation when non-Black Asians across the world want to appropriate Black American cultures. What space can Black Asians find in Asian communities when Blackness is unwanted and mistreated yet simultaneously stolen and parodied? How can Black Asians, and Black folks as a whole, feel safe with non-Black Asians when the perpetrator of the Charleston massacre wrote on his website that East Asians “are by nature very racist and could be great allies of the White race?” Dear non-Black Asians, it has long been time to shift our priorities. When the Black Lives Matter movement was beginning to be derailed by those who were using #AsianLivesMatter, it was clear that these non-Black Asians didn’t realize that Black Asians exist too and that if they actually gave a fuck about Asian people at all, they would support Black Asians and Black Lives Matter. But aside from that self-serving reason, the derailing of Black Lives Matter also hurts non-Black Asians because white supremacy relies on anti-Blackness to survive. A white supremacist world is not sustainable without anti-Blackness fueling it. And because white supremacy, and oppressive systems in general, rely on erasure, non-Black Asians forget that before Europeans started the Atlantic slave trade, there was the Arab slave trade of East Africans. Grappling with our anti-Blackness as Asian Americans has to take place both within and outside of a white supremacist context, because non-Black people committing anti-Blackness predates European anti-Blackness. This is not to say that non-Black Asians are more responsible than Europeans for anti-Blackness; rather, I am pointing out the fact that non-Black Asians certainly did not need white people to instruct them on how to be anti-Black. Claiming that anti-Blackness is a result of white conditioning is shirking responsibility.

### Link—Black White Binary

Calls to disband the black/white binary are rooted in a desire to skirt the question of anti-black racism. This paradigm’s institutionalization speaks not to the dogma of black scholars and activists, but to the enduring and unique force of anti-blackness.

Sexton 10 (Jared, Associate Professor, African American Studies UC Irvine, “Proprieties of Coalition: Blacks, Asians, and the Politics of Policing”, 2010, Critical Sociology 36(1) 87-108) rz

