### 1AR K – Lawrence and Dua [1:20]

By positing slavery as the starting point of American racism, the scholarship you cite glosses over colonization of land that required genocide of indigenous peoples, **Lawrence and Dua ‘05:**

“Decolonizing Antiracism” Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua Social Justice Vol. 32. No. 4 (2005) pp 120-143 http://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/bonita-lawrence-decolonizing-anti-racs.pdf

We can see a similar erasure of colonialism and Indigenous peoples in writings on slavery. **Writers** such as Gilroy, Clifford, and others have **emphasize**d the **ways** in which the **enslavement of Africans has shaped** European discourses of modernity, European identity, and contemporary articulations of **racism.** As Toni Morrison powerfully states, “modern life begins with slavery” (cited in Gilroy, 1993b: 308). **We do not contest the importance of slavery**, but **we wonder about the claim** that **modernity began with slavery**, given the significance of colonialism and Orientalism in constructing Europe’s sense of itself as modern. Equally important, the claim that modernity began with slavery, **rather than** with **the genocide** and colonization **of Indigenous peoples** in the Americas **that preceded it**, erases Indigenous presence. The vision evoked is one in which the history of racism begins with the bringing of African peoples as slaves to what became the United States and Canada. How does such theorizing about slavery fail to address the ways in which **modes of** slavery, and the **anti-slavery** movement in the United States, **were premised on earlier and continuing modes of colonization** of Indigenous peoples? For example, **out of whose land would** the **“40 acres” be carved?** How do we account for the fact that the same week President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, he approved the order for the largest mass hanging in U.S. history, of 38 Dakota men accused of participating in an uprising in Minnesota (Cook-Lynn, 1996: 63)? Such events suggest connections between the anti-slavery movement, the ongoing theft of Indigenous land, and the forced relocation or extermination of its original inhabit­ants. There was also a **resounding silence among anti-slavery activists**, women’s suffragists, labor leaders, and ex-slaves such as Frederick Douglas concerning land theft and Indigenous genocide. Such silences **reveal an apparent consensus** among these diverse activists that the insertion of workers, white women, and blacks into U.S. (and Canadian) **nation-building was to continue** to take place **on Indigenous land**, regardless of the cost to Indigenous peoples. In short, **the relationship between** slavery, **anti-slavery, and colonialism is obscured when slavery is presented as** the **defining** moment in North American racism. Thus, critical race and postcolonial scholars have systematically excluded on­going colonization from the ways in which racism is articulated. This has erased the presence of Aboriginal peoples and their ongoing struggles for decolonization, **precluding a more sophisticated analysis of migration, diasporic identities, and** diasporic **countercultures.**

Impacts – **A.** terminal defense on your criticism – the basis of your historical claims is flawed. You incorrectly analyze social relationships behind American racism **B.** turns case – history proves your efforts further colonialism. The postcolonial approach of erasure means omission IS the problem, **Lawrence and Dua 2:**

International **critical race** and postcolonial **theory has failed to make Indigenous presence** and colonization **foundational** in five areas. First, native existence is erased through theories of race and racism that exclude them. Second, theories of Atlantic diasporic identities fail to take into account that these identities are situated in multiple projects of colonization and settlement on Indigenous lands. Third, histories of colonization are erased through writings on the history of slavery. Fourth, decolonization politics are equated with antiracist politics. Finally, theories of nationalism contribute to the ongoing delegitimiz[e]ation of Indigenous nationhood. Though often theorizing the British context, these writings have been important for shaping antiracist/postcolonial thinking throughout the West. To illustrate the ways in which critical race theorists erase the presence of Aboriginal peoples, we have chosen Stuart Hall’s essay, “The West and the Rest” (1996a). Hall introduces **a postcolonial approach** to “race,” racialized identities, and racism. For him, the emergence of “race” and racism is located in the histori­cal appearance of the constructs of “the West and the Rest.” Thus, the inhabitants of the Americas are central to the construction of notions of the West. He links the colonization of the Americas with Orientalism. Moreover, the strength of Hall’s chapter is that in elaborating a theory of “race,” he makes the connection between colonialism and knowledge production, between the historical construction of the idea of “race” and the present articulations of “race.” Despite these strengths, Hall **fails** to examine the ways in which colonialism continues for Aboriginal peoples in settler nations. Indeed, he posits colonialism as having existed in the past, only to be restructured as “postcolonial.” For example, in commenting on the last of five main phases of expansion, Hall defines “the pres­ent, when much of the world is economically dependent on the West, even when formally independent and decolonised” (Ibid.: 191). No mention is made of **parts of the world** that **have not been decolonized.** As a result, **Aboriginal peoples are relegated to a mythic past**, whereby their **contemporary existence and struggles** for decolonization are erased from view and thus **denied legitimacy.** Moreover, he fails to explore how the ongoing colonization of Aboriginal peoples shapes contemporary modes of “race” and racism in settler nations (including those in the Caribbean, where people of African and Asian descent have established political authority). Rather, the relationship between colonialism and the articulation of “race” is limited to the ways in which the colonial past is rearticulated in the present. What are the consequences of such omissions for Aboriginal peoples in settler societies and for their struggles for nationhood? How do **such omissions distort** our **understanding of** the processes of “race” and **racism**?