Beyond and Between / Black and White

In the post-civil rights era USA, the demand for paradigm shift with respect to racial theory is a defining characteristic of political culture.7 We are told in a variety of tones that race matters are no longer, if ever they were, ‘simply black and white’. At best, the focus of a black-white dualistic analysis is deemed inadequate to apprehending the complexity of racial formation in the wake of post-1965 immigration and the rise in rates of interracial dating and marriage since the landmark Supreme Court ruling in the case of Loving v. Virginia (1967). At worst, the Procrustean tendency is deemed politically stunting insofar as it precludes a ‘discussion of the colors in the middle, now inexorable parts of the Black/white spectrum’ (Cho 1993: 205). There is already a considerable literature in the social sciences and humanities which details those vexed positions that are ‘neither black nor white’ (Sollors 1997), encompassing not only the articulation of emergent multiracial or ‘mixed race’ identity claims (Daniel 2002; J.M. Spencer 1997; R. Spencer 1999), but also critique and political mobilization among Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Chicano/as, Latino/as, and American Indians (Aguilar-San Juan 1994; Gracia and De Greiff 2000; Jaimes 1991).8 However, the notion of an ‘endemic’ black-white model of racial thought is something of a social fiction – one might say a misreading – that depends upon a reduction of the sophistication of the paradigm in question. Once that reduction is performed, the fiction can be deployed for a range of political and intellectual purposes (Kim 2006). In addressing the call to displace the black-white paradigm, we may recognize that its purported institutionalization indicates more about the enduring force of anti-blackness (Gordon 1995, 1998) than the insistence of black scholars, activists or communities more generally.9 When broaching the ‘explanatory difficulty’ (Omi and Winant 1993: 111) of present-day racial politics, then, one wonders exactly who and what is addressed by the demand to go ‘beyond black and white’. One finds a litany of complicating factors and neglected subjects, but it is accompanied by a failure to account cogently for the implications of this newfound complexity. The recently appointed Dean of the Wayne State University Law School, Frank Wu, has written: ‘“beyond black and white” is an oppositional slogan … it names itself ironically against the prevailing tradition … It is easy enough to argue that society needs a new paradigm, but it is much harder to explain how such an approach would work in actual practice.’ (Wu 2006: xi) It is harder still to explain why such an approach should be adopted. In fact, the implementation of the ‘new paradigm’ of racial theory seems unfeasible because it does not – and perhaps cannot – develop a coherent ethical justification as an attempt to analyze and contest racism. Taken together, these ambiguities beg a key question: what economy of enunciation, what rhetorical distribution of sanctioned speaking positions and claims to legitimacy are produced by the injunction to end ‘biracial theorizing’ (Omi and Winant 1994: 154)? In pursuing this question, consider the following provocation by another noted legal scholar, Mari Matsuda (2002), offered at a 1997 symposium on critical race theory at the Yale Law School: When we say we need to move beyond Black and white, this is what a whole lot of people say or feel or think: ‘Thank goodness we can get off that paradigm, because those Black people made me feel so uncomfortable. I know all about Blacks, but I really don’t know anything about Asians, and while we’re deconstructing that Black-white paradigm, we also need to reconsider the category of race altogether, since race, as you know, is a constructed category, and thank god I don’t have to take those angry black people seriously anymore’ (Matsuda 2002: 395). It is important to note that this contention, like those of Ture and Hamilton and Wu above, is not issued against progressive political coalition, but rather is drawn from a sympathetic meditation on the need for more adequate models of racial analysis and strategies of multiracial alliance-building in and beyond the US context. What Matsuda polemically identifies are dangers attendant to the unexamined desire for new analyses and the anxious drive for alliance, namely, the tendency to gloss over discrepant histories, minimize inequalities born of divergent structural positions, and disavow the historical centrality and uniqueness of anti-blackness for the operations of ‘global white supremacy’ (Mills 1998). Sexton: Proprieties of Coalition 91 Matsuda urges the refusal of what historian David Hollinger (2003) has coined the ‘one-hate rule’ or the presumption of ‘the monolithic character of white racism’. By calling to question the motive force of a nominally critical intervention on the black-white paradigm, Matsuda traces a fault line in the field formation of Asian American Studies that marks an opening for the present inquiry. It seems that the question of anti-black racism troubles contemporary efforts at mediation among the non-white – between black and non-black communities of color – and interpolates ‘Asian American panethnicity’ (Espiritu 1992) in ways that exceed even the immanent critique of that conceptual touchstone and principle of organization (Lowe 1996; Ono 1995). If one of the benefits of a reconstructed racial theory addressing ‘the increasing complexity of racial politics and racial identity today’ (Omi and Winant 1994: 152) is its capacity to grasp ‘antagonisms and alliances among racially defined minority groups’ (1994: 154), that political-intellectual enterprise is not without hazard.10 As we will see below, this fraught dynamic is especially (though by no means exclusively) evident in the academic literature of ‘black-Asian conflict’ in the urban USA. The public commentary dates back to at least the 1980s, but it reached a new level of production in the 1990s following the highly publicized black-led boycott of Korean grocers in Flatbush, New York in 1990 (Kim 2000) and, more sensationally, the Los Angeles uprising of 1992 (Okihiro 1994, 2001, 2006; Yamamoto 1999). In the second edition of their widely noted Racial Formation in the United States, sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant state, for instance: ‘The lessons of the Los Angeles riot are instructive as a starting point to criticize bipolar conceptions of race’ (Omi and Winant 1994: 152, emphasis added). Yet, rather than serving as a critical starting point, the 1992 multiracial conflagration has, for the most part, sowed a good deal of confusion regarding the aptness of inherited frameworks of racial theory for the production of knowledge and the ongoing challenges of political organizing and activism on the Left. On both counts, the flashpoint between African Americans and Asian Americans in general and the ‘Black-Korean conflict’ in particular have been acute.11 In this sense, the following critical engagement is not simply a response to the observations of a select few scholars or even a rejoinder to academic trends. Rather, it is an invitation to radical rethinking that should be considered germane to those interested in forging a more ethical relation to ‘black strivings in a twilight civilization’ (West 1996) and, more pointedly, to those that still feel the need ‘to take those angry black people seriously’ (Matsuda 2002: 395). It is perhaps unnecessary to add that this reckoning would be a prerequisite to thinking more properly about social justice on a global scale.

### Link—Tokenization

The 1AC’s demands for the Asian-American body to be a distinct point on the spectrum of colonialism may be anti-white, but it’s also anti-black- Their assertion of Asian-American identity as distinct is just a symptom of vampirism from black politics, only to discard them when it no longer serves them a further purpose

Kim 4 (Kil Ja Kim, writer, educator and activist currently living and working in Philadelphia. Her intellectual and political interests are Asian American politics, immigrant politics, and Black-Asian American relations, 1/28/2004, “”Question From the Inside”, <http://www.nathanielturner.com/questionfrominside.htm> | JJ)

\*All offensive language has been marked with a strikethrough and has been replaced with brackets\*

\*Grammar issues within the text – instances of “me” have been replaced with “I” in brackets\*

For a long time, I have considered myself a person of color (POC). I remember the first time I became really invested in POC politics was when I attended a predominantly white liberal arts college. As a Korean woman I gravitated towards the Black students socially and organizationally on campus. I had been involved in Black student activities in my high school, and socially was very comfortable around Black people compared to many of the white students. So "choosing" between Black and white was the option for me as an Asian teenager with few Asian people to be around. I chose to hang out with the Black students. Many of the Black students on the college campus referred to themselves as people of color. But it became clear throughout my four years that we had very different perspectives of what this meant. I thought it meant all non-white people. My racial analysis was not that complicated, but I thought in terms of white and non-white and so anyone who was part of the latter was a person of color. Black students and the Black administrator, who was the only one in student affairs, tended to think differently. Not uniformly across the board of course, but enough did. To many Black people on my campus, people of color was equal to Black. Activities planned for people of color were geared towards African American students in terms of content, outreach and invited guests. And ~~me~~ [I], the Asian person who had "found myself" with the support of Black people, was pissed. I resented what I considered Black people's reverse racism, selfishness and limited perspective. I would suggest, more like demand, that people of color be a more expansive term. Black students and the Black administrator would (patiently) explain to me that they had struggled to get people of color activities for Black students, that they had only so much of a budget and that it was a priority for them to recruit and retain Black students. I never stopped to think of how much more likely Asians are to go to college than Blacks. Instead, I was just pissed. I made demands such as asking them to change the name of a Black organization to something having to do with people of color so I could feel included instead of "tokenized." Again, Black people had to patiently explain to me why it was important to have an organization for Black people but that I was welcome to participate. I wanted to be co-editor of a Black campus magazine, feeling I had "earned" this responsibility because of all of my involvement. I would meet with white administrators demanding to know why they did not fund Asian American oriented programs as much as they did Black programs. I would accuse the white administrators of being racist towards Asian Americans and demand that some of the budget for minority student affairs reflect "all people of color." Later, I set off to "find" my Asian American identity, beginning my own organization on campus and demanding classes be taught to reflect “my experience.” I stopped supporting some of the Black student events, resentful because I felt "used" and "overlooked" by those I had shown support for. And all along, it was Black students who supported me and showed up to my events. Some even nominated me for a Martin Luther King Jr. Award my senior year and the Black student organization gave me a student leadership award at their Black baccalaureate ceremony. At the ceremony, they did not present me with a Kente cloth, as is traditionally done with Black graduates. During the planning stages of the event I had made sure to remind them, "I'm Asian, not Black!" And so to accommodate me, they had gone to great lengths to buy me a Korean flag. It has been almost seven years since I graduated from undergrad. But the ~~fucked~~ [messed]-up tendencies I showed were not isolated to my early college years. Nor were they isolated to me. As I became more involved in racial politics off of college campuses, I learned more that my behavior was not just that of some immature, self-centered college student trying to find her racial and cultural identity. Indeed, I have come to understand that anti-Black racism and hostility was the means to finding myself and expressing what it meant to be an Asian American and a POC. When I got involved in Asian American activism, it was not from the vantage point of not wanting to do activism with white people. For some, that is how we get involved in POC work. We have been isolated or have isolated ourselves to working with white activists. So many POC are very hungry to be around anyone not white. For me, though, getting involved in both Asian American and POC work was really a way to escape working with Black people. Of course, POC work involved Black people here and there. But POC work was a way for me to "not be stuck" working with just Black people or getting "used" by them. It was a way for me to see myself as more "worldly" and "more cosmopolitan" than those I had dismissed as "nationalist" Black people on my college campus, long before I even really had a better understanding of what nationalism was or the variations of it. In short, POC work was a way for me to be both Asian American and "buddies" with Black people. I could soothe my conscience by saying I was not like others because I am not totally "abandoning" Black people, as is the case with most of us who find meaning in our lives by interacting with Blacks but then dump them when something better comes along. Instead, I saw myself as some sort of "bridge" between communities. I was also conducting research on Korean-Black conflict and wanted to "heal" the rift, a gesture that made me feel better. Like some weird post-1965 missionary activist, I saw myself as someone who, because of my past experiences, was some kind of innovative "border crosser." I was able to have it three ways, I could be friends with Blacks and be Asian American and be a POC. Now I did not, of course, acknowledge that I thought I was better than Black people. Instead, I wanted to "find" my true self and "expand" my horizons and others. Or at least that's what I told myself and others. I came to find that other Asians, those who had been in similar situations coming up politically, felt the same way. I remember talking to an Asian woman who told me how she "saved" her boyfriend from being Black by giving him books written by Asian Americans. Her boyfriend had been politically and socially engaging Black people and politics, but this was not his "true" identity. The woman felt the need to intervene. This story is not an isolated one, as I have met more Asian Americans who develop an affinity with Black politics and people but then jump ship when they get a chance to be with Asian Americans. Many of us, Asian American or not, have drunk from the fountain of knowledge we call Black politics only to spit the water back into the well when we are no longer thirsty. See, Asian Americans don't tend to jump ship for ethical reasons. It is certainly not an issue of feeling that they shouldn't have more power compared to, or over Blacks, or because they shouldn't have too much control in Black people's affairs. If they felt this way, they wouldn't adamantly defend Asian business owners who create business enclaves in Black neighborhoods or they wouldn't be so quick to establish Asian hip hop or spoken word collectives that tell off Black people at the same time appropriating from them. And so me, I jumped ship like the rest of them. I got involved in Asian American politics to the point where I saw myself as Asian American, read and wrote about Asian American affairs, and presented myself as Asian American at political events, college settings and social gatherings. The fucked [messed] up part of it though is that I was able to solidify my identity as both Asian American and POC by being anti-Black. My sense of myself politically was basically established by distancing myself from Blacks.