The alternative is to recognize the historical relationship between colonization and racism in order to foster productive dialogue, which requires reframing the discussion on indigenous terms, **Lawrence and Dua 3:**

1. Aboriginal sovereignty is a reality that is on the table. **Antiracist theorists must begin** to talk about how they are going to place antiracist agendas **within the context of sovereignty and restoration of land.** 2. Taking colonization seriously changes antiracism in powerful ways. Within academia, antiracist theorists need to begin to make **ongoing colonization [is] central to** the **construction of knowledge about race** and racism. They must learn how to write, research, and teach in ways that **account for Indigenous realities as foundational.** 3. This article has focused on antiracism theory, but the failure of antiracist activists to make the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples foundational to their agendas is also important. **Most** antiracist groups **hav**e **n**o**t** included Indigenous concerns; when they do, they employ a pluralist framework. There is a strong need to begin discussions between antiracist and Aboriginal activists on how to frame claims for antiracism in ways that do not disempower Aboriginal peoples. The aim of this article was to **facilitate dialogue between antiracism** theorists and **activists and Indigenous** scholars and **communities.** We chose to write it in one voice, rather than coming from our different perspectives (with Bonita Lawrence rooted in Indigenous perspectives, and Ena Dua in antiracism and postcolonial theory) because we sought to go beyond a pluralistic method of presenting diverse views without attempting a synthesis. For Ena, working in a collective voice meant attempting to take on Indigenous epistemological frameworks and values, a pro­cess that was difficult and incomplete. For Bonita, working in a collective voice meant viewing Indigenous concerns from within antiracism, instead of attempting to critique of it from the outside. However, because our dialogue was a critique of existing trends in postcolonial and antiracism theory, a centering of issues within Indigenous frameworks was sacrificed. As we worked within the framework of antiracism and postcolonial theory, we continually struggled over the fact that Indigenous ontological approaches to antiracism, and the relationship between Indigenous epistemologies and postcolonial theory, could not be addressed. We have learned that dialogue between antiracism theorists/activists and In­digenous scholars/communities **requires talking on Indigenous terms.** Aboriginal people may find little relevance in debating antiracism and postcolonial theory, which excludes them and lacks relevance to the ongoing crises facing Aboriginal communities. They may prefer to speak to the realities of contemporary coloniza­tion and resistance.

Even if you mitigate the links, the perm always fails – pluralism just further brushes aside the indigenous cause, **Lawrence and Dua 4:**

Equally disturbing, **when we look at the few scholars who include Aboriginal peoples** and decolonization in their theoretical frameworks, **decolonization politics are equated with antiracist** politics. Such an ontological ap­proach places decolonization and antiracism within a liberal-pluralist framework, which decenters decolonization. Frankenberg and Mani’s (1992) classic article on the possibilities and limits of postcolonial theory is an example of this. Notably, these authors attempt to analyze slavery, racialization, and identity in conjunction with colonization. Im­portantly, they acknowledge the limits of applying the term postcolonial to white settler societies. In their view, the term cannot account for the forms of antiracist and Aboriginal struggles in the United States: “the serious calling into question of white/Western dominance by the groundswell of movements of resistance, and the emergence of struggles for collective self-determination most frequently articulated in nationalist terms” (*Ibid*.: 480). For them, the term “post-civil rights” may be more applicable. “Let us emphasize that we use the term ‘post-Civil Rights’ broadly to refer to the impact of struggles by African Americans, American Indian, La Raza, and Asian-American communities,” which, they argue, collectively produce “a ‘great transformation’ of racial awareness, racial meaning, racial subjectivity” (*Ibid*.: 480–481). Frankenberg and Mani take seriously the need to bring ongoing colonization into antiracist and postcolonial theory, yet our concern is that they place decolonization struggles **within a pluralistic framework**. As a result, **decolonization struggles become one component of a larger** antiracist **struggle. Such pluralism**, while utopian in intent, **marginalizes decolonization** struggles **and continues to obscure** the complex **ways** in which **people of color have participated in projects of settlement.** In contrast, we believe ongoing **colonization** and decolonization struggles **must be foundational** in our understandings of racism, racial subjectivities, and antiracism.