## Setter-Colonialism K

### Link—Move to Innocence

Their depiction of Asian experience fails to confront their own embodiment of settlerism. This is a settler move to innocence that reinforce the settler’s mentality and settler violence—this turns case.

Kahina 13 /Nuunja Khaina is a student and activist living in the United States who writes occasionally for Intercontinental Cry, [*Indigenous Settler? Decolonization and the Politics of Exile*](https://intercontinentalcry.org/indigenous-settler-decolonization-and-the-politics-of-exile/), <https://intercontinentalcry.org/indigenous-settler-decolonization-and-the-politics-of-exile/>

Settlers of color, like their white counterparts, engage in the oppression of Indigenous peoples. Even the successes of people of color in the United States or Canada – such as assimilating into dominant capitalist structures, as CEOs or other executives – happen at the expense of American Indians by further entrenching settler colonialism. Instead of working to attain ‘success’ by joining and normalizing dominant settler society, people of color must work towards justice through [decolonization](http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/18630) and reflect on their own status in a settler colony built on violence against Indigenous peoples. As an Indigenous person who is not Native to the Americas but has an active consciousness of indigeneity, my situation is somewhat different from other settlers of color. The struggle I’m engaged in for my people, the Imazighen, is opposing the processes of Arab colonialism entrenched in North, yet I’m doing this work from a settler colony. I certainly didn’t choose to come to the United States, but I directly benefit from the dispossession of American Indian nations. I am able to attain an education and pursue my goals – including activism for the Amazigh nation – because I live in a ‘Western’ settler colony built on the genocide(s) of American Indian peoples. From this position, I have greater power and more opportunities for activism, such as a degree of political safety. Problematizing this relationship as both Indigenous and settler is necessary if I am going to claim any sort of “solidarity” with Indigenous nations in the Americas. Indigenous dispossession, genocide, and resistance in the Americas cannot be just convenient analogies for me to use in explaining the struggle of my own people. I have heard other Imazighen living in the United States express solidarity with American Indians, namely that our situation and struggle against colonialism is similar. We have not, unfortunately, moved beyond that discourse to question our own complicity in colonialism. The late settler colony allows certain privileges and advantages even to the North African exile: opportunities to prosper if one assimilates, to participate ‘equally’ in the destruction of Indigenous lands, and achieve material gains from Indigenous dispossession. As we consider the politics of exile – as Edward Said, for example, has [written about](http://www.dobrasvisuais.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Reflections-on-Exile.pdf) as a Palestinian-American – we must step outside ourselves to question: where are we in exile, and on whose backs? Said writes that “modern Western culture is in large part the work of exiles, émigrés, refugees” in a fascinating passage offering support for the conception of the American ‘melting pot,’ a poetic multiculturalism in a land supposedly espousing freedom and liberty for all. All, that is, except the Indigenous nations who continue to face systematic marginalization and disempowerment, colonialism and genocide. For there to be an American ‘melting pot,’ there must be an American settler state. Other diasporans, such as the Oromo scholar Asafa Jalata, have written about [promoting social justice](http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1056&context=asafa_jalata) from the position of the exile and use the language of Indigenous rights. Yet once again, there is no critical reflection of one’s own role in reproducing and supporting the settler colonial state, the state which allowed him to pursue his own fight for freedom. In many ways, I think we are simply so engaged in our own struggles that we have become unwilling to accept our own role in violent colonial processes. What does it mean if I invoke the platform of Indigenous rights to achieve justice for my people if I do nothing to fight for those whose homeland I have no right to live upon? There are clear and concrete ways in which settlers, including settlers of color and exiles, can work for justice alongside Indigenous peoples in settler colonies such as the United States. We can work for decolonization on Indigenous terms, being responsive to feedback and guidance. According to[Dakota scholar Waziyatawin](http://www.healingtheearthpress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Waziyatawin-sample.pdf), this begins with truth-telling and the recognition of our role in the destruction of Indigenous lands, sovereignty, and livelihoods. Waziyatawin herself provides many specific examples of ways in which settlers can contribute to decolonization efforts. For example one group of non-Native activists called [Unsettling Minnesota](http://unsettlingminnesota.org/) worked to raise money in order to buy back land on behalf of Dakota people. In addition, we can listen and react to the demands of Indigenous liberation movements like [Idle No More](http://decolonization.wordpress.com/2012/12/24/idlenomore-in-historical-context/).