### Miscellaneous

A similar ontological assumption about colonialism and Indigenous peoples exists in **theories of Atlantic diasporic identities.** Most of these works on the Ameri­cas **fail to** raise, let alone **explore**, the **ways in which such identities have been articulated through the colonization of Aboriginal peoples**, or the ways in which the project of appropriating land shaped the emergence of black/Asian/Hispanic settler formations. Paul Gilroy’s (1993: 17) influential text, *The Black Atlantic*, illustrates this. In it, Gilroy explicates two interrelated projects. The first is to rethink modernity via the history of the black Atlantic and the African diaspora, and the second is to examine the ways in which diasporic discourses have shaped the political and cultural history of black Americans and black people in Europe. However, Gilroy’s history of the black transatlantic does not make any significant reference to Indigenous peoples of the Americas or Indigenous nationhood. Similar to Hall, when Gilroy mentions Indigenous peoples or colonization, it is to locate them in the past. In one of the few references to Indigenous peoples, Gilroy states, “striving to be both European and black requires some specific forms of double consciousness.... If this appears to be little more than a roundabout way of saying that the reflexive cultures and consciousness of the European settlers and those of the Africans they enslaved, the ‘Indians’ they slaughtered, and the Asians that they indentured were not, even in situations of the most extreme brutality, sealed hermeneutically from each other, then so be it” (*Ibid*.: 2–3). Reducing Indigenous peoples to those slaughtered suggests that Indigenous people in the Americas no longer exist, renders invisible their contemporary situation and struggles, and perpetuates myths of the Americas as an empty land. In *Routes*, James Clifford (1997) extends Gilroy’s work on diasporic identi­ties. Importantly, Clifford opens up the possibilities for exploring how Indigenous leaders/theorists have shaped black counterculture and how black counterculture may be premised on a colonizing project. “For the purposes of writing a counter-history in some depth,” he suggests, “one can imagine intersecting histories.” Clifford also acknowledges the presence of Indigenous peoples and their struggle for decolonization: “Tribal or Fourth World assertions of sovereignty and ‘first nationhood’ do not feature in histories of travel and settlement, though these may be part of the Indigenous historical experience” (*Ibid*.: 252). A closer look at Clifford’s treatment of these issues is disappointing, however. Concerning how diasporic claims intersect with other histories, Clifford’s work lacks significant references to Indigenous writers, leaders, or resistance movements. Rather, he references Jewish, Islamic, and South Asian histories in the making and critique of modernity (*Ibid*.: 267). Despite the importance of Clifford’s insight that **diasporic visions** cannot be studied in isolation from one another, he **do**es **not ask how these diasporic visions**, the processes of constructing home away from home, **are premised on the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples.**

**There is also a curious ambiguity in terms of integrating issues of Indigenous sovereignty. “The claims made by peoples who have inhabited the territory since before recorded history and those who arrived by steamboat or airplane,” Clifford notes, “will be founded on very different principles” (*Ibid*.: 253). Rather than elaborate on such principles, Clifford focuses more on assertions that Aboriginal peoples are also diasporic, which leads him to raise what he sees as ambiguities in Indigenous nationhood. For example, in contrasting Indigenous and “diasporic” claims to identity, Clifford suggests that Indigenous claims are primordial. For him, Indigenous claims “stress continuity of habitation, Indigeneity, and often a ‘natural’**

**critical race** and postcolonial **theory has failed to make Indigenous presence** and colonization **foundational in five areas. First, native existence is erased through theories of race and racism that exclude them. Second, theories of Atlantic diasporic identities fail to take into account** that these **identities** are **situated in** multiple projects of colonization and **settlement on Indigenous lands. Third, histories of colonization are erased through writings on the history of slavery. Fourth, decolonization politics are equated with antiracist politics. Finally, theories of nationalism** contribute to the ongoing **delegitimiz[e]**ation of **Indigenous nationhood.** Though often theorizing the British context, these writings have been important for shaping antiracist/postcolonial thinking throughout the West.

Caribbean settled by blacks and asians