### Link—Starting Point

The focus on the difference of the Asian experience from the White body of the 1AC literally erases the ground on which we stand – this is a move to innocence that short circuit the radical potential of the 1AC. Settlerism must be a fundamental starting point

Patel 13 /Shaista Patel, PhD candidate in Sociology and Equity Studies in Education and Women and Gender Studies @ the University of Toronto, [*Where are the Settlers of Colour?*](https://unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/2013/03/11/where-are-the-settlers-of-colour/), https://unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/tag/settlers-of-color/

The narrow moral distance that Milley discusses in her article has made me ask myself what that distance is between people of colour here and white settlers. I have often heard people of colour with left politics claim that “our relation to this land is different.” How is this difference lived differently by bodies of colour? On one hand, people like me fight for justice in the name of being Canadians. We often stand in various anti-racist rallies to claim our rights as Canadians, and some of us – especially those born here – feel offended when we are asked where we are “really” from. On the other hand, we also claim innocence. We say that we are coming from other post-colonies, and that we too are victims of direct or indirect European colonization. Even when we recognize that we are settlers, there is no sense of urgency for most of us to organize with the Indigenous peoples and nations here. I think that we not only need to question where we are coming from but more importantly, also consider the place we have come to. What does citizenship mean for racialized people in a white settler-colony? What does it mean when we demand these citizenship rights, which are rights based in white supremacy, dispossession, and genocide of Aboriginal peoples? For instance, when Muslims today (and I include myself here) write and organize against legislation like the*Anti-Terrorism Act* or against acts of racial profiling, do we look at what the*Indian Act* is still doing to continue genocide against Indigenous peoples here? Do we look at how Indigenous activists have a long history of being labelled as terrorists? Do we ask ourselves why Aboriginality and urbanity are still framed as mutually exclusive? If we think that we people of colour have a right to be here, then where do we think people of native nations belong? There are a few clarifications I would like to make here: I am not saying that we share the same power as white settlers, or that race, class, gender, and citizenship do not define where and how bodies are organized in Canada. Milley stresses the significance of white settlers mobilizing for Indigenous sovereignty in a white settler colony; I recognize that in such mobilizations the risks for people of colour are far greater than they are for white people. But we still need to discuss what our organizing against racism and colonialism looks like and carefully map out strategies for doing this work. So, what I am saying is that people like me who have the privilege of mobility, and have the resources, and whose status here is not as tenuous as that of refugees, should definitely engage in serious political action. Whether we first came to this land as freed slaves, refugees, or under the racist policies of the Immigration Act, we are all here now, and we benefit from the settlement process. We need to re-imagine and re-work our anti-racist efforts in ways that do not continue the erasure of Aboriginals. We need to stop paying mere lip-service to Indigenous sovereignty and recognize that the forces that dehumanize us as racialized people are the same forces that continue the genocide of First Peoples. We need to stop being defensive when we are told by Aboriginals or other people in or outside our activist groups that perhaps we need to be more critical of how we are working for Indigenous sovereignty in our organizing.